

Lucian and the Authorship of *De Saltatione*

Graham Anderson

THERE has never been any single cogent argument for denying the authenticity of *De Saltatione*, generally ascribed to Lucian. But the treatise is clearly eccentric in a number of ways. It is an encomium of pantomimic dance, a subject Lucian scarcely mentions in his canonically accepted works; it deals sympathetically with the stage performer, whom he usually despises; and its author has presented his material in a form grotesque by any standards: he digresses into a long catalogue of pantomime themes, and his discussion is at times completely disorganised.¹ I wish to show that these and other eccentricities need not suggest that the author is an anonymous expert in dancing but are in fact typical of Lucian's methods when he sets out to improvise an erudite treatise on something he knows very little about. (To avoid circularity I shall refer to the author of *De Salt.* hereafter as 'the author', as opposed to 'Lucian').

There should be no problem about the motives which would have encouraged Lucian to write such a piece. He wrote the pair *Imagines* and *Pro Imaginibus* as compliments to Panthea, Lucius Verus' mistress prior to the latter's marriage with Lucilla in A.D. 164;² the co-emperor was also interested in *fidicinas et tibicines et histriones scurrasque*

¹ This led R. Helm to condemn the work (*Lucian und Menipp* [Leipzig 1906] 370), with the dubious argument that Lucian could never cast himself as a Stoic (*cf. Salt.* 2); but Helm later recanted, *RE* 13 (1927) 1759f. J. Bieler had already advanced detailed arguments against Lucian's authorship on linguistic grounds (*Ueber die Echtheit des Lucianischen Schrift de Saltatione* [Progr. Wilhelmshaven 1894]); these were easily refuted by D. S. Robertson (*The Authorship and Date of Lucian's de Saltatione*, in *Essays and Studies presented to William Ridgeway* [Cambridge 1913] 180–85). M. Kokolakis, *ΠΛΑΤΩΝ* 11 (1959) 3–11, usefully expands the historical background to Robertson's article. For the technical background to pantomime, see H. Bier, *De Saltu Pantomimorum* (Diss. Bonn 1920), with the supplements by L. Robert, *Hermes* 65 (1930) 106–22, and Kokolakis 11ff. The parallels between *Salt.* and Libanius' *ὑπὲρ τῶν ὀρχηστῶν* are discussed by Helm, *Lucian und Menipp* 365ff, and J. Mesk, *WS* 30 (1908) 58–74; they are inconclusive for the relationship between *Salt.* and Aristides' lost *κατ' ὀρχηστῶν* (see n.6 *infra*), and are of course no help towards determining the authenticity of *Salt.* itself.

² For the chronology see J. Schwartz, *Biographie de Lucien de Samosate* (Brussels 1965) 17.

mimarios (*SHA Verus* 8.11), and Lucian could have been expected to supply appropriate diversion in the same way.³ H. Richard thought the comments so exaggerated that the author of *De Salt.* must be parodying the technique of encomiasts;⁴ but we should note that Lucian for his part could flatter with assurance, as in *Nigrinus*, *Pro Imaginibus* and *Harmonides*; and an encomium of pantomime would have been no challenge to a writer who could extract compliments even out of a grammatical solecism (*Pro Lapsu* 15f). Such a writer might of course be privately amused at his own *volte-face*, but that is not a matter for his audience; Lucian is an opportunist of this kind in his use of material, and it would be no surprise if he were to praise a dancer as *χειρόσοφος* in front of the enthusiast Verus without expecting the emperor to know that he criticises the use of the word elsewhere (*Salt.* 69: *Rhetorum praec.* 17, cf. *Lexiph.* 14). Bompaire doubted Lucian's authorship because the interest in dancing is so obviously 'un-Hellenic' and therefore alien to Lucian's temperament and good taste.⁵ But any encomiast has to take his patron's enthusiasms into account,⁶ and the author of *De Salt.* makes it perfectly clear in the introductory dialogue (§2) that he himself would be regarded as a very unlikely advocate for pantomime—as a man *παιδεία σύντροφος καὶ φιλοσοφία τὰ μέτρια ὠμιληκῶς*.

