

The Uses of Bookishness

EWEN BOWIE
Corpus Christi College, Oxford

1. Introduction

This paper addresses some of the different ways in which the surviving texts of Greek novels recognise and make play with their textuality, their status as a book to be read, and directs its focus particularly upon *The Incredible things beyond Thule* of Antonius Diogenes and upon Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*. It does so because these two texts appear to be much more interested than the others in flaunting their textuality. Of these other novels (which I briefly discuss first) those of Xenophon and Achilles give their readers no overt nudge to remind them that they are engaged in an act of reading, while that of Heliodorus does so only very late in his work: Chariton occupies an interesting, intermediate position.

The openings of Xenophon and of Achilles Tatius plunge the reader *in medias res* without any gesture towards the reading process: 'There was in Ephesus a man among those who had the greatest power there, Lycomedes by name. To this Lycomedes was born, by a wife from that area, Themisto, a son Habrocomes ...' and 'Sidon is a city on the sea; the sea that of the Assyrians; the city the mother-city of the Phoenicians; its people the father of the Thebans . . .'¹ The same technique is adopted by Heliodorus in his famous opening 'As day was just spreading its smile and the sun was casting its beams down upon the ridges...': only after ten books does Heliodorus

¹ X. Eph. 1,1,1: ἦν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἀνὴρ τῶν τὰ πρῶτα ἐκεῖ δυναμένων, Λυκομήδης ὄνομα. τούτῳ τῷ Λυκομήδῃ ἐκ γυναικὸς ἐπιχωρίας Θεμιστοῦς γίνεται παῖς Ἀβροκόμης . . . Ach. Tat. 1,1,1 Σιδὼν ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ πόλις· Ἀσσυρίων ἢ θάλασσα· μήτηρ Φοινίκων ἢ πόλις Θηβαίων ὁ δῆμος πατήρ.

imprecisely describe his work as ‘the composition ... which a Phoenician man from Emesa composed’.²

Chariton’s opening creates for the reader a narrator, but a narrator with features of the oral, as suggested by his verb ‘I shall narrate’, as well as of the written, hinted at by his self-description as ‘secretary’ (ὕπογραφεύς): ‘I, Chariton of Aphrodisias, secretary to the rhetor Athenagoras, shall narrate an amatory affair that happened in Syracuse.’³ There is no clear marker of textuality in his recapitulations either at 5,1 ‘How Callirhoe was married to Chaereas ... this was set out in my earlier account (λόγος): and what followed I shall now narrate’ or at 8,1,1 ‘How Chaereas ... captured Aradus ... was set out in my earlier account (λόγος).’⁴ Interestingly, however, we find Chariton introducing a term indicating textuality a few lines later: ‘And I think that in fact this last written work will be most pleasurable to my readers.’⁵ This presentation of the work at Book 8’s opening as a written composition is ultimately endorsed in Chariton’s *envoi* at its end: ‘This is what I have written up about Callirhoe.’⁶ The movement of Chariton’s terminology from words which are poised between orality and textuality to a word which is definitively textual, ‘I have *written* up’ (συνέγραψα), may reflect the author’s own awareness of moving from a mode of story-telling which had strong affinities with oral narration to a para-Thucydidean written text. It would require the eye of faith to see here some impact of the work of Antonius Diogenes, which I argued recently might after all have been written as early as the 50s or early 60s AD.⁷ But I would like to retain the idea of some such impact during Chariton’s period of composition as at least a formal possibility.

Quite independently of that or of any other hypothesis about the date of Antonius Diogenes, however, let me now turn to the ways he plays off orality against textuality.

² Hld. 1,1,1 ἡμέρας ἄρτι διαγελώσης καὶ ἡλίου τὰς ἀκρωρείας καταυγάζοντος and 10,41,2 τὸ σύνταγμα . . . ὃ συνέταξεν ἀνὴρ Φοῖνιξ Ἑμισσηνός. For the term σύνταγμα cf. Diod. Sic. 1,3; Plut *Mor.* 1036c = *de Stoic. Rep.* 10.

