

ἐπὶ μέντοι τοῦ Πλάτωνος καὶ ἄλλη τίς ἐστίν, ὡς ἔφην, διαφορά· οὐ γὰρ μεγέθει τῶν ἀρετῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ πλήθει πολὺ λειπόμενος ἄμουσίας, ὅτε μὲν πλείον ἔτι τοῖς ἀμαρτήμασι περιττεύει ἢ ταῖς ἀρεταῖς λείπεται.

ἄμουσίας M. Heath: ἀπουσίας P | ὅτε μὲν R.H. Martin: ὁ μὲν P

With regard to Plato there is, as I said, another difference. Although, not only in the greatness of his good qualities but also in their number, he is far removed from lack of refinement, sometimes he is still more abundant in faults than he is deficient in good qualities.

ἄμουσίας is a minimal change for ἀπουσίας; compare the corruption of ἄμουσος ἦ to ἄλλους ὄση at 39.2. That passage, one of three occurrences of ἄμουσος (cf. 28.1, 34.2), echoes Plato, *Symposium* 196e in its quotation of Euripides fr. 663 (admittedly a hackneyed citation). Since ἄμουσος and ἄμουσία occur at least twenty-four times in Plato, the word is at any rate apt in a Platonic connection. Martin's ὅτε μὲν elegantly resolves the apparent contradiction between the two parts of the sentence: limiting the scope of the adverse comment produces a complex but self-consistent assessment of Plato as an outstanding author who sometimes goes badly astray—precisely the view which Longinus expresses elsewhere (cf. e.g. 4.4 ποτε).

On this approach, therefore, the first part of the sentence makes the expected positive statement about Plato as a stylist. Moreover, there is a satisfactory contrast with the preceding discussion of Demosthenes: Demosthenes' good qualities are limited in number, though very great; Plato's are very numerous as well as very great. The second part of the sentence recognizes the other side of Plato's style: for all his greatness, he sometimes writes very badly. This restatement in more challenging terms of the problem about Plato posed in ch. 32 indicates that the discussion of the preliminary questions in chs 33–4 is complete, and that the crucial issue must now be faced squarely; hence Longinus continues with the question: 'what, then, did they have in view, those godlike authors who aspired to what is greatest in literature, disdaining accuracy in every detail?' In other words, the combination of great excellences and serious faults in Plato poses in an acute form the question of why the greatest authors do not strive to eliminate faults from their style, a question definitively answered in chs. 35–6. This approach thus prevents the discussion reaching a premature conclusion at 35.1 and restores continuity with what follows.

One might in addition consider deleting λείπεται: Plato is always good, but in some passages his faults outnumber even *his* good qualities.

University of Leeds

MALCOLM HEATH
m.f.heath@leeds.ac.uk

THE LITERARY LIVES OF A SCHEINTOD: CLITOPHON AND LEUCIPPE 5.7 AND GREEK EPIGRAM

Can a death bring revivification? In this note, I will suggest that a sort of rebirth in death occurs in the second *Scheintod* of Achilles Tatius' *Clitophon and Leucippe*. There, in the hero's lament over what he believes to be his beloved's corpse, the novelist revives and reformulates a theme found in sepulchral and declamatory epigrams.

Book 5.7 of *Clitophon and Leucippe* finds the hero in pursuit of his beloved whom pirates have abducted. During the chase, the brigands slay and decapitate Leucippe, and they throw her body into the sea like so much jetsam—or so it seems to Clitophon. Unaware that the jettisoned corpse is in fact a slave's, he recovers it from

the water and proceeds to issue a typically overwrought lament. Clitophon cries that Leucippe has died a *θάνατον διπλοῦν, γῆι καὶ θαλάσσει διαιρούμενον*, and that he only has *τὸ λείψανον . . . τοῦ σώματος*. He proceeds to complain that the division between sea and land is *οὐκ ἴση*, since he has the larger corporeal part of Leucippe, but lacks the smaller vital part (i.e. the head), which possesses *τὸ πᾶν* of her. Clitophon then concludes his speech by kissing his love's neck, since, as he says, *τύχη* has begrudged him kisses on her face; and upon returning to land, he piously buries what is left of her.