Lucian himself shows little interest in dancing of any kind in his canonically accepted works: he feels at liberty to mention the *κόρδαξ* or the *πυρρίχη*, since both of them are 'sanctioned' by references in classic passages of Plato or Aristophanes; but for the contemporary *ὄρχηστοδιδάσκαλος* (*De Merc.cond.* 27)⁷ he has the utmost contempt. But he has no committed interest in historiography either, and yet he

³ Robertson, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1), developing the view of W. Schmid, *Bursian Jahresb.* 108 (1901) 254.

⁴ *Ueber die Lykinosdialoge des Lukian* (Progr. Hamburg 1886) 36f.

⁵ *Lucien écrivain, imitation et création* (Paris 1958) 356f.

⁶ As Lucian himself admits elsewhere (*Merc.cond.* 35). For Lucian and Aelius Aristides see A. Boulanger, *RevPhil* 47 (1923) 150f. This sophist enjoyed considerable prestige with Marcus Aurelius (Philostr. *VS* 582f). It would certainly not be unreasonable for someone wishing to fraternize with Lucius Verus to compliment the co-emperor's frivolous tastes and challenge a particularly ponderous rival at the same time. Cf. Kokolakis, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 9.

⁷ *κόρδαξ*: *Icar.* 27, *Ar. Nub.* 540; *πυρρίχη*: *D.Deor.* 8, *Pl. Legg.* 815b. For the *ὄρχηστοδιδάσκαλος* see Kokolakis, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 11. Harmon (*LCL* V pp.402f) assumes that the Pseudologist must have been a pantomime actor (*Pseudolog.* 25), which Kokolakis denies, *ibid.* 47. Neither has suggested that his performance of the blinding of the Cyclops may itself be a pantomime (*Pseudolog.* 27). It could certainly be an amateur's improvisation in the style.

could improvise half a treatise of armchair advice when the Parthian War made the subject topical.⁸ The author of *De Salt.* emphasises that he himself is a new convert to dancing, and an unlikely one at that (2f); and the treatment he adopts coincides in three broad respects with Lucian's interests. *De Salt.* includes a review *κατ' ἔθνη* to explain how the dance arrived in Greece; Lucian applies the same technique to philosophy (*Fugitivi* 6–9) and religion (*Iupp. Trag.* 42). *De Salt.* also focuses attention on the solo performer, who figures frequently in Lucian's similes and anecdotes from the stage.⁹ And above all the author of *De Salt.* has found an entirely new angle from which to attack tragedy: instead of condemning a pageant of ranting actors, he has the opportunity to prove that even a single performer in a dumb-show can do better! The last point alone would have been sufficient incentive to Lucian to go out of his way in this manner.

But would a writer like Lucian with no real interest in dancing have been *able* to write the work? The author falls into Lucian's usual habit of taking shortcuts whenever there is any specialised research to be done: the aforementioned *Pro Lapsu* is also a classic example of how Lucian could twist a handful of hackneyed quotations and exempla into an impressive treatise on the most recondite trivia. Most of the material can be accounted for in school reading, and the rest can safely be inferred to be random information pressed into service, rather than the fruits of conscientious antiquarianism.¹⁰

The author of *De Salt.* proceeds in exactly the same way—a flourish of Homer and Hesiod is enough to prove that dancing has a respectable antiquity: Hesiod's Eros (*Theog.* 120: *Salt.* 7); the Muses dancing (*Theog.* 4: *Salt.* 23); Meriones the dancer (*Il.* 16.617f: *Salt.* 8); dancers on the shield of Achilles, itself a 'textbook' of rhetorical ecphrasis (*Il.* 18.593–606: *Salt.* 13); Odysseus watching the dancing Phaeacians (*Od.* 8.256ff: *Salt. ibid.*); and dance as ἀμύμων (*Il.* 13.636ff: *Salt.* 23) or as the art of peace (*Il.* 13.730f: *Salt. ibid.*).