³ Ch. 1,1,1 Χαρίτων Ἀφροδισηεύς, Ἀθηναγόρου ῥήτορος ὑπογραφεύς, πάθος ἐρωτικὸν ἐν Συρακούσαις γενόμενον διηγήσομαι.

⁴ Ch. 5,1,1-2 ὡς μὲν ἐγαμήθη Καλλιρόη Χαίρεα ... ταῦτα ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν λόγῳ δεδήλωται τὰ δὲ ἐξῆς νῦν διηγήσομαι and 8,1,1 ὡς μὲν οὖν Χαίρεας ... κατέσχευεν Ἄραδον ... ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν λόγῳ δεδήλωται.

⁵ Ch. 8,1,4 νομίζω δὲ καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον τοῦτο σύγγραμμα τοῖς ἀναγινώσκουσιν ἥδιστον ἔσεσθαι.

⁶ Ch. 8,8,16 τοσάδε περὶ Καλλιρόης συνέγραψα.

⁷ Bowie 2007a.

2. *Textuality and orality in Antonius Diogenes*

Diogenes (as he is almost always named by Photius, our chief source for the content and structure of *The Incredible Things beyond Thule*) offers a recurrent tension between the textual and the oral. This is true in whatever way we reconstruct his written work from Photius' summary, though of course the particular effects will be different if we think that Photius has altered the order in which a reader acquires information.

The reconstruction that seems to be most widely accepted has a preface consisting of two epistles:⁸ in one of these Diogenes addressed Faustinus; called himself a poet of Old Comedy (which, we should recall, was a performance genre),⁹ claimed the testimony of his predecessors for most of what he told; and set out, apparently at the beginning of each book, the names of the men who had published such material earlier. It is worth noting that although he later insists on the bookishness of his own product, we do not know from Photius that Diogenes referred explicitly to *books* written by his predecessors, and the phrase 'but at any rate he has the testimonies of older people about the majority of the tales he has spun' allows for either oral or written sources (with the term τῶν μυθολογηθέντων, 'the tales he has spun', conjuring up intimations of orality).¹⁰

Books, reading and writing, however, dominate the second epistle, a dedication of his written works (συγγράμματα) to Faustinus' sister Isidora: Photius is explicit that this was to be found 'at the beginning of the book'.¹¹ In it he first adduces the intermediary Balagrus (whose name is spelled Balacrus in other sources) writing to his wife Phila, daughter of Antipater, about the discovery of the burial inscriptions of Deinias, Dercyllis, Mantinias and family after Alexander's siege of Tyre, then the discovery of cypresswood tablets on which (as we have been told earlier by Photius 111a20-25) the Athenian Erasinides had, on Deinias' instructions, written out the whole story as told in Tyre by Deinias to an Arcadian Cymbas.¹²

⁸ Stephens and Winkler 1995, 101-118 (and for a translation of Photius' summary, 121-129).

⁹ For some ways in which Diogenes does indeed appear to exploit Old Comedy see Bowie 2007b.

¹⁰ ἀλλ' οὖν ἔχει περὶ τῶν πλείστων αὐτῷ μυθολογηθέντων ἀρχαιότερων μαρτυρίας, Photius 111a36-7: the translation of Stephens and Winkler 1995, 127 'he has a library of ancient testimonials' imports a bookishness not explicitly present in the Greek.

¹¹ κατ' ἀρχὰς τοῦ βιβλίου, Photius 111a41.