With its grotesquerie that approaches (or even surpasses) the absurd, this lament has elicited moans not of sorrow, but of disapproval from some of its readers. Gaselee, for instance, writes in a note to his Loeb edition that 'no translation can make this labored rhetoric anything but ridiculous'.¹ Still others have suggested that the scene is part of the larger comic or parodic intentions of the author. Anderson claims that this is the case, adding that the *Scheintod* is an obvious opportunity for burlesque;² and Durham, pursuing his now discredited but still insightful argument that Achilles Tatius' novel is a sustained parody of Heliodorus, contends that this and all the false deaths contain 'hoaxes and . . . grotesque laments', indicating that 'Achilles Tatius is again laughing at his predecessors'.³ While it is certainly true that there is such a humorous side to Clitophon's incongruous rhetoric, nevertheless I do not believe that parody underlies the scene. Rather, a more neutral form of intertextuality occurs in it, a reworking of anterior material that has gone overlooked by critics.⁴ For in the hero's lament, Achilles Tatius, a writer who composes 'sick humor at its most scholarly',⁵ redeploys and adapts an epigrammatic motif found in a number of poems preserved in the *Palatine Anthology*, namely, the mutilation of a body at sea and the partial recovery of him/her on land. It is the outlandishness of this theme that underlies Clitophon's baroque, ludicrous words, an outlandishness that Achilles Tatius does not (and perhaps cannot) exaggerate to parody, but reworks to originality, as we will see.

Among the sepulchral epigrams preserved in Book 7 of the *Palatine Anthology*, there are several poems that present in varied forms this motif. Of these, two linked texts contain elements similar to those found in Clitophon's lament. The first, *A.P.* 7.288, is written by Antipater of Sidon. In his first-person epitaph, a fisherman (or perhaps sailor) has had his skeleton stripped of flesh by fish, and his bones have washed up on shore. This double death Antipater captures in the words *ἀλλὰ θάλασσα / καὶ χθὼν τὴν ἀπ' ἐμεῦ μοῖραν ἔχουσιν ἴσην* (288.1–2)—a phrase of which there is a faint though distinct echo in Clitophon's *οὐκ ἴση τῆς θαλάσσης πρὸς τὴν γῆν ἢ νομή*. The analogies between these texts, however, are more thematic than verbal. Both writers adapt a broadly conceived *topos* in which a death at sea results in mangled corpses whose parts are only partially recovered and interred. Parallels to Achilles Tatius' scene are also found in an epigram of Leonidas of Tarentum. He opens *A.P.* 7.506, a variation on the same motif as Antipater's, with the statement that *κὴν γῆι κὴν πόντῳ κεκρύμμεθα*. These words, spoken by the narrator Tharsys, who was bitten in half by a sea-monster while diving to loosen an anchor, closely resemble Clitophon's *γῆι καὶ θαλάσσει διαιρούμενον*. The first-person figure in Leonidas'

¹ S. Gaselee (trans.), *Achilles Tatius* (London and New York, 1917), 253.

² G. Anderson, *Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play* (Chico, 1982), 27.

³ D. B. Durham, 'Parody in Achilles Tatius', *CP* 33 (1938), 15–17.

⁴ Vilborg, for example, is silent on the matter in her commentary, and Garnaud includes no annotation in his Budé edition.

⁵ G. Anderson (n. 2), 24.

poem also speaks of his own *λείψανα* (506.11), while the narrator of the novel cries out over τὸ λείψανον of Leucippe. Such correspondences reveal how Achilles Tatius takes Tharsys' epitaphic lament and puts it into the mouth of his narrator. While he alters the poem's dramatic situation—it is pirates, after all, and not creatures of the deep who maim 'Leucippe' rather than the first-person narrator Clitophon—the verbal likenesses and thematic parallels are enough to show that he reuses Leonidas' material in creating his hero's speech, just as he incorporates into it elements drawn from Antipater.

This is not to say, however, that the novelist is alluding to either poetic predecessor in an active, precise, or exclusive way. That is, the analogies between Clitophon's lament and the epigrammatic poems are not attempts to direct the reader's attention to those texts as specific models and so to incorporate their content as a subtext, a second register of signification that stands in an either ironic or emphatic relation to the novel's passage.⁶ The similarities in word and phrase occur because Achilles Tatius is describing the same conventional situation as the poets. There is a motif, in other words, that Clitophon's words and the first-person sepulchral poems share; but it is not a particular manifestation of that motif that Achilles Tatius recalls, nor is it the circumstances of any single poem to which he refers his own passage. Instead, it is the thematic thread itself running through individual works that concerns the novelist, the conventional, stock material that belongs neither to Antipater or Leonidas, but rather stands as public literary property. Achilles Tatius' imitative strategy is to vary this common code artfully, 'to make something new and fresh out of something well-worn'.⁷ His intertextual engagement with the epigrams is interpretable as a negotiation of *topoi* rather than as an engagement with specific situations in specific poems.⁸ Hence there is no *aemulatio*-charged challenge to his precursors, precisely because it is the topical code and not a poet's text containing it that he reworks. In this, the novelist's treatment of anterior literature is not unlike the strategies of variation employed by the epigrammatic poets themselves, who delight in treating the same theme again and again.⁹ Achilles Tatius' principal objective is to express with an original voice conventional material—an imitative technique common in the mimetic world of ancient literature, but one that Achilles Tatius has been seen too infrequently to employ.¹⁰

