sentence in a coherent, probably correct form. Convincing also is his emendation <ὁ ἰατρός> at p. 212, 643C2.

Less convincingly C. preserves the not reduplicated form δειπνηκότων T, alleging that it be a colloquial form, although parallels are not found in Plutarch.

In the commentary, p. 298 n. 145, C. affirms that μετά, p. 164,3 means 'durante', while he translates it with 'dopo'. The true sense lies between, namely 'verso la fine', which he himself suggests at p. 298.

At p. 315 n. 163, he mistakenly takes στοιχεῖον to be a Pre-Socratic term. At p. 350 n. 230 the river Cephisos is correctly identified as the Boeothian, but p. 118,14 as the Attic one.

Several, mainly orthographic, mistakes occur: p. 38,3 Plotino for Platone; at p. 46,4 one reads 646 for 637; p. 77 Bolkenstein; p. 110 *Die Ordnung der Olympic Spiele*; p. 296,1 Stantford and p. 296,21 Strantford; p. 358 n. 245 δαπανώσης for δαπανωμένης (twice); p. 367,7 Plutarch's father, Autobulus, has got the name Autolico.

Such mistakes are, however, of marginal significance and cannot detract from the evident merits of this edition. C. has accomplished an excellent work which will occupy a place of honour in the series of editions of the CPM.

Göteborg SVEN-TAGE TEODORSSON

VARIA LUCIANEA

A. CAMEROTTO: *Le metamorfosi della parola. Studi sulla parodia in Luciano di Samosata*. Pp. 349. Pisa and Rome: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 88-8147-161-2.

P. VON MÖLLENDORFF: *Lukian:* Hermotimos*, oder* Lohnt es sich, Philosophie zu studieren? Pp. 226. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2000. Cased, DM 78. ISBN: 3-534-14976-9.

M. BILLERBECK, C. ZUBLER: *Das Lob der Fliege von Lukian bis L.B. Alberti. Gattungsgeschichte, Texte, Übersetzungen und Kommentar*. Pp. 264. Bern, etc.: Peter Lang, 2000. Cased, £29. ISBN: 3-906765-24-5.

Three recent publications reflecting very different approaches to one of the most elusive of ancient authors are reviewed here. The bibliography on Lucian is growing slowly as his sophistication—apparently so congenial to the self-consciousness of this millennial age—is more appreciated, and as his self-arrogated status as a literary and cultural 'outsider' is more sympathetically and intelligently assessed. The emergence of detailed, research-level commentaries on individual texts, in particular, is a relatively recent phenomenon, and one to be applauded: detailed attention to his language and intertextuality certainly helps to substantiate the broader claims made on his behalf.

C.'s book is the only non-commentary in this batch, but certainly does not lack detail or attentiveness. Ranging across the entire *oeuvre*, C. presents (in over 300 pages of text) a global theory of Lucianic satire, predicated upon Genette's distinction between hypertext (parodying text) and hypotext (parodied text), and arguing for a dynamic, productive relationship between the two. Lucian's satire is (a *donné* of modern criticism) fundamentally hybrid, a mixture of genres and registers, of seriousness and comedy, and also of prose and verse; it constructs itself as pluralist

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.75 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and combinatory, in opposition to the univocal 'tradition'. It demands, then, an audience sufficiently attuned to the repertoire of literary classics to appreciate the author's aesthetic challenge.

This is a subtle and thoughtful work, sensitive to the nuances of satirical writing; all Lucianists will learn from it. If it has a flaw, that lies in taking Lucian (paradoxically) rather straight. The various talking heads presented in the text (Lycinus, the Syrian, et al.) are unmasked as Lucianic surrogates rather too swiftly ('e naturalmente l'autore satirico', p. 248; cf. pp. 210, 280): if the *persona* represents the author, what is the point of the *persona*? C. underplays Lucian's canny elusiveness, preferring instead the fiction of an omnipresent, authentically Lucianic voice that repeatedly advertises itself programmatically.

Ambiguity and pluralism have a certain (arguably fading) modishness. C. risks overidealizing his subject's decentred, kaleidoscopic 'ripresa e . . . rielaborazione dell' intera tradizione letteraria' (p. 99). The problem here lies in a face-value acceptance of Lucian's own self-stylization as the outsider who affronts 'the tradition' (thus reified). Lucian may represent himself as the anti-generic hybridizer, but surely in the context of the conflicts for identity in the second-century empire, this self-representation is a claim staked for cultural centrality? Marginal positionality can (as we know today) easily be recouped as a bid for power.