¹² 'He spun a tale' (διεμυθολόγησε) 111a20, cf. 'to narrate' (διηγεῖσθαι) and 'narrating' (διηγούμενος) 109b3 and 7. It is not at all clear from Photius where in Diogenes' text this

The version of the genesis of the *The Incredible Things beyond Thule* that Isidora, and any like-minded reader, is encourage to adopt, then, is that the multi-volume written text of Diogenes with its prefatory, written epistles is a faithful replica of a similar written text, whose transcription was commissioned by Balagrus: Photius' participle in the middle voice, 'he had the tablets transcribed' (μεταγραψάμενος) does not of course imply that this Hellenistic war-lord executed the transcription with his own hand and eye. This written text that lay behind the written narrative of Diogenes was, he claimed, preserved on cypress-wood tablets (he might expect an alert reader to begin calculating how many tablets such a voluminous story would occupy!) but was a version of the explicitly oral narrative of Deinias; and of course this oral narrative in turn encapsulated the orally communicated narratives of Dercyllis and Azulis.¹³

If, as usually held, not just one but both of those letters stood before the main body of Diogenes' work, then it seems overwhelmingly probable that at the outset he announced that it was to be a work in 24 books. This would certainly help to explain why Photius himself assigns it 24 books at the start of his summary: 'Read: 24 books of Antonius Diogenes' *The Incredible Things beyond Thule*.'¹⁴ It is also quite probable, on this scenario, that his list of authorities for each book was assembled in a section prefatory to the whole work, presumably (to judge from the phraseology of 111a39-40) in the epistle addressed to Faustinus.¹⁵

information was to be found. The name Erasinides is indeed to be found in Attica, once, in 409 BC (cf. *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* ii 153 s.n. Ἐρασινίδης) while Erasinus is found three times in the 6th-5th c. BC and eight times in the first three centuries AD (cf. *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* ii 153-4 s.n. Ἐρασίνος). But a learned author from Aphrodisias might know it as an Ionian-Attic name from the use of Erasinus in Cyzicus, Smyrna and Magnesia ad Sipylum, documented there for the imperial period, and of Erasinus in Miletus and Erasinides in Colophon, where they are documented for the 4th c. BC, and of Erasinides in Ephesus, where is attested in the 2nd/1st c. BC. (I am grateful to Dr. Richard Catling for supplying this information in advance of the publication of *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* VA.).

¹³ 'He interrogates her' (ἀναμανθάνει) 109a29, 'when she was narrating' (διηγουμένης) 109b9, cf. 'Azulis narrating' (διηγούμενον) 110b22-4.

¹⁴ ἀνεγνώσθη Ἀντωνίου Διογένοϋς τῶν ὑπὲρ Θεούλην ἀπίστων λόγοι κδ' (i.e. εἴκοσι τέσσαρες), 109a6. Does the use of the singular verb imply that Photius initially expected its subject to be the neuter plural *The incredible things* (τά ... ἄπιστα), and at some stage modified his sentence to include the number of books (λόγοι)?

¹⁵ I am far from confident that this widely accepted reading of Photius' report is correct. It seems possible, for example, that the letter to Faustinus was incorporated in Book 24 at the conclusion of the whole work (i.e. roughly where we find it in Photius' summary) and that only the letter dedicating the work to Isidora and setting out the *Be-*

This highlighting of the difference between oral narrative, ‘tales that are told’ (μυθολογηθέντα), and the power of written texts to preserve such a narrative may have been reflected in at least one more of the work’s details.

At 110a16-17 we read for the first time in Photius’ summary about two items in Paapis’ magic weaponry of mass destruction, a bag of books and a box of herbs: ‘next how Mantineas and Dercyllis took from Leontini Paapis’ little bag, with the books in it, and the little box of herbs.’¹⁶ Paapis must have recovered these by the time he bewitches Mantineas and Dercyllis after catching up with them on Thule (110a42-b4). Once Paapis has been killed by Thruscanus of Thule, passionately in love with Dercyllis, near the end of Book 23,¹⁷ the following Book 24 introduces a new narrator, Azulis,¹⁸ presumably, like Paapis, an Egyptian, who is able to discover from Paapis’ bag of books¹⁹ how to cure both the trance of Mantineas and Dercyllis and the death-like condition of their parents.