The author has made the most of all this, but his real standby, as he himself betrays in passing (34), is the intermittent discussion of dancing in Plato's *Laws* (Books 6–7). While this is not a work which Lucian

⁸ See esp. G. Avenarius, *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung* (Meisenheim am Glan 1956) 178, who rightly concludes that Lucian has patched together a large number of secondhand platitudes about historiography in the second half of the treatise.

⁹ e.g. *Adv. Ind.* 8–10; *Pisc.* 36; *Apol.* 5; *Gall.* 26; *Icar.* 17; *Neky.* 16.

¹⁰ See my *Lucian: Theme and Variation in the Second Sophistic* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 41, 1976) 130ff.

himself uses often,¹¹ the whole context of the discussion of dancing would be an important text for Plato's views on *paideia* and one which an author of Lucian's limitations might be expected to be able to draw on with no great effort: even Maximus of Tyre, who represents the lowest and most mechanical level of sophistic culture, resorts to the same nexus of passages for his discussion of dancing and music (see Hobein's parallels to *Or.* 37.4). The *Laws* would provide the author of *De Salt.* with the *πυρρίχη* and *ἐμμελεία* (814E–815A); he would have to find only the *κόρδαξ* and *κικιννίς* elsewhere, and the latter is mentioned together with the *ἐμμελεία* in a simple classification of dances associated with satyric drama, tragedy and comedy (*Salt.* 22). The author would then only have to know that the *ὑπόρχημα* is the characteristic dance of choral lyric (*Salt.* 16); the context suggests that he has included the *ὄρμος* in his treatment of Spartan dancing, and he most probably recollected it from a source which dealt with Spartan training (12), like the *γυμνοπαιδία* which follows it. From *Timaeus* 40c he could have extracted the *χορεία ἀστέρων*, which provides the beginnings of dancing in *De Salt.* 7. Plato would also supply him with numerous references to the Corybants (e.g. *Symp.* 215E, *Crito* 54D, *Euthyd.* 277D).

Harmon (*ad Salt.* 8) notes that he does not make the usual confusion of these dancers with the Curetes: it would be a reasonable guess that this is because he has extracted the latter direct from Hesiod once more (fr.23 Merkelbach-West, cf. *Theog.* 477ff). And once we subtract this material directly available from a sophist's standard reading, we are left with only isolated ingredients. There is some bizarre paradoxography: Indians dance in honour of the sun; and Ethiopians do a war dance (*Salt.* 17, 18). We cannot safely speculate on the source in either case, but there is nothing to suggest that it was a treatise on dancing; we should bear in mind that Lucian himself certainly knew some exotic *Indica*,¹² and Ethiopia was an equally magnetic locale for sophistic writers.¹³ The information in *De Salt.* is minimal here—as much, in fact, as Lucian knows about Indian and Ethiopian philosophies in *Fugitivi* 7. Nor is the author of *De Salt.* better informed about

¹¹ A few scattered reminiscences are collected in W. H. Tackaberry, *Lucian's Relation to Plato and the Post-Aristotelian Philosophers* (Toronto Studies, philol. ser. 9, 1930) 62–85.

¹² For his use of Megasthenes and Ctesias see A. Stengel, *De Luciani veris historiis* (Berlin 1911), *passim*.

¹³ As suggested by the parallel in Heliodorus' bizarre novel (9.19), cited by Harmon *ad loc.*

the Salii, and their perfunctory appearance was presumably prompted only by a Roman patron. The author may not even have needed to go as far as a handbook for the information that the *πυρρίχη* took its name from Pyrrhus,¹⁴ while the mention of dancing in the mysteries is only a means of introducing a respectably 'Attic' institution, also available in *Leges* 815.

