Literary memory and new voices in the ancient novel

Edited by Marília P. Futre Pinheiro
and J.R. Morgan

ANS 29

Literary memory and new voices in the ancient novel

ANCIENT NARRATIVE

Supplementum 29

Literary memory and new voices in the ancient novel

edited by

Marília P. Futre Pinheiro

&

J.R. Morgan

Contents

Foreword

This is one of the last volumes in a series of selected papers presented at the International Conference on the Ancient Novel (ICAN IV), which was held at the Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, from 21 to 26 July 2008. The papers in this volume discuss, from various perspectives, the engagement of the ancient novels with their predecessors and aim to identify and interpret the resonances, of different degrees of closeness, of those texts (Homeric epics, traditional and nuptial poetry, the historiographical tradition, Greek theatre, Latin love elegy and pantomime) as elements of an intertextual and metadiscursive play.

First of all, I express my utmost gratitude to my fellow editor, John Morgan, for his careful reading and editing of the papers, and for his friendly, generous and continual support during the long process of preparing this volume. Special thanks are also due to CLEPUL, Center for Lusophone and European Literatures and Cultures for having sponsored this book. I am indebted to Luís Pinheiro for dealing promptly and efficiently with all the bureaucratic issues related to this sponsorship.

The Attic black-figure hydria on the front cover, of the last quarter of the sixth century B.C., was formerly a part of the collection of Sir Francis Cook, in the Monserrate Palace, Sintra. It depicts the killing of Troilus, one Priam's sons, by Achilles, during the Trojan War. Unfortunately, the vase was subjected to restorations which badly damaged the drawing.[1] Eventually, it was cleaned by Dr. Dietrich von Bothmer, the then Chairman of the Department of Greek and Roman Art of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, who, having spent a few days in Lisbon, restored, with the owner's consent, the piece's original drawing. The scene depicted on the hydria represents the young Troilus, still alive, standing on the altar of the sanctuary of Apollo Thymbraeus. It appears that Achilles' raised left arm has not yet grasped the boy's hair, even though the figure of Troilus has been badly damaged and only the lower part of his body is preserved. The column to the right of the altar represents the walls of Troy and we can also discern the

---

[1] The curious and eventful history of the vase up to its present condition is described in detail by the Coimbra scholar Maria Helena da Rocha Pereira: *Greek Vases in Portugal*. Coimbra: Centro de Estudos Clássicos e Humanísticos da Universidade de Coimbra, 2010², 159-165 (1st. edition 1962).

shields of the Trojan warriors coming to the boy's rescue. Despite its absence from the Homeric tradition and the fact that the *Iliad* makes only one mention of Troilus (24.257), other ancient sources show well enough how popular was this episode.

We owe Sofia Cruz, Chairman of the Board of Directors of Parques de Sintra - Monte da Lua, S. A. (PSML) and António Nunes Pereira, Director of the Palaces of Sintra, PSML, thanks for help in granting us permission to reproduce an image of this hydria. We also are grateful to Ana Oliveira Martins, Coordinator of the Department of Communication, PSML, for information about ceding image rights, and to José Marques Silva, Comunication Department, PSML, for providing us with a high resolution image of the vase. We also address our words of thanks to Francisco Vinhas, the present owner of the piece, for having granted us permission to use the image.

Our sincerest gratitude extends to Roelf Barkhuis for his constant kindness, professionalism and dedication in every step of this volume's preparation. We are also indebted to Maaike Zimmerman for meticulously preparing the indexes.

Our last words are addressed to the contributors, to whom is due our utmost gratitude for their collaboration and for having patiently borne all the delays due to adverse circumstances in great part beyond our control.

Marília P. Futre Pinheiro

Introduction

MARÍLIA P. FUTRE PINHEIRO
University of Lisbon

When, in the mid-70s, the time came for me to choose a topic for my PhD, I was advised by one of my former masters, Prof. Joaquim Lourenço de Carvalho, to embark on an area that was practically unexplored in the field of Classical Studies: the ancient novel. There was, at that time, among classicists, a general idea that the essentials of Greek literature lay before the death of Alexander and that all subsequent production was nothing but an epilogue, an appendix, an imitation of more or less doubtful quality. The authors of late Greek Literature appeared to us as virtually indistinct figures, in an undifferentiated limbo, from which stood out, for a brief moment, a few more resonant (*e.g.* Lucian or Plutarch), like points of light in an obscure and uniform literary panorama. Study of the literature of that period concentrated on those few outstanding figures, thus making impossible an overview of the literary culture as a whole, and obscuring its originality and the close relationship between authors and their contemporary society.

This prejudice was manifested, in the first place, by the disproportionate weight that was attributed to the classical period, to the neglect of later ones. A. Lesky's monumental work, *A History of Greek Literature*,[1] is a very illuminating example of this fact. Secondly, the ancient authors themselves often accentuated their debt to their predecessors in the golden centuries, and thus were also responsible for the dissemination of this value judgment. This dependence, repeatedly assumed, emphasized the scholarly and derivative aspect of this post-classical literature and led to its authors being categorized as mere epigones and imitators of the past, and to their works being viewed through a prism of relative merit, underestimating their real value and subordinating them to their models.

There is no doubt that Greek literature of the late period does not have the sparkle or follow the rhythm of frantic creation of the literature of the classical period. With its archaic bent, more focused on the conservation and transmission of tradition, born under the sign of conquest and exploitation, its main concern is

---

[1] Lesky 1963.

to preserve the unity and continuity of *paideia*, the main source of cohesion in Greek culture and education, which the Romans would adopt as a cultural standard for the entire empire. Distanced from the contingencies of geography and the turmoil of historical becoming, the culture of this society, rooted in a vast geographical and temporal space, extending from the foundation of the library of Alexandria by Ptolemy to the closing of the Platonic school in Athens by Justinian, was based on the dialectic between unity and diversity, between change and continuity.

Therefore, when the Greek novel appeared on my horizon as a possible theme for a doctoral dissertation, the moment seemed to me opportune to start a dialogue between two worlds, culturally and chronologically very distant, and to reconcile the two aspects of my academic background: on the one hand, the classical component; on the other, a fascination (inculcated in me, in the last year of my undergraduate studies, by the Professor of Theory of Literature, the poet and writer David Mourão-Ferreira) with the modern currents of literary criticism, and the desire to break new paths, supported by analytical methodologies not normally used in the study of ancient literature. And so, inspired by the innovative work of Tomas Hägg,[2] I proposed to undertake a reading of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*, using the methodological toolbox of modern discourse theory or *narratology*. In the past, Otto Schissel von Fleschenberg[3] had advocated and rehearsed an outline of a formalist-type approach to *The Aethiopica*, which found echoes in the monograph by Thomas R. Goethals[4] and, above all, in the essay by Victor Hefti,[5] who argued that formal particularities of Heliodorus' work justified, by themselves, a detailed analysis of the author's narrative technique. His formalist approach to *The Aethiopica* mirrors this new analytical trend.

Gérard Genette's work, *Figures III*, was, for me, one of the main repositories of information and a decisive lever for the analysis of Heliodorus' narrative technique and his novel's narrative syntax.[6] I came to the conclusion that Heliodorus distanced himself from the general pattern and structure of the other novels, thus anticipating the more subtle and daring narrative games of the genre. Due to its high level of technical perfection and artistic elaboration, *The Aethiopica* presents original characteristics that afford it not only a special place in the set of ancient fictional narratives, but also elevate its author to a prominent position in the entire panorama of fictional literature. For Heliodorus, the art of narrating is a game, a

---

[2] Hägg 1971.
[3] Schissel von Fleschenberg 1913.
[4] Goethals 1959.
[5] Hefti 1950.
[6] Futre Pinheiro 1987.

challenge that tickles his ingenuity and imagination. For the reader, on the other hand, *The Aethiopica* is a mental exercise and a permanent challenge to his patience, tenacity and intelligence. However, a different approach to the Greek and Latin novel consists in identifying and analyzing the intertextual dialogue that authors hold with the literary tradition. Admittedly indebted to ancient literature, as mentioned above, the ancient novel develops itself within a diachronic process in which every text is a crossroad of semic elements in permanent dialogue.[7] This dialogue between *hypotexts* and *hypertexts*[8] creates, through a web of allusions and intertextual references, a sort of set of 'inner boundaries by means of which the fictional prose texts… interact with and respond to other texts that support them and serve as their models…'.[9] 'These border crossings sometimes merge in an intricate pattern of dialogic relationships…which defines the polysemic and complex ambiguity of the genre'.[10]

The papers in this volume discuss, at different levels, the meeting of the ancient novels with their predecessors and aim to identify the marks and the more or less remote resonance of texts that influenced them, in light of some of their most frequently echoed antecedents (Homeric epics, traditional and nuptial poetry, the historiographical tradition, Greek theatre, Latin love elegy and pantomime) as part of an intertextual and metadiscursive play.

Bibliography

Bakhtin, M. 1978. *Esthétique et Théorie du roman.* Paris: Gallimard.

Futre Pinheiro, M. P. 1987. *Estruturas Técnico-Narrativas nas Etiópicas de Heliodoro*. Universidade de Lisboa, Ph.D.

Futre Pinheiro, M. P. 2018. 'Landmarks and turning points in the study of the ancient Novel since the Fourth International Conference on the Ancient Novel, Lisbon, 2008', in: E. Cueva, S. Harrison, H. Mason, W. Owens & S. Schwartz (eds.), *Re-Wiring the Ancient Novel*, volume 1: *Greek Novels*. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 24.1. Groningen: Barkhuis, XIII-XXXIV.