This ‘little bag’, *πηρίδιον*, has now appeared in another context, in fragmentary texts preserved on a papyrus roll from Oxyrhynchus, *P.Oxy.* 4760.²⁰ The attribution of these fragments to the work of Antonius Diogenes is virtually assured by its reference both to Paapis (in fr. 1) and (in fr. 2) to a ‘little bag’, *πηρίδιον*, and soon after to a box, *κιβώτιον*, which is very probably the box of herbs:

fr. 1

] κ . [] κ [
] Πάαπισ[] Paapis]
] ηξιουσ.[]’(she) asking’ or ‘they ask’[

fr. 2

] . . [
] . επα . [
] . ευοκαιπ.σ	
] .σ.αυρω τὸ δὲ πη-] to a cross(?) but the lit-

gläubigungsapparat of the discovery of the cypress-wood tablets in coffins was located at the opening of the work (a location that is inescapable given the phrase *κατ’ ἀρχὰς τοῦ βιβλίου*, Photius 111a41). But this would not affect the central elements in my argument, and cannot be pursued here.

¹⁶ ἔπειτα ὡς λαβόντες Μαντινέας καὶ Δερκυλλίς ἐκ Λεοντίνων τὸ Παάπιδος πηρίδιον μετὰ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ βιβλίων καὶ τῶν βοτάνων τὸ κιβώτιον.

¹⁷ ἐραστής διάπυρος Δερκυλλίδος, 110b5-8.

¹⁸ εἰσάγει Ἄζουλιν διηγούμενον, 110b24.

¹⁹ ἐκ τοῦ πηριδίου ἀνευρών τοῦ Παάπιδος, 110b27.

²⁰ Parsons 2006a.

5	ρίδιον]ον βιβλίων περι	tle box] of books around
] . αυτου τῷ τραχη-] his neck
]ν συνκαταφλεχθείη]might (?not) be burned together with
	κι]βώτιον	παρεθη	b]ox ‘he put next to’ or ‘was cast aside’
] . ὁ Μαντίας] Mantias
]ν τοῖς ἀρχου-] to the authorities
10] . [] . [

The details of the action here are far from clear, but they show that the duo of the ‘little bag’, *πηρίδιον*, and ‘box’, *κιβώτιον*, had already been highlighted at some point earlier in the story than their important function on Thule, perhaps indeed before they were annexed by Mantineas and Dercyllis in Leontini. As Parsons noted, there is another little box in the work, the box, *κιβώτιον*, which was found in Tyre to contain the cypress-wood tablets on which the whole story was written. I suggest that the pairing of books and box, *κιβώτιον*, in both places is not due to mere chance. Their use as Paapis’ stage-props which turn out to be crucial to the liberation of his victims reminds the reader, both when reading whatever book contained the Leontini episode and then later when reading the opening of Book 24, that the literary resurrection of the whole story depended on a little box, *κιβώτιον*, whose existence was a pre-condition for the transcription of the cypress-wood tablets into the 24 books of Antonius Diogenes’ work. It would perhaps be going too far to claim this as a *mise en abyme*, but in a narrative within which we are insistently being asked to attend to the role of oral narrators²¹ it reminds us that without the magical effect of writing and of books we readers cannot expect access to oral narratives, ‘tales that are told’ (*μυθολογηθέντα*).

I have deliberately avoided discussion of the epistles within the story (*PSI* 1177, *P.Oxy.* 3012) since these were discussed by Hans Bernsdorff at the RICAN 4 conference. But of course they too, as noted already by Stephens and Winkler (1995, 149) display ‘a self-consciousness about writing and about the physical media’ and emphasise within the story the importance to communication of letters, *γράμματα*, in a way that mirrors the writing down of the story on tablets that readers encounter in a frame which was itself epistolary.