But the intertextual relationship between Clitophon's lament and Greek epigram is not evident only in the passage's links to Antipater and Leonidas. There are two other poets who rework the theme of death and mutilation in water and partial recovery of the body on land whose texts also contain material similar to that in Achilles Tatius'

⁶ G. B. Conte, *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets* (Ithaca, 1986), 42 and 88–90 discusses allusion as a means to create a second mimetic register. While this work and Hinds's (see nn. 6 and 7) deal with Latin literature, nevertheless the principles expressed in them are applicable to Achilles Tatius and much ancient Greek literature, which is itself, of course, broadly intertextual. The equivalence of Latin and Greek imitative techniques is noted by D. A. Russell, 'De Imitatione', in D. West and T. Woodman (edd.), *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature* (Cambridge, 1979), 1.

⁷ S. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge, 1998), 40.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 42.

⁹ This phenomenon is analysed fully in S. L. Tarán, *The Art of Variation in Hellenistic Epigram* (Leiden, 1979), *passim*.

¹⁰ A. Heiserman, *The Novel Before the Novel* (Chicago, 1977), 119–30 notably does not overlook this aspect of Achilles Tatius' narrative art.

second *Scheintod*. The first is Flaccus, whose poem, *A.P.* 7.542, tells of a tender boy who fell through the surface of the frozen river Hebrus and was decapitated by a particularly sharp icy shard. Because the current carries his body away (just as another stream bore Orpheus', a resemblance that may not be accidental), the child's mother can retrieve only his *κάρα*, which she proceeds to lay on a tomb while issuing a lament that addresses the grotesque liquid/terrestrial division of his remains: *τέκος, τέκος, εἶπε, τὸ μὲν σου πυρκαϊή, τὸ δέ σου πικρὸν ἔθαψεν ὕδωρ* (542.7–8). An almost identical poem to Flaccus' is *A.P.* 9.56, a declamatory epigram composed by Philip of Thessalonica. Once again, ice severs a child's head, and the poet (this time in his own voice) speaks of the way in which two different elements have divided him. In so doing, he employs the line *ἀμφοτέρων δὲ δοκῶν, οὐδενός ἐστιν ὅλως* (56.8),¹¹ which resembles closely Antipater's *οὐδετέρης ὅλος εἰμι θανὼν νέκυσ* (288.1). This correspondence indicates that a common theme underlies both works (and, by extension, Flaccus' and Leonidas'), and that this theme engenders a vast range of treatments. Because the epigrammatic motif is common to these texts, and because Achilles Tatius has been seen to employ it himself in composing Clitophon's lament, it is not unreasonable to suppose that Leucippe's decapitation depends upon that motif as well. That is, the fact that Clitophon speaks over her headless frame may be a precise inversion of the situations in Flaccus' and Philip's poems. Whereas in the epigrams mothers recover and lament over the heads of their sons, Clitophon retrieves everything but Leucippe's *κάρα* and proceeds to issue his plaint that, as Curtius writes about a Latin version of the epigrammatic motif written by Paul the Deacon in the Carolingian period, is reminiscent in its unnaturalness of rhetorical exercises.¹² Such a reversal of the recovered corporeal part may be seen as another instance of thematic variation, of the manipulation of a common code. It is not Flaccus or Philip who stands behind Achilles Tatius' text as sole precursor, just as it was not Antipater or Leonidas. Rather, it is the motif that these poets deploy, the theme of mutilation and partial recovery common to them, that the novelist reworks in Clitophon's lament.

Again, then, we see that Achilles Tatius' primary authorial strategy in his second *Scheintod* is to modify and fuse different expressions of an epigrammatic theme, to alter a collective store of elements so as to achieve originality. Such an engagement with that poetic genre, which is not unique among novelists,¹³ reveals the richness of a scene that has previously seemed puerile and laughable in its horror, and compels us to reassess both the passage and its author. For in so integrating paradoxical and bizarre material into a scene of exaggerated fiction, Achilles Tatius reveals his sophisticated use of the literary past rather than an unnatural lack of taste.

Yale University

SCOTT C. MCGILL

¹¹ It should be noted that this line as well as the previous—*δύσμορος, ἥς ὥδινα διείλατο πῦρ τε καὶ ὕδωρ*—is subjected to particular censure in D. L. Page and A. S. F. Gow, *The Garland of Philip: Commentary and Indexes* 2 (Cambridge, 1968), 351. Writes Page, 'The last couplet is among the silliest in the present collection.' It is perhaps no coincidence that this poem, similar as it is to Achilles Tatius, elicits the same critical scorn.

¹² E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1953), 293.

¹³ Longus' relation to the epigrammatic tradition, for example, is well established. See R. Hunter, *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe* (Cambridge, 1983), 26–7 (on parallels with Zonas), 41–2 (on parallels with Agathias), and 72 (on parallels with Philodemus and Paulus Silentarius).