Genette, G. 1972. *Figures III*. Paris: Seuil.

Genette, G. 1982. *Palimpsestes*. Paris: Seuil.

Goethals, T. R. 1959. *The ʹAethiopicaʹ of Heliodorus: A Critical Study*. Columbia University, Ph.D.

Hägg, T. 1971. *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances. Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius and Achilles Tatius*. Stockholm: Svenska Insitutet i Athen.

Hefti, V. *ZurErzählungstechnik in Heliodors Aethiopica*. 1950. Wien: Adolph Holzhausens.

---

[7] On the concept of dialogism, see Bakhtin 1978, 99 ff.

[8] Genette 1982.

[9] Futre Pinheiro 2018, XXV.

[10] Id. Ibid. XXV.

Lesky, A. 1963². *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*. Bern, München: Francke.

Schissel von Fleschenberg, O. 1913. *Entwicklungsgeschichte des griechischen Romanes im Altertum.* Halle: Niemeyer.

Introduction

J.R. MORGAN
Swansea University

In my Oxford undergraduate days in the late 1960s and early 1970s it was possible, but not really encouraged, to include the *Cena Trimalchionis* and the first two books of the *Metamorphoses* among the optional texts studied for Honours Moderations. The Greek novels were nowhere to be seen. My schoolboy tastes for the decadent and countercultural led me towards the Latin novels, of course, but also to Hellenistic literature, Roman elegy, and Silver Age Latin (I still adore Lucan). In those days intertextuality was not a thing, but nevertheless we were learning that these texts did not spring straight from their authors' experience on to the page, but were mediated through intense erudition and allusivity, that they were shaped by their place on the library shelf at least as much as by their authors' individuality. At the time, that seemed a hard pill to swallow, and literariness felt somehow antithetic to authenticity, like an effacement of the writer's self. Eventually, however, I got the hang of it, thanks to Virgil mainly, and came to enjoy more and more the sheer density of reading and the apparently endless mutual enrichment of classical texts.

Through reading around Petronius and Apuleius I became aware that there existed lengthy fictional narratives in Greek, but it was difficult to find out more about them. The first book I was pointed towards was B.E. Perry's *The Ancient Romances*,[1] and it taught me two things: first that the Greek novels and the Latin novels were fundamentally different beasts, and secondly that the Greek novels operated at a lower literary level, and catered to a less educated readership, including (horror of horrors) women. Rohde's big book in German was beyond me at that point, but I discovered Bryan Reardon's article in *Phoenix*, and it was possible to order up his *Courants littéraires* from the stacks of the Bodleian.[2] The combined allures of the non-canonical, the understudied and the ever-so-slightly illicit were too strong to resist, and when I had the opportunity to go on to doctoral

---

[1] Perry 1967.
[2] Rohde 1876/1914; Reardon 1969/1984; Reardon 1971.

research I had already decided that I wanted to work on the Greek novels. I quickly discovered that these texts were both underrated and extraordinarily interesting, but at first, under the influence of Tomas Hägg's excellent book, my interest was primarily in how the novels told their stories, a kind of embryonic narratology, although that word was not yet in my lexicon.[3] By the end of my research, however, I had come to sense that the novels were not an isolated outcrop of a subliterary substratum, but rather were part of a cultural continuum and could potentially repay the sort of close and learned reading we take for granted with Hellenistic poetry and its Latin affiliates.

Much of my own later work has followed along this path, particularly my commentary on *Daphnis and Chloe*.[4] I've also learned a great deal from students and colleagues, who have taught me that the novelists were actively engaging with a whole spectrum of cultural, literary and philosophical currents, and I shall now shamelessly advertise their work. For example, Meriel Jones's work on masculinity demonstrates not only that contemporary discourse on gender provides a tool which can be used to situate the novelists in their socio-cultural context, but that the novelists were in dialogue with that discourse, extending and testing it imaginatively.[5] Similarly Rachel Bird's work on *sophrosyne* in the novels has traced how they exploit existing discourses from philosophy and literature to explore imaginatively the limits and contradictions of an apparently conventional moral category.[6] Sarah Maguire's dissertation *Charikleia in Context* shows how Heliodoros exploited a series of literary patterns and philosophical-religious tropes to create the character of his heroine.[7] Koen De Temmerman's work on characterisation in the Greek novels has shown that the novelists knew and creatively exploited the techniques of contemporary rhetoric.[8] Maria-Elpiniki Oikonomou and Aldo Tagliabue have both done important work on Xenophon of Ephesus, and have convinced me that, although his novel is less showily allusive than most of the others, it is nevertheless intertextual in a different way.[9] Nicolò d'Alconzo has investigated the place of the visual arts in the novels, and shown how the novelists creatively interpret and respond to painting and sculpture, but also how they play a crucial role in the on-going theoretical conceptualisation of art criticism in rhetoric in Late Antiquity.[10] Mai Musie's dissertation on Persians in the Greek novels

---

[3] Hägg 1971.
[4] Morgan 2004.
[5] Jones 2012.
[6] Bird 2020.
[7] Maguire 2005.
[8] De Temmerman 2014.
[9] Oikonomou 2010, Tagliabue 2017.
[10] d'Alconzo 2015.

argues that the novelists' representations of ethnicities not only draw on traditional literary stereotypes, but interrogate those stereotypes in surprisingly rigorous and intelligent ways.[11] My long-term colleague Ian Repath has explored in minute detail how the novelists respond to the writings and teachings of Plato, both on a lexical and stylistic level, and on a philosophical one, often inverting and subversively distorting central Platonic images and discussions.[12] Saiichiro Nakatani and Gillian Bazovsky have studied the afterlife of the novels and shown how they crop up in unexpected places later on, respectively in the French theatre and early twentieth-century English children's literature.[13]

All this is by way of saying that my earlier self would have been as surprised as my later self is delighted by the contributions in this volume, linked as they are by the theme of the connection of the novels, Greek, Roman and Byzantine, to literary traditions. The range of connections charted is remarkable, identifying new perspectives on some of the usual suspects and also bringing some new players into the frame: Homer, tragedy, epithalamia, Sappho (even in the Byzantine novel), rhetorical teaching, historiography, Plato, Roman satire, the fabulist Phaedrus and the epigrams of Martial. The forms taken by these connections vary, of course, in terms of intention, intentionality and specificity, and the editors have not tried to impose any conceptual strait-jacket on the contributors who analyse them here. The theoretical debate over the semantic distinction between allusion and intertext is ultimately a rather sterile one, and in a way we have sidestepped it by using the term 'literary memory' in our title. No single key opens all the doors, and what matters is working out flexible critical strategies of reading and interpretation that will enable us to put the observation of specific instances to productive and interesting use, regardless of the labels we might attach to them.

To go back to the things I learned from Perry. First, it is clear that the novels, both Greek and Latin, are *not* lacking in sophistication, and that even the least obviously literary of them shows an awareness of literary tradition and an engagement with the agenda of contemporary higher education. Second, although the surviving Greek novels clearly do differ from the surviving Latin novels in many respects, in the matter of literary memory they are playing in the same broad park, albeit with different team-mates. We have reflected this continuum in the basically chronological ordering of the papers in this volume, interleaving the Latin novelists with the Greek, to stress the point of their contemporaneity and kinship.

---

[11] Musie 2018.
[12] At greatest length in Repath 2002.
[13] Nakatani 2005, Bazovsky 2007.

Bibliography

d'Alconzo, N. 2015. *Works of Art in Ancient Greek Novels.* PhD Diss. Swansea.

Bazovsky, G.R. 2007. *The Paradox of Pan. At the Wild Frontiers of 'Children's' Literature.* PhD Diss. Swansea.

Bird, R. 2020. *Sophrosune in the Greek Novel. Reading Reactions to Desire.* London: Bloomsbury.

De Temmerman, K. 2014. *Crafting Characters. Heroes and Heroines in the Ancient Greek Novel.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hägg, T. 1971. *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances. Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius and Achilles Tatius*. Stockholm: Svenska Insitutet i Athen.

Jones, M. 2012. *Playing the Man. Performing Masculinities in the Ancient Greek Novel.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maguire, S.L. 2005. *Charikleia in Context.* PhD Diss. Swansea.

Morgan, J.R. 2004. *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe. Translated with an Introduction and Commentary.* Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Musie, M. 2018. *The Representation of Persians in Ancient Greek Novels.* PhD Diss. Swansea.

Oikonomou, M.-E. 2010. *A Commentary on Book 5 of Xenophon of Ephesus.* Diss. Swansea.

Nakatani, S. 2005. *Achilles Tatius and Beyond. Studies in the History of Reception of Leucippe and Clitophon in Modern Europe.* PhD Diss. Swansea.

Perry, B.E. 1967. *The Ancient Romances: a Literary-historical Account of their Origins.* Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.

Repath, I. 2002. *Some Uses of Plato in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon.* PhD Diss. Warwick.

Tagliabue, A. 2017. *Xenophon's Ephesiaca. A Paraliterary Love-story from the Ancient World.* Ancient Narrative Supplementum 22. Groningen: Barkhuis.

Reardon, B.P. 1969/1984. 'The Greek novel'. *Phoenix* 23, 291-309; reprinted in H von Gärtner, ed., *Beiträge zur griechischen Liebesroman.* Hildesheim: Olms, 218-236.

