



Echoes of Thucydides' Sicilian Expedition in Three Greek Novels

Author(s): Stephen M. Trzaskoma

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Classical Philology*, Vol. 106, No. 1 (January 2011), pp. 61-65

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](http://www.uchicago.edu)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/659114>

Accessed: 02/04/2012 06:52

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Classical Philology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

ECHOES OF THUCYDIDES' SICILIAN EXPEDITION
IN THREE GREEK NOVELS

I CHARITON

The Athenians' expedition to Sicily and its defeat by the Syracusans during the Peloponnesian War is a frequent and well-known point of reference for the narrator and characters of Chariton's *Callirhoe*.¹ Already in the novel's second sentence Callirhoe's father Hermocrates is identified as "the one who defeated the Athenians"² (1.1.1), and after a series of allusions both subtle and overt throughout the novel to the wartime events in Sicily, the Syracusans' victory is touched upon one last time in the final episode. When Chaereas and Callirhoe have returned to Syracuse, the people "felt greater gratitude for this day than they had for the day of their victory celebration" (8.7.2).³ Other portions of the historian's work are imitated and referenced by Chariton,⁴ but the Sicilian war is a primary locus of his allusions.

Still, three verbal echoes of the Sicilian portion of Thucydides' account have, I believe, been missed. All occur in Chariton's seventh book, which mostly comprises a narrative of the war between Persia and Egypt in which Chaereas plays a leading role. They do not necessarily inform the immediately surrounding context in drastic ways or force radical reinterpretation on the part of a reader who recognizes them, but they are unmistakable nonetheless and do have an effect. In combination with the web of Thucydidean imitation and allusion throughout the novel, they contribute to the literary texture and a sense of literary filiation, all the while adding depth to their individual moments. Certainly the reflections of Thucydides in *Callirhoe* are more sophisticated than those in Xenophon of Ephesus or Achilles Tatius that I present below, and they show a more sustained engagement with the historian.⁵

1. Chariton 7.2.8 and Thucydides 6.1.2

Tyre alone of the cities in Phoenicia resists the Egyptian advance. Chaereas' exploits during the ensuing siege are modeled on Alexander's in 332 B.C.E., but Chariton slyly winks at Thucydides' *History* in his description of the island city: ἡ μὲν γὰρ πόλις ἐν θαλάσῃ κατῴκισται, λεπτή δὲ εἰσοδος αὐτὴν συνάπτουσα τῇ γῇ κωλύει τὸ μὴ νῆσον εἶναι ("The city is situated in the sea, and a narrow causeway connecting it to the land keeps it from being an island," 7.2.8). Chariton has reversed Thucydides' description of Sicily: καὶ τοσαύτη οὖσα ἐν εἰκοσισταδίῳ μάλιστα μέτρῳ τῆς θαλάσσης διείργεται τὸ

1. See particularly Bartsch 1934, Zimmermann 1961, and Hunter 1994 for general discussion of historiography and Chariton. Regarding the Sicilian Expedition, Reardon (1996, 323–24) writes: "[Chariton] has a general knowledge of some of the more familiar events in Greek history, notably the Athenian defeat in Sicily (which recurs with tedious frequency in the text)." Connors 2002, 15–16, summarizes the recollections of the expedition in the novel. Smith 2007, while treating more generally the various functions that allusions to Athenian matters play in *Callirhoe*, makes frequent mention of the Sicilian Expedition.

2. All translations are my own.

3. The day of their return thus becomes assimilated to the day of their marriage, both defined by their superiority to the day of victory in strikingly similar terms. Compare Chariton 8.7.2 (χαρίν ἡπίστατο μᾶλλον ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης ἢ τῆς τῶν ἐπινυκίων) with Chariton 1.1.13 (ἥδιον ταύτης τὴν ἡμέραν ἡγαγον οἱ Συρακόσιοι τῆς τῶν ἐπινυκίων); see Smith 2007, 190. I cite the text of Reardon 2004 throughout.

