

Longus and Thucydides: A New Interpretation

Edmund P. Cueva

IN THE PROOEMIUM to his narrative Longus refers to Thucydides' *Archaeology* (1.22.4) when he terms his novel a *κτῆμα τερπνῶν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις*. Many scholars view this allusion as one of many learned references in the text.¹ This essay argues that Longus intends more than a show of erudition: by recalling the historian, he not only stays within the tradition of opening a novel historiographically,² but also

¹E. E. Seiler, ed., *Pastoralia Graeca* (Leipzig 1843) 161; G. Valley, *Über den Sprachgebrauch des Longus* (Uppsala 1926) 101–102; H. H. O. Chalk, "Eros and the Lesbian Pastorals of Longos," *JHS* 80 (1960) 32–51; P. Turner, "Daphnis and Chloe: An Interpretation," *G&R* 7 (1960) 117–123; W. E. McCulloh, *Longus* (New York 1970) 31–32, 68, and 85; A. M. Scarcella, "La Tecnica dell' Imitazione in Longo Sofista," *GIF* 23 (1971) 34–59; R. L. Hunter, *A Study of Daphnis & Chloe* (Cambridge 1983) 4 n.18, 85 n.6, and 48–52; T. A. Pandiri, "Daphnis and Chloe: The Art of Pastoral Play," *Ramus* 14 (1985) 116–141; J. R. Vieillefond, ed., *Longus: Pastorales* (Paris 1987) cxviii–cxx; B. D. MacQueen, *Myth, Rhetoric, and Fiction* (Lincoln 1990) 64, 140–141, 146–148, and 157–159; J. R. Morgan, "Daphnis and Chloe: Love's Own Sweet Story," in J. R. Morgan and Richard Stoneman, ed., *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context* (London/New York 1994) 64–79. These are cited hereafter by authors' names.

²The historical in *Daphnis and Chloe* has not gone unnoticed. Niklas Holzberg, *The Ancient Novel* (transl. Christine Jackson-Holzberg [London/New York² 1995]) 10, has shown that Longus in a historiographical manner "presents chronologically or relates the respective adventures of the separated protagonists in parallel accounts," and argues that Longus purposely imitates historiographical methods. Consuelo Ruiz-Montero, "The Rise of the Greek Novel" in Gareth Schmeling, ed., *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden 1996), writes that the earliest form of the novel, *Ninus*, uses history and historical figures as background, and because the historical can also be found in *Sesonchosis*, *Metiochus and Parthenope*, and *Chaereas and Callirhoe* it has been theorized that "the novel was viewed as a deviation from historiography" (45). Ruiz-Montero is a bit more tempered in evaluating the role of history in

demonstrates that even though conversant with historiography he will not be writing a historical account. Instead he uses history to help him alter the genre. Proof of this modification appears in the second and third books of the novel when Longus renders *τερπνοτέρα* the serious Thucydidean account dealing with Mytilene and Methymna. Given the use of Thucydides as subject matter in the Hellenistic and Roman rhetorical schools, I believe that Longus here is refashioning Thucydides in technique and narrative.³

Precedents for historiographical introductions in the novel are found in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and in *Ephesiaca*. Chariton writes: Χαρίτων Ἀφροδισειεύς, Ἀθηναγόρου τοῦ ῥήτορος ὑπογραφεύς, πάθος ἐρωτικὸν ἐν Συρρακούσαις γενόμενον διηγήσομαι (1.1.1): he identifies himself, his place of origin, and says that he will relate an amorous account. The archetypes upon which to base this historical approach to opening a prose work included Hecataeus of Miletus (*FGrHist* 1 F 1), Herodotus (1.1–5), and Thucydides (1.1). In the opening to *Ephesiaca* Xenophon Ephesius writes: ἦν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἀνὴρ τῶν τὰ πρῶτα ἐκεῖ δυναμένων, Λυκομήδης ὄνομα. τούτῳ τῷ Λυκομήδει ἐκ γυναικὸς ἐπιχωρίας Θεμιστοῦς γίνεται παῖς Ἀβροκόμης (1.1). He does not identify himself, but gives the parentage of the novel's hero. Although this may not seem to reflect historiography, it does in fact parallel the opening of an historical text: Δαρεῖου