Reardon, B.P. 1971. *Courants littéraires grecs des IIe et IIIe siècles après J.-C.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Rohde, E. 1876/1914. *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorlaüfer.* Leipzig: Breitkopf & Hartel.

Recognition in the Greek novels

ALAIN BILLAULT
Université de Paris-Sorbonne

Recognition (*anagnōrisis*) is the retrieval of a knowledge which had been lost. For some heroes of the Greek novels, this knowledge is about their own identity. This fact does not always get the attention it deserves. Here is how the plot of the Greek novels has often been epitomised: a boy and a girl of good breeding, endowed with stunning beauty and all good qualities, meet and fall passionately in love. Fortune compels them to go through many ordeals, but they survive and finally they will live happily ever after. This type of synopsis does not specify the sufferings the characters have to endure, but they are supposed to be well known: separation, forced travels, storms, shipwrecks, attacks from pirates and bandits, captivity and maltreatment, near-death experience and divine judgment form the usual course of events in the novels. The loss of identity is also a part of it. It may be less spectacular, but sometimes plays an important part in the plot because it entails a recognition process. This process has been studied in an enlightening way by Silvia Montiglio.[1] The loss of identity may materialise in different ways. Their real identity may be unknown even to the heroes themselves and needs to be restored and proclaimed. It may also be forgotten or misunderstood even by their closest companions. In both cases, recognition re-establishes an order which had disappeared and at the same time creates confusion and sheds a light upon the frailness of human identity and the disorder of human life as the Greek novelists describe it.

The real identity of the heroes is sometimes unknown at the beginning of the story. Longus tells how Lamon, a goatherd who was pasturing his flock in the country-side of Lesbos, found a baby boy who had been exposed, and that, in the same area, Dryas, a shepherd, discovered a baby girl in the same condition two years later (1,2-6). They decided to adopt the children and gave them a name. The boy was called Daphnis and the girl Chloe. Thus the heroes of Longus' novel are

---

[1] Montiglio 2013.

foundlings who are brought up by adoptive parents. They are unaware of their real origin. Lamon and Dryas do not know it either, but they presume that it is higher than their own because the children have been left with fine clothes and luxurious recognition tokens which denote that they were born in rich families. But, until Book 4, their genuine parents remain unknown. In Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*, Charikleia is also a foundling whose real identity is definitely discovered when Kalasiris reads the confession which the Queen of Aithiopia had written upon a strip which she had left with her daughter when she had decided to expose her (4,8-9). Her destiny is akin to the destiny of Oedipus and Cyrus as Sophocles (*Oedipus Tyrannus*) and Herodotos (1,108-130) tell it. They too were baby princes who were exposed to die and managed to escape death to be recognised later as kings. Oedipus' recognition happened when he was already a king and led him to tragedy. Cyrus became a powerful conqueror, but, in the end, he was killed in a battle. Charikleia's destiny is not tragic. Recognition plots may be similar, but they are not totally identical; they are always to some extent unique. But they may have common features. Daphnis and Chloe are not children of kings, but they share in the same condition as Charikleia. They have all been severed from their real origin. This does not prevent them from living a real life, but this life is not entirely founded upon truth. As Terence Cave has pointed out, recognition is about characters whose life has been broken because they have been separated from their past.[2] The life they live has its own truth, but this truth is not the entire truth. There is another truth, an original truth in which it does not share. Daphnis, Chloe and Charikleia live in error and this error concerns their identity. It comes to an end when recognition happens.

This is why recognition is the expected outcome in *Daphnis and Chloe* and in the *Aithiopika*. It is expected and delayed at the same time. Meanwhile, it determines and shapes the plot. Longus tells the story of the erotic education that will enable Daphnis and Chloe to become famous lovers whose story will be told as a legend which will inspire a painter and later a novelist. He does not neglect any step of this education. But at the same time, he also tells another story, the story of the discovery of the heroes' real identity. He never permits the reader to forget about the mystery of their birth. Even though the love story takes the front of the stage most of the time and develops at a quicker pace than the other one until Book 4,[3] Longus regularly reminds us of the recognition-tokens which were left with the babies and provide evidence for their higher station in society (1,2,3; 1,5,2-6,1; 3,26,3; 3,30,2; 3,32,2). He repeats that they are foundlings, that they were nursed by a goat and ewe (1,7,2; 1,16,2; 1,16,5, 2,23,2, 2,39,4, 3,32,1), that

---

[2] Cave 1988, 227-231.
[3] Montiglio 2013, 90-93.

they deserve noble offers of marriage (1,19,3; 3,25,3, 3,30,5, 3,31,4). He also suggests that their parents may well reappear one day (1,19,3; 3,25,3; 3,26,3; 3,32,2), which they do in the second part of Book 4. Daphnis is recognised by his parents, and then Chloe is recognised by her father (4,19-26; 4,30-36). This double recognition takes place at the same time as the marriage of Daphnis and Chloe is decided and celebrated. The recognition story and the love story merge in the finale of the novel, but they are not connected up to this point. Longus is mindful of the progression of the recognition plot until the end.

In the *Aithiopika*, Heliodoros also gradually reveals Charikleia's real identity and its consequences. Charikles, the priest of Apollo in Delphi, explains to Kalasiris how she was entrusted to him by a young black man who told him that the girl had been exposed by her mother, how he had taken care of her and discovered her identity by reading the confession that her mother had written upon a silken strip that she had left with other recognition tokens (2,30-32). But the mysterious African man does not reveal the girl's identity to Charikles. Charikles will actually discover it only at the end of the novel (10,34-38). Kalasiris reads the strip earlier and tells Charikleia about her exposure and her parents (4,8-13). But this gradual revelation is only the first stage of the recognition process. When Theagenes is eager to see recognition take place, Charikleia warns him that it will be a slow process (9,24,3-8). It actually takes the whole of Book 10.

In the *Aithiopika* recognition is thus the mainspring of a long story. This is also the case with *Daphnis and Chloe*, but there is a difference: Heliodoros tells only that story while Longus tells two stories. Heliodoros concentrates more on recognition than Longus does. Recognition shapes the entire plot of his novel and is the critical event that resolves it. Thus the plot of the *Aithiopika* follows the same path as the most famous recognition tragedies such as *Oedipus Rex* or *Iphigeneia in Tauris*, even though its outcome is not tragic. But recognition stories in the Greek novels are not limited to re-establishing the genuine identity of foundlings. They also involve characters who have been separated by the course of their adventures and want to meet again. Will they recognise each other and how? This is another major question which the reader asks himself. The answer is up to the novelists.

This is why recognition appears as the prime mover and the main theme of many episodes. They are often most surprising. In Chariton's novel, Chaireas arrives in Miletos, where he knows that Kallirhoe has been sold as a slave by the pirate Theron. He visits a temple of Aphrodite. He prays to the goddess and asks her to give him back the wife she had previously given him in Syracuse. When his prayer is over, he immediately sees a golden image of Kallirhoe which Dionysios has dedicated to the goddess. He faints. The priestess of the temple helps

him to recover and comments on his fainting as a good omen. She shows him the golden image and reveals to him that the girl was once a slave whom Aphrodite has made the wife of Dionysios, the first man in Ionia (3,6,4-5). Polycharmos rushes Chaireas out of the temple before he can utter a word. When they are outside, Chaireas laments his misfortune. Recognition has made him unhappy. Before he discovered and recognised the image of Kallirhoe, he could still hope to get her back. This is not the case anymore. Recognition here happens with reversal. It seems to be a happy event. Chaireas has not yet retrieved Kallirhoe, but he has seen her image, which means that she has some connection with Miletos and that Chaireas has come to the right place. But when the priestess reveals what this connection actually is, Chaireas is devastated. Recognition with reversal is Aristotle's favourite type in chapter 11 of the *Poetics*. On the other hand, in chapter 16, he expresses the low opinion he holds of recognition with tokens. Aristotle's analysis of recognition applies to tragedy and cannot be transferred automatically to the novel, a completely different genre. But it can be used as a reference for a better understanding of the design of recognition in the novels. Chariton resorts to recognition with tokens and reversal. With this hybrid recognition, his plot takes a sensational turn. Chaireas had said to Polycharmos that he was not even sure that Kallirhoe was still alive (3,6,2). Now he knows that she lives with her new husband in the neighbourhood, and that he cannot get to her and may have lost her forever. Recognition provides good and very bad news at the same time. It is an ambiguous event, a two-faced *peripeteia* with dangerous potentialities. It can harm unexpectedly when it happens. It can also cause trouble when it does not happen.