4. See the *apparatus fontium* in Reardon 2004 and Papanikolaou 1973, 21–22, for specific examples of verbal echoes of Thucydides.

5. Luginbill 2000 traces in detail the deep influence of Thucydides on one episode in the novel, the outbreak of the Egyptian revolt.

μὴ ἥπειρος εἶναι (“and despite its great size, it is prevented by about twenty stades of sea from being mainland,” 6.1.2).

The Thucydidean phrase was notable. It was singled out at Demetrius, *De elocutione* 72 as an example of the *megaloprepes* style for its hiatus of long vowels (ὥσαύτως καὶ τὸ μὴ ἥπειρος εἶναι τὸ Θουκυδίδειον, “also in the same way Thucydides’ phrase ‘from being mainland’”). The same reversal that Chariton performs occurs in two authors elsewhere in preserved Greek literature. Aelius Aristides in his *Panegyric in Cyzicus* 12 makes the reference to Thucydides explicit: καίτοι Θουκυδίδης γε ἐπαινεῖ Σικελίαν, ὅτι εἴκοσι σταδίου ἀπέχει τῆς ἥπειρου τοῦλάχιστον· ἡ δὲ τοσοῦτον ἄρα ἀπέχει τῆς ἥπειρου ὥστ’ ἐξεῖναι καὶ λαθεῖν τὸ μὴ νῆσον εἶναι (“And indeed Thucydides praises Sicily because it is at its closest twenty stades from the mainland. But Cyzicus is so close to the mainland that it is possible even to forget its not being an island”). Note also Aristides’ mention of Tyre in the same connection in the immediately preceding context. We have also the two occurrences in Dionysius of Byzantium’s *Per Bosphorum navigatio* 6, τοῦ δ’ αὐχένος, ὑφ’ οὗ διείργεται τὸ μὴ νῆσος εἶναι (“of the isthmus by which it is prevented from being an island”) and 12, τοῦ διείργοντος τὸ μὴ νῆσον εἶναι τὴν πόλιν αὐχένος (“of the isthmus that prevents the city from being an island”). In isolation, there seems no reason to assume that Chariton is dependent upon either of these second-century C.E. authors for the phrase, since he seems to have gotten his Thucydides direct and the chronology is most unlikely.⁶ The coincidence, though startling, is merely evidence for the memorable nature of the Thucydidean original. We might note that Chariton clearly expected at least some of his audience to recognize the wordplay and its origin without formal attribution of the sort we find in Aristides.

2. Chariton 7.5.8 and Thucydides 7.70.8

The Egyptian king offers Chaereas his choice of command over the land or naval forces, but supposes he will choose the latter: οἶμαι δὲ οἰκειότερόν σοι εἶναι τὴν θάλασσαν (“For I suppose that the sea is [the element] more your own,” 7.5.8). The general context and the joining of this particular noun to the comparative of this adjective make this almost certainly a reminiscence of Thucydides 7.70.8. There we have the climactic sea battle between the Athenians and Syracusans. The desperate Athenian commanders ask their own captains “whether they retreated because they thought that the most hostile land was now more their own than the sea” (εἰ τὴν πολεμιοτάτην γῆν οἰκειοτέραν ἤδη τῆς . . . θαλάσσης ἡγούμενοι ὑποχωροῦσιν). The point is a familiar one in Chariton: the Syracusans’ excellence is proven by their victory over the Athenians.⁷ In this specific instance, the king’s logic is impeccable for those who know Thucydides: the Syracusans proved themselves masters of the sea by defeating the Athenians, a people for whom that element was οἰκειότερα. The Egyptian goes on to make explicit this very argument in the next sentence: if the Syracusans beat the Athenians in Sicily and the Athenians beat the Persians in the Persian Wars, then Chaereas will certainly defeat the Persians.⁸ Perhaps because the surrounding context makes the general reminiscence so explicit, the specific verbal debt to Thucydides’ Sicilian narrative has gone unnoticed.

