

Lucian of Samosata in the Two Hesperias
An Essay in Literary and Cultural Translation

MICHAEL O. ZAPPALA



Lucian of Samosata in the Two Hesperias

Scripta Humanistica

Directed by
BRUNO M. DAMIANI
The Catholic University of America

ADVISORY BOARD

Samuel G. Armistead
*University of California
(Davis)*

Juan Bautista Avallé-Arce
*University of California
(Santa Barbara)*

Theodore Beardsley
*The Hispanic Society of
America*

Giuseppe Bellini
Università di Milano

Giovanni Maria Bertini
Università di Torino

Heinrich Bihler
Universität Göttingen

Harold Cannon
*National Endowment
for the Humanities*

Michael G. Cooke
Yale University

Dante Della Terza
Harvard University

Frédéric Deloffre
*Université de Paris-
Sorbonne*

Hans Flasche
Universität Hamburg

Robert J. DiPietro
University of Delaware

Giovanni Fallani
Musei Vaticani

John E. Keller
University of Kentucky

Richard Kinkade
University of Arizona

Myron I. Lichtblau
Syracuse University

Juan M. Lope Blanch
*Universidad Nacional
Autónoma de México*

Louis Mackey
*The University of Texas
at Austin*

Leland R. Phelps
Duke University

Martín de Riquer
Real Academia Española

John K. Walsh
(Berkeley)

MICHAEL O. ZAPPALA

Lucian of Samosata in the Two Hesperias
An Essay in Literary and Cultural Translation

Scripta Humanistica

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Zappala, Michael, 1948-

Lucian of Samosata in the Two Hesperias : an essay in literary and cultural translation / by Michael Zappala.

p. cm. -- (Scripta Humanistica ; 65)

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 0-916379-71-X : \$49.50

1. Lucian, of Samosata--Appreciation--Spain. 2. Lucian, of Samosata--Influence. 3. Spanish literature--Classical period, 1500-1700--History and criticism. 4. Spanish literature--Greek influences. 5. Satire, Latin--History and criticism. 6. Satire, Spanish--History and criticism. 7. Humanists--Spain. I. Title. II. Series: Scripta Humanistica (Series) ; 65.

PA4236.Z18 1990

860.9'003--dc20

89-70324

CIP

Publisher and Distributor:
SCRIPTA HUMANISTICA
1383 Kersey Lane
Potomac, Maryland 20854 U.S.A.

• SCRIPTA HUMANISTICA

Printed in the United States of America

For my wife, Nancy, without whom

". . . nothing rises into the bright coasts of light,
nor waxes glad nor lovely."

Lucretius

This page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
I	11
Lucian, Classical Paideia, the Fathers and Byzantium	
II	32
The Hermeneutical Path and the Images of Lucian in Italy	
III	52
Lucian, Hellenism and Pro-Reform Literature	
IV	63
Lucian, Hellenism and the Reform (Part II)	
V	82
Byzantium, Hellenism and Lucian in Fifteenth-Century Spain	
VI	109
Hellenism and Lucian in Sixteenth-Century Spain	
VII	144
The Lucian of the Quattrocento and Cinquecento in Spain	
VIII	167
Images of Lucian in Golden Age Spain: The Moral Philosopher	

IX	191
Lucian as Moral Philosopher: The Second Period (1560-1600)	
X	203
Lucian as Moral Philosopher: The Third Period (1600-1680)	
XI	213
Lucian as Atheist	
XII	221
Lucian, Fantastic Literature and Subjectivism	
XIII	234
Lucian and Golden Age Historiography	
XIV	243
Lucian as Authority on Style	
XV	251
Conclusion	
Notes	256
Bibliography	305
Index	357

Preface

First and foremost, I would like to remember the invaluable help of the late Raimundo Lida who guided me through the first draft of this book, and who will always be for me, as Gracián might have phrased it, "El Maestro." I would also like to thank the staff of the many libraries, the Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid, the Biblioteca de El Escorial, the Library of Congress of the United States, who in so many ways facilitated the investigations which are presented in this essay. I would like to register here as well my thanks to Dr. Bravo García of the Classics Department of the Universidad Complutense for his help and encouragement in my investigations into the *fondos* of the Biblioteca Nacional.

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

The importance of the place of Lucian of Samosata in the letters of the Spanish Golden Age has long been recognized by authorities such as Menéndez Pelayo, Amezcúa and María Rosa Lida. The call for a comprehensive study of that influence has been equally well documented by O. Green and J. K. Demetrius.¹ Demetrius' pertinent question—"How many books do our libraries contain which can provide us with immediate information on Homer's influence and position in Spain, or for that matter, Hesiod's or Lucian's?" (*Greek Scholarship*, 7)—has still not received, in the case of the Sophist from Samosata, an adequate response. In spite of several short and now outdated works of Förster, Apraiz, Caccia, Viñas Mey,² and the more recent and substantial investigations of Vives Coll, Robinson and Mattioli which merit a closer look, a comprehensive study on the works of Lucian and their contribution to Golden Age literature is still to be realized.³

Spanish critics of the influence of the Syrian have concentrated principally on their own literature, and have overlooked for the most part the cumulative and interrelated lines of influence of the works of this popular author, "fra gli autori greci . . . il prosatore più letto" (Mattioli, "Pico e Poliziano," 189) in Byzantium and in the Italy of the Quattrocento and the Cinquecento. Without considering what Lucian meant to the Byzantines and the Italian Humanists, it is difficult to understand the contradictory images of the Sophist in the literature of the Golden Age.

Vives Coll's *Luciano de Samosata en España*, the most detailed exposition of the satirist's presence in Golden Age letters, evidences how excising Lucian from this past results in partial or inaccurate evaluations. Vives Coll establishes the fact of indebtedness of a number of Spanish authors of the Golden Age to Lucian. He does not, however, situate or explain these appropriations in the context of the history of rhetoric or of the ideological or stylistic polemics of the period. While he notes, for example, that a passage of the pseudo-Lucian *Cynicus* appears in John Chrysostom's *Homiliae in Joannem*, he does not relate the presence of this text in the work of a Father to the wholesale absorption of the rhetoric of the Second Sophistic by John Chrysostom and his fellow Cappadocians. Nor does he relate questions concerning the absorption of *paideia* (Clement of Alexandria, Jerome, Tertullian)⁴ to a similarly problematical expansion of culture in the Spanish Golden Age. When Hortensio Félix Paravicino draws

on Lucian's *Toxaris* in his "Sermón de la Circuncisión" for his reference to the blood-rites of friendship, or when Fray Lorenzo de Ayala mines a *Dialogus Deorum* for its mention of the Arcadians in his funeral oration on the death of Philip II,⁵ the presence of Lucian supposes the view of the Syrian as moral philosopher, the heritage of the Italian Quattrocento. It also supposes a knowledge of Thomas More's reference in the preface to his translations of Lucian to Chrysostom's use of the *Cynicus*.

In evaluating the numerous translations made by Spaniards of Lucian's works in the Golden Age, Vives Coll again gives the reader little sense of the varied nature of these versions and the different backgrounds of the translators. Angel Cornejo's Castilian *Toxaris*, for example, is made from an intermediary Latin version and belongs to the tradition of Cistercian writings on the charism of spiritual friendship (Bernard, Aelred). Andrés Laguna's translation from the Greek of the difficult *Tragodopodagra*, on the other hand, is a philological tour de force unique among Spanish translations as a mirror of Italian taste of the Cinquecento rather than the moralizing "Lucianesimo" of the Quattrocento.⁶ The Latin *De Dea Syria* of the Portuguese Humanist, Jorge Coelho, while it does not communicate the parody of the original, does reflect the interest in comparative religion present in a special way in the Portuguese court of his day. Vives Coll's treatment of the Spanish translators is also marred by a tendency to evaluate their work on a scale of *fidus/non fidus*, rather than to identify the cultural keys which govern the reinterpretation of the original Greek.

Vives Coll's evaluation of the Lucianic imitations by Golden Age authors is qualified by an overly restrictive focus. He seeks the Classical Lucian in Golden Age texts rather than the "philosophical" satirist bequeathed to Spain by Italy and Byzantium. Lucian had been moralized by the translators of the period, and in one case had been glossed allegorically to accommodate his thought to Catholic doctrine.⁷ Cervantes's use of Lucian's *Icaromenippus* alongside Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* in the Clavileño episode of the *Quijote*, or the wedding of Lucian and Horace in *El Crotalón* make the search for an original Lucian somewhat unilluminating.

In fact, Lucian's satire rarely furnishes a direct and exclusive model for Golden Age works. More often it is alloyed to other genres of didactic literature popular in the age. Vives Coll, for example, does establish the Lucianic affiliation of Gutierre de Cetina's *Mosca*, but does not comment on the etiological fable and the Hexaëmeral topic of "el hombre desprovisto" which situate the work in the line of the Quattrocento Lucianists Alberti and Collenuccio. Also, while it is true, as Vives Coll states, that the contrast of

Providence with human malfeasance in *El Crotalón* is a reflection of the popular "philosophical dialogues" of Lucian in Golden Age literature, this critic overlooks Mateo Alemán's use of the cosmological myths of the *Momus* of Leon Battista Alberti, a Lucianic satire of the mid-fifteenth century reprinted in Madrid in Spanish translation a year before the appearance of the *Guzmán de Alfarache*.

