

THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN

A Journal of International Scholarship and Special Topics Since 1925

ISSN: 0009-8337

Reference Abbreviation *CB*

VOLUME 85 ♦ 2009 ♦ NUMBER 1

CONTENTS

- Truth from Fiction in Catullus' Gellius Poems 1
SHAWN O'BRYHIM
- Useful Truths, Enchanting Fictions: Historians
and Novelists at Play..... 11
LUCA GRAVERINI
- Brothers in the Night: Agamemnon & Menelaus
in Book 10 of the *Iliad* 27
BENJAMIN SAMMONS
- Seasons and Similes in the *Aeneid*..... 49
GEORGE FREDIC FRANKO
- Book Reviews
- Sally-Ann Ashton, *Cleopatra and Egypt*. / ROBERT GURVAL 60
- Han Baltussen, *Philosophy and Exegesis in Simplicius: The Methodology
of a Commentator*. / EDWARD WATTS 62
- Claudia Baracchi, *Aristotle's Ethics as First Philosophy*. / SILVIA CARLI 63
- Roger Beck, *A Brief History of Ancient Astrology*. / JEFFREY L. COOLEY 65
- Ann Bergren, *Weaving Truth: Essays on Language and the Female in Greek
Thought*. / FREDERICK GRIFFITHS..... 67
- Joanne Berry, *The Complete Pompeii*. / SARAH LEVIN-RICHARDSON. 69
- Mauro Bonazzi and Cristoph Helmig, eds. *Platonic Stoicism –
Stoic Platonism: The Dialogue between Platonism and Stoicism
in Antiquity*. / ANDREW R. HILL 71
- David J. Breeze, *Roman Frontiers of Britain*. / JOSEPH LEMAK 72
- Katrina Cawthorn, *Becoming Female: The Male Body
in Greek Tragedy*. / MARY EBBOTT 74
- S. Cuomo, *Technology and Culture in Greek and
Roman Antiquity*. / JEANNETTE MARCHAND 76

Vergilian Society Study Tours Part I, 2012

Roman Jordan, July 7-18, 2012

(Directors: Phillip Stanley, Professor Emeritus; George Perko)

Jordan is a bridge between sea and desert and East and West and is a land of mesmerizing beauty and contrast: from the mountains around Amman to the Dead Sea below sea level. Our tour begins in Amman. From the capital we travel north to the Roman city of Jerash, one of the best preserved Greco-Roman cities with its theaters, temples, churches and colonnaded streets. We journey down to the Dead Sea, visiting Mt. Nebo, where Moses saw the Promised Land before dying and we visit sites built by Herod. From here we go to Petra, entering through the narrow pass to gradually see unfold the mysteries of the Rose Red City with its spectacular treasuries, royal tombs, burial chambers, and high places of sacrifice. Afterward we journey south to visit the Wadi Rum Desert and explore its moon-like landscape. This is where Lawrence of Arabia stayed and where the movie was filmed. From the desert we travel to Aqaba on the Red Sea. This will be a memorable journey through one of Rome's wealthy eastern provinces. For a sneak preview of our tour and the sites to which we will travel visit the virtual reality web site at <http://www.virtualworldproject.org/vr/core/toc.html>.

"In the Footsteps of Poets and Painters, Proletarians and Princes: Rediscovering the Bay of Naples in Greek and Roman Times" early July 2012

(Directors Ann Koloski-Ostrow, Brandeis University; Steven Ostrow, M.I.T.)

Residents of Naples Bay hailed from slave and freedman circles, from the ranks of the free-born poor, from middling traders, artisans and municipal worthies, and ranged upward to top aristocrats, and not a few Emperors themselves. We shall meet many of these souls at home, at work, and at Campanian play. Sites include Sperlonga, Terracina, Cumae, Lake Avernus, Solfatara, Pompeii, Naples, Paestum/Poseidonia, Puteoli/Pozzuoli, Beneventum, Saepinum, Herculaneum, Oplontis (Torre Annunziata), Capri, Baiae, Bacoli, Misenum.

USEFUL TRUTHS, ENCHANTING FICTIONS: HISTORIANS AND NOVELISTS AT PLAY

With this paper I am going to offer a general overview of the relationship between historiography and the novel in the ancient world. A necessary introductory remark is that the latter is not a well-defined literary genre, and it remains a subject of contemporary debate exactly which literary works ought to be labeled as "novels." I shall remain on rather safe ground here, confining myself to those Greek and Latin novels that are usually acknowledged as "canonical," without exploring the so-called "fringe novels."¹ However, the question "what is a novel," especially for ancient culture, remains open. For example, the widely accepted modern description of the ancient novels as "extended prose fiction" relies exclusively on form and content, and as such it is at least partially unsatisfactory: it neglects, for example, all questions regarding style, purpose, and audience, and it takes for granted that a sharp distinction can easily be drawn between fiction and historical truth. As a matter of fact, and as far as we know, even ancient literary theorists had no comprehensive and unequivocal definition for the novel: the genre arose too late, and it was usually considered too lowly, to attract the attention of ancient philologists. So a comparison with historiography can help us to mark the boundaries of the literary space occupied by prose fiction: firstly, because "what is historiography" was a question commonly addressed by historians themselves in their works: therefore we can consider historiography as a well-defined literary genre, which can help us to shed some light on the features of the not-so-well-defined, but clearly different and in some ways opposite, ancient novel. Secondly, this comparison is useful precisely because it allows us to begin with the assumption that historiography and the novel are quite the opposite, the former dealing with truth, the latter with fiction. We shall see later on that this contrast needs to be blurred and complicated, but it nevertheless offers a good starting point.