²¹ Cf. the well-formulated judgement of Stephens and Winkler 1995, 116: ‘In a fairly strong sense, we may say that this is a novel in which many things happened but nothing happens: the only present-time events are acts of narrating and listening. The lovers Deinias and Dercyllis do not have adventures together, they do not woo, they narrate.’

Before leaving Antonius Diogenes let me draw attention to two other details in the first of which, at least, it may be thought that the narrator is playing with modes of transmitting information, while in the second he is revealed as highly conscious of the character of the narrative.

First, the name of his envoy from Arcadia to Tyre whose mission is presented as the catalyst for the recording of the adventures of Deinias and Deryllis on the cypress-wood tablets: Cymbas (Κύμβας).²² This is an unusual name, and I guess it would have struck an imperial Greek reader as unusual.²³ But I note that among the range of meanings registered by Hesychius κ 4541 Latte s.v. κύμβη is to be found the meaning ‘knapsack’ or ‘bag’: ‘*kymbe*: a type of ship, and a vinegar jar and a bag’ (κύμβη· νεὼς εἶδος²⁴ καὶ ὀξύβαφον καὶ πήρα). Is Diogenes playing with the idea that the vehicle for the transportation to Arcadia of the cypress-tablets bearing the narrative of Deinias’ adventures is a Bag, just as it was a bag that carried round the indispensable magic books of Paapis? Note that, at least in Photius’ summary, the bag and Cymbas are juxtaposed (at 110a14-16).

Second, a detail in the other new Oxyrhynchus fragment.²⁵ My point relates only to column ii 20-24, where Mantias (found as the hero’s name in *P.Oxy.* 4760 fr.2,9 (printed above) and as an alternative form of the hero’s name already in the manuscripts of Photius), is being pursued by *parthenoi* for reasons which are obscure:

P.Oxy. 4761 col. ii

20	διώκουσαι [δὲ	[but] pursuing (them?)
ἡμέραν ὅλην καὶ νύκτα ἐπόμε-		for a whole day and following (them)
ναι ἠνώχλουν. ἀλλ’ ὁ Μαντία[ς		for a night they harassed them: but Mantias,
ἄλλας καὶ ἄλλας σκολίας ὀδ[οῦς		(by?) one set of twisting paths after another
ὑπεξαγαγὼν ἐλαθεν ἀφι]		leading them away to safety arrived undetected

²² Photius 109b3, 111b27.

²³ The *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* registers Cymbadeia (Κυμβάδεια) for Laconia in the 3rd century BC (SEG 11.677b) and Cymbalos (Κύμβαλος) for Arcadia in the 4th and 3rd centuries BC (SEG 11,1070; IG 5(2) 38.52. No other epigraphic attestation is registered for volumes 1-5. It is likely that Cymbalos (Κύμβαλος) and certain that Lucian’s name Cymbalion (Κυμβάλιον) at *Dialogues of courtesans* 12.1 and 14.4 (in the first case certainly, and in the second probably, for an *auletris*) derive from the Greek word for ‘cymbal’ (κύμβαλον) and not from κύμβα or κύμβος meaning ‘cup’ etc.

²⁴ Cf. Soph. fr. 127 Radt = fr. 123 Nauck².

²⁵ *P.Oxy.* 4761 = Parsons 2006b, with suggestions for supplement and interpretation by Bernsdorff 2006.