As for Dionysus in India (*Salt.* 22), again we should note that Lucian himself wrote a *prolalia* on the subject (*Bacchus* 1–4). Beside this the equally absurd picture of Priapus teaching the young Ares the war dance will come as no surprise (*Salt.* 21); we should notice that Lucian in turn makes much of the tradition of an equally unlikely warrior, Pan (*Bis accusatus* 9–11; *Dial.Deor.* 22.3); and the Priapus tradition, otherwise unattested, is not likely to have been culled from a technical manual on dancing itself.¹⁵ The supposed inscription in honour of dancers in Thessaly (*Salt.* 14) suggests a 'Lucianic' technique: Lucian was given to improbable inscriptions in exotic places,¹⁶ and he liked to try his hand at small stretches in non-Attic dialect.¹⁷ The greatest absurdity is the euhemerising of Proteus as a pantomimic dancer (*Salt.* 19), but that would again be no surprise if the author is Lucian, who makes the god draw a learned analogy between his own versatile person and an octopus (*Dial.Mar.* 4)!

Apart from these sophistic flourishes there is very little left of the 'history' of dancing. The author pretends that there is a development to present-day perfection (34), just as Philostratus pretends that there is a direct connection between the first and second sophistic, despite the gap of so many centuries.¹⁸ It is also instructive to compare the sheer bulk of information with which the genuine antiquarian Athenaeus is able to inundate his reader (628C–631E): he sets out to supply the very kind of information which the author of *De Salt.* makes such a point of avoiding: the literature *περὶ εὐρημάτων* looms large in this impressive collection of names and founders of dances.¹⁹

¹⁴ For the real explanation see K. Latte, *De saltationibus Graecorum* (Giessen 1913, repr. Berlin 1967) 28.

¹⁵ For the explanation of this unique but perfectly probable Priapic tradition see G. Kaibel, *GöttNachr* 1901, 488ff. It is not necessary to assume (*contra* Roscher, *Lex.* 2972) that the author took the tradition from a collector of Bithynian cult-lore about the god; he might easily have known the tradition that Priapus is a son of Dionysus (Roscher 2971).

¹⁶ Cf. *Dips.* 6; *Ver.Hist.* 1.7, 2.28; *Scythia* 2.

¹⁷ e.g. *Vit.Auct.* 3–6, 13f; *De Domo* 20; Bompaire, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 633.

¹⁸ Cf. G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1969) 9.

¹⁹ For these authorities see Latte, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.14) 1–17.

Again, however, Athenaeus has little more actual evidence at his disposal and concentrates on what he can supply about the dances of tragedy, comedy and satyr drama, or Spartan athletic dancing, from literary interests as much as from technical treatises (630c). Sophists who derive their information from this kind of source find their stocks of information running short before very long. It is therefore not surprising that the author of *De Salt.* should break off his 'history' of dancing to attack those who have written at length on the forms and history of pantomime, *πολυμαθίας ταύτην ἐπίδειξιν ἡγούμενοι παρέξειν*: this is mere *φιλοτιμίαν ἀπειρόκαλον . . . ὀψιμαθῆ . . . ἄκαιρον* (33).

Having made these criticisms of the 'experts' he proceeds to emulate them himself: each of these objections can be applied to his own account of the themes which the dancer has to memorise, spread over the next twenty-four paragraphs. This curious preamble confirms that the writer is an amateur, tilting at the professionals before he begins his own display: one notes that Lucian is equally ponderous when setting himself up as an adviser on historiography (*Hist.conscr.* 34–36). Since the author of *De Salt.* has been a convert to dancing, he has to overwhelm the audience with his command of the subject. All this amounts to is a list of (mainly tragic) themes (37–61), which are, we should note, a special interest of Lucian's. The author of *De Salt.* may not have had either time or means for adequate research into dancing; or he may not have been prepared to put the effort into a work which he might not be able to use again. He avoids naming dancers, possibly because he was neither sufficiently interested nor well enough versed in the subject to know them. Lucian for his part has the same limitation when naming actors;²⁰ and there are at least two apparent misunderstandings in the *De Salt.* account.²¹