the development of the novel: history played a "crucial part in the formation of the novels" (48). For discussion of history and the novel see Holzberg 35–42, esp. 41–42, and J. R. Morgan, "History, Romance, and Realism in the *Aithiopika* of Heliodorus," *ClassAnt* 1 (1982) 221–265. T. Hägg, "*Callirhoe and Parthenope*: The Beginnings of the Historical Novel," *ClassAnt* 6 (1987) 184–204, notes that the earlier novels are historical in tone. On historiography and Chariton see R. L. Hunter, "History and Historicity in the Romance of Chariton," *ANRW* 2.34.2 (1994) 1055–1086.

³See Valley 101 and Vieillefond cxviii–cxix on the use of Thucydides in sections of the novel other than the prooemium. Cf. Virgilio Paladini, *La Storia della scuola nell' antichità* (Milan 1952) 58; Frederick A. G. Beck, *Greek Education: 450–350 B.C.* (New York 1964) 145–146, 285, 312–313; A. B. Bosworth, *From Arrian to Alexander: Studies in Historical Interpretation* (Oxford 1988) 65, 67, 76, 138; R. Nicolai, *La Storiografia nell' educazione antica* (Pisa 1992) 228 and 240–242.

καὶ Παρυσάτιδος γίγνονται παῖδες δύο, πρεσβύτερος μὲν Ἄρτα-
ξέρξης, νεότερος δὲ Κῦρος (Xen. An. 1.1). Xenophon Ephesius
imitates his namesake by giving the names of the hero's parents
and by echoing γίγνονται παῖδες with γίνεται παῖς.

Just as Chariton echoes the opening lines of histories and Xenophon reflects the work of his namesake, Longus pays homage to his literary predecessors. He does not start his work with the expected "I am X, hail from Y, and shall write about Z." Instead he comments that he will be writing (presumably his novel) in response to a picture he saw while hunting in Lesbos. He writes that the document is a κτῆμα τερπνὸν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, "a pleasing possession for all men."

Longus' juxtaposition of κτῆμα and τερπνόν has caused scholars to ask if and why Longus alludes to the Archaeology of Thucydides (in particular 1.22.4). Several answers have been suggested: Turner proposes that Longus wants to reveal that he has a serious purpose in mind, a purpose as serious as that of Thucydides, which is to make "people understand human life" by producing "something of universal significance ('a possession for all men')" (118). He sees the inclusion of myth as facilitating the conveyance of the novel's purpose to the reader. For Turner the aim of this book is didactic in nature and serves as guide for the eventual maturation of the reader. The reader should be able to integrate harmoniously life's events, some of which can be disturbing and most of which are common to all, by reading the story of Daphnis and Chloe. Longus' plan, therefore, correlates to Thucydides' goal of providing a source through which people can predict the future by understanding and examining past human behavior.

McCulloh views the reference to the historian as "external validation through association with historiography": Longus repeats the key word "possession," reverses the role of delight, keeps the instructional utility of the past for the future, and adapts the justificatory principle of the perennial and universal

recurrence of the subject chosen for analysis (31–32). Hunter convincingly interprets the literary echoes as Longus affiliating himself with Herodotus (49): by stressing the element τὸ τερπνόν within an allusion to Thucydides, Longus aligns his work with that of Herodotus, whom ancient scholars saw as the object of Thucydides' attack in 1.22.

MacQueen suggests that the Thucydidean terminology in the prooemium is intrusive in nature: the framework of the novel is pastoral and the historical breaks the "frame of reference." Longus' approach to serious historiography is continued in the first passages of the novel proper, but, MacQueen warns, "Longus invites us to think about history but will not allow us to mistake what we are reading for history" (64, 158).