6. The weight of scholarly opinion dates Chariton before Aristides and Dionysius. One of the later authors could, of course, have read Chariton and admired the effect.

7. See Kuch 1996, 217, for the frequency and importance of this point in Chariton.

8. At the same time, the allusion enriches the conceptual relationship we are to imagine between Syracuse and Athens in the novel. Chariton, as a good reader of Thucydides, would recall that what made the Syra-

The same Thucydidean passage is treated by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Thuc.* 26), and it is also clearly referenced by Aelius Aristides (*In Defense of the Four* 301), who uses it to highlight the strength of the Athenians at sea. Once more there seems no reason, despite the coincidence of Chariton and Aelius Aristides, to suppose Chariton acquired the phrase from any author but Thucydides himself.

3. Chariton 7.6.1 and Thucydides 6.17.8

Chaereas is victorious at sea ὥστε μὴδὲ ἀντίπαλον αὐτῷ γενέσθαι τὸ πολέμιον ναυτικόν (“so that the enemy fleet could not rival him,” 7.6.1). At the start of his narrative of the Sicilian Expedition, Thucydides has Alcibiades give a speech (6.15–18) urging the Athenian invasion. One point in favor of the attack is that the Spartans and their allies, with their weak navy, will not be able to harm the Athenians even if the latter send away a large portion of their own forces, ὑπόλοιπον γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐστὶν ἀντίπαλον ναυτικόν (“for we have a fleet to rival theirs remaining,” 6.17.8). The noun and adjective are elsewhere not conjoined in Greek, and ἀντίπαλος is a favorite word of Thucydides, in whose work it appears with some frequency.⁹ More particularly, Chariton is able through the importation of the Thucydidean context to stress the absolutely crushing nature of the victory. Chaereas so thoroughly deprives the Persian empire of its naval forces that it has not a single ship remaining, whereas Athens still had some naval resources at its disposal after the Sicilian Expedition. Chariton’s allusions to the *History* here and in the two instances above show both his thorough familiarity with his source text and the high expectations he had for at least some of his readers, whom he presumed would be able to appreciate such intertextual effects.

II XENOPHON OF EPHEBUS

The *Ephesiaca* is a novel generally seen as devoid of specific verbal borrowings from Classical authors, though motifs and aspects of the plot show our author apparently interacting with, for instance, elements from those authors—for example, when Anthia is married against her will to a rustic, this recycles Electra’s marriage to a farmer in Euripides, though we cannot say whether Xenophon had read the play. I believe, however, that Xenophon may imitate Thucydides closely in at least one passage.

1. Xenophon Ephesius 1.14.1 and Thucydides 7.85.1

Anthia and Habrocomes’ ship is attacked by pirates at 1.13.5–6, and a general slaughter ensues. The hero and heroine surrender to the pirates’ captain, Corymbus, asking him to stop the killing (μηκέτι φόνευε)¹⁰ and to take them as slaves instead. In the sentence that follows, modern editors aside from Georges Dalmeida have accepted W. A. Hirschig’s παύσασθαι (1.14.1): ἀκούσας ὁ Κόρυμβος εὐθὺς μὲν ἐκέλευσε παύσασθαι

cusans so successful against the Athenians was the very similarity of the two peoples (μάλιστα γὰρ ὁμοίотροποι γενόμενοι, *Thuc.* 8.96.5). Smith (2007, 176–82) treats the Sicilian Expedition and its reflexes in Chariton at length (much of the chapter in which this discussion occurs seems to have escaped indexing and so can be missed). The argument there (at p. 180) is that Chariton “has . . . modelled his depiction of” Chaereas’ departure from Syracuse with an embassy and his arrival in Ionia “on Thucydides’ account of the Athenian expedition to Syracuse.” A fuller analysis is not possible in the space here, but obviously it would have to take into account Chariton’s clear references to the Sicilian Expedition aside from those in the departure scene, something I intend to pursue in a future publication.