Vives Coll's articles evidence similar lacunae. In his "Algunos contactos entre Luciano de Samosata y Quevedo," he confirms the traditional title of Quevedo as "Luciano español" by identifying the source in Lucian of several passages of the *Sueños*. Yet from the point of narration, Quevedo's mordent invective has little in common with Lucian's essentially rational presentation of individual perceptions. The desperate *exclamatio* of anonymous figures dangling on the author's puppet strings has little place in Lucian's dialogue. In fact, Cervantes, or Villalobos or the Valdés brothers are, from a point of view of narrative, far more likely candidates for the epithet usually applied to Quevedo.

If Lucian's fortunes in Spain can only be adequately appraised in the light of the long history outside of Spain from the period of the Church Fathers to the Reformation, his impact on European letters cannot at all points be gauged with accuracy if Spain, especially the far-reaching Spain of Charles V and Philip II, is left out of the picture as a "unique" case.⁸

Christopher Robinson's *Lucian and his Influence in Europe*, while admirable for its illuminating analysis of the diverse fortunes of different themes in Lucian's opus, falls into several not very useful distinctions (a "Northern" and "Southern" Lucian, a "pre-Erasmist" and "Erasmist" Lucian). These dichotomies arise in part from the inadequate attention paid to the history of Lucian in Spain and Italy. It is odd that Gualdo Rosa, in an otherwise comprehensive review of the work, did not mention the consequences of Robinson's apocoped Europe. His view, for example, that the Quattrocento was "an age in which Lucian was seen as the expounder of ancient philosophy and the critic of a discredited religion, rather than as a frivolous denigrator of the very principle of religious and philosophical thought" (84), is at odds with Valla's use of Lactantius' description of Lucian to describe himself. It is unlikely that Poggio Bracciolini would have branded Valla as *subsannator*, or that Erasmus would have penned his long defense of Valla in his edition of the *Annotationes*, if Valla's appropriation of Lucian's fame had been a trivial matter. Robinson's single image of the Syrian creates the difficulty of explaining "how the shift from this picture of Lucian as second Cato to one of him as mocking sceptic took place" (96). In fact, there was no shift. The

double and contradictory image of the Syrian sophist as moral philosopher but also atheist runs throughout the Quattrocento.

His study could also have gained by avoiding the dichotomy of a Northern and Southern Lucian of clearly contrasting fortunes, a map Mansfield avoids in his study of Erasmus (*Phoenix*, 78). Luther was no more fond of Lucian than the Spanish monks gathered in Valladolid in 1527 to condemn Erasmus. Yet Melancthon and Jacobus Micyllus translate Lucian in Protestant Europe, even as Coelho, Jarava and Niccolò da Lonigo translate him in Catholic Europe.

Nor is there a chronological line delimiting a pre-1550 Lucian from a post-1550 Lucian. Robinson's comment, for example, that only during the second half of the sixteenth century did opposition to Lucian by religious authorities become manifest needs correction. Even after the watershed decade of the 1550's, the opposition to Lucian was not total. In Catholic Europe, while most of the polemical, Erasmist satire modelled on Lucian was proscribed in the *Indices*, in fact, only Lucian's *De Morte Peregrini* and the pseudo-Lucianic *Philopatris*, a work even then known by the editors of Lucian to be apocryphal, were prohibited. Lucian continued to be read as a school author, appeared on the *ratio studiorum* of the Jesuits, and was occasionally staged, as he had been in the Quattrocento.

Among Protestant reformers, whether Northern or Southern, there are similar contradictions. In spite of Luther's fulminations against the Syrian Momus, the dialogues of Lucian acquire Evangelical trappings, most notably in Curione's Pasquinades. Later, Bruno will frame his indictment of the inquisition with a reference to *Necyomanteia* (*Spaccio in Dialoghi*, 631).⁹

Robinson also somewhat overstates the eclipse of Lucian's fortunes in Catholic Europe after the 1520's. The activity of Spanish and Portuguese translators of Lucian (Coelho, Laguna, Jarava, Herrera Maldonado), the publication of Niccolò da Lonigo's popular *Dialoghi piacevoli* and the other editions of Lucian published in Italy in the Cinquecento, attest to the continuing interest in him by Italian and Spanish Humanists of the 1500's.¹⁰ This same overly schematic view of North and South informs Robinson's remark that Lucian's anti-Christian label was characteristic of his fame in Northern Europe, whereas, in fact, it was in Southern Europe that Lactantius' description of Lucian as an author who spared neither gods nor men is used by Poggio Bracciolini to brand Valla as irreverent. At the end of that same century, Il Galateo will reiterate the same image. In the early sixteenth century, Ponticus Virunius in the prologue to his small anthology of Lucian (Bologna, 1503) will counter the vitriolic

diatribe of the *Suda Lexicon*.¹¹ And it is in Southern Europe, again, that certain factions of the Catholic Church move against Hellenism: "qui graecizabant, Lutheranzabant" was not coined in Northern Europe.

A more serious matter is Robinson's parenthesizing of nearly the entire corpus of Lucianic imitations and translations in Spain. He mentions only a few Lucianic imitations such as *El Crotalón*, *El diálogo de las transformaciones de Pitágoras* and the dialogues of Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola. These omissions explain Robinson's "surprise" that "it comes as perhaps more of a shock to learn that one of the most remarkable and sustainedly Lucianic works of the century was written in Spain around 1552. This is *El Crotalón*" (121). In fact, it is precisely in the decade of the 1550's in Spain, the decade of a particularly intense cultivation of Lucian, that one would expect to find an imitation such as *El Crotalón: the Luciani Dialogi* (1551), Alberti's *Momus* in Spanish translation (1553), the *Viaje de Turquía*, the *Lazarillo de Tormes* (1554), and the *De Militaris Gloriae Palma* of the Rocaberti brothers appear in that decade.

The literary geography of Robinson's Europe also leads him to conclude that the *Dialogus Mortuorum* was the last Lucianic genre to establish itself, and that in "the sixteenth century examples are relatively rare" (144). This assertion parenthesizes Alfonso de Valdés's *Mercurio y Carón* and Vives's *De Dissidiis Europae*, the first in a long line of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century *Dialogi Mortuorum*. Some of these pieces, like *Los tres de la fama: junta de muertos y desengaño de vivos*, or the *Plá junta en el Panteón del Escorial*, are published (in *Curiosidades bibliográficas*, 551-556). Others, such as the *Decisión de Apolo en la pretención de mayor alabanza entre los dos validos de las mayores potencias de Europa*, are still in manuscript (BN MS 10838, ff. 84-101).¹² In the case of Francisco de Ojeda, the tradition of the *Dialogi Mortuorum* influences his recasting of the *Purgatorio de San Patricio* into a colloquy of the dead peopled by the narrator-protagonist, "don Juan de Aragón y otros conocidos suyos" (BN MS 10825).

In fact, attention to the Spanish *Dialogi Mortuorum* and of the Spanish authors' indebtedness to Pontano, Valla and Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini would have done much to fill in the only obvious flaw of Robinson's study: the omission of the anti-clerical and polemical literature modelled after Lucian in the Quattrocento, much of which was cast as underworld dialogues.

Finally, the exclusion of Spain from Robinson's study is unfortunate for the history of the picaresque novel. In view of the impact of Spanish picaresque literature on prose fiction in the rest of

Europe, a consideration of the presence of Lucian's works in the *Lazarillo de Tormes*, in the *Guzmán de Alfarache* and in Cervantes's *Licenciado Vidriera* is necessary to complete Robinson's study of the Atticist's contribution to Renaissance letters.

Louis Andrew Murillo in his study of the prose dialogue in sixteenth century Spain falls, like Robinson, into a polarity between the Platonic-Ciceronian or "Italian" dialogue, and the "Erasmist," Lucianic, "dramatic" dialogue of lively characterization ("Spanish Prose Dialogue," 21-22). This distinction fails to account for either the numerous imitations of Lucian's dialogues in the Quattrocento, from Lauro Quirini's *Dialogus* to the *Eremita* of Il Galateo, or for the presence of Lucian's dramatic technique in the so-called philosophical dialogues of the period. This polarity also overlooks the dramatic performances of Lucian's pieces throughout Europe in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Scattered notices—a performance of Lucian in Bruges in 1487, the dramatic presentation of *Vitarum Auctio* recorded by Marsilio Ficino in the mid-fifteenth century—¹³ indicate that the Quattrocento was quite familiar with the dramatic dialogue. It is difficult to understand, in fact, Erasmus' *Colloquia* or the works of the Spanish Erasmists apart from the satire of Pontano and Alberti.

The distinction between philosophical and dramatic dialogue also tends to skew Murillo's evaluation of literary documents. While his exclusive focus on the argumentation of Lucena's *De Vita Beata* ("Spanish Prose Dialogue," 28) supports his view of the work as a "philosophical" dialogue, it does not do justice to the sport, the literary irony, the presence of the author as actor, all of which situate the treatise in the line of Lucianic satire as it was written in Quattrocento Italy. Why, for example, mention the presence of the hidden secretary in Juan de Valdés's *Diálogo de la lengua* as example of the creation of autonomous characters and forego mention of the same phenomenon at the end of *Vita Beata*?