The novelists also know how to use this type of situation. At the beginning of the last book of his novel, Chariton warns the reader that the story he is telling will have a happy ending. But he also specifies that Tyche had a different plan (8,1,2-5). With his army of Egyptian insurgents, Chaireas had conquered the island of Arados. He had taken prisoner Stateira, the queen of Persia, and all the people in her train. Kallirhoe was among them, but he did not know. So Tyche wanted him to leave the island unaware and lose his wife forever. At the end of Book 7, this plan seems to be implemented (7,6,6-12). The Egyptian soldier who has been appointed to watch over the prisoners wants to speak to the Persian queen, but does not dare enter the place where she is. He stays close to the door. He wants to cheer her up and promises that his admiral will want to marry her. It is not Stateira, but Kallirhoe who listens to him.[4] She replies that she will never accept such a marriage. The Egyptian soldier gets back to Chaireas and tells him

---

[4] There is a lacuna in the text at this point (7,6,7); the missing section must have explained how the soldier comes to be speaking to Kallirhoe.

about this refusal. Chaireas bitterly orders him to let the lady alone. Misunderstanding is the key to this episode which is stuffed with irony. The Egyptian inadvertently offers Kallirhoe the prospect of marrying her own husband. Kallirhoe refuses and wants the admiral, that is to say her husband, to come and kill her. Chaireas blames the soldier for ignoring the right way to charm a lady, who is his own lady. The soldier confesses that he entirely made up the story about the marriage, but Chaireas and Kallirhoe are really married. Chaireas wonders whether the lady is not mourning over her own marriage, which Kallirhoe actually is doing. This is what happens when recognition does not take place. The characters are unaware of what they are saying and doing because they have not recognised each other. The non-recognition plot which Tyche has designed has started to run its course. This is when, according to Chariton, Aphrodite decides otherwise (8,1,3). As Chaireas is preparing to leave Arados, the Egyptian soldier reminds him of the lady who had refused marriage and invites him to try to convince her. He goes and talks to her. Kallirhoe immediately recognises him (8,1,6-10). The heroes meet again and the will of Aphrodite is fulfilled. But is it really the will of the goddess? The reader may suspect it is the will of Chariton. He is entitled to presume that the novelist has suggested that recognition might have not happened, and then makes it happen as he wants it to. Chariton has presumably masterminded the plot and mentions the will of Aphrodite in order to hide or to pretend to hide his own power behind her divine authority. And he really has much power. He makes recognition happen, but he could have decided otherwise. He uses recognition as a clever contrivance to bring the story to an end.

Xenophon of Ephesos is less clever when he impedes recognition to delay the outcome of his story. When Hippothoos takes Anthia prisoner for the second time, they do not recognise each other (4,3,6). Yet he had previously kidnapped her and decided that she should be sacrificed to Ares. He had prepared the sacrifice, but could not perform it because the army attacked and destroyed his bandit-gang. He managed to escape and Anthia was safe (2,13,1-4). When they meet again, they both seem to have forgotten this episode. They engage in a new adventure where, for the second time, Hippothoos decides that Anthia must be put to death after she has killed a bandit who wanted to rape her. She is thrown to wild Egyptian dogs, but is saved by another bandit who is in love with her (4,4,1-6,6; 5,2,1-5). Nevertheless, when she meets Hippothoos for the third time in Tarentum, she does not recognise him. But he recognises her, reminds her of what they have been through together, falls in love with her and even wants to marry her. But he renounces her when she reveals she is the wife of Habrokomes, Hippothoos' best friend (5,9,4-13). Recognition happens at last after two episodes of non-recognition. We find the same type of sequence at the end of the novel (5,10,9-12,6). When Leukon

and Rhode, the former servants of Habrokomes, meet him again in Rhodes, they do not recognise him immediately. And when they meet Anthia later in the same sanctuary, they do not recognise her either at first sight. This final sequence is shorter than the previous one, but both mean that, in the novel, recognition needs time to happen and that the novelist is the master of that time. Xenophon can make it long or short. He can make recognition happen or not as he wants to. However, he tries to avoid situations that would have seemed most unlikely: when Anthia and Habrokomes meet again at the end of the novel, they recognise each other immediately (5,13,3). At this moment, non-recognition was out of the question. But this type of limit does not seem to exist for Achilles Tatius.

Cave has remarked that the artificial aspect of recognition has always caused much prejudice against it.[5] Achilles Tatius certainly contributed to recognition's bad reputation. He emphasises that recognition is an artifice and that he uses it as an artifice when recognition is extremely likely to happen and he decides that it will not happen. Non-recognition is certainly one of his favourite devices.[6] In book 5, Kleitophon marries Melite, a wealthy and loving widow (5,14). As for Leukippe, who is supposed to have been kidnapped and murdered by pirates, she reappears in the story under the name of Lakaina (5,17-25). She is a slave and works on Melite's country estate in Ephesos. Kleitophon arrives there with Melite. They meet Leukippe-Lakaina, who tells Melite about her misfortune and shows her the marks and scars which are clear proof that she has been maltreated by Sosthenes, Melite's steward. Melite pities her. She blames Sosthenes and removes him from his stewardship. As for Kleitophon, he does not recognise Leukippe, although he has some doubts because he sees a certain resemblance between Lakaina and Leukippe. She has to send him a letter to tell him who she actually is, and she is later recognised as Leukippe even by Melite who happens to read the letter (5,24). As an immediate consequence of this recognition, Melite forces Kleitophon to make love to her, although he had managed not to touch her even though she was supposed to be his wife (5,25-27). This sequence of events is extremely unlikely, to say the least. Satyros gives Leukippe's letter to Kleitophon and tries to explain to him why he could not recognise her. He says she looked like a boy and the cutting-off of her hair had totally changed her (5,19,2). This is a highly unconvincing explanation. And to complete the irony of the episode, Kleitophon for the first and the last time makes love to his second wife when he has just recovered his first one. Achilles Tatius deliberately lays bare the artificial aspect of recognition by resorting to non-recognition in the most incredible way. He uses artificial non-recognition to reveal that the story he is telling is itself an

---

[5] Cave 1988, 2.
[6] Montiglio 2013, 68-76.

artefact which is free from the constraints of realism. But whether it happens or not, recognition entails uncertainty. It is not a simple contrivance which leads automatically to the same end. It is an event which happens or might happen and results in diverse and unpredictable consequences. As Cave has pointed out, it re-establishes an order which had been lost and creates confusion at the same time.[7]

This confusion often makes the characters unhappy. In Longus' novel, when Daphnis has been recognised by his parents, Chloe thinks that she has lost him forever (4,27). When she is kidnapped by Lampis, Daphnis regrets the happy life they were living together prior to his recognition (4,28). Due to recognition, Chloe even becomes unrecognisable: after Dionysophanes has recognised her as a foundling and given permission for Daphnis to marry her, she is dressed as a bride and Daphnis hardly recognises her (4,32). In this way recognition may cast doubts on the identity of a character after he has been recognised. But doubts may also appear in the process of recognition itself. At the end of the *Aithiopika*, Heliodoros is piling up proofs to establish that Charikleia is really the daughter of Hydaspes and Persinna (10,10-16). Charikleia speaks for herself and shows the strip and the other recognition tokens which had been exposed with her. Sisimithres testifies that he picked her up and raised her when she was a little girl. She was conceived in the sight of a painting portraying the salvation of Andromeda by Perseus, which is why she was born white-skinned. The painting is brought on and put close to Charikleia to demonstrate how much she looks like Andromeda. Charikleia also shows the black mark she bears on the skin of her arm. The little girl whom Sisimithres had picked up had the same one. Hydaspes at last recognises Charikleia as his daughter. But the objections he has raised before, the gathering of the items and the long time the whole episode takes to reach Charikleia's recognition create a feeling of uneasiness. Even when recognition seems to be assured, it does not happen easily. It is a difficult and doubtful process. It cannot be organised in advance. Charikleia thought she could control its unfolding from the beginning through to the end, but at the same time she could make a shrewd guess as to how it was going to develop. She had warned Theagenes not to grow impatient, she had chosen the moment she considered appropriate to enter the stage for the final act of her story, the act of recognition (9,24,3-8; 10,9,1-3). And it actually proves a long and difficult act to play. Hydaspes is not immediately convinced by the tokens and the signs that Charikleia is really his daughter. Charikleia had predicted to Theagenes that this type of evidence could not immediately trigger her recognition (9,24,7-8). Finally, she is recognised as the Ethiopian princess at the end of a scene which turns out to be even longer and more difficult than she had expected. As a matter of fact, she already knew that recognition could be wild and

---

[7] Cave 1988, *passim.*

rough. When she and Theagenes expect to be separated, they choose signs of recognition and passwords to inform each other of their travels. They also think it would be wise to change their appearance, which they do. They actually get separated. When they meet again, Charikleia immediately recognises Theagenes, but he does not recognise her. As she tries to hug him, he pushes her away. She has to remind him of the passwords they had chosen and he recognises her at last (5,4,7-5,5,2; 7,7,5-7). Thus recognition cannot easily be brought under control. It is a cause of turmoil and triggers unpredictable consequences for the characters. When Theagenes and Charikleia meet for the first time as they perform together a sacrifice in the temple of Apollo in Delphi, they fall in love at first sight. Kalasiris witnesses their meeting and declares that their souls have immediately recognised each other as fellows (3,5,4). This philosophical commentary has its root in Plato's *Phaedrus* (249b-257b). It entails a pre-established order which is revealed at the moment when Theagenes and Charikleia meet. But this order was previously unknown to them. They had no idea that their souls were going to recognise each other. They do not control this recognition when it takes place nor will they will control the adventures which originate from it. Recognition may cause happiness, but the characters cannot keep a check on its process and consequences.

So recognition reveals the precariousness of their condition as they live in an uncertain and unstable world. They are certainly not unchanging in the course of the plot. Their identity is not permanently unquestionable. It may be forgotten or ignored; it may waver and disappear for a while. When they have been separated, it is not always easy for them to meet again and recognise each other. They cannot control recognition. It provides a vivid image of their helplessness. As they put recognition to such a use, the Greek novelists turn out to be less idealistic than they are supposed to be. They actually resort to recognition 'to confirm the lovers' unchanged and reciprocal love', as Silvia Montiglio aptly puts it.[8] But in their handling of recognition, they also prove well aware of the uncertainty of happiness, of the power of chance and of the confusion that often prevails in human life.