9. Forms of ἀντίπαλος appear some twenty-seven times in Thucydides, an observation I owe to the first anonymous referee.

10. I cite the text of O’Sullivan 2005 for the *Ephesiaca*.

(φείσασθαι F) φονεύοντας (“Corymbus heard this and immediately ordered [his men] to stop the slaughter”). If this is in fact what Xenophon wrote (and Hirschig’s correction seems both natural and obvious, the construction with φείσασθαι being otherwise unparalleled), then we must face the possibility that this most unliterary of authors is here alluding through specific verbal reminiscence to Thucydides 7.85.1.¹¹

Very few who have read the account of the miserable retreat of the Athenians after the battle in the great harbor will forget the horrific image of the slaughter in the Assinarus (Thuc. 7.84), where the exhausted and thirsty Athenians drink the muddy and bloody river water as the Syracusans indiscriminately kill them. It is at this point that the Athenian commander Nicias surrenders himself to the Spartan Gylippus καὶ ἑαυτῷ μὲν χρήσασθαι ἐκέλευεν ἐκείνόν τε καὶ Λακεδαιμονίους ὅτι βούλονται, τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους στρατιώτας παύσασθαι φονεύοντας (“and he bid Gylippus and the Spartans to do with him as they would but to stop the slaughter of the other soldiers”). The specific language is so close that in any other extant novel we would have no difficulty in recognizing an attempt by the author to highlight the suffering of the novelistic hero and heroine through the reworking of earlier Classical works. But the general view of Xenophon, “bare of literary allusion as he is,”¹² rightly makes us hesitate.

To argue in favor of conscious imitation, one may point out that the general context (surrender in the face of overwhelming force and unrestrained slaughter) is perfectly suited to the allusion. Several additional details may further attenuate our hesitation in accepting the echo. First, the surrender leads to further disaster for at least some participants in both accounts—in Thucydides, Nicias is put to death by the Syracusans despite his surrender; in Xenophon, the pirates take only a few captives (despite their intention before the attack to take any survivors to sell them), set fire to the ship, and kill the rest. Second, the one to whom surrender is offered does not in the end obtain his desire—in Thucydides, Gylippus wants to keep Nicias alive for his own reasons, but the Syracusans ignore these and put the Athenian to death; in Xenophon, Corymbus falls in love with Habrocomes and hopes to keep him as his share of the booty, but the leader of the pirate gang forces Corymbus to hand the boy over. Third, the ultimate outcomes share a broad resemblance—Thucydides tells us that many of the Athenians eventually escaped and made their way home; in Xenophon, Anthia and Habrocomes, as well as Leucon and Rhode, survive enslavement and return home at the end of the novel. Fourth, there is the matter of the quarries—in Thucydides, the prisoners are kept in the quarries of Syracuse; later in Xenophon, Habrocomes’ time working in the quarries of Nuceria (5.8.1–4, 5.10.1–2) may be a small gesture toward the Athenians’ fate. Finally, though each element of the citation is common, the combination is surprisingly distinctive—a search of the online *TLG* shows these are the only two passages in Greek that join these three verbs in a single construction before the sixth century C.E. Even if we limit ourselves to looking for combinations of παύομαι and φονεύω, there is only the very different τοῦ φονεῦειν ἐπαύσαντο (“they ceased from the slaughter”) at Josephus *Bellum Judaicum* 2.498.

11. For Xenophon’s lack of literary texture, note the judgment of Morgan (Morgan and Harrison 2008, 221) that in terms of intertextuality he “seems the most primitive” of the extant novelists. In this regard O’Sullivan (1995, 165) memorably compares Xenophon with Chariton, whom by contrast he describes as “something of a literary magpie.”