The author is safest when he is posing as a professor of répertoire. But how are his dancer's themes related to Lucian's stock in his canonically accepted works? The list of myths in *De Salt.* corresponds well with those used by Lucian: it is based chiefly on Homer, Hesiod and tragedy (61) with some unacknowledged additions from Herodotus. Bompaire hastily dismisses them as "souvent peu connues" (*supra* n.1, p.582) and therefore un-Lucianic, though he admits elsewhere (195 and n.4) that Lucian does in fact use recondite myths from

²⁰ Bompaire, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 437.

²¹ Kokolakis, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 20f.

time to time. It is easy to lose sight of the fact that if Lucian were the author, he would know the myth of Boreas and Oreithuia (*Salt.* 40) from its prominent appearance in Plato, *Phdr.* 229c (in fact it also appears in an undoubtedly genuine work at *Philopseudes* 3); and he would also know of the two Erotes (*Salt.* 38, cf. 7; Hes. *Theog.* 116f) from Plato, *Symp.* 178b. Dido and Aeneas (46) might well be of slight significance to a second-century Greek, but if Lucian could mention Augustus in *Pro Lapsu* 18 as a concession to his Roman patron, he could also produce the most hackneyed of Roman traditions as a compliment to Verus. This leaves only a small proportion of myths still outside Lucian's own usual repertoire (Nisus-Scylla, *Salt.* 41; Hypsipyle and Archemorus, 44; Medea's dream, 53). Harmon notes that the last of these is not in fact a normal part of the Medea legend, but duly compares Apollonius Rhodius, *Arg.* 3.616–82. It is not necessary to assume that there was a pantomime theme based on this, though the possibility is certainly not excluded; but it would be a passage which a sophist might be expected to know for other reasons as an exercise in *εὐγκρισις*. Lucian does not use *all* the rest of the material which occurs in this section of *De Salt.*, but he does exploit a cross-section of each 'block' of mythology sufficiently large to suggest that he would have been aware of the remainder.²² The author of *De Salt.* introduces an unusual element into the story of Polycrates, probably by confusing the tyrant's brother with his daughter (54): Harmon insists that Lucian knew his Herodotus too well to make such a mistake (*LCL* V p.261), but the version of Polycrates' death at *Charon* 14 is not quite accurate,²³ and in the same dialogue Lucian transposes Tellus of Athens and Cleobis and Biton in Solon's list of happy men (10). This is clearly the kind of material for which Lucian trusted to memory.

The selection of myths from outside Greece reflects limitations very similar to Lucian's own: the Aetolian cycle (50) culminates in Heracles on Oeta (*Peregrinus* 21; *Hermot.* 7; *Dial.Deor.* 13); Italy (55) is represented by Phaethon and the poplars (*De Electro*; *Dial.Deor.* 25.2); the west (56) by Heracles' labours, ending with the oxen of Geryon (*Heracles* 2); Phoenicia (58) by Attis and Stratonice (*Syr.D.* 15, 17ff);

²² e.g. *Salt.* 49: Lucian is not interested in Pasiphae but mentions both Daedalus (*Icar.* 2) and Talus (*Philops.* 19); of the Argonauts he selects only Orpheus and Heracles (*Fugit.* 2) as well as the talking keel (*Gall.* 2).

²³ S. Walz, *Die geschichtlichen Kenntnisse Lukians* (Diss. Tübingen 1921) 46.

and Egypt (58) by Osiris (*ibid.* 7), Epaphus (*cf. Dial.Mar.* 7.2) and the metamorphosis of the gods (*De Sacrificiis* 14). Lucian insists on the mystical character of Egyptian mythology (*Deorum Concilium* 11, *cf. Dial.Mar.* 7.2); in *De Salt.* the dancer is to use more symbolism in presenting it (τὰ γὰρ Αἰγυπτίων μυστικώτερα ὄντα εἴσεται μὲν, συμβολικώτερον δὲ ἐπιδείξεται 59). It is difficult to see how the dancer could be *more* symbolic than he has to be in pantomimic dance anyway (*cf. Salt.* 63); the remark would be more intelligible if it were in fact Lucian himself who is applying his usual comment regardless.