Bibliography

Cave, T. 1988. *Recognitions. A Study in Poetics.*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Montiglio, S. 2013. *Love and Providence. Recognitions in the Ancient Novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---

[8] Montiglio 2013, 225.

'Similar to Artemis or to the Golden Aphrodite':
Topoi of nuptial poetry and rhetoric
in the Greek novel[*]

CECILIA NOBILI
Università degli Studi di Bergamo

In recent years a popular branch of studies in the field of intertextuality has been to trace the influence of the major Greek literary genres on the Greek novel.[1] Massimo Fusillo called this phenomenon 'polifonia',[2] and scholars have analysed the plots of the novels and found allusions to drama, historiography, rhetoric, lyric and many other genres. In this context, the relationships between fiction and a literary genre that enjoyed great success in both the classical and the imperial age have been oddly disregarded: I am talking about nuptial literature, whose influence on the extant Greek novels I will now attempt to outline.

Marriage represents the 'social backbone of the romances and the focus of the love plots', as Brigitte Egger argues,[3] not only because the marriage of the main characters constitutes the starting point or the end of all the stories, but also because in the novel's world love finds its only legitimate fulfilment in matrimony. In some cases the wedding ceremonies are described in detail, in others they are just rapidly evoked, but they always reflect real contemporary practice.[4] In archaic and classical times, the rite was accompanied by wedding songs, sung by the bride's companions during the procession to the groom's house and before the entrance to the nuptial bedroom; from the Hellenistic age onwards the songs

---

[*] I wish to thank David Konstan and Aldo Tagliabue for reading my paper and giving me useful comments and suggestions. I am also grateful to the editors, John Morgan and Marília Futre Pinheiro, for their untiring work and their improvement of my paper.

[1] On intertextuality in the Greek Novel, see Morgan & Harrison 2008; the contributions in Doulamis 2011a; Zanetto 2014.

[2] Fusillo 1989.

[3] Egger 1994, 260.

[4] On matters legal, Egger 1994 has shown how the novels present a mixture of contemporary and archaising legal conventions.

began to be accompanied by wedding orations composed by famous rhetors (at least in the most eminent families).[5] The novels we know are no exception in this regard and the *hymenaios* is often mentioned in descriptions of weddings.[6] The words spoken are explicitly recorded in only one passage,[7] but, as we shall see, many motifs clearly borrowed from nuptial literature can be traced in most of the passages concerning marriage.

The history of nuptial poetry is long and its origins date back to the pre-archaic age.[8] We do not have many examples of ancient *hymenaioi*, which disappeared like the rest of popular poetry; nevertheless, we can try to reconstruct their main features thanks to a few extant poems[9] and, above all, thanks to the rhetors of the imperial age, such as Menander, pseudo-Dionysius, Choricius and Himerius.[10] The late rhetorical *epithalamia* were directly inspired by the archaic *hymenaioi* and were extremely numerous; furthermore, the recurrence of the same motifs in both the *hymenaioi* and their rhetorical epigones demonstrates the early codification of their most characteristic *topoi*.[11]

---

[5] To be exact, the term *hymenaios* should refer to the songs that accompanied the bride during the procession to her bridegroom's house, whereas the *epithalamios* was the song sung before the nuptial bedroom. The term *epithalamios* soon replaced *hymenaios* (or at least they became synonyms); Alexandrian grammarians, for example, grouped Sappho's nuptial poems, including the *hymenaioi*, under the single title of *Epithalamia*. See Muth 1954; Lambin 1992, 77-104.

[6] X. Eph. 1,8,1; 3,5,3; 3,6,1; 3,6,2. Chariton 1,1,13; 2,1,3. Ach. Tat. 1,13,5; 5,11,2; 5,16,5. Longus 4,34,1; 4,40,2. Hld. 2,29,4; 6,8,2; 6,8,3.

[7] Chariton 8,1,11, strictly speaking a reunion of husband and wife rather than a wedding.

[8] See Hom. *Il.* 18,490-496; 24,62-63; *Od.* 4,15-19; 23,133-151. [Hes.] *Scut.* 270-277.

[9] Sappho's epithalamia (Frr. 30, 31?, 44, 103-117 L.-P.), Hesiod's so called *Marriage of Peleus and Thetis* (Fr. 211 M.-W.), Theocritus' *Epithalamium to Helen* (*Id.* 18), a few passages from Aristophanes' comedies (*Pax* 1332-1357, *Av.* 1720-1765) or Euripides' tragedies (*Phaët.* 227-244). For a complete survey of evidence of Greek nuptial poetry see Contiades-Tsitsoni 1990 and Lyghounis 1993.

[10] Menander Rhetor and pseudo-Dionysius of Halicarnassus wrote treatises to teach their pupils how to compose orations (commonly called *epithalamia* or *gamēlia*) in praise of couples who were about to marry (Men. Rh. 399-412 Russell-Wilson; [D. H.] *Rh.* 260-271 Usener-Radermacher). Later sophists such as Himerius and Choricius wrote orations that scrupulously respect the suggestions given in such treatises, even if we cannot be sure that they read the works of Menander, pseudo-Dionysius or similar treatises of unknown writers (Him. *Or.* 9 Colonna; Chor. *Or.* 5 and 6 Foerster-Richtsteig). Scholars have pointed out that these late works repeat and revise the same *topoi* that we find in archaic *hymenaioi,* with so much care that they are valuable evidence for reconstructing the features of many lost works. The rhetors themselves insert citations from Sappho or other poets into their speeches (Chor. *Or.* 5,19-20 F.-R.; Him. *Or.* 9,4; 9,16 C.; 9,19; Men. Rh. 402 R.-W.) See Rizzo 1898; Gallavotti 1965; Völker 2003.

[11] Wheeler 1930; Russell 1979.

In recent years, many scholars have investigated the relationship between novel and sophistic, recognising a dense network of verbal and thematic coincidences that shows how far the novelists were indebted to the sophists' art. This is particularly evident for the so called 'sophistic' novels, i.e. *Daphnis and Chloe, Leucippe and Clitophon*, and the *Aethiopica*; however, the influence of rhetoric is not totally absent even in the 'pre-sophistic' ones, i.e. the *Ephesiaca* and *Callirhoe*. Writers like Longus or Achilles Tatius, who probably lived at the *acme* of the sophistic age (2nd-3rd century CE), were able to master all the rhetorical devices used by contemporary rhetors, as we can see in the *ekphraseis, agones*, trials and so forth. Nuptial rhetoric is no exception: in their works we can detect many passages presenting themes typical of contemporary wedding orations or prescribed by treatises like those of pseudo-Dionysius and Menander Rhetor. This influence should not surprise us, since marriage speeches constituted an important part of sophists' education and, from the second century onward, became so popular in the Greek upper class that they survived into the Byzantine and Christian world.

Let us begin by analysing Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*.[12] At 1,17-18 we find an exemplary parody of a well-known nuptial *topos*, which can be defined (in Goldhill's words) as 'a playfully eroticised version of the natural world as a different sort of model for human intercourse'.[13]

> Satyrus grasped the gist of my words, and, to provide me with a pretext for speaking further on the subject, replied:
> 'Are you really saying that Eros has so much strength that he can actually hurl his brand as far as the bird kingdom?'
> 'Not only the bird kingdom,' I said. 'After all, there is nothing marvellous in that: like them, he has wings. No, he can reach snakes, plants, and (in my opinion) stones! […] They say that there are various instances of plant desiring plant, but this desire particularly afflicts the palm tree. There are, they say, male and female palms. The male lusts after the female, and if the female is uprooted from the patch where the male is planted, the lusting male pines. […] There is also another kind of marriage, a transmarine marriage of waters. The lover is a river in Elis, the beloved a spring in Sicily. The river flows through the sea as though it were a plain. The sea does not destroy the sweet

---

[12] Another passage in Achilles Tatius that clearly recalls rhetoric is 1,8,3-9: the whole passage is a parodic imitation of the *thesis ei gamēteon,* where the students were required to debate the question of whether a man should get married (Lib. *Prog.* 8,550-561 Foerster; Apht. *Prog.* 42-47 Rabe; Nicol. *Prog.* 71-76 Felten).

[13] Goldhill 1995, 69.

lover with its salty surge, but parts to make way for his course, and the parting of the sea acts as a channel for the river; in this way it escorts the Alpheus to his bride, Arethusa. Thus it is that whenever the Olympic festival takes place, and many people cast all sorts of gifts into the eddies of the river, he immediately bears them to his beloved, a river's dowry. Yet another mystery of desire arises, this time among snakes, and not just a mutual desire in snakes of the same species, but even between different types of snake. The viper, a terrestrial snake, is stung with desire for the lamprey, also a snake but a marine one (with the form of a snake but the habits of a fish)'. (trans. Whitmarsh)

In this passage Clitophon explains to his slave Satyrus the power of Eros, which is represented as affecting the whole of nature, including metals and rivers, animals and plants, birds and reptiles. So male and female palms cannot be separated; rivers also love each other with overwhelming passion, as shown in the case of Alpheus, which runs under the sea to Syracuse, in order to reach his beloved Arethusa. The whole passage is drawn from nuptial rhetoric, though embellished by a detailed scientific knowledge that recalls the Hellenistic treatises.[14] Menander and pseudo-Dionysius, in fact, explain that it was necessary to start any oration with the praise of Gamos as a natural force, describing his primordial role in the creation of the world and its power to mate animals and plants.