Morgan (73–74) proposes that Longus' novel is "preoccupied with its own status as a fiction, and the relationship between fiction and experience in general," and that the prooemium echoes and subverts Thucydides' Archaeology. He notes that the historian meant his work to have a "propaedeutic function by embodying universal truths of human nature which readers in the future will find helpful in making sense of their own experience." Like Turner, Morgan views the novel as an educational introduction to an emotion that we all may experience:

His readers will be able to draw from the fiction knowledge of universals which can be applied in reality. But where Thucydides contrasted the utility of his history with the pleasures of myth (or could we say fiction?), Longus sees pleasure and utility as yet another pair of harmonizing opposites: as a garden combines art and nature, so a novel fuses myth and history, fiction and truth. Thus, in his prologue, Longus can describe his story as a history of love, *historia erotos*.

Longus, according to Morgan, replaces the "narrative specifics" that exemplified human nature with Love.

Thucydides writes that in his work the fabulous, τὸ μυθῶδες,

is excluded, and that perhaps as a result the work will be less pleasing to its audience. He also prefers to write a possession for all time (κτῆμα ἐς αἰεῖ) rather than something that will be momentarily pleasing. Finally, the historian proceeds to the causes for the outbreak of the war between the Greek city-states. In the narrative, therefore, Thucydides goes from the fabulous, τὸ μυθῶδες, and what leads to it, to a work of true worth, κτῆμα ἐς αἰεῖ, and ends up with the causes of the Peloponnesian War. The outline may then be formulated as myth—intrinsic worth—cause (history).

Longus reverses this progression. He begins by writing that he has seen (εἶδον, *pr.* 1) a picture that told a story. He uses the term ἱστορία for the content of the painting,⁴ and clarifies the word by writing that he will tell his readers the stories (myths) found in the painting and dedicate them to the mythological characters Eros, Pan, and the Nymphs. It is the pointed insertion of the word ἱστορία that makes clear Longus' approach: he wants to make the factual in his novel resemble myth, and thereby distances himself from Thucydidean stylistics.

Before the dedication of the book, however, Longus declares that his work is more than just a literary exercise: κτῆμα τερπνῶν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, ὃ καὶ νοσοῦντα ἰάσεται, καὶ λυπούμενον (*pr.* 3). The novelist then proceeds to relate the myth of Daphnis and Chloe. Longus' outline, therefore, is cause (history)—intrinsic worth—myth, a modified reversal of Thucydides.⁵

⁴The term ἱστορία can mean the written account of an investigation, e.g. Hdt. 7.96 and Arist. *Rh.* 1.14.13. In the prooemium Longus' use of this word does not echo Thucydides but rather Herodotus (1.1, 2.99, 2.118, 2.119). Marios Philipides, *Longus: Antiquity's Innovative Novelist* (diss. SUNY Buffalo 1978) ch. 1, suggests that Longus is familiar with the elements that constitute an historical enquiry and knows that ὄψις and ἀκοή are therefore necessary. In addition, when Longus writes that his work is a ἱστορίαν ἐρωτος that νοσοῦντα ἰάσεται he is also categorizing the term ἱστορία, and consequently his work, as a searched for and investigated cure for an erotic illness (cf. Hippoc. *De arte* 1.3, *Praec.* 2.7, 8.5, 12.4, 13.9–13).

⁵Although Pandiri (117) examines the pastoral significance of the prooemium, she seems to be heading to this same conclusion: "Longus ... slyly reverses his (Thucydides') values." This reversal of Thucydidean methodology

In order to make sure that the reader understands that he is using historiographical elements, Longus also reports on what must be done in order to write history or to research the necessary material. The method consists of seeing (εἶδον) or having first hand experience of the data; in this case it is the γραφήν (*pr.* 1) that tells the lovers' ἱστορία, or ἔργα.⁶ A written response (ἀντιγράψαι, *pr.* 2) should then be produced. If first-hand experience of the subject matter cannot be attained, second-hand knowledge must be sought (ἀναζητησάμενος, *pr.* 3) such as reports (φήμην, *pr.* 1).⁷ The finished product should