If we look for a commonly accepted answer to the question "what is historiography," we should consult Thucydides. In a famous programmatic passage, the Athenian historian implies that historiography is Ζήτησις τῆς ἀληθείας "a quest for truth" (1.20.3). From the following

¹For a general introduction to the ancient novel, and to the modern critical debate about it, see Graverini in Graverini-Keulen-Barchiesi 2006, chapter 1, with further bibliography. On the concept of "fringe novels" see e.g. Holzberg 1996 and Keulen in Graverini-Keulen-Barchiesi 2006, 179 ff., with further literature. The translations adopted in this paper are as follows: Cole Babbitt 1936 (Plutarch, *De gloria Atheniensium*); Foster 1919 (Livy); Forster Smith 19282 (Thucydides); Hanson 1989 (Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*); MacLeod 1967 (pseudo-Lucian, *Amores*); Paton 1925 (Polybius); Rushton Fairclough 1929² (Horace, *Epistles*); Reardon 1989 (Greek novels); Russell 2001 (Quintilian); Oldfather 1933 (Diodorus Siculus); Stahl 1952 (Macrobius); Trapp 1997 (Maximus of Tyre). In some places, I have introduced some small variations to adapt the translation to the context.

lines it is clear that historiography is a very serious matter.² It involves hard and thorough research to ascertain what has really happened; the primary source is what the historian himself has witnessed with his own eyes,³ and only secondarily the evidence given by other eyewitnesses. Hearsay is not accepted.⁴ Myths—that is, unverifiable traditional narrations of any kind—are not accepted either.⁵ This narrowing of historiography to bare and verifiable facts has its consequences: the narration will be *aterpesteron*, Thucydides says, that is, not sweet, agreeable, seducing; but instead it will be a possession for all future readers (*ktema...es aiei*), who will be able to learn from past events.

To gauge the distance between historiography and the novel, let us read another famous programmatic passage, the prologue to Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, whose Thucydidean flavor is well known:⁶

I produced the four volumes of this book, as an offering to Love, the Nymphs, and Pan, and something for mankind to possess and enjoy (κτῆμα...τερπνὸν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις). It will cure the sick, comfort the distressed, stir the memory of those who have loved, and educate those who haven't.

²"But as to the facts of the occurrences of war (τὰ δ' ἔργα τῶν πραγθέντων), I have thought it my duty to give them, not as ascertained from any chance informant nor as seemed to me probable, but only after investigating with the greatest possible accuracy each detail, in the case both of the events in which I myself participated (οἷς τε αὐτὸς παρήν) and of those regarding which I got my information from others....And it may well be that the absence of the fabulous (τὸ μὴ μυθώδες) from my narrative will seem less pleasing to the ear (ἀτερπέστερον); but whoever shall wish to have a clear view both of the events which have happened and of those which will some day, in all human probability, happen again in the same or a similar way—for these to adjudge my history profitable will be enough for me. And, indeed, it has been composed, not as a prize-essay to be heard for the moment, but as a possession for all time (κτῆμά τε ἐς αἰεί)." (1.2.2-4)

³*Autopsia* is always the most important historical source for ancient historians. Cf. Dorati 2008:136: "la scrittura storica antica è in larga misura fondata sul presupposto che lo storico sia, dove possibile, presente nel testo come Personaggio—come 'testimone', implicito o esplicito, se non come 'protagonista'—; di qui un peso dell'elemento autobiografico in senso lato di fatto estraneo alla storiografia moderna."

⁴On the strong opposition between *opsis* and *akoe* see below, n.25.

⁵Cf. Bowersock 1994:1ff., who quotes the beginning of Plutarch's *Life of Theseus*: "Just as geographers, O Socius Senecio, crowd on to the outer edges of their maps the parts of the earth which elude their knowledge, with explanatory notes that 'What lies beyond is sandy desert without water and full of wild beasts,' or 'blind marsh,' or 'Scythian cold,' or 'frozen sea,' so in the writing of my Parallel Lives, now that I have traversed those periods of time which are accessible to probable reasoning and which afford basis for a history dealing with facts, I might well say of the earlier periods 'What lies beyond is full of marvels and unreality, a land of poets and fabulists, of doubt and obscurity.' But after publishing my account of Lycurgus the lawgiver and Numa the king, I thought I might not unreasonably go back still farther to Romulus, now that my history had brought me near his times." Flory 1990 suggests that in Thucydides *to mythodes* has also a more specific meaning than simply *mythoi*, and refers to "patriotic stories in particular and sentimental chauvinism in general" (194); see also below, n.9.

⁶Cf. e.g. Hunter 1983:48-50; MacQueen 1990:138-159; Morgan 2004:16-17.

Like Thucydides' *Histories*, Longus' novel advertises itself as a universal *ktema*, "possession": something valuable, a literary work offering some sort of knowledge and utility. However, this new *ktema* is also *terpnon*, "delightful," while Thucydides, as we have seen, declares that the absence of mythical qualities makes his account of the Peloponnesian war *aterpesteron*, "not delightful". So myths and novels are qualified as something *terpnon*, while historiography is not. This adjective is part of a coherent set of expressions that define fiction, both in the programmatic statements of writers and in the few comments by readers that remain to us. Fiction is sweet, psychagogic, delights its audience, and metaphorically "titillates his ears."⁷ Here are some examples:

...and I think that this last chapter will prove very agreeable (ἡδίστον) to its readers... (Chariton 8.1.4)

Well sir, by Zeus and by Eros himself, please do not hesitate to delight me (ἡσείν) with your love story, even though it seems a myth. (Achilles Tatius 1.2.2)

Literary people should after extended reading of serious authors relax mentally, to refresh themselves against subsequent exertions. They will find this interlude agreeable if they choose as company such works as not only afford wit, charm and distraction pure and simple (ἄ μὴ μόνον ἐκ τοῦ ἀστείου τε καὶ χαρίεντος ψιλὴν παρέξει τὴν ψυχαγωγίαν), but also provoke some degree of cultured reflection. (Lucian, *A True Story* 1.1-2)

This morning I have been quite gladdened by the sweet (γλυκεῖα) winning seductiveness of your wanton stories, so that I almost thought I was Aristides being enchanted beyond measure (ὑπερκηλούμενος) by those Milesian Tales. (Pseudo-Lucian, *Amores* 1)

I will caress your ears (*auras tuas permulceam*) with my sweet whisper. (Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 1.1.1)