Does this whole section betray that the author of *De Salt.* has used a single source? Kokolakis²⁴ accepts the view that he may have used such authorities as Didymus, Tryphon, Aristoxenus, Aristocles, Seleucus, Dioscorides and others; but his only evidence is the author's own statement (33, 61) that he is aware of the relevant literature and has been very selective! This only implies however that he knew of its existence, a different matter.²⁵ Harmon (*LCL* V p.248 n.2) notices the geographical layout, and in view of the curious brevity of the catalogue it would be tempting to suspect that the author had on this occasion gone to a handbook. But we should note that Lucian was certainly capable of piecing together the most elementary information into an imposing catalogue (*Vitarum auctio, Pro Lapsu*): the author of *De Sacrificiis* or *De Luctu* could easily have written the central portion of *De Saltatione*.

The same technique would account for the curiously haphazard final section (62ff): a casual collection of what turn out to be Lucian's own favourite *topoi*, pressed into service by an author faced with an unlikely subject. Two pantomimes are mentioned (62, 83): the adultery of Aphrodite and the madness of Ajax. Lucian wrote miniature dramas on both (*Dial.Deor.* 17, *Dial.Mort.* 29).²⁶ The point of the story of Demetrius' drama and the dancer (63) is that the performer dazzles his audience without the help of expensive props; with a slight change of scene this is the same story as Lucian's elaborate comparison between Evangelus and Eumelus (*Adv.Ind.* 8ff). Again, a ἡμιέλλην wants to use a dancer as his interpreter (64); Lucian knows the motif of the

²⁴ *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 24 and n.48.

²⁵ Lucian makes similar tendentious claims about his command of examples for the correct use of χαίρειν, εὖ πράττειν and ὑγιαίνειν (*Pro Lapsu* 7), or the meaning of ἀποφράς (*Pseudolog.* 15).

²⁶ Bompaire, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 583 and n.2.

barbarian misinterpreting a civilized spectacle²⁷ (*Anach.* 1ff, wrestlers; *ibid.* 23, actors). Another barbarian imagines that a dancer with five rôles must also have five souls (66); Lucian gives the cock a series of comic transmigrations (*Gallus* 19f). The author of *De Salt.* applies the classic simile of the cuttlefish to the dancer (67); Lucian applies an elaborate example to Proteus (*Dial.Mar.* 4.3). The dancer can represent the three parts of the Platonic soul, and the dancer's silence represents the silence of Pythagoras (70). Caster²⁸ objected that symbolic interpretation would be "tout à fait étrangère à l'esprit de Lucien." In fact this would be in favour of Lucian's authorship rather than against it: the author is careful to quote such a theory at second-hand (*ἤκουσα δέ τινος καὶ περιττότερόν τι νεανιευομένου*). But all is fair in the *ἄδοξον*: in *Muscae Encomium* Lucian makes ridiculous connections between the same two philosophers and the fly—its reviving 'proves' the immortality of the soul (7), and Muia was associated with Pythagoras (11)! The author of *De Salt.* enlarges on blood and dust in wrestling (71) as Lucian does in *Anacharsis* 2f; he combines Heracles and Aphrodite (73), as Lucina combines Heracles and a *cinaedus* (*Adv.Ind.* 23) or Heracles and Omphale (*Hist.conscr.* 10); and the dancer's physique is held up to the Polyclitan canon, as is Peregrinus' in *De Morte Peregrini* 9. The final anecdote (83f) is about a man who overacted the madness of Ajax. This very theme is the basis in Lucian's acknowledged works for a number of favourite anecdotal motifs: the mad performer (*Hist.conscr.* 1) who forgets his proper rôle and runs amok (*Piscator* 36), and whose misconduct nearly causes a grave injury to his supporting actor Odysseus (*cf. Pseudologista* 27).