Two other works treat neighboring areas of the questions of Lucian in Spain, Marcel Bataillon's *Erasmus y España* and Emilio Mattioli's *Luciano e l'umanesimo*, but do not illuminate the area of our study. In view of Lucian's fundamental importance in Erasmus, there are surprisingly few references to the Greek satirist in Bataillon's otherwise exhaustively documented essay. In beginning his study with the Alcalá of Cisneros, Bataillon documents what can be called the middle chapter of the story of Lucian in the Renaissance. He does not consider the transmission of images of Lucian or the polemicization of the Atticist in the Quattrocento, or the continued reading of the Syrian after the eclipse of Erasmus. In fact, the accusations incurred by Erasmus for his associations with Lucian were the result of the underlying and unresolved contradiction of Lucian's

images in Italy in the 1400's. Rooted in the far larger issue of the contradictory attitudes of the Fathers to Classical paideia, this ambivalence in regard to Lucian had been carried over into Byzantium, from there transmitted to Italy, and from the cradle of Humanism north to Germany and West to Spain.

Mattioli's *Luciano e l'umanesimo* is a particularly well-founded treatment of the "first chapter" of the Quattrocento Humanists, but his study might have been titled with greater accuracy to reflect its focus. There is no appreciation of the intense interaction of Spanish and Italian cultures in the 1400's or of the historical trends of that century which made the imitation of Lucian such a polemical issue in the Golden Age.

As is the case with Robinson's study, the organization of Mattioli's work tends to obscure the ideological context of Lucian's influence. While, for example, his treatment of the rediscovery of Lucian and the "Lucianesimo" of Alberti and Pontano are particularly compelling, the categories ("Lucianesimo libellistico," "curiosità erudita") tend to restrict his evaluation. The importance of Lapo's comment, for example, in the introduction to his translation of the *De Longaevitas*—Barbarians, he writes, live longer than do civilized peoples because they live according to nature—with its inverted civilization/barbarism antithesis is not illuminated by Mattioli's comment that the value of the version is "esclusivamente documentario." This cultural inversion, present in Lucian's treatment of the Scythian and the Greek in *Toxaris*, formed part of the extensive anti-court literature of the period, and will later figure prominently in Guevara's "Villano del Danubio." Nor does Mattioli's label of "curiosità erudita" explain the pessimistic discourse of Maffeo Vegio's *Veritas et Philaethes*. The search for inner peace in Vegio's dialogue, the disenchantment with political and religious institutions and the social criticism of the speaker, Veritas, look forward to the difficult quest for peace in Vives's *De Dissidiis Europae* or Erasmus' *Querela Pacis*. Even Lucian's most playful exercises in adoxography, such as the *Iudicium Vocalium* or the *Musca*, can be rewritten and integrated into serious debate on contemporary issues. While *Iudicium* can be used exclusively for its philological information—Alvar Gómez de Castro mentions it, for example, in a discussion on the Greek Alphabet (BN MS 7896, 329)—, it can also be quoted, as Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim does, as an example of a critique of philosophy. For the Pyrrhonist, the struggle between the Sigma and the Tau demonstrates the minuscule level on which discord can operate.¹⁴ *Musca* is used for political commentary,¹⁵ or rewritten in Alberti's version of the piece in the tradition of the Hexaëmera. The conflict between elephant and flea can even signal, in Erasmus' *De*

libero arbitrio, the polemical engagement among unequals (O'Rourke Boyle, *Rhetoric and Reform*, 1-4).

Finally, David Marsh's study, *The Quattrocento Dialogue: Classical Tradition and Humanist Innovation*, is of interest for its genial insight that among the different dialogue traditions of that period, it is the Lucianic dialogue tradition which "inspired Quattrocento Humanists to comprise their most novel kinds of dialogues" (7). Marsh does not, however, develop this insight in his essay.

After the works of Mattioli, Bataillon, Vives Coll, Murillo, Marsh and Robinson, a great deal remains to be done. The adequate documentation of the vast, uneven and varied influence of Lucian on Golden Age literature has not previously been done. The traditional parsing of a canon of works already held to be in some sense "Lucianic" closes the question of the Syrian's influence rather than opens it. Most studies review the same authors (Alfonso de Valdés, Cristóbal de Villalón, Andrés Laguna, Bartolomé Leonardo de Argensola, Quevedo, Mateo Alemán) whose widely differing texts are collected under the "Lucianic" label. Lucian's influence in Spain is clearly more comprehensive than this canon. From the appearance of Lucian's *Dialogus Mortuorum XII* in the mid-fifteenth century to the works of Bances Candamo, few authors in Spain do not in some way pay homage to the varied opus of the Sophist of Samosata. In Golden Age literature, it is often the passing reference to the Greek Sophist that reveals the different and at times contradictory images of the Syrian which coexisted in the culture of that period.

Previous studies of the history of Lucian's influence on the literary and intellectual culture of the Spanish Golden Age have not related his place in Spain to his history in the rest of Europe or to the even larger question of the problems inherent in the rebirth of Hellenism in Latin Europe. Lucian's *translatio* across the two Hesperias has an historical coherence which, in the case of Spain, has not yet been studied.¹⁶ Lucena's comment to Alonso de Cartagena in his *De Vita Beata* on the cultural translation of philosophy ("nascio en Grecia . . . Pithágoras la sembró por Italia. Tú trasplántasla en España. ¡Beata ella, felice Castilla!" [Paz y Meliá, *Opúsculos*, 112-113]) could be applied to the fortune of Lucian's texts as well. This lacuna can be explained in part by the fact that many of the translations and imitations are in Latin, and that this great body of imaginative literature until recently has attracted few scholars of vernacular literature (Curtius, Bolgar, Highet).

The goal of the present essay is to evaluate the reactions and problems arising with translation—in its broadest sense of "hermeneutical motion" (Steiner, *After Babel*, esp. 296-413)—of

Lucian's works, and to study the Syrian's situation, as Gertrude Stein said of St. Teresa, "half in [Spain] and half out out of doors [Europe]." The complete story of Renaissance attitudes toward Lucian also requires consideration of a number of valuable sources of information previously unmined: the extensive *parerga* of the *Opera Omnia* of Lucian in the editions of Micyllus, Cognatus and Bourdelotius, all of which were available in Spain, the Lucian of the proverb collections, the numerous *Vitae Luciani*, and the copious and informative notes of Alvar Gómez de Castro.

The first thing revealed by a study of the texts of Lucian in the Italian Renaissance and the Spanish Golden Age is that the influence of this widely read author (Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought*, 29) has no single image or profile. The process of dissemination of Lucian's works is largely contingent on translation into Latin or the vernacular. The hermeneutical spiral evolving from these versions spins out a great many texts and reading publics. Lucian was read in the original by a tiny elite of Hellenists. The only Greek Lucian widely read were small excerpts in school editions, the selection of which was determined by contemporary ideals of propriety. The Latin Lucian of the Quattrocento and Erasmus, More and Micyllus had, of course, a much larger public. Yet these Latin Lucians by no means presented a single image of the Sophist. For More and Erasmus, his works exemplified moral eloquence. For Melanchthon and some of the German translators of the *Opera Omnia* of 1538, Lucian formed part of an agenda of radical religious reform. For Juan Francisco Mas, Lucian's works are part of a pedagogical program. Vernacular translations of a limited number of Lucian's works had the largest reading public of the period. These versions, like the Latin Lucians, are mediated readings, "translated" towards the culture of the author of the version.

In addition to the progressive modification of Lucian's works through translation, the variety of subject matter of the eighty-odd pieces of the Renaissance Lucian reinforced the multiple image of the Syrian: Renaissance writers of fantasy and travel romances, historiographers, philologists, antiquarians, comparative anthropologists, homilists all read Lucian, but, according to their reading interests, read different groups of his works. Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writers and readers, then, thought of Lucian in many different, specific and at times inconsistent ways.

The tendency present in the sixteenth century and today to ally Lucian to Humanist, or Protestant, or progressive movements does not reflect the history of Lucian's influence in the Renaissance. The crisscross of Protestant and Catholic Lucianists seriously qualifies this view. Melanchthon and Von Hutten, molding the ironic, detached

works of Lucian to their partisan purposes, saw his satire as a powerful tool for reform, as did Erasmus, the Valdés brothers or Andrés Laguna. Other writers, like Luther or López de Zúñiga, alarmed by what they accurately perceived as the "open" dialogue of this *subsannator*, saw only a subversive skepticism in the Syrian's work. Perhaps the only valid dichotomy of friends and enemies of Lucian in this period is a division into "open" enthusiasts, and pessimists given to "closure" or codification.

The present study is an attempt to present the multiple images of Lucian in the continuum of literary cultures from the Fathers to the authors of the Golden Age. In the case of the "middle chapter," the Quattrocento, I have centered the study on the pre-reform line of Italian Humanism, since it has not been studied in either Bataillon and Robinson, and overly limited in Mattioli.