Fables—the very word acknowledges their falsity—serve two purposes: either merely to gratify the ear or to encourage the reader to good works. They delight the ears (auditum mulcent) as do the comedies of Menander and his imitators, or the narratives replete with imaginary doings of lovers in which Petronius Arbiter so freely indulged and

⁷On this metaphorical expression, and the other passages quoted below, see Graverini 2007:esp. 43-47.

with which Apuleius, astonishingly, sometimes amused himself. (Macrobius, *In Somnium Scipionis* 1.2.7–8)

Antonius Diogenes' romance...is most agreeable (πλεῖστον ἔχει τοῦ ἡδέος) in the ideas it expresses. (Photius, *Bibliotheca* 166.109a)

His [scil. Iamblichus'] vocabulary is flowing and gentle (ῥέουσα καὶ μαλακή). As for its sonorous qualities, the words have not been given rhythmical force so much as titillating and, so to speak, mincing movement (ἐπὶ τὸ γαργαλίζον, ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι, καὶ βλακῶδες παρακεκίνηται). (Photius, *Bibliotheca* 93.73b)

This insistence on the sweet, soothing, psychagogic qualities of fiction is ambivalent. On the one hand, it is clearly derogatory, especially in the view of conservative and traditionalist readers such as Macrobius. Such readers assume the typically Roman and (partially) Greek attitude against anything that is not clearly and directly useful, and/or too sophisticated. "Sweet, soft, soothing" for them qualify something as non-Roman, often also non-Greek, too Oriental. In a word, too effeminate.⁸

On the other hand, Longus' prologue, like the other narrative texts quoted above, simply adopts a metaliterary language, which helps the reader to place what he is about to read in the ancient literary space. Thucydides, as we have seen, suggests that there is a substantial identity between the categories of *mythodes*, fiction, and *terpnon*, "pleasant, delightful." So *terpnon* is obviously derogatory as long as it is used by and for historians, but it would not be at all offensive to say that poetry is *terpnon*—in fact, quite the opposite. What is important, to Thucydides and many others such as Livy, is not to mix *terpnon*, that is the pleasure and seduction typical of poetry, with truth:

...from the evidence that has been given, anyone would not err who should hold the view that the state of affairs in antiquity was pretty nearly such as I have described it, not giving greater credence to the accounts, on the one hand, which the poets have put into song, adorning and amplify-

⁸Cf. the *Introduction* to Keulen 2007:esp. 8ff. and 21ff. It is interesting that exactly the same terms I have pointed out so far recur often in the rhetorical polemic: they are used by old-style professors of rhetoric (like Aelius Aristides and Quintilian) to censure the new, Asianist rhetoric, that tries to soothe its audience with flourishing sentences and a singsong elocution rather than convince it with rational reasoning. Cf. Graverini 2007:28–35; Keulen 2007:21ff.

ing their theme, and on the other, which the chroniclers (λογογράφοι) have composed with a view rather of pleasing the ear (ἐπὶ τὸ προσαγωγότερον τῇ ἀκροάσει) than of telling the truth, since their stories cannot be tested and most of them have from lapse of time won their way into the region of fabulous (ἐπὶ τὸ μυθῶδες) so as to be incredible. (Thucydides 1.21.1)

Such traditions as belong to the time before the city was founded, or rather was presently to be founded, and are rather adorned with poetic legends (*poeticis magis decora fabulis*) than based upon trustworthy historical proofs, I purpose neither to affirm nor to refute. (Livy 1 pr. 6)

Therefore, according to Thucydides and Livy, historiography is the realm of truth; only fiction (that is, for them, poetry and mythography) can be sweet, soothing, delightful, psychagogical.⁹ Fiction and only fiction can claim the right to offer delight to its audience and to please the ears of those who listen to it. Historiography needs to be useful and educational; fiction—be it in prose or poetry—mainly has to be enchanting. These two attitudes do not seem to combine well: Thucydides and the historians aim at being accurate and useful, while novelists, like poets, prefer sweetness and psychagogy.¹⁰

In a way, this is a very reassuring concept, since it lets us draw very clear-cut boundaries between literary genres. However, the comforting sharpness of the distinction between historiography and the novel is mainly the consequence of contrasting Longus to Thucydides, and we have to abandon it—or at least, as I said, we should blur and complicate it. Certainly, it is evident that Longus, in his prologue, is playing an intertextual game with Thucydides' programmatic passage. However, these two authors are divided by an arc of time of about six centuries, and much happened in that period. For example, historiography changed considerably: in order to appreciate the relationship between Longus and historiography, we should also take Hellenistic

⁹On Thucydides' attitude towards poets and logographers (and Herodotus) see Corcella 2006; Rood 2006:234ff.

¹⁰This also marks a continuity from the ancient to the modern novel: think, for example, about the psychagogical power of the adventure books Don Quixote was so fond of (cf. *Don Quijote* 1.50: "Los libros que están impresos con licencia de los reyes y con aprobación de aquellos a quien se remitieron, y que con gusto general son leídos y celebrados... ¿habían de ser mentira?... ¿hay mayor contento que ver, como si dijésemos, aquí ahora se muestra delante de nosotros un gran lago de pez hirviendo a borbollones..."). Don Quixote never questions the truthfulness of those adventure books, and he is completely absorbed in their narrative world. A more healthy and useful way to react to the sweetness and psychagogy of fiction is suggested by Maximus of Tyre in the passage quoted below in the text.

historiography into consideration.

To have an idea of the new trends of historiography, we can read a programmatic fragment from the Hellenistic historian Duris:

Duris of Samos in the first book of his Histories says: "Ephoros and Theompompos, on the whole, were not up to the events (they narrated). They attained no μίμησις, nor did they offer any pleasure (ἡδονή) in their discourse: they only took care to write down."¹¹

According to Duris, offering *hedone*, pleasure, is now an unavoidable task of the historian, who cannot limit himself to writing down what has happened. From that scanty fragment we can infer that *hedone* is mainly produced by *mimesis*, a vivid representation and not merely a faithful but dry description of what has happened. Historiography has discovered the importance of a rhetorical device, *enargeia* or *evidentia*. Let us take a seat for a moment in a rhetor's classroom in order to listen to a short lesson on *enargeia*. Quintilian explains that:

As to *evidentia*, it is, to my understanding, undoubtedly an important virtue of Narrative, when a truth requires not only to be told but in a sense to be presented to the sight (*ostendendum*).