The strategy adopted by Mantias to secure the escape of this mysterious group of young men is rational and predictable enough in a real situation. But this rapidly narrated episode of Mantias' escape is a *mise en abyme* of the deceptive skills shown in the author's own elusive narrative. Any reader hoping for a close encounter with *The incredible things beyond Thule* advertised by the work's title has to wait until the 24th book, and is taken on many sets of twisting paths on the way. The chase in *P.Oxy* 4761 might therefore have as one of its functions the metaliterary role also played by the labyrinthine cave in which Heliodorus has Charicleia secreted and Thisbe killed, a place of darkness and complexity that precipitates confusion and misunderstanding.²⁶

3. *Textuality and orality in Longus*

As in the novels of Chariton and Antonius Diogenes, so too in *Daphnis and Chloe* there is a clear opposition between stories orally told and the writing down of the text which is the vehicle for conveying these stories to the reader. In some ways the unnamed 'interpreter of the painting' (ἐξηγητὴς τῆς εἰκόνοϛ) of preface 3 plays a role like that of Deinias in Antonius Diogenes, while the similarly unnamed narrator who boasts 'I have elaborated four books' (τέτταραϛ βίβλουϛ ἐξεπονησάμην) has the role played in *The incredible things beyond Thule* by the Athenian *rheto*r (λόγων τεχνίτηϛ) Erasinides²⁷. But Deinias is narrating his own and others' adventures, while the unnamed 'interpreter of the painting' is working with his eye on a material object which in other ways is like the cypress-wood tablets written in duplicate. Moreover the redundant description of the painting as a 'depiction of a painting' (εἰκόνοϛ γραφήν, preface 1) allows Longus to call it simply 'the depiction' (τῆ γραφῆ) in his narrator's mission statement 'a longing seized me to write a pendant to the depiction' (πόθοϛ ἔσχεν ἀντιγράψαι τῆ γραφῆ), giving a *trompe l'oeuil* impression of exact correspondence between his highly pictorial narrative and the picture in the cave.²⁸ The narrating figure of the 'interpreter' thus risks becoming little more than an interface between two forms of 'depicting/writing' (γραφῆ).

²⁶ Hld. 1,28-29.

²⁷ For the phrase used of Erasinides at Photius 111a22, λόγων τεχνίτηϛ, cf. X. Eph. 3,2,8, where it is used of the profession fraudulently claimed by the rich Byzantine Aristomachus who falls in love with Hyperanthes.

²⁸ For the relation between the description of the painting in the proem and Longus' narrative cf. Mittelstadt 1967, Philippides 1983.

Once warmed up by this tension in the preface the reader encounters instance after instance of ‘tales told’ (μυθολογήματα). This particular term ‘a tale told’ (μυθολόγημα) is used only once, at 2,35,1, where it is applied to story of Syrinx that Lamon tells the company: but the verb ‘to tell a tale’ (μυθολογεῖν) is used of the two other inset tales, those of Phatta in Book 1 and of Echo in Book 3,²⁹ and the simple noun ‘tale’ (μῦθος) is applied to the stories of Syrinx and of Echo.³⁰ The couple’s response to the oral exposition of Philetas at 2,7,1 is also compared to responses to a ‘tale’ (μῦθος), showing both that ‘tales’ were reckoned to give pleasure and that what Philetas has been saying is not in all respects, in Longus’ terms, a ‘tale’ (μῦθος), however much it may recall a Platonic ‘tale’ (μῦθος). It is not surprising to find the collective term ‘tales told’ (μυθολογία) used at 4,17,3 of Gnathon’s learned repertoire, acquired in the symposia of *roués*, i.e. in a context of live storytelling, when he makes a sophistic speech proving that a love-object can well be of a lower status than his or her lover, and cites the cases of Aphrodite’s desire for Anchises, Apollo’s for Branchus and that of Zeus for Ganymede.

What is, perhaps, surprising is that Pan castigates the impious Methymnan admiral on the grounds that Eros wants to create a ‘tale’ (μῦθος) from Chloe (2,27,2). Coming before the two ‘tales’ (μῦθοι) that illustrate the erotic violence of Pan, but after the use of ‘tale’ (μῦθος) for the story of Phatta (1,27,1), this divinely authorized generic classification forces the reader to re-examine the terminology offered by the preface: what the ‘interpreter’ has told to the writer, and what the painter of the ‘depiction of a painting’ (εἰκόνοσ γραφήν) had previously painted, are to be seen as a ‘tale’ (μῦθος) – and just like the ‘tales’ (μῦθοι) of Phatta, Syrinx and Echo, it is an aetiological ‘tale’ (μῦθος), explaining why there is a cult in that particular place that takes that particular form.