is consistent with the experimental nature of *Daphnis and Chloe*. Longus deliberately adapts regular plot ingredients, such as the *Scheintod* of the heroine, or voyages to distant places, into new forms. His uniqueness has caused some scholars to exclude him from their surveys of this genre: F. A. Todd, *Some Ancient Novels* (London 1940) 2, on the basis that this work "stands alone in ancient literature as a union of the Romance with the pastoral"; M. Hadas, "Cultural Survival and the Origins of Fiction," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 51 (1952) 258, views Longus as excessively contaminated by "the bucolic tradition"; M. Fusillo, "Textual Patterns and Narrative Situations in the Greek Novel," in *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel I*, ed. H. Hofman (Groningen 1987), 17-31, isolates this novel because supposedly "it is a perfumed pastoral written by a sophisticated aristocrat for sophisticated aristocrats" (17). *Daphnis and Chloe*, however, should be studied because it demonstrates that after Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesus, whether or not through the influence of the Second Sophistic, the novel genre begins to change from a historically detailed form to one that is more mythological in nature.

It can be said that the texts of Chariton and Xenophon, with their inclusion of the gods Venus, Eros, and Isis, are just as mythological as Longus. Longus' setting, however, is in a less obvious historical period. And although the war between Mytilene and Methymna may tie the narrative to the events of the fifth century B.C., Longus does not seem to want to make his narrative too realistic in nature because realism may spoil the idyllic milieu of the novel. Longus does supply some information on topography; for research done on this data see H. J. Mason, "Longus and the Topography of Lesbos," *TAPA* 109 (1979) 149-163; P. Green, "Longus, Antiphon, and the Topography of Lesbos," *JHS* 102 (1982) 210-214; E. L. Bowie, "Theocritus' Seventh Idyll, Philetas and Longus," *CQ* 35 (1985) 67-91. Although these scholars postulate that Longus knew the topography of Lesbos, this inclusion of topographical data tells us nothing about the novel's historical setting.

⁶ A. Wouters, "The eikones in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* IV 39,2: 'Beglaubigungsapparat'?" (*Sacris Erudiri. Jaarboek voor Godsdienswetenschappen* 31 [1989/90] 465-479) 476, argues that the εἰκόνες in the last book of the novel form the painting mentioned in the proemium. They are, according to Wouters, "the codification of *Daphnis'* and *Chloe's* experiences."

⁷ The narrator's work of research (ἀναζητησάμενος) parallels Thucydides' research. Longus, however, will modify the historian at a different level.

be written down (γράφειν) in some form (βίβλους, *pr.* 3). Longus also notes that this is not easy work (ἐξεπονησάμην).⁸

Longus continues his narrative by including immediately after the prooemium more Thucydidean echoes (1.1–2):

πόλις ἐστὶ τῆς Λέσβου Μυτιλήνη, μεγάλη καὶ καλή· διείληπται γὰρ εὐρίποις ὑπεισερούσης τῆς θαλάττης, καὶ κεκόσμηται γεφύραις ξεστοῦ καὶ λευκοῦ λίθου. νομίσεις οὐ πόλιν ὄραν ἀλλὰ νῆσον. ἀλλὰ ἦν ταύτης τῆς πόλεως τῆς Μυτιλήνης ὅσον ἀπὸ σταδίων διακοσίων ἀγρὸς ἀνδρὸς εὐδαίμονος, κτῆμα κάλλιστον.

Longus seems compelled to call attention to the word κτῆμα. He already used it in the prooemium, and made clear that his “possession” would be one that was “a pleasing possession for all men” in contrast to the κτῆμα⁹ found in Thucydides. In addition to the use of κτῆμα, Longus further emphasizes the connection with the historian by mentioning Mytilene. The purpose of these additional allusions needs explanation. I suggest that Longus wants to apply his reversal of the Thucydidean progression to the account (3.1–50) of Mytilene’s revolt from Athens and its war with Methymna. Longus, in other words, will change the serious tone of the historical conflict into something *τερπνοτέρα* in the novel’s account of the skirmish between Methymna and Mytilene.

Since it has been established that Longus employs Thucydidean phraseology in his prooemium, I shall now comment on some of the allusions (some direct borrowings) to Thucydides in order to show that it is the Mytilenean-Methymnaean narrative that Longus wishes to transform.¹⁰

(1) Long. **1.22.1: ὁ μὲν κινδύνου παρὰ τοσοῦτον ἐλθὼν ~

⁸Perhaps ἐξεπονησάμην may refer to Theoc. *Id.* 7.51 and not to Thucydides.