...*enargeia*, what Cicero calls *illustratio* and *evidentia*,...makes us seem not so much to be talking about something as exhibiting (*ostendere*) it. Emotions will ensue just as if we were present at the event itself.¹²

So the historian not only needs to inform and to educate his readers. He also has to arouse their emotions, make them believe they are living the events he narrates, not merely reading them. This means that historiography is becoming more and more similar to a theatrical play, whose main virtue is to make his audience forget the theatre, the seats, the other people: the audience is almost magically transported into the narrative world, as Horace says in his *Epistles*:

methinks that the poet is able to walk a tight rope, who with airy nothings wrings my heart, inflames, soothes, fills it with vain alarms like a magician, and sets me down now

¹¹In Photius, *Bibl.* 176,121 a-b = Jacobi, *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* 76 F 1. On the proneness of Hellenistic historiography to include fiction and to offer pleasure to its audience, see Morgan 1993; Wiseman 1993:138ff.

¹²Quintil. 4.2.64 and 6.2.32. On *enargeia* in Hellenistic historians see Wiseman 1993:141-146.

at Thebes, now at Athens. (Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.210 ff.)¹³

Polybius mentions (1.4.11) "the profit and the delight [*to chresimon* and *to terpon*] of History": adopting once again a Horatian perspective, we can translate his statement by saying that history can be both *utile* and *dulce* (*Ars* 343), just like theatre. The contamination between sweetness and usefulness affects, on the other side, also poetry: it is possible to read poetry between the lines, and extract useful teachings from its sweet myths. For example, this is how Maximus of Tyre confutes Socrates' charges against Homeric poetry:

Anyone who hears such stories about Zeus and Apollo and Thetis and Hephaestus divines at once that the tale is telling them one thing, but hinting at another. Leaving its surface pleasures (τὸ τερπνόν) to the ear, he joins the poet in his enterprise, rises with him to a higher level of imagination (φαντασία), and collaborates with him in the fashioning of the tale, simultaneously mistrusting and reveling in the license proper to myth.

So it would seem that the chasm between historiography and poetry has become less forbidding than in Thucydides. Polybius moves away from his Athenian predecessor, and goes the same way as Longus—certainly not all the way, but nevertheless the same way.

Various techniques are available to ancient historians to offer pleasure to the reader through *enargeia*, but the most important was certainly the use of vivid and dramatic details: laments of prisoners, moaning of the wounded, direct speeches of some characters, and so on.¹⁴ So these historians add secondary details, most often fictional de-

¹³On the deception of the audience in the theatre see e.g. the anonymous treatise *On the Sublime*, 15 (where poetic *enargeia* is connected with the *ekplexis* "amazement," of the audience: see Graverini, forthcoming); or Plutarch, *De gloria Atheniensium* 348c: "Tragedy blossomed forth and won great acclaim, becoming a wondrous entertainment for the ears and eyes of the men of that age, and, by the mythological character of its plots, and the vicissitudes which its characters undergo, it effected a deception (ἀπάτην) wherein, as Gorgias remarks, 'he who deceives is more honest than he who does not deceive, and he who is deceived is wiser than he who is not deceived.' For he who deceives is more honest, because he has done what he promised to do; and he who is deceived is wiser, because the mind which is not insensible to fine perceptions is easily enthralled by the delights of language." Cf. Morgan 1993, 181 and n.9, with further literature.

¹⁴The chapter on *ekphrasis* ("description") in Hermogenes' handbook of rhetoric recommends that "if we are describing a war, we shall first of all mention the preliminaries such as the generals' speeches, the outlay on both sides, and their fears; next, the attacks, the slaughter, and the dead; finally, the victory trophy, the triumphal songs of the victors, the tears and enslavement of the victims" (*Progymnasmata* 16.22; trans. Woodman 1988:89. Cf. Wiseman 1993:144ff.). On *ekphraseis* in the Greek novels see Bartsch 1989 and Morales 2004.

tails that nevertheless are not meant to draw the reader away from historical truth, but exactly to make historical truth more credible, “evident,” and enjoyable.

Of course, this evolution of historiography was not without differences, even large differences between different authors. However, on the whole, Quintilian’s claim (10.1.31) that historiography is “extremely near to poetry, and in a way poetry in prose” is not groundless, at least as regards Hellenistic historiography. Fiction and pleasure play an important part in this kind of literature.

This leads us into a no-man’s-land between historiography and the novel—all the more so if we remember that one of the most common modern ways to describe the ancient novel is to point out that it is exactly a sort of “poetry in prose” (therefore not so distant from historiography in Quintilian’s view): while novels are written in prose, they have a fictional content, and fiction was normally connected to poetry in the ancient tradition.¹⁵ The two literary genres interact, and even need each other. As we have just seen, historiography needs fiction to attain *enargeia* and offer pleasure to its audience, but also the novel needs a historiographical attitude to attain credibility.

Even the most incredible fiction, indeed, needs to be believed, or at least to stipulate, as Coleridge said, a “suspension of disbelief” with its audience: this is part of the “enchantment” of fiction. Consider, for example, the most implausible device of modern science fiction, galactic voyages at the speed of light, or even faster—“warp speed” in Star Trek lingo. They seem to violate a basic tenet of relativity, but certainly Einstein’s field equations are of no great concern to most Star Trek fans; and then, since most of us at least know that space-time is curved, it is not so difficult to imagine that it can be easily “warped” according to our needs of the moment. However, there is a side-effect to warp speed that everybody can immediately understand: how can a starship accelerate to the speed of light in a split second without the crew, not to speak of the starship itself, being crushed by the tremendous inertia? After all, anybody who has ever traveled by car or plane has felt the effects of inertia on his own body at “normal” accelerations, and can imagine what it would be like multiplied by several thousand times (good old Newton is by far more intuitive than Einstein, and his laws are more difficult to ignore). To preserve the integrity of their starships