> Nor should you stop here: you must show how the god touches even streams and rivers, creatures that swim and those of the land and of the air. You should incorporate narrative in all this – e.g. how Alpheus the Pisan loves the Sicilian spring Arethusa and goes against his own nature, and, like a passionate bridegroom, goes bubbling through the sea, seething, to the island of Sicily, and falls into the lap of his beloved Arethusa and unites with her – and stories of creatures that swim, for it is plain that the beasts of the sea know the rites of marriage, like those of the land and all that fly. Marriage subdues to his rite even the savage and horribly roaring lion, and yokes him to the law of Aphrodite; he does the same to wild leopards and all such beasts. As to trees, you should point out that they too are not without their part in marriage, for the tendrils on leaves are devices of trees for mating, and these too are inventions of the god. (Men. Rh. 401-402 R.-W., trans. Russell - Wilson)[15]

---

[14] Cf. Konstan 2013, who investigates the attitudes of animals towards Eros and erotic drive in Hellenistic and imperial sources. On Achilles Tatius' scientific sources see Rommel 1923, 62-72; Vilborg 1962, 34-36.

[15] Cf. also [D.H.] 262-263 U.-R. This prescription is scrupulously followed by Himerius (*Or.* 9,7-11 C.) and Choricius (*Or.* 6, 6-9 F.-R.), who display a great number of mythical and physical paradigms. On Menander see Russell & Wilson 1981 and Heath 2004; on

In Menander's text we find many of the examples mentioned by Achilles Tatius, such as the reference to birds and plants, the narration of the myth of Alpheus and Arethusa, and the reference to wild beasts such as lions and leopards, which represents a valid counterpart to the story of the love between the snake and the lamprey narrated in the novel.

A couple of similar passages appear also in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*: the first and most significant is 2,7,1-5, where Philetas utters a magnificent encomium of Eros, which, like *Gamos* in the treatise of Menander, has power over all living beings: no god, tree, animal or river can escape his violent assault:

> So Philetas continued, 'Love is a god, my children, young, and beautiful, and winged. This is why he delights in youth, pursues beauty and gives souls wings. He has more power even than Zeus himself, he is lord of the elements, lord of the stars, lord of his fellow gods. Even you do not have such mastery over your goats and sheep. Every flower is Love's work, every tree is his creation; it is he that makes the rivers flow and the winds blow. I have known a bull in love: he bellowed as if he had been stung by a gadfly. I have known a billy-goat in love with a nanny-goat: he followed her everywhere.' (trans. Morgan)

What is interesting here is that the speaker is Philetas, a well educated poet-shepherd who plays the role of *erōtodidaskalos* and shows a thorough knowledge of rhetoric.[16] Another example of this kind of rhetorical passage can be found at 4,17,3-4: Gnathon, trying to persuade Astylus to entrust Daphnis to him, blames Eros for his power, which leads lovers to fall in love with any kind of living being, including plants, rivers, and beasts. Gnathon, like Philetas, has received some sort of rhetorical education, because he has learnt all the *erōtikē mythologia* in *symposia*, with such care that Astylos describes him as a *sophistēs*.[17]

On the basis of these passages, we can say that Achilles Tatius and Longus had expert knowledge of rhetorical literature concerning marriage and wedding rituals. There is no doubt that they (Longus in particular[18]) knew the lyric

---

Choricius' Epithalamia see Pizzone 2004 and Penella 2005; on Himerius Rizzo 1898 and Völker 2003.

[16] On Philetas as *praeceptor amoris* see Di Marco 2000. See also Morgan 2011 and Repath 2011.

[17] Long. 4,18,1. On poetical allusions and rhetorical embellishments in Gnathon's speeches see Pattoni 2005, 89-92.

[18] On quotations of Sappho in Longus see Hunter 1983, 73-76, who recognises in Long. 3,33,4 a clear reference to Sappho's famous epithalamium of the apple; nevertheless,

antecedents represented by Sappho's epithalamia; nevertheless, the sophistic me-diation is in both cases very strong. Rather different is the case of the two other novelists, Chariton and Xenophon, who have often been described as pre-sophis-tic, although many sophistic passages can be found even in their work. However, the influences from nuptial literature that we can notice in these two works are very different from those in Achilles Tatius and Longus.

In one of the first scenes of the *Ephesiaca* of Xenophon of Ephesus we find a description of a feast in honour of Artemis celebrated by the Ephesians. The whole passage seems to be influenced by literary tradition rather than by contemporary religious practice.[19] A long procession, made up of boys and girls of marriageable age, leaves the town for the temple of the goddess. The young people are sump-tuously dressed, carry torches, perfumes, baskets and incense, and the whole at-mosphere recalls that of wedding ceremonies; in fact, it is said that it was common practice for the Ephesians to find a bride or a groom on that occasion.

> The local festival of Artemis was in progress, with its procession from the city to the temple. […] There was a great crowd of Ephesians and visitors alike to see the festival, for it was the custom at this festival to find husbands for the girls and wives for the young men. So the procession filed past – first the sacred objects, the torches, the baskets and the incense; then horses, dogs, hunting equipment… some for war, most for peace. And each of the girls was dressed as if to receive a lover. Anthia led the line of girls; she was the daugh-ter of Megamedes and Euippe, both of Ephesus. Anthia's beauty was an object of wonder, far surpassing the other girls. […] Often as they saw her in the sacred enclosure the Ephesians would worship her as Artemis. And so on this occasion too the crowd gave a cheer when they saw her, and there was a whole clamour of exclamations from the spectators: some were amazed and said it was the goddess in person; some that it was someone else made by the god-dess in her own image. But all prayed and prostrated themselves and congrat-ulated (*emakarizon*) her parents. 'The beautiful Anthia!' was the cry on all spectators' lips. (1,2,2-5, trans. Anderson)

Sapphic hints in the novel are often undoubtedly mediated by other literary sources, such as Theocritus. See also Pattoni 2005, 93-99.

[19] Cf. Nilsson 1906, 243-247; Gärtner 1967, 2058-2059; Ruiz Montero 2007, 268: 'Da molti anni non si è del tutto sicuri che la descrizione della processione iniziale, in cui sfila l'eroina nelle vesti di Artemide cacciatrice, corrisponda alla realtà'. See also Nobili 2020 for literary and material evidence in Heliodorus' Delphic section.

The most handsome boy is Habrocomes, the son of one of the most important citizens, whereas pre-eminent among the girls is the beauty of Anthia, often mistaken by her fellow-citizens for the goddess Artemis herself; the sight is so wonderful that the crowd gazes at them with admiration and dreams about their possible marriage.

In a similar way Chariton describes the wedding of Callirhoe and Chaereas wedding in their home town, Syracuse:

> The sound of the marriage hymn (*hymenaios*) pervaded the city, the streets were filled with garlands and torches, porches were wet with wine and perfume [...] When she appeared in public the whole crowd was struck with wonder, as when Artemis appears to hunters in lonely places; many of those present actually went down on their knees in worship. They all thought Callirhoe beautiful (*ethaumazon*) and Chaereas lucky (*emakarizon*). It was like the wedding of Thetis on Pelion as poets describe it. (1,1,13-16, trans. Reardon)

Every detail of these passages recalls the descriptions of wedding rituals that we find in Greek literature from Homer onwards and in the novels themselves:[20] the nuptial atmosphere that pervades the passages leads the authors to insert more or less overt references to nuptial literature. The praise of the brides and grooms (commended for their beauty, but also for their virtue and ethos), in particular, evokes the encomium of the couple that forms the main part of nuptial epithalamia, both rhetorical and poetical.[21] Himerius praises the bride and bridegroom comparing their complementary virtues, and Menander explains how rhetors must celebrate the newlyweds and their families.[22] Sapphic epithalamia are almost entirely dominated by the praise of the bride, suggesting that this was the original and most typical form of archaic *hymenaios*. In Sappho fr. 112 L.-P. the bride's beauty attracts Eros and in the well known fr. 31 L.-P., in which critics have seen many points of contacts with the epithalamia,[23] the girl is so beautiful that she upsets the groom and everyone is looking at her.

This is exactly the reaction that people feel as they gaze at Anthia or Callirhoe, the effects of whose beauty are profusely reported by the novelists. In Theocritus'

---

[20] The most significant wedding descriptions are Chariton 1,1,13-16 and 3,2,15-17; X. Eph. 1,8,1-3; Longus 4,33-34 and 4,40; Hld. 6,8.

[21] Hock 1997, 461, notes that Xenophon's description of Anthia is organised from head to foot and recalls the *ekphraseis* of the *progymnasmata*.

[22] Him. 9,15 C.; Men. Rh. 403-404 R.-W.

[23] This interpretation dates back to Wilamowits and had great fortune among the scholars. See McEvilley 1978 with bibliography, and Lardinois 1996, 167-168.