Chapter I

Lucian, Classical Paideia, the Fathers and Byzantium

The Spanish Erasmists thought of Lucian as a moral philosopher. They paid homage to the moralized Lucian of the Quattrocento Humanists and Erasmus by editing him (Francisco de Vergara), translating him (Jorge Coelho, Andrés Laguna, Angel Cornejo, Francisco de Herrera Maldonado), imitating him (Alfonso de Valdés, Cristóbal de Villalón, Cervantes), or patronizing his translations (Tomás de Villanueva). This varied activity constitutes an extended gloss to Erasmus' text, "a Luciano nihil fere triviale solet proficisci" (*Luciani Dialogi*, ed. Robinson, 366). Yet when Lucian appears in the anti-Erasmist tracts of Sepúlveda and Alberto Pio, it is as a term of invective. The Syrian's detractors appropriate Lactantius' description of him as a mocker "qui diis et hominibus non pepercit" (*Divinarum Institutionum*, 1,9,8).¹

These conflicting views of Lucian as moralist and scoffer arise in part from the variety of Lucian's works, and are among his divergent images present in the literature of the Quattrocento and later in the Spanish Golden Age. The varied, even contradictory images of Lucian as moral philosopher, impious mocker, historiographer—even model for hagiographers—, writer of fantasy, Attic stylist and philological commentator, reflect both Lucian's cultivation of numerous genres and a long heritage which had shaped and refashioned the literary opinion of the works of the itinerant word-crafter.

As early as Aurispa's letter at the beginning of the fifteenth century, Lucian is praised for his "rerum varietate" (Aurispa, *Carteggio*, 2:407). Later, the printer of an anthology of the Syrian's works (Paris, 1515), recommends them to a variety of reading publics ("Tu quicumque sis, sive orator, sive artista, physicus, jurista aut theologus").² In the Amsterdam *Opera Omnia* of 1743, Lucian is described as "grammaticum, rhetorem, advocatum, medicum, historicum, philosophum, poetam, politicum" (1:xlvi). Later, Andrés Bello will refer to the "extremada variedad" of Lucian's works (*Literaturas de Grecia y Roma*, 86-87) and Wieland will call the Syrian "the most varied genius that has ever existed." This view of the range and variety of Lucian's works and reading publics has since been lost. Except for Menéndez Pelayo (*Estudios*, 5:329-331), most prominent Hispanists of this century (M. R. Lida, Morreale, Green) mention Lucian only as a satirist of mores. As Paul-Henry Michel

writes, the influence of Lucian on the spirit of Humanism is a "vaste sujet qui n'a pas encore été traité avec l'ampleur qui'il mérite" (*Pensée de Leon Battista Alberti*, 7-8).

The most important divergence of images, the atheist mocker and the moral philosopher, is present in Byzantium (Photius vs. the *Suda Lexicon*), the Quattrocento (Guarino da Verona vs. Poggio Bracciolini) and the sixteenth century (Erasmus vs. Luther, Ginés de Sepúlveda vs. Alfonso de Valdés). This division of opinion is rooted in the conflicting attitudes of the early Christian writers to the rhetorical and philosophical inheritance of Classical Antiquity. Paul frames the rejection of rhetorical and philosophical inheritances in 1 Cor 2:4 where he contrasts the Spirit and the technical reasoning of philosophy.³ Later, Tertullian states the philosophical objection in his famous "Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis?" (*De Praescriptione Haereticorum*, 7), and Jerome in his famous dream vision, later moderated (Epist. 85), frames the relationship of pagan rhetoric and Christian culture as an alternative of *Christianus* or *Ciceronianus* (Epist. 22). Jerome's view will echo in the antithetical formulae (*veritas/fucus, piscatores/oratores, ficta/vera, falsa/vera, sapientia/elocuentia*) of the Christian polemic against rhetoric.

While some writings (the *Didascalia Apostolorum*) enjoin the Christian reader to eschew the "gentiles libros," other Christian authors, such as Clement of Alexandria, advocate a prudent assimilation of Classical culture (Daniélou, *Gospel Message*, 60). For Clement, certain precepts of Greco-Roman philosophy had been communicated to man by the angels and prepared the way for Christianity. For Justin, this assimilation honored a supposed Greek debt to Hebrew culture, even when that source of wisdom had been misinterpreted.⁴ Augustine's stance (*De Doctrina Christiana*, 2, 40, 60) is typical of the moderate view: Christians leaving paganism, like the Jews coming out of Egypt, must relinquish the bad and taking the good turn it "ad usum meliorem." Basil also advocates a prudent assimilation in his image of the Christian bee at work in the garden of pagan letters (*PG*, 31:569). This line of selective appropriation will later be carried forward by Erasmus and Budaeus.

The earliest mention of Lucian exemplifies his complex place in the culture of Antiquity. In discussing the myths of the pagans, Lactantius mentions Lucian as a writer who "spared neither gods nor men." This phrase, excerpted from its context, will be used repeatedly as a criticism of Lucian by Golden Age authors such as Vives and Hernán Núñez. The original reference to these myths, ridiculous enough to pass for satire, points to a significant contact between Lucian's mocking of Olympus and the diatribes of the Christian apologists. Both apologists and Lucian satirize the myths

of the poets and the contradictions of the schools of philosophy. The criticism of the anthropomorphic deities in Lucian's *Dialogi Deorum*, for example, recalls passages of Lucian's fellow Syrian, Tatian (*Oratio ad Graecos*, 8-11), Arnobius (*Adversus Nationes*, I, 28, 34; III, 25-27; IV, 26-28), or Athanasius (*Contra Gentes*, 9-13). Jupiter's and Apollo's foibles were a frequent source of humor in Lucian (*Jupiter Tragoedus*, 1, *Dialogus Deorum*, 16, 1) as well as in pseudo-Justin (*Oratio ad Graecos*, 2) and Firmicus Maternus (*De Errore Profanarum Religionum*, 12, 1-2).

The review of philosophies in Lucian's *Hermotimus* and *Auctio Vitarum* echoes in the review of creeds in Justin (*Dialogus cum Tryphone*, 2), Tatian (*Oratio ad Graecos*, 2-3), and Gregory of Nazianzus (*Contra Julianum*, I). Repeating a basic objection to the plethora of philosophies stated in Lucian (*Hermotimus*, 14)—"At all events," Lucian's mouthpiece, Lycinus, says, "one of their systems, I suppose, is true. They can't all be true if they differ" (*Works*, 6:287)—, Arnobius writes: "Unless we are mistaken, this difference of opinions is a sign of persons who know nothing about the Truth" (3, 37). Arnobius extends this criticism to the "uncertain and conflicting notions" of poetic myths as well (3, 42).⁵ One of these philosophers, Alexander of Abonuteichus, will appear as a figure of satire both in Lucian (*Alexander*) and in Athenagoras (*Legatio*, 26).

The extensive review of pagan schools of thought in Justin's *Dialogus cum Tryphone* (2) answers Lucian's injunction (*Hermotimus*, 46) that all schools of philosophy be systematically studied as a preparation for discerning the truth. Lucian, more interested in comic banter than philosophy, discards the search as impossible. His Lycinus will limit his advice to "keep sober and remember to disbelieve," whereas Justin claims to have realized the survey proposed by Lucian and to have found the truth.⁶

While the Greek and Latin Fathers did not attempt to rehabilitate Lucian, syncretists of following ages, Byzantine scholiasts, Quattrocento Humanists, Erasmus and his followers in Spain, comment similarities of genre or theme, and relate Christian apology and Lucian's satire. The nineteenth-century student of religion, Kestner, will argue that Lucian was converted to Christianity after reading Tatian, and that the "serious" *Charon* or *Icaromenippus* belong to a crypto-Christian phase after his supposed conversion (Freppel, *Apologistes*, 55-94). Volaterranus images this view in reverse in referring to Lucian's supposed apostasy.

Despite this Classical-Christian syncretism, Lucian's "negative rationalism" (Chadwick, *Early Christian Thought*, 20) is clearly at odds with the world view of the apologists and the purpose of their satire. Athanasius, for example, does not stop at scoffing at Zeus,

but considers his violations of Semele, Leda or Artemis, and asks "who would not mock *and condemn him to death?*" (*Contra Gentes*, 12). For Athanasius, the immorality of the gods is an infraction of an immutable law. For Lucian, the "sophist's sophist" (Anderson, "Lucian," 61), the pagan myths, like his other material, have no fixed meaning and are varied to suit divergent contexts (*Lucian: Theme and Variation*, 1-22).

The satire of the apologists, at the service of a specific agenda, is closer to Renaissance works supposedly modelled on Lucian than to the Syrian's disinterested scoffing. Alfonso de Valdés's defense of the foreign policy of Charles V, or Erasmus' defense of his *philosophia Christi* confirms a specific program.

Lucian and the Greek Fathers

The university town of Athens in the fourth century was where the Second Sophistic penetrated the Church, profoundly transforming the preaching and writing style of those schooled in its techniques and making them "exact and self-conscious practitioners of the New Sophistic."⁷ In "Athens and letters," as Gregory of Nazianzus called it (*De Vita Sua*, 211), Libanius, a rhetor highly thought of throughout the Byzantine period (*Douze récits*, 77, 306, 445), taught John Chrysostom, perhaps Basil, and several other Christians who comprised approximately a dozen of his eighty students (Petit, *Étudiants de Libanius*, 41). For Petit, Basil and Libanius "s'y sont connus assez intimement" (*ibid.*). Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil's brother, Gregory of Nyssa, studied there too under the pagan Himerius and Christian Prohaeresius. Under these teachers, the Christian students will read, among other authors, Lucian of Samosata (Impellizzeri, *Letteratura bizantina*, 136). In their works, the text of Lucian will appear in surprisingly different contexts. Gregory of Nazianzus, for example, may have modelled the opening of his funeral oration on Basil with the words of Lucian's *Demonax* (PG 36:493).