¹⁵Cf. Graverini-Keulen-Barchiesi 2006:17–26, with further bibliography at p. 56. Of course, the closeness between novel and poetry is not limited to antiquity. At the beginning of his *Traité de l’origine des romans* (1670), Pierre-Daniel Huet pointed out that “autrefois, sous le nom de Romains, on comprenait, non seulement ceux qui étaient écrits en prose, mais plus souvent encore ceux qui étaient écrits en vers. Le Giraldu et le Pigna, son disciple, dans leurs *Traité de Romanzi*, n’en reconnaissent presque point d’autres, et donnent le Boiardo, et l’Arioste pour modèles. Mais aujourd’hui l’usage contraire a prévalu....”

and their crews, Star Trek writers introduced the “inertial dampeners.” Nobody knows exactly how they work, but their effect is two-fold: they nullify the effect of inertia and they allow the audience of the TV serial to enjoy those wonderful startups of the USS Enterprise, from standing to warp speed, without necessarily thinking “no, that’s ridiculous.”¹⁶ Inertial dampeners improve Captain James T. Kirk’s life expectancy, but most importantly they allow Captain Kirk’s fans (especially those more fastidiously attentive to details) to suspend their disbelief more easily and to take pleasure in their TV movie. Some of them suspend their disbelief so much so that they attend meetings and conventions wearing pointy Vulcan ears or full Starfleet uniforms, or even speaking the Klingon language: it is an extreme example of an audience particularly (although only temporarily) enchanted and almost swallowed-up by a fiction that, in classical terms, would be defined as “sweet” and “psychagogical.”

It is more or less for the same reasons that the Greek novels, especially the first ones, have an atmosphere of historicity. There are historiographical incipits, some historical characters, real and detailed geographical and chronological settings; there are even some extra-textual features, such as titles and author pseudonyms, that point at historiography.¹⁷ It is interesting to note that historiographical (as well as epic, and theatrical) features were so built into the novelistic genre that later, in the 2nd century, “sophistic” novels took a more detached and sophisticated attitude towards them. They rationalize about “how and how much historical a novel should be,” and the answer can be both serious and ironic. We have seen Longus’ recipe: a novel is a *ktema terpton*, both similar to and different from a Thucydidean history, and somewhat more similar to a Hellenistic history. In the second part of this paper I will offer another example from Apuleius, roughly contemporary to Longus.

The first text I am going to quote refers to the same programmatic statement by Thucydides which I quoted at the beginning.¹⁸ Just a few lines before that passage, Thucydides explains his method regarding the speeches he has inserted in his *Histories* (1.22.1):

As to the speeches that were made by different men...it has been difficult to recall with strict accuracy the words actually spoken, both for me as regards that which I myself heard, and for those who from various other sources have brought me reports. Therefore the speeches are given in

¹⁶For an analysis, both serious and light-hearted, of the “technology” of Star Trek from the viewpoint of a modern physicist see Krauss 1995.

¹⁷Cf. Graverini-Keulen-Barchiesi 2006:44–47, with further bibliography at p. 59.

¹⁸Cf. Graverini 1997:266ff.

the language in which, as it seemed to me, the several speakers would express, on the subjects under consideration, the sentiments most befitting the occasion, though at the same time I have adhered as closely as possible to the general sense of what was actually said.

In Apuleius' novel Lucius, the main character, has exactly the same problem as Thucydides. He wants to inform his reader about what happened during a trial; of course, since he is metamorphosed into an ass he could not be admitted inside the courthouse, so he explains the origins of his information (10.7.3–4):

I heard that this was the way things proceeded from a great many conversations (*compluribus mutuo sermocinationibus cognovi*). Since I was at the manger, however, I cannot know what words the accuser used to press the charges and what means the defender used to rebut them—the actual speeches and debates, in effect. What I did not know I cannot report to you, but what I reliably ascertained (*comperi*) I shall set down on these pages (*ad istas litteras proferam*).

How and how often to insert in a historiographical work the speeches delivered by generals and other characters was a hot question in ancient historiography, one that originated many controversies and polemical statements.¹⁹ That Lucius is acting the part of a historian in the passage quoted above is made clear, first of all, by the language he uses: *comperio* is a technical term to define the work of a historian.²⁰ It is also worth noting that in this passage the story, usually presented as an oral account, becomes explicitly a written book²¹—a sort of a figure for the literary, bookish character of Lucius' statement. There are even some structural parallels with Thucydides. Apuleius' distinction between *gesta* (what happened) and *verba* (the discourses that were pronounced), follows in reverse order the structure of Thucydides' programmatic passage: in the Greek historian the first paragraph is devoted to discourses (ἄσα μὲν λόγῳ εἶπον ἕκαστοι, 1.22.1), the second to the occurrences of the war (τὰ δ' ἔργα τῶν πραχθέντων, 1.22.2). This structure is pointed out by μὲν... δ' in Thucydides, and by *autem* in Apuleius. Like Thucydides, Lucius clearly differentiates between first-

¹⁹Cf. e.g. Walbank 1985.

²⁰See e.g. Sallust, *Cat.* 22.4; *Iug.* 17.2, 45.1, 67.3; Livy 5.35.3, 32.35.8, 38.28.8; Tacitus, *Agr.* 11.1; *Ger.* 9.2; *Hist.* 2.42.2; *Ann.* 4.20.2. For other historiographical topoi adopted by Apuleius see Loporcaro 1992; Graverini 1997; Graverini 2007:158–165.

²¹But the expression *profero ad has* also some theatrical undertones: see Graverini 2007:178 ff.

hand and second-hand information.²² However, in this case the result is what any serious historian would avoid, or at least would declare to avoid: a total reliance on hearsay. It is not even the dignified hearsay sometimes allowed by historians such as Thucydides: I was not there, so I cannot but rely on the accounts by other selected and faithful eyewitnesses. No, Lucius only reports the fragments of chitchat and gossip he hears from passers-by. The wording itself points to a fictive account: *sermocinationes* are, according to Quintilian, just words that an orator puts in somebody's mouth according to his character.²³ In technical terms, “*prosopopoeia*”; more plainly, “fictive speeches.”