That the whole story is a ‘tale’ (μῦθος), albeit a ‘tale’ (μῦθος) in which Eros operates under very different rules from those obtaining in ‘classical’ ‘tales’ (μῦθοι),³¹ may be one of the reasons that Longus has devoted so much labour (πόνος), as asserted by his verb ‘I have elaborated’ (ἐξεπονησάμην) to creating a world that exists entirely without texts. Admittedly Longus teases us with the detail that Lamon and Dryas have Daphnis and Chloe taught ‘letters’ (γράμματα, 1,8,1), and prompts us to see this as fishy by twinning ‘letters’ (γράμματα) with ‘all that is reckoned fine in the countryside’ (πάντα ὅσα καλὰ ἐπ’ ἀγροικίας). But this knowledge of ‘letters’ (γράμματα) turns

²⁹ 1,27,1; 3,22,4; 3,23,5; cf. 3,9,4.

³⁰ 2,33,3; 2,35,1; 3,22,4.

³¹ For the differences see Bowie 2007c.

out to be superfluous not simply in the country but even in Longus' city, Mytilene. No epistles are sent; no erotic graffiti are carved; no inscriptions identify the paintings or the statue of Eros Poimen in the cave of the Nymphs, the new temple of Pan Stratiotes, or even the temple of Dionysus in the garden of Dionysophanes. This is a very different world from the inscription-populated cityscapes in which Longus himself and his (presumably) city-dwelling readers lived. Even the urban members of the cast never resort to writing. The nearest we come to a textually inscribed object is the bacchic fawnskin (νεβρίς) given by Dorcon to Chloe (1,15,2): 'and its colour was as if it was sketched/inscribed with colours' (καὶ αὐτῇ τὸ χρῶμα ἦν ὡσπερ γεγραμμένον χρώμασιν). This non-textual use of 'sketched/inscribed' (γεγραμμένον) takes us back to the εἰκόνοσ γραφήν of the preface and warns us that within the story the 'letters' (γράμματα) taught to Daphnis and Chloe at 1,8,1 will never be realized as an act of writing.

Is Longus' elimination of textuality simply a predictable and logical consequence of his thought experiment? Perhaps. But Longus constantly reworks the tropes of earlier novelists, and I suggest that in this play with orality and textuality he is also doing this. Just as the pair of digressions parading pseudo-scientific nonsense (1,30,6 and 2,1,4) poke fun at such digressions in Achilles Tatius (and, it may be, in Antonius Diogenes and Iamblichus), so too the sharp and scrupulous division between the oral and textual worlds may be there partly to remind us of Antonius Diogenes, to endorse Diogenes' distinction between the orally narrated and the written in his frame, but perhaps also to question the appropriateness of his reliance on a satchel of books and on several written epistles in a fictional world which is so predominantly one of oral narrators. The clue is given in the phrase 'Four books' (τέτταρα βίβλους, preface 3). Enumeration of books had become common enough in the prefaces of long histories, sometimes, as in Diodorus Siculus,³² to help the reader understand how these books were apportioned. Its migration to a fictional work is first attested in the case of Antonius Diogenes, where part of its effect was of course to assimilate the written work to historiography. But a preface proclaiming 24 books and announcing that 'the testimonies of older people' (ἀρχαιοτέρων μαρτυρίαι) for 'the tales told' (τὰ μυθολογηθέντα) would be offered for each book was so outrageous as to be a tempting target. Of course, whether Longus is aiming at this target or not, his advertisement of four books, for a reader in whose hands either a codex or a roll would manifestly be the bearer of quite a short work, would be likely to be read as somewhat parodic. Is it any sur-