The myth that Libanius, on the point of death, will say (Sozomenus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, 8,2,2)⁸ that John Chrysostom would have been a worthy successor "if the Christians hadn't snatched him away,"⁹ suggests a *translatio eloquentiae*. Whether this anecdote is true or not, Lucian, a "lectitissimo tunc auctore" (Gregorius Nyssenus, *Opera*, ed. Jaeger, 8, 1:130-131) was assimilated as part of the standard school curriculum (Jenkins, "Hellenistic Origins," 44), commented and imitated (Wilson, *Scholars*, 25). Winter's observation

that "hominibus saeculi IV Luciani scripta in summis deliciis fuerunt" (*De Luciani Scholiis*, 1) is evident in Libanius' use of Lucian and in the works of his Christian students. The Syrian is one of the "direct models of their style" (Jaeger, *Early Christianity*, 77).

Despite their rhetorical training, these Christian writers still experienced tension between the divergent claims of *oratores* and *piscatores*. Paul's indictment of rhetoric and the awareness on the part of Libanius' Christian students of the stylistic inferiority of the Bible manifested itself in several ways. Basil, for example, was well aware that the "barbarous style" of the Bible, "in substance truth, though in style unlearned," as the bishop elegantly expressed it in a letter to Libanius, contrasted unfavorably with the urbanity of Classical prose. Despite this framing of Christian culture and Classical paideia as an alternative between untutored truth (*piscatores*) and hubris (*oratores*), most of the Fathers assimilate Classical paideia, but also involve themselves in varying degrees of contradiction.

A letter of Basil to Libanius provides a good example of how differences of esthetic and religious ideals could be handled. Basil denigrates the style of his "slovenly letter" (Epist. 339). Moses and Elijah, he writes, communicated their thoughts in a "barbarous tongue." When Libanius responds (Epist. 340), he limits his comment on the style of the Bible to the observation that it is not a manual of style: "You say . . . that there is in you no ability of speech at all, since the books you now use do not produce that ability." Later, Basil will again draw the antithesis between Libanius's Attic eloquence and his own artlessness (contradicted by his use of Attic verb-forms) as a disciple of fishermen. Centuries later, Martin van Dorp will, with much less diplomacy, reiterate the cultural tensions of the Libanius-Basil correspondence in a letter to Erasmus: "siquidem literae sacrae latine quidem scriptae sunt barbarae, dormitante interprete; Graecae autem dispeream si Lutiani [sic] elegantiam assequantur" (*Erasmi Epistolae*, 2:129).

This gap between theory and practice in regard to the use of Classical rhetoric is more surprising in Gregory of Nazianzus' letter to Gregory of Nyssa. Accusing the most Classicizing of the Greek Fathers of laying aside holy and sweet books for "briny and undrinkable" writings, and of preferring to be a rhetor rather than a Christian (Epist. 11), Gregory of Nazianzus couches his indictment of esthetic paganizing in conspicuously Classical terms. Unattributed phrases from Hesiod's *Works and Days*, quotes of Euripides and Pythagoras, the use of homoiototon, parallelism and antithesis, the play between literal and figurative meanings, and the use of dialogue reveal Gregory of Nazianzus' clear affiliation with the aula of

Libanius, and confirm his description of himself as a lover of Classical Athens (*PG*, 36, 517).

At other times, the Fathers' cultural ambivalence takes the form of attack on eloquence or on excessive attention to style. While these attacks are less surprising in Theophilus of Antioch (*Ad Autolyicum*, 1,1) or Tatian (*Oratio ad Graecos*, 26), even Chrysostom, Libanius' pupil, evidences this ambivalence in his sermon on John 2,2. He presents the Evangelist as illiterate, and declares that the more the Greeks laugh at the harsh Hebrew names [Bethsaïda, Zebedaeus] of John's "barbarous" birthplace, and the more distant these names are from Greek culture, the more splendid they will be for him. His most specific denial of his training under Libanius, however, occurs in his panegyric on St. Babylas, Bishop of Antioch. Libanius had written a monody on the destruction by lightning of the Temple of Daphne on the night after Julian had ordered Babylas' bones transferred to a different location. Chrysostom, interlacing quotations from Libanius' piece with mockery, calls attention to the powerlessness of the pagan deities, and insults his teacher by referring to him as "a sophist of the City" and "a wise fool" (18-19).

The Fathers' coolness to the cultural inheritance of Classicity also manifests itself in hypersensitive reactions to rhetorical excess. Eusebius records the criticism of Paul of Samosata for his prideful, melodramatic recitations (*Hist. Eccles.*, 7,30,8), and Chrysostom draws a similarly critical sketch of an orator apotheosized by a theater crowd.¹⁰ Gregory of Nyssa will excoriate Eunomius "the dithyrambist" for his use of his "Asiatic" rhythms and rhymes and his castenet-sounding, staccato kola (Goggin, *Gregory of Nyssa*, 103). Despite Gregory's qualms about Eunomius, the showy panoply of the Asiatic style will mark the display rhetoric of these Athens-trained Fathers.

The most problematical question regarding the literary inheritance of Antiquity was the application to the Bible of the methods of text criticism, "pagan" tools, used to analyze secular literature. Eusebius, for example, reproaches Theodotus of Byzantium for making "full use of the arts of unbelievers to establish the opinion of their sect" (*Hist. Eccles.*, 5,28,13-14).¹¹ He also records with outrage the application of text collation to the Bible: "They laid hands fearlessly on the divine Scriptures saying that they had critically revised them." Indeed, Eusebius continues, the disciples of Theodotus "vied in making copies which they [had] 'corrected'—that is to say, destroyed" (5,28, 15-17). In the fourth century, Theodore, like Chrysostom a student of Libanius and later bishop of Mopsuestia (390-428), also applied the criticism traditionally used in the explication of Classical texts to the Bible.

Centuries later, the polemic surrounding Valla's New Testament collation or Erasmus' change of "verbum" for "sermo" in his translation of John 1,1, will reenact the tensions recorded by Eusebius. The recrudescence in the Renaissance of this entangled and problematical relationship of rhetoric, text criticism and apology is particularly important for the study of Lucian, because the opponents of these "new" philological methods use the name of Lucian to sum up their accusations of hubris and impiety.

The recreation of the works of Lucian in a Christian framework begins with John Chrysostom and the Cappadocians. In his *De Professione Christiana*, Gregory of Nyssa retells the anecdote of Lucian's *Piscator* (36-37).¹² In the version of Lucian, an Egyptian king teaches apes to dance and places them on display. During an exhibition of their skills, a spectator tosses nuts into the orchestra and the apes change "from artists of the ballet to the simians they really were" (36). Lucian then calls on Plato, Chrysippus and Aristotle to judge those mimicking without conviction the conventional appearance of philosophers.

Gregory's version is explicitly Christian. It is also more emphatically sophistic. Lucian's king has become a showman in Alexandria. In Gregory's account the center of interest shifts from the performing monkey to the audience. Whereas Lucian's narrative focus only peripherally takes in the crowd ("the carefully planned ballet was entirely broken up and was laughed at by the spectators," 54), nearly half of Gregory's amplified account describes audience reaction.

Gregory's moral lesson is also more specific than Lucian's. The Syrian merely notes that the apes were distracted by the nuts. Gregory writes that one of the spectators cast almonds, "the sort of thing which tempts the greediness of such beasts." He then applies the tale to Christian formation: dried fruit, almonds, "or any sort of food like these," glory, ambition, luxury—the leap from literal to figurative is a hallmark of Patristic imagery—bring forth "apish souls." While they can mimic Christianity, these souls quickly reveal a lower, unprofessed nature when tempted.

In *Piscator*, this tale is part of Lucian's criticism of hypocrisy among philosophers. Gregory, in contrast, anchors the story in a positive ideal, and frames his anecdote with the topic of the congruence of names and things: "we would not want not to be that which that name [Christian] signifies." The name should be a reality, not only "the cloak of a name."

A similar transformation of one of Lucian's most popular scenarios, the moral view from a vantage point (*Bis Accusatus*, 12, *Jupiter Tragoedus*, 34, *Icaromenippus*, 20), exemplifies the distance

between Athens and Jerusalem. In a homily on Matthew 23, 9 Chrysostom introduces the similitude of earthly life as a child's game observed by the "citizens of heaven." Just as adults can knock down a child's playhouse, so the "citizen of heaven" can fell splendid buildings with a thought. Whereas Lucian's gods fluctuate between alarm at their own powerlessness or amusement over the absurdity of human behavior, the preacher's heaven-dwellers, seeing destruction below, "do not so much laugh as weep since they have compassionate hearts."

The Patristic Lucian in Golden Age Spain

How much were Golden Age authors aware of this early history of Lucian, the varied positions of the apologists regarding Classicity and the role of the Syrian as a model of style for the Fathers? In view of the apparent remoteness of fourth-century culture from the sixteenth century, it is worth anticipating the connection between the two periods.