12. The phrase is from O’Sullivan 1995, 149.

III ACHILLES TATIUS

Explicit verbal citations are sometimes seen as a rarity in Achilles Tatius,¹³ although he is an author obviously well versed in earlier literature and capable of sophisticated intertextual effects.¹⁴ Scholarship on the novel has not seen Thucydides as an author of particular interest for *Leucippe and Clitophon*,¹⁵ but there does seem to be at least one verbal imitation.

1. Achilles Tatius 5.16.3 and Thucydides 7.70.8

We saw above that Chariton gives his Egyptian king language (οἰκειότερόν σοι εἶναι τὴν θάλασσαν) to conjure up the climactic moment in Thucydides' Sicilian narrative, the battle in the Great Harbor of Syracuse upon which the fates of the Athenians and Syracusans teetered in the balance (γῆν οἰκειότεραν . . . θαλάσσης). An altogether wittier recollection of the dramatic sentence in question is a reminiscence at Achilles Tatius 5.16.3. Clitophon has been putting off the sexual advances of Melite by increasingly specious argument. His attempt in 5.16 centers his justification on the unsuitability of their making love onboard their ship because Leucippe died at sea. Melite counters by asking, "But is it not even more fitting on the sea for Eros and Aphrodite's mysteries?" (ἐν θαλάσσει δὲ μὴ καὶ οἰκειότερόν ἔστιν Ἔρωτι καὶ Ἀφροδίσει μυστηρίους;¹⁶). She explains her reasoning by referencing Aphrodite's birth from the sea. The erotic has swept the historical and military from the sea if one notes the source (and the allusions in Chariton and Aelius Aristides indicate that at least some ancient readers would have spotted the collocation of θάλασσα and οἰκειότερος)—and regardless of whether one thinks of the allusion as being only to Thucydides or as a double reference to both that historian and to Chariton, Achilles Tatius' romantic precursor.¹⁷

STEPHEN M. TRZASKOMA

University of New Hampshire

13. Garnaud 2002, x–xi.

14. Compare the opinion of Morgan (Morgan and Harrison 2008, 221): Achilles Tatius' novel belongs with Longus' and Heliodorus' as those that "most reward intertextual exploration."

15. Certainly in comparison with Chariton and Longus. For the latter and Thucydides, see the preface of Vieillefond 1987, Cueva 1998, Luginbill 2002, and Trzaskoma 2005. The last three point sufficiently to the earlier bibliography.

16. The text has been frequently suspected, primarily because of the neuter singular comparative. See the *apparatus criticus* of Vilborg 1955 ad loc. and the comments at Vilborg 1962, 100. The neuter itself is not the problem, as Sexauer (1899, 39) saw, since a neuter predicate here is perfectly in accord with Achilles Tatius' style, especially so since Melite's pronouncement is a generalizing statement (and compare the neuter after a feminine subject in the corresponding passage of Chariton). The difficulty is actually the identification of the *subject*. Hercher's change of ἐν θαλάσσει to θάλασσα may be correct, but attempts to change the gender of the adjective are misguided even if we follow Hercher on the noun. The text may, in fact, be sound, as the silence of Garnaud 2002 on the matter indicates; we could simply be dealing with the ellipsis of an infinitive such as εἶναι ("is it not more fitting for them to occur at sea?") or an easy extension of οἰκειότερόν ἔστι to a fully impersonal construction ("is it not more fitting for them at sea?"). Regardless, the basic sense of the question is clear and my identification of it as an imitation of Thucydides is unaffected by any proposed emendations.

17. I thank the Center for the Humanities at the University of New Hampshire and the Loeb Classical Library Foundation for financial support during the period in which this note was researched and written.