³² D.S. 1.4-5.

prise, then, that when Longus surprisingly and incredibly introduces Tyrian pirates (as I believe they indeed are) in the north-eastern Aegean, they resort to a Carian ship to assist their piracy, a ship whose claimed Carian origins³³ takes the connoisseur reader to Caria's greatest city during the empire, Aphrodisias, and to its two founders of imperial Greek fictional narratives, Chariton and Antonius Diogenes?³⁴

4. Conclusions

Both Antonius Diogenes and Longus present their narratives in ways that draw attention to the differences between oral story-telling and the writing down of texts to be read. In each case this ploy may to some extent be prompted by the writers' awareness that their written work stands close to an oral genre or genres likely to be familiar to readers, and may have as one of its aims the direction of readers' minds to reflect on the way this genre of prose fiction is pioneering a different relation to oral narratives from any exemplified in previous writing, whether poetry or prose. In the case of Antonius Diogenes this interest may be partly explained by his own time of writing being so near to that of the birth of Greek prose fiction. In the case of Longus the explanation may partly be sought in the writer's decision to adopt an entirely new recipe for a novel, drawing on Theocritean bucolic poetry as well as on earlier novels; but some details, particularly Longus' specification of the number of books into which his miniature work is divided, raise the possibility that this focus is also attributable to the influence of Antonius Diogenes.

Bibliography

Bernsdorff, H. 2006. 'Zur Handlung von P.Oxy. 4761 (Antonios Diogenes?)', *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 9, 7-12.

³³ 'Tyrian pirates with a Carian light ship' (Τύριοι ληστὰὶ Καρικὴν ἔχοντες ἡμιολίαν) 1,28,1.

³⁴ For arguments in favour of Chariton's priority in developing the Greek ideal novel see Bowie 2002: a full case will be made in a forthcoming monograph by Stefan Tilg. For arguments for a similarly early (i.e. mid-first century AD) date for Antonius Diogenes see Bowie 2007a, and for an endorsement of the proposal made by Bowersock 1994 that Antonius Diogenes' place of origin was also Aphrodisias, see Bowie 2002.

- Bowersock, G.W. 1994. *Fiction as History*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London: California University Press.
- Bowie, E.L. 2002. 'The Chronology of the Earlier Greek Novels since B.E. Perry: Revisions and Precisions', *Ancient Narrative* 2, 47-63.
- 2007a. 'Links between Antonius Diogenes and Petronius', in M. Paschalis, S. Frangoulidis, S.J. Harrison, M. Zimmerman (eds.), *The Greek and the Roman Novel: Parallel Readings* [Ancient Narrative Supplementum 8], Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library, 121-132.
- 2007b. 'The Ups and Downs of Aristophanic Travel in the Greek literature of the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D.', in E. Hall, A. Wrigley (eds.), *Aristophanes in performance 421 BC-AD 2007*, Oxford: Leggenda, 32-51.
- 2007c. 'Pulling the Other: Longus and Tragedy', in C. Kraus, S. Goldhill, H.P. Foley, J. Elsner (eds.), *Visualizing the Tragic: Essays in Honor of Froma Zeitlin*, New York: Oxford University Press, 338-352.
- Mittelstadt, M.C. 1967. 'Longus: Daphnis and Chloe and Roman Narrative Painting', *Latomus* 26, 752-761.
- Parsons, P.J. 2006a. '4760: Antonius Diogenes', *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 70, London: The Egypt Exploration Society, 9-15.
- 2006b. '4761: Novel. (Antonius Diogenes?)', *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 70, London: The Egypt Exploration Society, 15-22.
- Philippides, M. 1983. 'The Prooemium in Longus' *Lesbiaka*', *Classical Bulletin* 59, 32-35.
- Stephens, S.A., Winkler, J.J. 1995. *Ancient Greek Novels: The Fragments*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.