Also rather inflexible is the construct of 'the educated reader' (pp. 261–302), a *topos* of much recent writing on Lucian (see also von Möllendorff, pp. 210–18). For C., *paideia* is a club with openly publicized rules of membership; and membership, in return, allows readers entirely in on the joke. But do you ever truly know that you are (properly, completely, up-to-dately . . .) educated? If we take *paideia* instead as the site of interpersonal contest, ambiguity, and doubt, then the vibrant and discomfiting aspect of Lucianic satire lies in its opacity. You can never be sure whether he is laughing with you or at you. To take an example, from the *True Stories*: C. takes seriously (p. 296) Lucian's claim that everything in the account is an enigmatic (cf. ἤινικται) parody of an ancient author (1.2); but is it not preferable to see Lucian as teasing his readers with trails (more or less misleading) of literary reference? James Joyce wrote of *Ulysses* that 'I've put in so many enigmas and puzzles that it will keep the professors busy for centuries arguing over what I meant' (R. Ellmann, *James Joyce* [Oxford, 1983], p. 521) . . . can we ever know for sure, finally, what an 'educated' reading of Lucian would look like?

M.'s volume on the *Hermotimus* comprises an introduction, (German) translation, commentary, *apparatus criticus*, and brief essays. This huge text, the most elaborate of Lucian's parodies of the Platonic dialogue, has missed the detailed attention of many other Lucianic works; M. corrects this oversight with a learned and efficient work, though not without its provocations (see below).

The first part of the introduction sites Lucian in his cultural context, intelligently, although some will regret the sketchy generalizations ('Lukian lebte in einer Epoche, in der . . .', p. 4; 'An dieser Epoche und ihrer Literatur orientierten sich die Gebildeten der Zeit Lukians . . .', p. 5). A second introduction follows, summarizing the main tenets of the philosophical schools. The substance of the volume will, for most readers, prove more helpful. The translation is punchy and colloquial. The notes, keyed *à la* Aris & Phillips to the German rather than the Greek, concentrate primarily upon background information and allusions, rather than issues of textual interpretation. There is also a fair amount of literary explication, foreshadowing the essays that conclude the volume. M. is at his best when showing how Lucian artfully appropriates and ironically

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.75 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mangles the technical language and clichés of philosophy (e.g. nn. 40, 48, 53, 56, 69, 165). He is also alert to Homeric and Aristophanic intertexts.

The volume is completed by three interpretative essays. The first is a descriptive, glossed analysis of the structure of the text, which will appeal to those to whom this kind of thing (e.g. chiastic ring composition, p. 195) appeals. The second essay argues that Lycinus' position combines Stoic with Socratic aspects. It is the third essay, 'Strategien subversiver Ironie', that is the most interesting. Here M. makes use of the vein of Aristophanic allusions he identifies in the text, and in particular a supposed intertextuality with the debate between the *logoi* in the *Clouds*, to support his argument that the position of Lycinus is no less indeterminate (hence ironized) at the conclusion of the text than that of Hermotimus. The idea of an 'open' ending to the *Hermotimus* is in principle appealing. The Aristophanic allusion, however, is unconvincing. The metaphor of cloak-changing (*πορφυρίδα μεταμφιάσομαι*, 86) for lifestyle-changing is common in the period (cf. e.g. *Somn*. 16 for purple garments, and esp. Philostr. *Her*. 4.9 for *μεταμφιάσαι*), and need not allude to *Clouds* 1103 (which is in any case different: it is a *ἱμάτιον*, and—as Dover suggests—Right Logos is casting it off to run, not as a sign of conversion).

Finally, a real treat for muscolaudologists: a compendium of insect encomia, beginning with Lucian's *Encomium of the Fly*. An introduction summarizes the history in the classical world of the genre of the encomium (particularly the paradoxical encomium), discusses briefly the structure of Lucian's text, and surveys the reception history of this text in the Renaissance. The bulk of the volume contains a text, German translation, and commentary upon the *Encomium of the Fly*, and similar (although more cursorily annotated) treatments of Psellus' *Encomium of the Flea* and *Encomium of Bugs*, Leone Allaci's Latin translations of Psellus' texts, Eugenius of Palermo's verse *Blame of the Fly*, Guarino of Verona's translation of Lucian, and Leon Battista Alberti's *Fly*. *Terra nova* for most of us, I should venture, and the authors should be congratulated for, if nothing else, pointing out the extraordinary and sustained success of Lucian's unexpected classic.