⁹The κτῆμα of 1.1.2 is reinforced by the κτῆματα in 3.2.1, where the narrative dealing with the Mytilenean and Methymnaean skirmish comes to an end.

¹⁰The following is a compilation of the passages found in Valley and Vieillefond. Valley’s contributions are marked with *, Vieillefond’s with **, and mine with ***.

Thuc. 3.49.4: *παρὰ τοσοῦτον μὲν ἢ Μυτιλήνη ἦλθε κινδύνου*. In 1.22.1 Longus relates Dorcon's escape from the dogs with the help of Chloe and his rival Daphnis, while Thuc. 3.49.4 tells of the rescue of Mytilene by the second trireme dispatched by Diodotus. There seems to be no parallel between the two narratives, except perhaps that destruction is averted by rivals in the nick of time. In **Long. 2.19.1 there is a similar echo, *τότε μὲν δὴ παρὰ τοσοῦτον Δάφνις ἦλθε κακοῦ*; in the passages leading up to this line the villagers rescue Daphnis from the Methymnaeans. In addition to Thuc. 3.49.4, this phraseology also appears in ***Thuc. 7.2.4: *παρὰ τοσοῦτον μὲν Συράκουσαι ἦλθον κινδύνου*; once again, the theme of averting destruction is present.

(2) Long. *2.14.1: *κλυδώνιον* ~ Thuc. 2.84.3: *κλύδωνι*.¹¹ In 2.14.1 Longus writes that a wave caused by the wind blowing (*κινηθέντος ... τοῦ πνεύματος*) from the mountains pushed the boat into the open sea. In 2.84.3 Thucydides explains that it was a wind (*ὡς δὲ τό τε πνεῦμα κατήει*) that caused the heavy seas that made Phormio signal his ships to attack. Although seas troubled by the wind are a common occurrence, nevertheless a parallel exists.

(3) *αὐτερέταις* (Long. *2.20.1) may allude to *αὐτερέται* (Thuc. 1.10.4, 3.18.4) when combined with *ἐπέπλει τοῖς* (Long. *2.20.1); this combination occurs in numerous places in Thucydides.¹²

¹¹ *κλυδώνιον* is a *varia lectio* in Thuc. 2.84.3.

¹² More than sixty-five forms of *ἐπιπλεῖν* occur in Thucydides (cf. M. H. N. von Essen, *Index Thucydeus* [Berlin 1887] 154). Some may be echoed in Longus (most dealing with military action of some sort), for example: *λαβέσθαι χωρίων* in ***2.2.3, *πολυχειρίας* in ***2.2.4, *ὑπέφευγε* in ***2.4.2, *προσκόπους* in *2.12.1, *ἐς ἀνολκὴν λίθου* in *2.13.1, *διαθέοντες* in ***2.13.4, *μετέωρον* in ***2.14.1, *ἐπεκαλεῖτο* in ***2.14.4, *κακουργεῖν* in ***2.19.3, *ἀπόβασιν* in ***2.20.2, *ἀναλαβεῖν* in ***2.25.1, *αιφνίδιον* in ***2.25.3, *κῶπαι καθιέντων* in ***2.26.2, *ἀπεσπάσατε* in ***2.27.2, *ἀποβάθρας* in ***2.28.3, *ὄπλα κινεῖν* in *3.1.1, *οὐκ ἀνασχετὸν νομίσαντες* in *3.1.1, *μετεγίνωσκον* in ***3.2.2, *ἀδεῶς ἐπιμίγνυσθαι καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλασσαν* in *3.2.3, *ἐπεπήγει δὲ κρύσταλλος* in *3.3.2, *αὐτοκράτωρ* in ***3.2.4. All these words and phrases can be found in the historian's text (cf. von Essen). This is not to say that Longus borrowed each and every instance from Thucydides, but these words give the novel's narrative a distinctly Thucydidean flavor.