There is little difficulty in establishing the general popularity of both Lucian and the Greek Fathers. A glance at the number of manuscripts of the works of Fathers schooled in Athens in Kristeller's *Iter Italicum* or in the *Inventario general de manuscritos* of the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid confirms that these Christian rhetors were much read in the second age of Christian Humanism. Vives is intimately familiar with the Fathers and with Libanius (*Opera Omnia*, 6:342), and García Matamoros explicitly refers to the pagan literary formation of the Fathers: "¿No tenemos el ejemplo de los santos padres San Justino, San Basilio, San Jerónimo, que se formaron estudiando los modelos de los clásicos paganos?"¹³

While few Golden Age readers would have caught Gregory's reworking of Lucian's *Piscator* in his *De Professione Christiana*, not the most popular of Gregory's works despite translations into Latin,¹⁴ many would have been aware of the association of John Chrysostom and the Sophist. In the prologue to his popular Latin Lucian (Thompson, *Translations of Lucian*, 1-2), More, seeing in the pseudo-Lucian *Cynicus* a defense of the rigorous life of the Cynic, mentions Chrysostom's use of this work in a homily on the Gospel of John ("ut bonam eius partem in Homiliam quandam, quam in Ioannis Evangelium commentatus est, inserverit").

Lucian and Chrysostom were also linked as models of Attic purity (a partial truth in view of Lucian's modified Attic usage and the mannered, "Asiatic" style of Chrysostom's panegyrical works), and

appear together as school authors in the Sixteenth Century. Just as Lucian is celebrated for his brevity, Luis de Granada will call Chrysostom's style "tersa" (*Rhet. Eccl.*, 1:1). Vives also notes that the Father's style is "in elocutione Luciano et Galeno [similis]" (*Opera*, 6:342).

A number of Golden Age writers will forge associations between Lucian and the Fathers of the Church. Alvar Gómez de Castro, for example, finds parallels between Tertullian and Lucian (BN MS 9939, f° 106).¹⁵ Another Golden Age writer associates Lucian's mocking of the gods with Lactantius' satire: "y así burla de los tales dioses Luciano, y quien quisiere ver cosas muy buenas, acerca de la veneración y sacrificios de los gentiles, lea al buen Lactancio Firmiano" (Anríquez, *Retrato*, 13).

Golden Age preachers could have read of the anecdote of Libanius' near-anointing of Chrysostom as successor either in editions of Libanius,¹⁶ or through collections of anecdotes. Fernán Pérez de Guzmán, for example, writes in his *Mar de historias* (Valladolid, 1512), that Chrysostom "fue primero discípulo de Libanio sophista." Luis de Granada (*Rhet. Eccl.*, 1,2 2) also relates the anecdote but substitutes the name of Gregory of Nazianzus for John. Another variant of the *translatio studii* anecdote occurs in a letter of Juan Bonifacio to a Jesuit "sobre el amor que los de la Compañía deben tener al seminario de las letras humanas." Bonifacio narrates Basil's encounter with Libanius and his explication of Homer, "la cual le conquistó las simpatías . . . y le dio pie para seguir exponiendo los misterios de nuestra fe" (Olmedo, *Juan Bonifacio*, 148-149). Many Golden Age readers also could have read of Chrysostom's study under Libanius in Erasmus' translation of three pieces of the rhetor. Fifteenth-century readers in Spain, finally, would have absorbed the Lucian-Libanius connection in Aurispa's Latin version of the *Dialogus Mortuorum XII*, attributed by the Italian to Libanius.

The Golden Age reader also saw Lucian frequently intertwined with the Fathers. The overview, present in a number of Lucian's works, also occurs, for example, in the image of Chrysostom's watch-tower. A Spanish reader would likely have thought of the *Charon* or *Icaromenippus* when he read Chrysostom's lament in Pedro Bovistiau's *El Theatro del Mundo*: "¡O quién tuviera una atalaya, tan propia y mañosamente hecha, que della se pudieran ver a plazer todos los hombres, y quién alcançara una gran boz muy sonora, y alta, para desde allí dezir siendo oída, y entendida de todos, con el Real propheta David y dar este pregón . . ." (trad. B. Pérez del Castillo [Alcalá, 1566], ff. 11^v-12).

The Golden Age reader might also have thought of similar scenes in Mateo Alemán, Vélez de Guevara or Saavedra Fajardo. Origen's

description of the flight of the soul to heaven, its vision of the earth and the comparison of men and ants (*Contra Celsum*, IV, 85), could also have brought to mind *Icaromenippus*, 18.

Lucian was also integrated into the writings of the Church Fathers though the glossing of texts. A quotation of *Gallus*, for example, is illustrated by the writings of St. Gregory in the *Teatro de los dioses de la gentilidad* (2:14), and conversely, a passage of Tertullian is glossed with a text of Lucian.¹⁷ This mutual twining of cultures is not surprising in view of a number of Humanists such as Vincentius Obsopaeus and Petrus Mosellanus who produced Latin translations of both the Sophist and the Greek Fathers. Lucian was also associated with other pagan authors of the Patristic period. In his *Silva de varia lección*, Pero Mexía associates Julian and Celsus with the Sophist (*Silva*, 464).

In a more general sense, the writers of the Italian Quattrocento and the Spanish Golden Age had a task similar to that of the Greek Fathers. They were reintroducing their age to Classical eloquence. The work of translating Gregory of Nazianzus into Latin, initiated in late Antiquity and continued a millenium later, exemplifies these parallel moments in cultural history. In Dionisio Vázquez's "Sermón de la Ascensión," the twining of Classical rhetoric with Lucian and Cicero in a modified thematic sermon recalls the adoption of Classical form by the Christian Fathers schooled in Athens.¹⁸

Lucian in Byzantium

The continuity of the Greek rhetorical tradition is a fundamental characteristic of Byzantine literature (Garzya, *Storia letteraria*, 63). As Bompaire has observed, "le premier humanisme byzantin est moins un retour aux sources classiques qu'un authentique prolongement de la Seconde Sophistique" ("Photius," 84). The authors of the Second Sophistic had a special importance as models of correct style in New Rome, and, among these, Lucian was one of the most read and imitated. Häger's old observation ("iam inter omnes satis notum est Lucianum apud Byzantinos viros doctos nimium quantum auctoritate valuisse," *De Prodromi Fontibus*, 86), though further documented, has not been substantially modified.

Lucian's large opus was read, glossed in notes and brief essays, and imitated throughout the history of Byzantine letters. In the ninth century, there is the article of the *Bibliotheca* of Photius; in the tenth, the article of the *Suda Lexicon*. In that same century, Liutprand of Cremona, ambassador to the court of Leo VI, furnishes

in an anecdote about Leo's mention of Lucian the only reference to the Sophist in a Medieval Latin text (Newlin, "Lucian," 447-448). In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the mention of the Syrian in Michael Psellus, John Tzetzes, Michael Choniates and Theodore Prodromus constitutes what Garzya calls "une renaissance de Lucien" (*Testi bizantini*, 617). The reference to Lucian in Nicephorus Gregoras' *Byzantinae Historiae* as "an old Greek sophist who wrote colloquys of the dead" (PG, 148:1187), the prominent place of the Sophist in Thomas Magister's Attic *Lexicon* in the fourteenth century, imitations such as *Mazaris* in the fifteenth century, and the large number of manuscripts of Lucian written in that period indicate that his varied opus was consistently read in Byzantium.

A valuable witness to the continued currency of Lucian's works in Byzantium are the abundant marginal glosses. The oldest are thought to date back to c. 650 (Rabe, *Scholia*, vi; Helm, *De Fontibus*, 5-6). From the time of Photius, Lucian's influence is well attested by numerous glosses. These little notes are highly subjective, and provide an important insight into the Byzantine view of Lucian and how these literati dealt with the tension between Christian ideology and pagan rhetoric.

The glosses are also heralds of the highly reactive reading of Lucian in the Quattrocento and the Spanish Golden Age. From Bessarion's lengthy notes on his manuscript of Lucian to Juan de Villaquirán's comments on the margin of his Spanish *Charon*, Lucian will stimulate and provoke this special dialogue with the reader. It is also among the annotators of Byzantium that we see documented the multiple faces of the Syrian: the scoffer, the stylist, the rhetor "who sometimes touches on philosophical themes as well" (Wilson, *Scholars*, 186).

Byzantine Images of Lucian: Moral Satirist and Atheist Mocker

The view of Lucian as a mocker, noted by Lactantius, will be reiterated in copious epithets on the margins of Byzantine manuscripts. For some of the scholiasts, the reading of Lucian invited what Baldwin has so aptly called "a talent to abuse" ("Talent," 19): "liar," "blasphemer," "boaster," are among the accusations peppering the glosses.

The explicit references to Christianity in *Peregrinus* (11-13) and *Alexander* drew the most fire: the reference to Christ as "that crucified sophist" in *Peregrinus* (13) motivates an outburst against Lucian's "maddened tongue" (219). The Christians' praise of Pere-

grinus as a Socrates elicits a response notably at odds with the syncretism of other Byzantine literati: "What Christian, having been imprisoned for Christ, will stand to be exalted by the name of Socrates?" (217). Yet Lucian's possible parody of Ignatius—two hapax legomena of Ignatius' letter to Polycarp, "godly ambassador" and "God's courier," turn up in Lucian's "messengers of the dead" and "couriers of the shades"—elicits no comment.¹⁹ The association in *Alexander* (38) of atheists, Epicureans and Christians is glossed with the charge that Lucian wanted to obscure the doctrine of the Christians (183-84). Another note to *Alexander* (38) is of unusual interest for the phrase "Lucianic nonsense." By "nonsense" the commentator clearly means impiety.