Epithalamium to Helen, the bride's praise is conveyed through comparison with her companions, who are surpassed by Helen in beauty and virtue:

> … since it is indeed a daughter of Zeus who shares
> Your bed, one unequalled among those who walk in Achaea.
> What a wonderful thing it will be, if the child she bears resembles
> Her mother! We her companions are all of an age with her,
> And exercised with her by Eurotas' washing-pools, oiling ourselves
> Like men – a company of girls two hundred and forty strong;
> But none of us a match for peerless Helen. The face which
> Dawn at its rising reveals is beautiful, O lady Night,
> And beautiful is the vivid spring when winter loosens its grip;
> So too did golden Helen's beauty shine in our company.
>
> <div align="right">(18,19-28, trans. Hunter & Verity)</div>

The same aspect is underlined by Xenophon and Chariton: their heroes and heroines are the most beautiful people in their town and surpass their contemporaries in virtue and character. Both Anthia and Callirhoe are so beautiful that they are mistaken for a goddess:[24] this *topos* is commonly adopted by novelists, who underline the confusion that their beauty generates in spectators through the device of divine epiphany.[25] The comparison between heroine and goddess is not confined to Greek novels: it dates back to archaic times and has its origins in nuptial poetry. As we can see from Sappho fr. 44 L.-P., where the newlyweds are praised through comparison with the pre-eminent mythical married couple, Hector and Andromache, it was common practice in the *hymenaioi* to compare the bride (but also the bridegroom) to a divinity or mythical figure. Sappho offers other examples, such as fr. 111 L.-P., where the bridegroom is compared to Ares, though in fact all extant nuptial songs contain a divine comparison.

> High must be the chamber –
> Hymenaeum!
> Make it high, you builders!
> A bridegroom's coming –
> Hymenaeum!
> Like the War-god himself, the tallest of the tall!
>
> <div align="right">(trans. West)</div>

---

[24] Chariton 1,1,2; 1,14,1; 2,2,6; 3,2,14-17;4,7,5; 5,5,8; 5,9,1; 6,3,5; 6,4,6; 8,6,11. X. Eph. 1,12,2; 2,2,4.

[25] On this *topos* and on divine epiphany see Hägg 2002; Schmeling 2005; Cioffi 2014.

The same motif is found in the short *hymenaios* sung by the participants at the banquet in Lucian's *Symposium* (41), who celebrate the bride's beauty through a comparison with Helen and Aphrodite, and in most of the rhetors, confirming that the practice was common in their poetical antecedents. The goddess involved in these similes is usually Aphrodite, goddess of love and arranger of weddings, but comparisons with Artemis are not uncommon: even in Heliodorus' novel, so distant from Chariton and Xenophon in age and spirit, Charicleia is often compared to Artemis and mistaken for the goddess herself.[26] The best known literary antecedent for this simile is the passage from *Odyssey* 6 describing the encounter between Odysseus and Nausicaa, which is full of motifs drawn from erotic and nuptial poetry and which is also echoed by the literate Longus.[27]

The short passages from Chariton and Xenophon that we quoted earlier show other patterns that appear to be influenced by nuptial poetry: in fact they seem to be 'narrativisations' of their lyric models. The allusion to the wedding of Peleus and Thetis that we find in the passage of Chariton was used from archaic *hymenaioi* onwards as the mythical benchmark for newly wedded couples, as is demonstrated by the nuptial song attributed to Hesiod concerning the marriage between Peleus and Thetis.[28]

The use of the verb *makarizō* ('I call someone blessed') in Xenophon (1,2,7) and Chariton (1,1,16) is not due to mere coincidence: in both novels the verb or the related adjective *makar* ('blessed') frequently recurs in nuptial contexts.[29] The novelists derived this usage from wedding poetry, since the *makarismos* was a typical element of ancient *hymenaioi*, where it served to praise the bride or the groom for the fortune they had in finding such a perfect partner. A clear example of this practice is offered by the *hymenaios* sung by the chorus in Euripides' *Phaethon* to praise the wedding between Aphrodite and Phaethon, where the girls address the bridegroom saying:

---

[26] See Hld. 1,2,1-2: the description of Charicleia closely recalls that of Anthia in Xenophon; at 3,1-4 is described the procession in honour of Artemis where Charicleia and Theagenes first fell in love: the model is, again, Xenophon. Both the passages, like those of Chariton and Xenophon, are full of nuptial *topoi*. See Nobili 2020.

[27] Echoed also by Chariton 6,4,6. Long. 1,13,1-2; 4,17,5. See Dowden 1999, 232-233; Pattoni 2005, 76-84; Tagliabue 2011, 123-126. I treat elsewhere the presence of nuptial *topoi* in *Od.* 6. See Nobili 2006.

[28] Hes. fr. 211 M.-W. But see also [D.H.] *Rh.* 264 U.-R., who reports the same mythical example. In Chariton the comparison also occurs at 3,3,6.

[29] X. Eph. 1,7,3; 1,14,3; 2,2,4; 2,5,2; 3,7,3. Chariton 1,3,7; 2,6,1; 2,10,4; 3,1,8; 4,7,6; 5,8,3; 6,2,9; 8,1,11; 8,5,8; 8,8,16. Ach. Tat. 5,11,2. Longus 4,28,3. Hld. 1,16; 2,8.

'Hymen, Hymen! We sing to honour Zeus' daughter in the sky, mistress of loves, Aphrodite, wedding-maker for maiden-girls, Aphrodite. […] Oh blessed man, greater still in happiness than a king, who will ally yourself in marriage with a goddess, and will be praised in song throughout the boundless earth as mortals' only connection with immortals in marriage.' (240-244, trans. Collard & Cropp)

Almost all the nuptial songs we find in ancient literature present this recurrent use of the adjective *makar*.[30] The novelists unmistakably reproduce this ancient habit, deeply rooted both in popular custom and in literature, as is demonstrated by a passage from Chariton, which reports the words of a quasi-*hymenaios.* At 8,1,11 after Chaereas has recognised Callirhoe in the prisoners' tent, the whole army praises the reunited couple crying: 'What a lucky woman (*ō gynaikos makarias*), to win such a handsome husband'.[31] It is immediately evident that this short exclamation exactly corresponds to the traditional songs: the apostrophe to Callirhoe cannot fail to evoke the ancient *epithalamia*, such as Sappho fr. 112.1-2 L.-P., which says:

Happy groom (*olbie gambre*), the union you prayed for
Is now fulfilled, you have the girl of your prayers.
How handsome you are, with your gentle eyes,
And your lovely face all radiant with desire.
The Love-goddess has shown you special favour.
                                                    (trans. West)

The same can be said of the last sentence quoted from the passage of Xenophon: the narrator says that everybody cried that Anthia was beautiful, *kalē*. Once again we find the 'narrativisation' of a typical lyric formula: Sappho and Theocritus attest that the *hymenaioi* often included apostrophes to the bride such as *kalē*

---

[30] In archaic literature *makar* and *makarizō* are normally associated with gods (see De Heer 1969); the only circumstances when they are applied to men are nuptial poems and contexts (Hom. *Od.* 6,158-159; Hes. fr. 211.7 M.-W.; E. *Tr.* 311-312, *Hel.* 375-376, 1434-1435, *I.A.* 1076-1079; Ar. *Av.* 1722-1725; *Pax* 1333-1336). *Makar* is often replaced by *olbios*, with the same meaning (Hom. *Od.* 24,192-193; Sapph. fr. 112 L.-P.; E. *Alc.* 918-919, *Hel.* 639-640, Andr. 1218; Theocr. 18,16).

[31] It is interesting to note that this exclamation seems to be a reply to the sentence addressed by Chaereas to Callirhoe a few lines earlier: 'You shall have the husband you want'. The similarity to the Sapphic epithalamium cited below is even closer!

('beautiful') or *chariessa* ('charming').[32] Nevertheless, the exclamation is not restricted to the future bride: when Habrocomes appears before the crowd, everybody gazes at him crying *kalos Habrokomēs* and other words worthy of a god.[33]

To sum up, Xenophon and Chariton offer several examples of passages, where the nuptial atmosphere induces the author to insert themes or motifs typical of nuptial literature but, unlike Longus or Achilles Tatius where the role of sophists is overwhelming, the references are more strictly connected with literary memory than with rhetoric. Although a knowledge of nuptial orations on the part of the earlier novelists cannot be denied,[34] they show a more direct relationship with their poetic sources. At the same time, we can observe a general tendency among later authors, to interpret their lyrical models through the filter of sophistic, which gradually assumes an intermediary role between fiction and lyric. We must also consider that nuptial poetry soon assumed a popular character and we cannot exclude the possibility that Sappho's best known epithalamia became part of the traditional oral repertoire sung at marriages. This double nature of nuptial poetry is interesting in relation to the shifting polarity between popular and sophisticated that Graham Anderson recognised in Greek novels.[35]

Bibliography

Anderson, G. 1996. 'Popular and sophisticated in the ancient novel', in: G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden: Brill. 107-113.

Capra, A. 2008. 'L'efebo divino e l'incarnato della bella. Due note al testo di Senofonte Efesio (1.2.8 e 5.12.3)', *Acme* 61, 277-282.

Cioffi, R.L. 2014. 'Seeing Gods: Epiphany and Narrative in the Greek Novels', *AN* 11, 1-42.

Contiades-Tsitsoni, E. 1990. *Hymenaios und Epithalamion: Das Hochzeitslied in der frühgriechischen Lyrik*, Stuttgart: Teubner.

De Heer, C. 1969. *Μάκαρ - εὐδαίμων - ὄλβιος - εὐτυχής. A study of the semantic field denoting happiness in ancient Greek to the end of the 5th century b.C.*, Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Di Marco, M. 2000. 'Fileta praeceptor amoris: Longo Sofista e la correzione del modello bucolico', *SCO* 47, 9-35.

Doulamis, K. 2011 (ed.). 'Echoing Narratives: Studies of Intertextuality in Greek and Roman Prose Fiction', *AN Suppl. 13*. Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing & Groningen University Library.

---

[32] Sapph. fr. 108 L.-P.; Theocr. 18,38. See also Chariton 5,3,2: 'They claim that Callirhoe is beautiful as they claim that Dionysius is rich.'