The following “report” offered by Lucius confirms its fictionality in several ways, but there is no need here to analyze the tale in great detail. What is important is that the account of Lucius’ “historical methodology,” and a rather direct reference to Thucydides, are radically and humorously transformed into a statement of fictionality²⁴ and put into the mouth of an ass. While Longus and the Greek novels define their literary space through the assimilation and modification of previous literary experiences, the Latin way is more often parody. Longus and the Greek novelists use the tools of fiction, and they use them masterfully, to conceal fiction itself under a veil of historicity. Apuleius instead prefers to show his tools to his skilled readers; he admits the most educated part of his audience into his laboratory and lets them have a look through the curtain of his fictional writing.

Indeed, Lucius' authentication strategies usually offer only a slight, superficial patina of credibility to his stories. Underneath it, fictionality is still clearly visible, and is often enhanced by parody. Let us see another example. At 9.15.6 the donkey explains that:

As for me, although I was deeply angry at Photis' mistake in making me an ass when she was trying to produce a bird, nevertheless I was at least heartened by this one consolation in my painful deformity: namely, with my enormous ears I could ear everything very easily, even at a

²²In Thucydides, cf. also 1.22.2, οἷς τε αὐτὸς παρῆν καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων, “in the case of the events in which I myself participated and of those regarding which I got my information from others.”

²³“we are...allowed in this form of speech to bring down the gods from heaven and raise the dead, while cities also and people may find a voice. There are some authorities who restrict the term *prosopopoiias* to cases where both persons and words are fictitious, and prefer to call imaginary dialogues between men by the Greek name of dialogos, which some translate by the Latin *sermocinatio*” (9.2.31; cf. *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.55–56).

²⁴Cf. Zimmerman 2000:139: “this ‘Beglaubigungsformel’ reinforces, rather than weakens, the fantastic and absurd character of the description.” Also Keulen 2004:239f. points out that “in Gellius' and Apuleius' times...resorting to autopsy had become a topic of satire....Explicit references to eyewitness accounts, then, may function to unmask the inventor of untrue stories.”

considerable distance.

At a superficial level, everything is clear. Lucius is implying that the story he is about to tell is true: he knows what has happened, and he knows that because, thanks to his big asinine ears, he can hear a lot. But let us analyze this statement in the light of literary tradition. Should we trust Lucius' ears? Actually, a careful historian should not completely trust anyone's ears—not even his own. Historians and philosophers agreed: there is a hierarchy of sensory organs, which places sight well above hearing as regards reliability.²⁵ In this theorization, Polybius was a step ahead of Thucydides (12.27.1–2):

Nature has given us two instruments, as it were, by the aid of which we inform ourselves and inquire about everything. These are hearing and sight, and of the two sight is much more veracious according to Heracleitus. "The eyes are more accurate witnesses than the ears," he says. Now, Timaeus enters on his inquiries by the pleasanter (ἡδίων) of the two roads, but the inferior one.

After all, big-eared Lucius is not really a good historian. He is like Timaeus: he prefers what is *hedys*, sweet and pleasant,²⁶ to what is accurate—and by now we can recognize "sweetness" as a typical marker for fiction.

According to Polybius, and more generally to the ancient historiographical tradition, the best historian is a man who personally took part in the events he narrates; his first-person knowledge is based upon his sight (*opsis*, *autopsia*) and not upon his hearing (*akoè*), because he does not need to use testimonies offered by others. First-person experience makes a man more expert and knowledgeable, and such a man is the best historian. There was even a mythical paradigm for the *aner pragmatikos*, the knowledgeable man, and Polybius does not fail to mention it:

²⁵Cf. Walbank 1967:408; Schepens 1970; Mazza 1999:144 and n. 71; Graverini 2007:158 ff. A wider treatment, not limited to historiography, is in Solimano 1991 and Napolitano Valditarà 1994. On the same topos in the speeches of tragic messengers, Oniga 1985:123 f. and De Jong 1991:9–12. Cf. also Wille 2001; and, on Heliodoros, Liviabella Furiani 2003.

²⁶Several stories are qualified as *lepidae*, "agreeable, pleasant, delightful" in the *Metamorphoses*: see *fabularum lepida iucunditas* (1.2.6); *lepidae fabulae festiuitate* (1.20.5); *lepidi sermonis comitate* (1.20.8); *sed ego te narrationibus lepidis... avocabo* (4.27.8); *lepida de adulterio fibula* (9.4.4). And of course cf. the *lepidus susurrus* that, in the prologue, defines the whole novel. Hijmans et al. 1995:13 point out that the adjective *lepidus* at 9.4.4 "directs reception"; the statement of course can be applied to the other occurrences as well. Keulen 2007:21 argues that the same adjective also points to "the quality of sound in speech" and to the "verbal delight" offered by the narrating voice.

Wishing to show us what qualities one should possess in order to be a man of action (βουλόμενος ὑποδεικνύειν ἡμῖν οἶον δεῖ τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν πραγματικὸν εἶναι) he [scil. Homer] says: "The man for wisdom's various arts renowned, / Long exercised in woes, O muse, resound, / Wandering from clime to clime; and further on: Observant stayed, / Their manners noted, and their states surveyed: / On stormy seas unnumbered toils he bore." (12.27.10)

The programmatic reference to Odysseus and to the first verses of the *Odyssey* became a topos used later also by other historians, such as Diodorus Siculus.²⁷ I am sure that it will not be a surprise if I say that the very same topos is adopted by Apuleius, too (9.13.4–5):

That divine inventor of poetry among the Greeks, desiring to portray a hero of the highest intelligence (*summae prudentiae virum monstrare cupiens*), was quite right to sing of a man who acquired the highest excellence by visiting many cities and learning to know various peoples. In fact, I now remember the ass that I was with thankful gratitude because, while I was concealed under his cover and schooled in a variety of fortunes, he made me better informed, if less wise (*etsi minus prudentem, multiscium reddidit*).