In these scholia, literature is engulfed by ideology. The author of the gloss of *Peregrinus* (13) disregards Lucian's perplexed admiration of the generosity of the early Christian communities, "another Utopia in contemporary guise" (Anderson, *Lucian: Theme and Variation*, 26).²⁰ The glossator of *Alexander* (38) does not mention that the association of Christians and Epicureans is voiced by the very admirers of Alexander satirized by Lucian. The scholiast of *Icaromenippus* (8) comments a single phrase ("others have even ventured to tell who made [the universe] and how it was constructed") and overlooking the satiric intent of the original, concludes: "observe the impiety of Lucian" (101).

The search for anti-Christian barbs in Lucian explains the abusive epithets in glosses on apparently innocuous passages. One reader sees in Lucian's mention of a contemporary Syrian exorcist a reference to Christ, and reacts with characteristic spleen (163). Another reader sees in a reference to a ship's mast (*Vera Historia*, 2,41) which "budded, branched and bore fruit at the summit" a mocking reference to the staff of Aaron (24). The coincidence of the "twelve-month bearing vines" of *Vera Historia* (2,11) and Rev 22:2 is understood as a reference to prophecies (Ezek 47:12) about the New Jerusalem (21).

While it would be easy to dismiss the Byzantine reading of Christian references into Lucian, in fact, in some ways the glossators were not far from the mark. They recognized, for example, that the Bible and Lucian's writings shared certain literary conventions. The description of Lucian's fish in *Vera Historia* and the "large fish" in Jonah, or of the City of the Blessed and Jerusalem, in fact, form part of similar traditions of aretology and prophecy. This search for Lucian's Christian context has not been exhausted. Léon Hermann's study in the *Cahiers du Cercle Ernest Renan* witnesses a continuing endeavor to document in Lucian's texts responses to second century Christianity ("Lucien et le Christianisme," 2).

The most significant condemnation of Lucian as an atheist mocker is found in the *Suda Lexicon*, the tenth-century encyclopedia. The *Suda* article on Lucian is important because it was well circulated in the Renaissance and was a paradigmatic text for Lucian's detractors.²¹ In the *Suda*, Lucian is accorded what Baldwin calls the "sledgehammer" treatment (*Studies in Lucian*, 100). He is called "blasphemer" and "illspoken"—some manuscripts add here "or rather atheist"—because of his mocking of "divine things" (*Suidae [sic] Lexicon*, ed. Adler, 3:283). After a biography based in part on an autobiographical reading of *Peregrinus* (2), the author, placing Lucian in the tradition of famous "discerpti canibus," narrates his exemplary death: he was torn to pieces by dogs "since he raved against the truth."²² The writer closes the brief review of Lucian's life noting the offending passages in *Peregrinus*, and referring once again to Lucian's violent death and the punishment awaiting this "all-abominable" scoffer in the next world.

In spite of some readers' invective, other Byzantines recognized in Lucian a sometime ally of Christian apology. The fifth-century monk, Isidore of Pelusium, mentions Lucian as a Cynic and author of dialogues satirizing the contradictions of pagan philosophers (*PG*, 78, 1106). An anonymous gloss of *Iudicium Dearum* (13), makes the same point: "Sensibly and ingeniously you have jested and have insulted the things which the Greeks thought valuable" (165). A short, anonymous poem on Lucian also praises him as a "True rhetor, who all the names of the gods/ridicules, destroys, reduces to ashes" (Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, 2:472).

These glosses, then, transmit the contradictory attitudes inherited from early Christian apology. What is new, however, is the association of Lucian's works with the Bible, the annotation of his theological insights and presentation of his writing as moral philosophy. This view, communicated much later to Aurispa, Guarino and Filelfo by their Byzantine tutors, will be passed on to Erasmus, Pontano and the Spanish Erasmists.

Lucian's description of the head that travelled from Egypt to Byblos is annotated with a parallel from Isaiah 18:2:²³ "Our holy prophet Isaiah also censured and mocked this in his speech against Damascus" (187). The author of the note also cites Cyril's commentary on Isaiah. In a note to *De Luctu*, the scholiast (174) observes that the use of flutes in funerals was also described in "the Holy Gospel" [Matt 9:23]. Toxaris' mention to Mnesippus of fair-weather friends is glossed (223) with a reference to Matt 24:12. This "Biblical" reading of Lucian will have its own peculiar impact on the reading of the Sophist in Golden Age Spain. Rodrigo Caro, for

example, will mention a priest of Saturn in Lucian's *Saturnales* "que muchos juzgan ser Noé" (Caro, *Días geniales*, 1:176).

For several of the scholiasts, Lucian was a moral philosopher. Basilus of Adada, one of the few scholiasts known to us by name, and one of the most positively disposed to Lucian, praises Lycinus' criticism (*Convivium*, 34) of theoretical philosophy: "You have attacked these things ingeniously and you have spoken clearly and openly the truth about the virtues befitting the wise" (34). The same commentator expounds in detail what he sees as a veiled allusion to the union of body and soul (48) in Lucian's *Cataplus*, 14. He also glosses with approval Rhadamanthus' observation (*Cataplus*, 24) on sin as an invisible mark on the soul.

Some marginalia, of unusual interest for the history of Lucian's influence in the Renaissance, apply Lucian's criticism to contemporary life. These scholia, like the *Timarion* and *Mazaris*, evidence an awareness of Lucian's works as tools for criticizing contemporary society. In *Charon et Hermes* (*DM*, 22,8), the reader, glossing Hermes' comment on a philosopher's hypocrisy, observes that "these things are somewhat applicable to our monks" (261). Another reader makes a similar comment on the monks of his day (135) in response to Lucian's comment (*Piscator*, 30) that many admire Philosophy but few follow her.

The note to *Piscator* (11) is the most specific reference to clerical shortcomings. In Lucian's work, *Frankness, in search of Philosophy*, meets "men with short cloaks and long beards who professed to come directly from her." The glossator reading this exposé of false philosophers writes that those who infer "the same thing now about the monks and the bishops will not fall far from the mark." The monks and bishops, the reader remarks, are "adorned with garments and ornaments of folly" and deprive the faithful of the truth (132).

In glossing Lucian's reference to Sopolis, Lexiphanes' physician (*Lexiphanes*, 18), the Byzantine reader wishes that Sopolis' cure of his patient's antiquarianism could be applied to the political affairs of his day (201). Finally, in a note to *Toxaris*, one reader comments that the lack of friendship, notable in Lucian's day, is more acute in his present generation (223).

The antithetical views of Lucian as atheist mocker and moral philosopher do not coincide with two clearly delimited camps of commentators. Arethas, the tenth-century Archbishop of Caesarea, for example, both condemns and praises the Sophist. Of a passage in *Calumnia* (Bidez, "Aréthas," 396) he writes "How well you say the truth!" (27); "What you say there is the very truth!" (26). Yet when Arethas glosses *Juppiter Tragoedus* (47-49), true to the prelate's surname, 'fond of scoffing' (Bidez, 394), and to his office as

apologist, he pens two lengthy essays in response to Lucian's theory of predetermination and his view of Zeus (*ibid.*, 396-399).²⁴

Basilios of Adada voices similar reservations about the view of a disordered cosmos set forth by Lucian's Menippus (*Icaromenippus*, 4): "The things relative to life, o Lucian, you have said prudently and truly, censuring its instability and variableness, but not the things pertaining to the universe and to its organization. Because since you don't believe in God, you are quite ignorant of the One who had made it and the cause of its creation" (100).

The reactions of these responsive Byzantine readers, whether they build textual bridges back to the Bible or single out *sententiae* and isolated phrases for refutation or praise, establish Lucian's writings as the subject for moral commentary.

The Prose Stylist

Lucian's place in Byzantine literature, unlike his philosophy, was assured by his "Attic" purity and his ability to entertain. Tode's remark is still valid: "per omnia tempora summa auctoritate usus est; apud Graecos vero posteriores nullius libri magis in deliciis fuerunt" (*De Timarione*, 8-9). Lucian appears frequently as an authority in Byzantine works on grammar and philology, and is the model for numerous imitations. Even the scholia, not as a rule notable for their stylistic comments, describe Lucian's writing as "ingenious" (34, 165).²⁵

For Photius, whose literary acumen and vast readings are attested in the *Bibliotheca*, Lucian's style was "excellent" for its clear vocabulary and expressivity. "More than any other author," Photius declares, "Lucian's style is characterized by limpidity and purity." The reader, Photius continues, has the impression that he is not reading prose but that "a melody full of charm distills into his ears."²⁶

The expression "limpidity and purity" is particularly noteworthy for its provenance from Hermogenes' *Ideas* (1,2), a handbook on style much read and commented by Byzantine authors and, later, by Renaissance critics.²⁷ In Hermogenes, these adjectives describe the first category of style, 'clarity.' For Photius, as for Seneca (Leeman, *Orationis Ratio*, 1:220), or as for the Quattrocento Humanists or the commentators of Góngora, prose style had a specific ethical weight (Kustas, "Byzantine Rhetoric," 67).²⁸ The style of "gracious and noble simplicity" corresponded for Photius to the ideal Christian character. The emphatic and "pungent" style recommended by Hermogenes for other ends did not. Photius saw this "Christian" style in Lucian's

works and in the "customary clarity and purity" of the writing of John Chrysostom.