LITERATURE CITED

- Bartsch, W. 1934. *Der Charitonroman und die Historiographie*. Diss. Leipzig.
- Connors, C. 2002. Chariton's Syracuse and Its Histories of Empire. In *Space in the Ancient Novel*, ed. M. Paschalis and S. Frangoulidis, 12–26, Ancient Narrative, suppl. 1. Groningen.
- Cueva, E. 1998. Longus and Thucydides: A New Interpretation. *GRBS* 39: 429–40.
- Garnaud, J.-P. 2002. *Achille Tatius, le roman de Leucippe et Clitophon*³. Paris.
- Hunter, R. 1994. History and Historicity in the Romance of Chariton. *ANRW* 2.34.2: 1055–86.
- Kuch, H. 1996. A Study on the Margin of the Ancient Novel: “Barbarians” and Others. In *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. G. Schmeling, 209–20. Leiden.
- Luginbill, R. D. 2000. Chariton's Use of Thucydides' *History* in Introducing the Egyptian Revolt. *Mnemosyne* 53: 1–11.
- . 2002. A Delightful Possession: Longus' Prologue and Thucydides. *CJ* 97: 233–47.
- Morgan, J., and S. Harrison. 2008. Intertextuality. In *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel*, ed. T. Whitmarsh, 218–36. Cambridge.
- O'Sullivan, J. N. 1995. *Xenophon of Ephesus: His Compositional Technique and the Birth of the Novel*. Berlin.
- . ed. 2005. *Xenophon Ephesius, “De Anthia et Habrocome Ephesiacorum” libri V*. Munich.
- Papanikolaou, A. D. 1973. *Chariton-Studien*. Göttingen.
- Reardon, B. P. 1996. Chariton. In *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. G. Schmeling, 309–35. Leiden.
- . ed. 2004. *Chariton Aphrodisiensis: “De Callirhoe narrationes amatoriae.”* Munich and Leipzig.
- Sexauer, H. 1899. *Der Sprachgebrauch des Romanschriftstellers Achilles Tatius*. Diss. Heidelberg.
- Smith, S. D. 2007. *Greek Identity and the Athenian Past in Chariton*. Ancient Narrative, suppl. 9. Groningen.
- Trzaskoma, S. M. 2005. A Novelist Writing “History”: Longus' Thucydides Again. *GRBS* 45: 75–90.
- Vieillefond, J.-R., ed. 1987. *Longus: “Pastorales.”* Paris.
- Vilborg, E., ed. 1955. *Achilles Tatius: “Leucippe and Clitophon.”* Stockholm.
- . 1962. *Achilles Tatius: “Leucippe and Clitophon”; A Commentary*. Gothenburg.
- Zimmermann, F. 1961. Chariton und die Geschichte. In *Sozialökonomische Verhältnisse im alten Orient und im klassischen Altertum*, ed. R. Günther and G. Schrot, 329–45. Berlin.

SOME ALLEGED ECHOES OF APULEIUS IN JEROME

Harald Hagendahl's survey of Jerome's borrowings from the classics failed to register any debt to Apuleius.¹ More recently, however, Susan Weingarten has endeavored to show that Jerome's *Vita Hilarionis* exhibits several reminiscences of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.² Weingarten opens her case for Apuleian influence with the following state-

Works are cited according to *OCD*³ and *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae: Index librorum scriptorum inscriptionum*² (Leipzig, 1990) with its online *Addenda* at <http://www.thesaurus.badw.de/pdf/addenda.pdf>, unless otherwise indicated.

1. H. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics: A Study on the Apologists, Jerome and Other Christian Writers*, Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis 64.2 (Göteborg, 1958). Apuleius is likewise absent from his supplementary study, “Jerome and the Latin Classics,” *VigChr* 28 (1974): 216–27, and from the earlier investigation by E. Lübeck, *Hieronymus quos noverit scriptores et ex quibus hauserit* (Leipzig, 1872).

2. S. Weingarten, “Jerome and the *Golden Ass*,” in *Studia Patristica*, vol. 33, ed. E. A. Livingstone (Leuven, 1997), 383–89. She notes (p. 389) that scholarship has already recognized a general resemblance to the