Again, through the Homeric subtext Lucius the ass is playing the historian; his introductory words even seem to be a translation of Polybius' opening (*summae prudentiae virum monstrare cupiens*—βουλόμενος ὑποδεικνύειν ἡμῖν οἶον δεῖ τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν πραγματικὸν εἶναι). But can we really think that a donkey is an *aner pragmatikos*, a knowledgeable man, a reincarnation of Odysseus, a reliable historian? The text itself, with typical Apuleian humor, drops a hint that this is impossible. Lucius has passed through many sufferings and experiences, but without becoming *prudens*, "wise," like Odysseus. He has only become *multiscius*: that is, he has acquired no real knowledge, his sufferings have not made him any wiser. He knows more things, but he has only satisfied

²⁷"Although the learning which is acquired by experience in each separate case, with all the attendant toils and dangers, does indeed enable a man to discern in each instance where utility lies—and this is the reason why the most widely experienced of our heroes suffered great misfortunes before he 'of many men the cities saw and learned their thoughts'; yet the understanding of the failures and successes of other men, which is acquired by the study of history, affords a schooling that is free from actual experience of ills (1.1.2). Diodorus clearly thinks otherwise than Polybius, and advocates a more "bookish" experience. However, he resorts to the same Homeric quotation as Polybius to make his point: perhaps there is an implicit polemic. Odysseus is a paradigm of virtue for Polybius' *hegemon* also at 9.16.1; see Walbank 1967:142 ad loc.

his “congenital curiosity” without learning anything important.²⁸

To sum up, in Hellenistic and Imperial times historiography and the novel, in a way, seem to be attracted to each other, and perhaps they compete for the same audience. Historiography includes more and more fiction, tries to be more and more seducing and “sweet,” even at the expense of *akribeia*, precision and truthfulness. Novels are inspired by historiography to develop authentication strategies and to create that mix of belief and disbelief that alone makes fiction really enjoyable. The reading public of imperial times was in search of new experiences; “sweetness” and *psychagogia* appear to be the keys to success, and Imperial authors were well aware of that. The consequence, inevitably, was some hybridization of literary genres, resulting in inevitable paradoxes. Fiction enhances historical truth and makes it both more enjoyable and credible; novel writers use the tools of the historians to make their fiction more credible, and/or more sophisticated and ironic.²⁹

LUCA GRAVERINI
University of Siena at Arezzo
graverini@gmail.com

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bowersock, G.W. 1994. *Fiction as History. Nero to Julian*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.
- Bartsch, S. 1989. *Decoding the Ancient Novel. The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Cole Babbitt, F. 1936. *Plutarch's Moralia in Sixteen volumes. Vol. IV. 263D-351B*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.
- Corcella, A. 2006. “The New Genre and its Boundaries: Poets and Logographers.” In *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, eds. A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis. Leiden and Boston: Brill. 33–56.
- Dorati, M. 2008. “Considerazioni sulla focalizzazione e sul narratore onnisciente nel racconto storico.” *SIFC* 101:133–193.
- Fairclough, H. R. 1929²(1926¹). *Horace. Satires, Epistles and Ars poetica*. London and Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Flory, S. 1990. “The Meaning of to *mythodes* (1.22.4) and the Usefulness of Thucydides' *History*.” *CJ* 85:193–208.
- Foster, B. O. 1919. *Livy. In Fourteen Volumes. I. Books I and II*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.

²⁸I have analysed Apuleius' passage quoted above in greater detail in Graverini 2007:158–173.

²⁹I presented this paper at the Conference “Fiction, Truth and Reality: an Interdisciplinary Approach” (Katowice, October 2008), organized by Maria Pachalska and Bruce Duncan MacQueen. I am grateful to them and to the other colleagues who took part in the event: it was a very welcome occasion to discuss with scholars coming from a wide range of different fields, from classics to neuropsychiatry.

- Gill, C. and T. P. Wiseman. 1993. *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*. Exeter: University of Exeter.
- Graverini, L. 1997. “In *historiae specimen* (Apul. Met. 8.1.4). Elementi della letteratura storiografica nelle *Metamorfosi* di Apuleio.” *Prometheus* 23:247–278.
- . 2007. *Le Metamorfosi di Apuleio. Letteratura e identità*. Pisa: Pacini.
- . Forthcoming. *Amazing Stories*. In *Order and Fantasy: The Roots of Fiction in Classical Antiquity. Essays in honor of Prof. Bernhard Kytzler*, ed. B. D. MacQueen.
- Graverini, L. and W. Keulen, A. Barchiesi. 2006. *Il romanzo antico. Forme, testi, problemi*. Rome: Carocci.
- Hanson, J. A. 1989. *Apuleius: Metamorphoses*, 2 vols. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.
- Hijmans, B. L., Jr. et al. 1995. *Apuleius Madaurensis. Metamorphoses. Book IX. Text, Introduction and Commentary*. Groningen: Forsten.
- Holzberg, N. 1996. “The Genre: Novels Proper and the Fringe.” In *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. G. Schmeling. Leiden: Brill. 11–28.
- Hunter, R. L. 1983. *A Study of Daphnis & Chloe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jong, I. J. F. de. 1991. *Narrative in Drama. The Art of the Euripidean Messenger-speech*. Leiden: Brill.
- Keulen, W. H. 2004. “Gellius, Apuleius, and Satire on the Intellectual.” In *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*, eds. L. Holford-Strevens and A. Vardi. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 223–245.
- . 2007. *Apuleius Madaurensis. Metamorphoses. Book I. Text, Introduction and Commentary*. Groningen: Forsten.
- Krauss, L. M. 1995. *The Physics of Star Trek*. With a foreword by Stephen Hawking. London: Flamingo.
- Liviabella Furiani, P. 2003. “L'occhio e l'orecchio nel romanzo greco d'amore: note sull'esperienza del bello nelle *Etiopiche* di Eliodoro.” In *Studi di filologia e tradizione greca in memoria di Aristide Colonna*, eds. F. Benedetti and S. Grandolini. Naples: Edizioni scientifiche italiane. 417–441.
- Loporcaro, M. 1992. “Eroi screditati dal testo. Strutture della parodia nelle storie di briganti in Apuleio, Met. IV 9–21.” *Maia* 44:65–77.
- MacLeod, M. D. 1967. *Lucian*, vol. VIII. London and Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- MacQueen, B. D. 1990. *Myth, Rhetoric, and Fiction. A Reading of Longus's Daphnis and Chloe*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Mazza, M. 1999. *Il vero e l'immaginato. Profezia, narrativa e storiografia nel mondo romano*. Roma.
- Morales, H. 2004. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*. Cambridge and New York.
- Morgan, J. R. 1993. “Make-believe and Make Believe: The Fictionality of the Greek Novels.” In Gill-Wiseman 1993. 175–229.
- . 2004. *Longus. Daphnis and Chloe*. Oxford: Aris & Phillips.
- Napolitano Valditara, L. M. 1994. *Lo sguardo nel buio. Metafore visive e forme grecoantiche della razionalità*. Rome and Bari: Laterza.
- Oniga, R. 1985. “Il canticum di Sosia: forme stilistiche e modelli culturali.” *MD* 14:113–208.