Even Theodore Metochites, the champion of a clearly different style, approves Lucian's prose. For Metochites, Lucian and Libanius author a "quite simple" prose typical of those "educated in Syria." Metochites' only reservation about these two writers is their excessive concern with Atticism (*Miscellanea*, ed. Mueller, 128-129). An appreciation of Lucian's charm is evident as well in Michael Psellus' warning to writers not to limit their reading to the Greek romances and the "relaxed and playful works" of Lucian (Wilson, *Scholars*, 172).

In the case of Nicephorus Choumnus, an advocate, like Photius, of stylistic "clarity" (ibid., 172), the mention of Lucian, Libanius and Libanius' Christian pupils as models of the moderate style is part of an attack on an intentionally abstruse style then in vogue.²⁹ Choumnus' contemporary, Joseph the Philosopher, will also criticize the "swollen" language and the obscurity of the "moderns," successors of Synesius and Philostratus (ibid.).

Of all Byzantine commentary on Lucian, Photius' essay on the Sophist in his voluminous *Inventory and Enumeration of the Books that We Have Read*, later called the *Bibliotheca*,³⁰ is the most insightful, and, in the context of the polarized Byzantine opinion of Lucian, the most objective. Written by the best read scholar of the generation of the restoration of the icons, this mixture of literary criticism, literary biography and research notebook will be used by Greek scholars during the entire life of the Empire and later by Renaissance Hellenists.³¹

Photius writes that he compiled the summaries of his readings in the order he remembered the works. While Lucian's place, 128 in 280 essays, might not seem prominent, most of the preceding entries with the exception of a few romance writers (Jamblichus, Heliodorus) are authors of works on theology, doctrine and Church history. The only entries on rhetoric before Lucian are a brief note on Victorinus (essay 102) and an unenthusiastic paragraph on Libanius.

This "inventor of the book review" (Wilson, *Scholars*, 93) opens his essay on Lucian with a review of his readings in the Sophist: *Phalaris*, some of the *Dialogi Mortuorum*, the *Dialogi Meretricum* and "other writings on various subjects" (*Asinus, Vera Historia*) mentioned in other essays. Photius writes that "in nearly everything, he ridicules the ideas of the pagans, their error and their folly in their way of imagining the gods." Lucian's purpose, for Photius, is "to write a comedy in prose on the life of the pagans." Photius does not mention the infamous *Peregrinus*, and limits his comments to Lucian's criticism of pagan deities.

His most insightful observation concerns the absence in the Syrian's work of a positive system of thought. Lucian takes nothing seriously. He mocks the opinion of others, but himself has no opinion "unless you can say that his opinion is to have no opinion." At the end of his essay, Photius reiterates Lucian's lack of belief, and closes his review with an epigram he (and his Renaissance successors) will attribute to Lucian.³²

Lucian's works are also discussed in essay 129 on Lucius of Patras, and 166 on the writers of marvellous tales. His view of *Asinus* is particularly interesting for the independence of ethical and esthetic judgments. Like the censors of the Counterreformation *Indices*, Photius had serious reservations about the obscenity of Lucian's Milesian fable.

In view of the favorable opinion among Byzantine writers of Lucian's style, his appearance in numerous treatises on language—Hunger counts some 2,500 lexica on Attic usage ("On Imitation," 32)—is not surprising.³³ In Thomas Magister's *Ecloga Vocum Atticarum*, the number of quotes from the Sophist is surpassed only by his contemporary, Aelius Aristides, the two fourth-century writers, Libanius and Synesius, and the Classics, Aristophanes and Thucydides.³⁴

Lucian, Proverb Literature and the Epigrams

The Byzantine philologists, passing on to the Renaissance a body of memorable sayings extracted from Lucian's works, reinforce his image as author of moral wit. Erasmus will later collect many of these apophthegms and proverbs from the Byzantine paroemiographers and publish them in his popular *Adagia*,³⁵ and Alciati will include excerpts from Lucian in his *Emblemata* (e.g. "Potentissimus affectus amor" [CVI], "Semper praesto esse infortunia" [CXXX]).

The Byzantine collectors of proverbs (Zenobius, Arsenius, "Diogenianus," Apostolius) often illustrate their selections with texts of Lucian.³⁶ In Zenobius' collection, for example, all the sources of the adage (II,1) "[our] treasures are ashes" are from Lucian (*Timon*, 41; *Hermotimus*, 71; *Navigium*, 26; *Philopseudes*, 32); the famous proverbial closing of the *Musca*, "To make an elephant of a mouse," is also given as the single source of this proverb in Zenobius (III, 68). Georgius Cyprius, like Zenobius (I, 34), mentions only Lucian (*Vita Demonactis*, 4; *De Historia Conscribenda*, 4) as a source for "to touch with the tip of a finger." Apostolius annotates several proverbs exclusively with works of Lucian: "to drag by the nose"

(XVI, 44d) is glossed with the source *Hermotimus* (68); "to levy tribute from the dead" (III, 54b) with *Dialogus Mortuorum* (4,1); "to drink hellebore" (XIV, 30a) with *Dialogus Mortuorum* (17,2).

Even where Lucian mentions his use of a proverb (*Juppiter Tragoedus*, 25; *Vita Demonactis*, 4; *Dialogus Meretricum*, 3) and where the modern editors have noted other sources, the Byzantine proverb collectors glean these phrases from Lucian. Apostolius, for example, gives *Hermotimus* (28) as the source for "ready, as the proverb says, to sail the Aegean and Ionian seas on a mat" (*Works*, ed. Kilburn, 6:313), even though reference to Libanius, Pindar or Sophocles would have been at least as authoritative. For the Byzantines, quotation, like proverb, was a source of charm. Byzantine "deliciae" in Lucian is apparent in their frequent quotation from his works. An exile in the North, for example, opens his letter with Lucian's account of the mythical origin of amber and notes, as Lucian himself did, that none of his Northern neighbors would believe the tale.³⁷ Another writer will model an entire letter on Lucian's *Pseudologistae*.³⁸ Manuel II, writing from London in the winter of 1400 that there is no aid from the West, frames the anticipated reaction of his correspondent with a proverb used in *Zeuxis* (2): "I expect that you bear in your mouth the expression 'Our treasures are ashes'."³⁹ Even rather prosaic phrases, such as "a good runner," are excerpted from Lucian.⁴⁰ In view, however, of the practice of using unattributed quotes as a kind of game among readers, or of encoding references to Lucian (e.g. "the sweet Syrian"), it is probable that an enormous number of references to texts of Lucian still await discovery.

The epigrams attributed to Lucian by the Byzantines also reinforced his image as eloquent moralist. In the *Gnomologion* of one Byzantine anthologizer, two epigrams are attributed to Lucian (Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, 1:22). These epigrams appear among quotations from Sirach, Proverbs, and sayings extracted from Basil. The first, now considered to be Palladas', is a Classical reworking of Job 1:21.⁴¹ The second treats the Stoic theme of the brevity of life: "His qui bene agunt, vita tota brevis est/ His qui male, una nox interminabile tempus est" (*PG*, 117: 1147). Antonius Melissa, "the Bee," in his *Sententiae*, also records the first of these proverbs under the rubric "De egenis et pauperibus" (*PG*, 136).

Another split image Byzantium bequeathed to the Quattrocento and the Golden Age of Spain was Lucian the historiographer and teller of tall tales. For the Byzantines, Lucian's place as preceptor of history was assured by his *De Historia Conscribenda*, the only treatise of Classical Antiquity devoted exclusively to historiography. His place as author of fantasy was equally assured by *Vera Historia*, Lucian's satire of the Greek travel-romance, and by *Navigium* and *Philopseudes*.

Anderson's recent work has qualified the dichotomy of these two Lucians. For this critic the wild anti-exempla of *De Historia Conscribenda* reveal this so-called treatise on historiography to be a satire on paideia (*Lucian's Comic Fiction*, 1-12).⁴² The scholiasts' criticism of Lucian's use of irony in this work, however, indicates that for the Byzantines Lucian's *De Historia Conscribenda* was a serious work, or should have been wholly serious. Lucian's treatise on history offered its Byzantine readers a clear exposition of the technical and stylistic principles of writing history. Moreover, as "il punto culminante del proceso di attrazione della storia nella sfera retoricoletteraria" (Maisano, "Proemi," 331), Lucian's treatise was admirably suited to the handbook, rhetoric-conscious literati of Byzantium. The connection he draws between the work of history and the moral character of the historian was attractive to a public familiar with the Classical view of the good orator as good person.

While it is clear from the scholia, echoes in Byzantine historians and quotations from *De Historia Conscribenda* in the *lexica* on Attic usage that the work was much read, it is difficult to trace the specific indebtedness of historians to this little book. The topical nature of Lucian's precepts—utility as a criterion for historical writing, the necessary impartiality of the historian, the corresponding rejection of encomium (though not of partially fictionalized narratives or descriptions), the necessity of structural coherence—do not create an easily recognizable profile.⁴³ In the prologue to Agathias' *Historiae*, for example, the emphasis on the practical value of history and the criticism of panegyric in the writing of his contemporaries do not establish by themselves an affiliation with the *De Historia Conscribenda*. It is only in conjunction with other clues, an anecdote about the author's "conversion" from poetry to history reminiscent of *Gallus*, or the author's practice of fitting historical facts to narrative patterns of romance, that the precepts can be said to point back to Lucian.⁴⁴