In *Daphnis and Chloe* the military narrative pertaining to the war between Mytilene and Methymna is limited to 2.12.1–3.3.1, and the majority of the words that are Thucydidean in nature appear in this section of the novel. Moreover, ἀδεῶς ἐπιμίγνυσθαι καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλασσαν in *3.2.3 confirms that Longus had Thucydides in mind (Thuc. 1.2.2, οὐδ' ἐπιμιγνύντες ἀδεῶς ἀλλήλοις οὔτε κατὰ γῆν οὔτε διὰ θαλάσσης). Since it is clear that Longus verbally echoes Thucydides, I suggest that Longus had Thucydides' text as a model for his narrative of the Lesbian conflict. Longus, however, transforms this well-known episode of the Peloponnesian War.

Thucydides writes that Mytilene, along with all of Lesbos, with the exception of Methymna, rebelled from Athens because they feared the abuse of Athenian power: οὐ γὰρ εἰκὸς ἦν αὐτοὺς οὕς μὲν μεθ' ἡμῶν ἐνσπόνδους ἐποιήσαντο καταστρέψασθαι, τοὺς δὲ ὑπολοίπους, εἴ ποτε ἄρα δυνηθεῖεν, μὴ δρᾶσαι τοῦτο (3.10.6). No such grandiose justification is given in the novel for the military action between the two Lesbian cities. Rather the cause of hostilities finds its origin in a Methymnaean hunting trip in Mytilenean land (2.12–3.2). The hunters suffer the loss of their ship because the vine that they used to fasten their ship to the shore was eaten by a goat. As retaliation they beat Daphnis, and consequently some of Daphnis' compatriots attempt to help him. All participants end up giving their accounts of the event to an arbiter, who finds in favor of Daphnis; the Methymnaeans seek recourse in their own town.

This quasi-judicial episode parallels the famous policy debate between Cleon and Diodotus in Thucydides 3.37–48. It may be argued that Longus does not recall the debate between Cleon and Diodotus in the trial scene in the second book. But if the general premise is accepted that Longus is altering Thucydides by including the mythical in his novel and producing a work that will serve to instruct and at the same

time please the audience, we can see that Longus modifies the debate on Mytilene. Evidence of this is the pity (οἶκτος) he describes when Daphnis has finished his defense (τούτοις ἐπεδάκρυσεν ὁ Δάφνις καὶ εἰς οἶκτον ὑπηγάγετο τοὺς ἀγροίκους πολὺν, 2.17.1). It is οἶκτος, compassion, which moves Philetas to invoke Pan and the Nymphs to witness that Daphnis is blameless. Thucydides, conversely, has Cleon warn the Athenians not to make a mistake and yield to pity (ἀμάρτητε ἢ οἶκτῳ ἐνδῶτε, 3.37.2; μηδὲ ... οἶκτῳ ... ἀμαρτάνειν, 3.40.2). Diodotus also employs this word when he argues against Cleon (μήτε οἶκτῳ πλέον νείμαντες, 3.48.1). It is compassion, however, that moves Philetas to call upon the gods (the mythological), and thereby changes the serious tone of Thucydides. The historical narrative continues with the Athenians sending out a second ship to rescind the first decree, and concludes with παρὰ τοσοῦτον μὲν ἢ Μυτιλήνη ἦλθε κινδύνου (3.49.4); this is the basis for Longus' τότε μὲν δὴ παρὰ τοσοῦτον Δάφνις ἦλθε κακοῦ (2.19.1).

In keeping with Longus' transposed historical technique, the novel modifies the tenor of Thucydides' serious and important account. There is no real justification for the outbreak of hostilities in the novel. It may be said that the Methymnaeans, angered by the verdict favorable to Daphnis, did lose a great amount of money with the loss of their ship. The simplicity of the resolution of the skirmish, however, demonstrates that the war could not have been so important (3.2.4–3.1):