The challenge faced by Lucian, as by all paradoxologists, is how to render a banal subject fascinating: a virtuoso thrives on surmounting apparently impassable obstacles. But where Lucian glamourizes the unglamourous, the authors of this volume are less successful. The project sprang, so we learn, out of a university teaching seminar; and the book retains all the signs of an exemplary intellectual exercise. Thus the introductory material and notes tell us everything about sources and traditions (Aristotle's *History of Animals* bulks large), and usefully unpack MS history; but they also show little attempt to appreciate the principles that may have motivated the composition of these texts. The playful, catty Lucian advanced by C. and M. (in their different ways) is almost entirely missing here: B. & Z. consider their subject primarily in terms of 'sophistry'. Now, that these texts are 'sophistic' is not in doubt; but only an outdated view of sophistry can limit it to trivial play with literary form with no connection to wider society. Recent work (especially Gleason's *Making Men*, Schmitz's *Bildung und Macht*) has demonstrated the urgency of the agonistic battles for identity and power in sophistic performance space. The fly could easily have been interpreted as a Lucianic (/Aristophanic) *persona*, the apparently marginal figure staking a claim for cultural centrality. (This is the rôle played by insects in proverbs, e.g. at Ach. Tat. 2.22). But for B. & Z. Lucian's sophistry exists for its own sake, generating merely literary (in the narrowest sense of that word) work.

Reception history, moreover, is an ideal site for thinking about the different inflections generated by cultural and sociopolitical change. But B. & Z. offer little

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.75 Published online by Cambridge University Press

information upon the new contexts into which the Lucianic master-text is translated: what does it mean to cast oneself as a sophist (and a Lucianic sophist at that) in, for example, Renaissance Italy? What force does the anecdote about Domitian killing off flies with his pen (Suet. *Dom*. 3.1; cf. Guarino, pp. 183–4; Alberti, pp. 216–7) have in the context of the court? No answers here: for B. & Z., these entomological extravaganzas contain no flies in the ointment, let alone stings in the tail.

University of Exeter TIM WHITMARSH

PHILOPSEUDES

M. Ebner, H. Gzella, H.-G. Nesselrath, E. Ribbat: *Lukian:* Die Lügenfreunde*, oder* Der Ungläubige*. Eingeleitet, übersetzt und mit interpretierenden Essays versehen*. (Texte zur Forschung/ SAPERE 3.) Pp. 214. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001. Cased, €19.90. ISBN: 3-534-14949-1.

Lucian's *Philopseudes* has much to commend it to the growing number of readers interested in the seedy side of ancient popular belief. The dialogue is populated by a band of superstitious philosophers and their intellectual friends (the φιλοψευδεῖς, rightly preferred over the transmitted singular), who discuss such important issues as curing gout by wrapping a mouse's tooth in a lion's skin (or should it be a hind's?), and snake bites with the help of 'Chaldaean' incantations and chips from a young woman's tombstone. The cast of their stories features characters such as a Hyperborean who can make Hecate appear and the moon disappear, who summons people from death, and walks on water too (the rawhide shoes are essential). Also included are a Syrian exorcist, an Arab dispensing apotropaic rings (veritable amulets of iron ἐκ τῶν σταυρῶν), and an Egyptian sorcerer and his apprentice who, with various success, engage in broomstick animation. Among the bloodless characters are the restless ghosts of an improperly buried man and of a wife demanding the sacrifice of a forgotten sandal, as well as a statue of General Pellichos (the famous) which has healing powers, peripatetic tendencies, and a preoccupation with personal hygiene. All this our 'wise' men narrate not for the greater good (which here includes employment in the tourist industry) or out of poetic license (an idea notably explored in *True Histories*), but because they solemnly believe that such phenomena exist. Needless to say, they fail to impress the incredulous realist of the alternative title (ἀπιστῶν), who insists they should know better and persistently debunks their stories, for example by suggesting that the only true remedy against gout is a regime of vegetables, rest, and no alcohol, and that on closer inspection young Chrysis may prove to have succumbed not to the Hyperborean's love magic but to that equally powerful charm of twenty drachmas to which she was reputedly sensitive. In short, *Philopseudes* is both hilarious and an important social-historical document, and the contributors to this book are to be warmly thanked for soliciting a wider readership for it.

At the book's core is a rethought Greek text (by N.) which contains some clear improvements to McLeod's OCT (most notably the title), with a facing German translation (by G.) that, while not always doing justice to the tone of the original, accurately renders the sense (pp. 62–109). The edition is preceded by introductions to Lucian's life and works (N.) and to *Philopseudes* (E.), and it is followed by notes (G. and E.) as well as essays on Lucian and ancient philosophy (N.), Lucian and magic

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.75 Published online by Cambridge University Press