Hirzel (*Der Dialog* II 285) connects *De Salt.* as a whole with *Anacharsis* since both are conversations with a Cynic and the approach is Peripatetic; but this is entirely superficial. In *Anacharsis* the 'Cynic'—Anacharsis himself—goes away at the end unconvinced;²⁹ the didactic element is much less prominent and is cleverly used for humorous ends; and in *De Salt.* there is none of the "freie Blüthe und Kraft des Lebens" which Hirzel saw in *Anacharsis*. A more fruitful comparison can be made between *De Salt.* and *Quomodo historia conscribenda sit*: dancer and historian alike must present their events clearly (62:

²⁷ The story itself need not be the author's; *cf.* Philostr. *VA* 5.8: the Gadeirans think that Nero won his Olympic victory by literally conquering the Olympians!

²⁸ *Lucien et la pensée religieuse de son temps* (Paris 1937) 43 n.97.

²⁹ Bompaire, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 356 n.1; 678.

Hist.conscr. 43); accommodate to a succession of different situations (65–67: *Hist.* 49); combine mental and practical disciplines (69: *Hist.* 37); create a vivid realism in descriptions (63: *Hist.* 51); and maintain correct proportion (75: *Hist.* 16, 23). Both may combine pleasure with profit (71: *Hist.* 9) and the effect of eye and ear (78: *Hist.* 46f). Of course such headings are applied to vastly different circumstances, and the writer of *De Salt.* leaves out no absurdity: the dancer is shown as having solecisms (80), *κακοζηλία* (82), and knowledge of past, present and future (36) as readily as the bogus historians. It is quite clear that ‘Lucianic’ treatises on medicine or lyre-playing would be as easy to produce from the same set of headings as these two; and they would look just as uncomfortably alike.

Scholars analysing *De Salt.* have tried to explain it only in terms of textbook schemes. There is general agreement on the break at ch.35:³⁰ Bompaire (*supra* n.5, p.281 n.4) sees the work as two distinct and self-contained encomia (of dance, 7–34; of dancers, 35–84); others use the formula which Norden applied to Horace’s *Ars Poetica*: an *εἰσαγωγή* under the headings *Ars* and *Artifex*.³¹ But this classification is not entirely satisfactory even for the *Ars Poetica* itself,³² and it is still less so when applied to *De Salt.*; once the labels are attached, what happens to the catalogue of myths? As dancer’s *répertoire* it is *Ars*, but the writer has introduced it by a tenuous connexion with memory (36), so that it also falls under the heading of *Artifex*. The writer indeed has already announced that he is going to speak about the dancer (35) but does not reach any conventional discussion of his faults or merits until 62; 37–61 is a plain catalogue quite distinct from the material on either side and has to be seen as a single unit. The general layout is then familiar:

1– 4	Crato is shocked to hear about Lycinus’ enthusiasm for dancing,	<i>Introduction</i>	I
5– 6	but agrees to hear his defence.		II
7–25	‘Historical’ instances of dance.	<i>Catalogue</i>	Ia
26–32	Its rôle compared with that of tragedy and comedy.		Ib
(33–34)	A defence of the writer’s omissions.		

³⁰ Th. Sinko, *Eos* 14 (1908) 134; *RE* (*supra* n.1) 1759; L. Müller, *Eos* 32 (1930) 569–71.

³¹ *Hermes* 40 (1905) 481–528.

³² For criticism of Norden and summary of later developments in the search for a ‘scheme’ for the *Ars*, see C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry, Prolegomena to the Literary Epistles* (Cambridge 1963) 20–40.