τὸν μὲν οὖν κήρυκα τοῖς Μυτιληναίοις ὁ Ἴππασος ἀποστέλλει, καίτοιγε αὐτοκράτωρ στρατηγὸς κεχειροτονημένος, αὐτὸς δὲ τῆς Μηθύμνης ὅσον ἀπὸ δέκα σταδίων στρατοπέδον βάλομενος τὰς ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἐντολὰς ἀνέμενε. καὶ δύο διαγενομένων ἡμερῶν ἔλθων ὁ ἄγγελος τὴν τε ἀρπαγὴν ἐκέλευσε κομίσασθαι καὶ ἀδικήσαντα μηδὲν ἀναχωρεῖν οἴκαδε. πολέμου γὰρ καὶ εἰρήνης ἐν αἰρέσει γενόμενοι τὴν εἰρήνην εὕρισκιν κερδαλεωτέραν. ὁ

μὲν δὴ Μηθυμαίνων καὶ Μυτιληναίων πόλεμος ἀδόκητον λαβὼν ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος οὕτω διελύθη.¹³

If the conflict had been on the scale of the war in Thucydides' history, more than a simple diplomatic solution would have been necessary.

In the opening of the third book Longus concludes his account of the skirmish, and drives home the point that he is reworking Thucydides by including in 2.1.1–3.1 an abundance of historical and military terminology: ἐπίπλουν, νεῶν, ἀρπαγὴν, ὅπλα κινεῖν, καταλέξαντες ἀσπίδα τρισχιλίαν καὶ ἵππον πεντακοσίαν, στρατηγόν, ἐξορμηθεῖς, ὡς ἐπεισπεσοῦμενος ἀφρουρήτοις ταῖς πύλαις, σταδίους, κῆρυξ ἀπαντᾶ σπονδὰς κομίζων, αὐτοκράτωρ στρατηγός, σταδίων, στρατόπεδον, ἄγγελος, πόλεμον, etc. The militaristic tone set by these words and phrases, however, is altered by the simplistic resolution offered by Longus.

Longus adapts the historical account in the following manner. First, he takes a serious and weighty historical episode and reverses its somber tenor by reducing it in the novel to a squabble over a lost ship. Second, he interjects into the military narrative the mythological figures and stories of the Nymphs, Syrinx, and the god Pan. The insertion of the episode involving Pan is a clear reference and reverse correlation to the μυθῶδες of the Archaeology. In his epiphany to Bryaxis Pan declares ἀπεσπάσατε δὲ βωμῶν παρθένον ἐξ ἧς Ἔρωσ μῦθον ποιῆσαι θέλει (2.27.2), which is specifically what Thucydides wants to avoid in his history. Thucydides does not want to include the

¹³"Hippasus responded by sending the envoy to the people of Mytilene, although he had been elected as a general with full power to take decisions; meanwhile he pitched camp about a mile from Methymna and waited for his city's orders. Two days later, a messenger came and told him to recover the booty and return home without doing any damage. Being in a position to choose between war and peace, they found peace more profitable. And so the war between Methymna and Mytilene came to an end, finishing as suddenly as it had begun" (transl. Christopher Gill, in B. P. Reardon, ed., *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* [Berkeley 1989] 318).

mythical lest he run the risk of making his work an ἱστορία τερπνοτέρα, as Herodotus, the object of the attack in the *Archaeology*, had done (specifically in his account of Pan's epiphany to Pheidippides, Hdt. 6.105).

Turner writes that Longus is a "highly conscious artist with clear ideas about the purpose of his art, and he has left us a preface explaining them—or rather hinting at them, for the full meaning of his words is not immediately apparent" (117). Indeed the "full meaning" of the prooemium is not apparent until one realizes that Longus is playing an intertextual game. Morgan interpreted this intertextual dialectic as subverting the *Archaeology* because it made history into something fictional or mythical that conveyed "truth, about ourselves and about the world" (76). Longus' use of Thucydides is one of many instances of variation on earlier literature. I hope to have shown that by alluding to Thucydides Longus transforms the historian's approach to writing history, orients his work to the "pleasing" nature of Herodotus' writing style, and thereby composes a work that is both a κτῆμα τερπνὸν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις and a κτῆμα ἐς αἰεῖ.

July, 2000

Dept. of Classics
Xavier University
Cincinnati, Ohio 45207-5181
cueva@xavier.xu.edu