- Oldfather, C. H. 1933. *Diodorus of Sicily*, vol. I. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.
- Paton, W. R. 1925. *Polybius. The Histories*, vol. IV. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.
- Reardon, B. P., ed. 1989. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Rood, T. 2006. "Objectivity and Authority: Thucydides' Historical Method." In *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, eds. A. Rengakos and A. Tsakmakis. Leiden and Boston: Brill. 225-249.
- Russell, D. A. 2001. *Quintilian. The Orator's Education*. Vol. II: Books 3-5; Vol. III: Books 6-8. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.
- Schepens, G. 1970. "Éphore sur la valeur de l'autopsie (*FGr Hist* 70 F 110 = Polybe XII 27.7)." *AncSoc* 1:163-182.
- Smith, Charles Forster. 1928² (1919¹). *Thucydides*. With an English transl. by Ch. F. S., London and Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Solimano, G. 1991. *La prepotenza dell'occhio. Riflessioni sull'opera di Seneca*. Genova: D.A.R.F.L.C.L.E.T.
- Stahl, W. H. 1952. *Macrobius. Commentary on the Dream of Scipio*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Trapp, M. B. 1997. *Maximus of Tyre. The Philosophical Orations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Walbank, F. W. 1967. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, Vol. II. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 1985. "Speeches in Greek Historians." In *Selected Papers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 242-261.
- . 2007. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wille, G. 2001. *Akroasis. Der akustische Sinnesbereich in der griechischen Literatur bis zum Ende der klassischen Zeit*, 2 Vol. Tübingen and Basel: Attempto.
- Wiseman, T. P. 1993. "Lying Historians: Seven Types of Mendacity." In Gill-Wiseman 1993. 122-146.
- Woodman, A. J. 1988. *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*. London: Croom Helm.
- Zimmerman, M. 2000. *Apuleius Madaurensis. Metamorphoses. Book X. Text, Introduction and Commentary*. Groningen: Forsten.

**BROTHERS IN THE NIGHT: AGAMEMNON & MENELAUS
IN BOOK 10 OF THE ILIAD**

Book 10 of the *Iliad*, the so-called *Doloneia*, is one of the few extensive passages of the epic still widely suspected of being a significantly later addition to the whole. Nevertheless, the book is skillfully adapted to its place, coheres with its immediate and broader context, and has much in common with the rest of the *Iliad*, as its defenders have rightly pointed out.¹ Even those who deny its authenticity acknowledge numerous charming, if not particularly "Iliadic," felicities in its composition, including: its use of suspense, contrast, antithesis and reversal; its management of complex and intertwining narrative threads; its careful exploitation through detail of an unusual and eerie nocturnal setting; and its subtle, psychologically realistic characterization of the *Iliad's* heroes.² The purpose of this article is not to shed particular light on the question of authorship, but to look a little more closely at the last of the above-listed virtues, the poet's³ characterization of his heroes. I examine specifically the characterization of the two sons of Atreus, Agamemnon and Menelaus, with particular emphasis not on their individual characterization but on the portrayal of the relationship between them. The *Doloneia's* representation of this relationship is careful and progressive; it is also highly consistent with the depiction of the Atreidae elsewhere in the *Iliad*.⁴ But in my view, there is more at work than mere consistency or imitation. I argue rather that the *Doloneia* represents this relationship through a succession of scenes that correspond more or less directly to specific scenes elsewhere in the *Iliad*, and indeed scenes from the portion of the *Iliad* that precedes Book 10. I argue further that, at least with regard to the relationship of the Atreidae, one can see a kind of systematic explication, if not inter-

¹Lang 1906:258-80; Shewan 1911; van der Valk 1952:277-80; Sheppard 1966:82-89; Eichhorn 1973; Thornton 1984:164-69; Rabel 1991:286-91; Stanley 1993:118-28; Alden 2000:143-49.

²Jens 1955:617 offers a convenient summary of earlier appreciations; cf. Klingner 1964; Von der Mühl 1952:186; Reinhardt 1961:246-48. Klingner's (1964, originally 1940) influential article must be credited with setting a new tone for Analytic or "separatist" discussion of the *Doloneia*, concentrating on ways in which its poet carefully arranged for consciously planned effects, without necessarily attempting to imitate the magisterial virtues of the *Iliad* at large; for a similar approach see Danek 1988: esp. 177-229. For a reprisal of harsher estimations, see Fenik 1964:40-44. On characterization in particular, unitarians and separatists find common ground: Shewan 1911:150-68; van der Valk 1952:278-79; Reinhardt 1961:244; Klingner 1964:23-25; Danek 1988:220-21.

³Since I do not take a position on the question of authorship (aside from some final tentative remarks), I will refer indifferently to the "poet" of the *Doloneia*, without any suggestion that this poet is or is not Homer.

⁴As pointed out already by Robert 1950:243; Whitman 1958:284 with n. 70; Willcock 2002:223-24.