(35–36)	The cultural value of dancing.	
37–61	The dancer's repertoire, by regions	
37–48	of Greece,	IIa
49–59	and foreign parts.	IIb
62–84	Other aspects of the dancer: the merits of a good one, and the faults of the rest.	(IIIa IIIb)
85	Concluding frame: Crato's 'conversion'.	<i>Epilogue</i>

The arrangement just described is in accord with the schemes of many of Lucian's canonical works. I have described its operations in detail elsewhere.³³ Here it will be sufficient to note that dialogues as diverse as *Navigium* or *Prometheus* start out with a two-panel introduction followed by three more extensive panels dealing with the main theme; so does *Timon*, before Lucian tags on an ending which mimics the closing scenes of an Old Comedy.³⁴ In *De Salt.* also there are three marked divisions for the main subject; and the author has also introduced a characteristically 'Lucianic' element of contrast between the middle section and the other two panels. In *De Salt.*, however, the third section is particularly confused. The writer has set out to discover the dancer's qualities and faults; but he announces the topic rather belatedly, as he himself admits (74): 'Ἐθέλω δὲ ἤδη καὶ ὑποδείξαι σοι τῷ λόγῳ, ὁποῖον χρὴ εἶναι τὸν ἄριστον ὀρχηστὴν ἐν τε ψυχῇ καὶ σώματι. καίτοι τῆς μὲν ψυχῆς προεῖπον τὰ πλείστα. He allows some clumsy repetition (ταῖς χερσὶν αὐταῖς λαλεῖν 63, χειρίσοφος 69; the didactic function of dancing, 72, cf. 81; examples from gymnastics, 71, 77f), and on two occasions seems to interrupt his list of the dancer's faults with merits (78f, 81). This careless composition is not an argument for or against Lucian's authorship: it is clear that any writer who could organise the rest of the work could have worked out this section more clearly. But it is not difficult to explain at least some of the disruption here. The writer wants to contrast the dancer's merits and faults (80), but at the same time he is attempting to divide his mental from his physical qualities (74), so that some of the physical

³³ *op.cit.* (*supra* n.10) 135–63.

³⁴ So in *Navig.* 28–38, a fantastic battle scene between two fantastic meditations, or two debates, one on high and one below, with a casual conversation *en route* (*Timon, Piscator*). I adopt the following divisions:

	a	b	A	B	C	
<i>Navigium</i>	1–9	10–17	18–27	28–39	41–45	
<i>Prometheus</i>	1–3	4–6	7–10	11–17	18–19	20–21
<i>Timon</i>	1–6	7–11	11–19	20–30	34–40	

faults overlap (76). And to add to the confusion he seems to want to sum up the attractions of the dance (81) as near to the end as possible before finishing with his caricature of the mad dancer (83f).

Helm (*RE*, *supra* n.1, 1759) rightly hinted at resemblances to *Historia* and *Nigrinus*; these are most marked in the final section of *De Salt.* Lucian organised the didactic half of *Historia* badly;³⁵ and in *Nigrinus* he seems to have lost control of the discussion at the same critical point, just before the frame resumes and the interlocutor declares himself converted.³⁶ The same explanation will apply here: the author is trying to include all the material even remotely connected with the subject of his encomium, as if he will only have one opportunity to display it. He associates his ideas more and more loosely in an attempt to leave nothing out, and then brings himself to an abrupt and perhaps unconvincing conclusion.

The essay *De Saltatione* therefore answers to what we should expect from Lucian, writing for an occasion with neither knowledge nor interest in his subject. By contrast the encomium of Panthea in *Imagines—Pro Imaginibus* allowed a number of his interests to converge. *De Saltatione* gave him only very slender opportunities to use his répertoire, with disappointing results.

UNIVERSITY OF KENT AT CANTERBURY

July, 1977

³⁵ For the arrangement see H. Homeyer, *Wie man Geschichte schreiben soll* (Munich 1964) 13ff.

³⁶ *Nigr.* 34–35. For the problems raised by the structure of this dialogue see Bompaigne, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 277f, 504ff.