[33] X. Eph. 1,2,8. I accept here the recent emendation of the text proposed by Capra 2008: 'καλὸς Ἀβροκόμης' λέγοντες καὶ οἷα οὐδὲ εἰς καλοῦ μίμημα θεοῦ.

[34] See e.g. the careful description of Habrocomes and Anthia's *thalamos* in X. Eph. 1,8,1-3: this was an important element of nuptial orations, as Menander Rhetor states (404).

[35] Anderson 1996.

Dowden, K. 1999. 'Fluctuating meanings: "Passage Rites" in ritual, myth, *Odyssey*, and the Greek Romance', in Padilla, M.W. (ed.). *Rites of Passage in Ancient Greece: Literature, Religion and Society*, London &Toronto: Associated University Presses. 221-246.

Egger, B. 1994. 'Women and marriage in the Greek novels: the boundaries of romance', in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore & London: John Hopkins University Press. 260-280.

Fusillo, M. 1989. *Il romanzo greco. Polifonia ed eros*, Venezia: Marsilio.

Gallavotti, C. 1965. 'Echi di Alceo e Menandro nei retori tardivi', *RFIC* 93, 135-146.

Gärtner, H. 1967, 'Xenophon of Ephesus', *RE* 9, 2055-2089.

Goldhill, S. 1995. *Foucault's Virginity. Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hägg, T. 2002. 'Epiphany in the Greek novels: the emplotment of a metaphor', *Eranos* 100, 51-61; reprinted in Hägg 2004, 141-155.

Hägg, T. 2004. *Parthenope. Selected Studies in Ancient Greek Fiction (1969-2004)*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.

Heath, M. 2004. *Menander. A Rhetor in Context*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hock, R. 1997. 'The rhetoric of romance', in: S. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period. 330 B.C. – A.D. 400*, Leiden, New York & Cologne: Brill, 449-465.

Hunter, R.L. 1983. *A Study of Daphnis & Chloe.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Konstan, D. 2013. 'Between appetite and emotion, or Why can't animals have *erôs*?', in: E. Sanders, C. Thumiger, C. Carey & N. Lowe (eds.), *Erôs in Ancient Greece*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 13-25.

Lambin, G. 1992. *La chanson grecque dans l'antiquité*, Paris: CNRS.

Lardinois, A. 1996. 'Who sang Sappho's Songs ?', in : E. Greene (ed.), *Reading Sappho. Contemporary Approaches*, Berkeley and Los Angeles : University of California Press, 150-174.

Lyghounis, M.G. 1991. 'Elementi tradizionali nella poesia nuziale greca', *MD* 27, 159-198.

McEvilly, T. 1978. 'Sappho, Fragment thirty one: the face behind the mask', *Phoenix* 32, 1-18.

Morgan, J.R. 2011. 'Poets and shepherds: Philetas and Longus', in: Doulamis 2011, 139-160.

Morgan, J.R. & Harrison, S. 2008. 'Intertextuality', in: T. Whitmarsh (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 218-236.

Muth, R. 1977. '*Hymenaios* und *Epithalamion*', *WS* 68, 5-45.

Nilsson, M.P. 1906. *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung mit Ausschluss der Attischen*, Leipzig: Teubner.

Nobili, C. 2006. 'Motivi della poesia nuziale in *Odissea* VI 149-185', *RIL.Lett.* 140, 59-74.

Nobili, C. 2020, 'The sanctuary of Delphi in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*: between material culture and intertextuality'. *AN* 16, 15-36.

Pattoni, M.P. 2005. *Longo Sofista. Dafni e Cloe*, Milano: RCS.

Penella, R.J. 2005. 'From the Muses to Eros: Choricius' Epithalamia for student bridegrooms', in: C. Saliou (ed.), *Gaza dans l'antiquité tardive. Archéologie, rhétorique, histoire: actes du colloque international de Poitiers (6-7 mai 2004)*, Salerno: Helios. 135-148.

Pizzone, A. 2005. 'Choriciana', *Eikasmos* 16, 327-335.

Repath, I. 2011. 'Platonic love and erotic education in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*', in: Doulamis 2011, 99-122.

Rizzo, G.E. 1898. 'Saggio su Imerio il sofista', *RFIC* 26, 513-563.

Rommel, H. 1923. *Die naturwissenschaftlich-paradoxographischen Exkurse bei Philostratos, Heliodoros und Achilleus Tatios*, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Ruiz Montero, C. 2007. 'L'Asia Minore nel romanzo greco', in G. Urso (ed.), *Tra Oriente e Occidente. Indigeni, Greci e Romani in Asia Minore,* Pisa: ETS. 259-270.

Russell, D.A. & Wilson, N.G. 1981. *Menander Rhetor. Edited with Translation and Commentary,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Russell, D.A. 1979. 'Rhetors at the wedding', *PCPhS* 25, 104-117.

Schmeling, G. 2005. 'Callirhoe: god-like beauty and the making of a celebrity', in: S. Harrison, M. Paschalis & S. Frangoulidis (eds.), *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel*, Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing & Groningen University Library. 36-49.

Tagliabue, A. (2011), 'Le Efesiache di Senofonte Efesio come una 'Penelopeide', in M.P. Bologna & M. Ornaghi (eds.), *Signa Antiquitatis. Atti dei Seminari di Dipartimento 2010*, Milano: Cisalpino. 121-149.

Vilborg, E. 1962. *Achilles Tatius. Leucippe and Clitophon. A Commentary*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Völker, H. 2003. *Himerios. Reden und Fragmente*, Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

Wheeler, A.L. 1930. 'Tradition and Epithalamium', *AJP* 51, 205-223.

Zanetto G. 2014, 'Greek novel and Greek archaic literature', in: E. Cueva & S. Byrne (eds.), *A Companion to the Ancient Novel*, Chichester & Malden (Mass.): Wiley-Blackwell. 400-410.

Carpe diem, Carpe:
Horace, Petronius, and
the satirical rhetoric of the novel

ILARIA MARCHESI
Hofstra University

Petronius is a keen reader of Horace, in particular of his satirical corpus, and several central elements of the *Cena* have been shown to have an antecedent in Horace's second book of satires.[1] In the past, I have explored some elements of this intertextual dialogue: the catalogue of foods served at the party, the sudden opening of the ceiling to allow the descent of the *apophoreta*, the etiquette of avoiding any allusion to animal fables in the presence of the freedman host link, I have argued, Horace and Petronius.[2] Petronius' interest in presenting Horace as a textual antecedent, however, may affect other areas of Horace's poetic output beyond satire. In this paper, I propose to concentrate on three adjacent scenes of the *Cena Trimalchionis,* in which Petronius allusively evokes three specific details of Horace's *Carmina* 1,11—perhaps his best known lyric poem. I isolate three elements in Horace's poem: the theme of impending death, the futility of astrology, and the gnomic conclusion of the ode, in which Horace sounds the note of *carpe diem,* and I argue that they find an echo in Petronius. In the *Satyrica,* a similar series is constructed in a compact section of the dinner. Trimalchio's epigrammatic meditation on death comes in Chapter 34, the Zodiac plate he presents his guests appears in 35, and his punning on the name *Carpus* follows in 36.[3] In my view, this pointed progression allows an intertextual reading. Once Horace is activated as

---

[1] The argument has a long tradition: see, at least, Mayer 1982, Conte 1996, 57-61, Bodel 1999 and 2003; more recently, Payanotakis 2009.

[2] Marchesi 2005a and 2005b.

[3] From 37 on, the shift being marked by a strong (if ambiguous) signal from the narrator— *non potui amplius quicquam gustare* ('It was impossible for me to taste anything thereafter')—the scene changes, and the focus moves from food to Fortunata.

an antecedent in the memory of Petronius' readers, the three scenes emerge as subtly interconnected and possibly as a threefold rewriting of Horatian material.

If my suggestion of an intertextual relationship at work here has any merit, some suggestions may also be advanced on larger, theoretical issues surrounding the generic identity of the *Satyrica*. In my view, Petronius' keen interest in, and rewriting of Horace, contributes to the construction of the generic identity of his novel. It is not coincidental, as I will show in due course, that the threefold allusive episode culminates with a pun on *carpere*, a verb that in Horace comes very close to being a technical term of the lexicon of satire (*S*. 1,3,21). In redeploying a key-word in Horace's lyrical and satirical poetry, obliquely and through the voice of Trimalchio, the *Satyrica* re-establishes the centrality of the genre of satire and stakes a claim to its inheritance. To use Mikhail Bakhtin's terminology, we can say that when Petronius' novel asks to be read intertextually and targets satire as the intertext of choice, it also offers itself as an example of that omnivorous genre, one capable of digesting and reproducing any language, lyric included.[4]

Let me move to a more detailed reading of the evidence, beginning with the background text:

> *Tu ne quaesieris, scire nefas, quem mihi, quem tibi*
> *finem di dederint, Leuconoë, nec Babylonios*
> *temptaris numeros. ut melius, quidquid erit, pati,*
> *seu pluris hiemes seu tribuit Iuppiter ultimam,*
> *quae nunc oppositis debilitat pumicibus mare*
> *Tyrrhenum, sapias, vina liques, et spatio brevi*
> *spem longam reseces. dum loquimur, fugerit invida*
> *aetas: carpe diem quam minimum credula postero*. (Hor. *C*. 1,11)

Horace's ode opens with a prescriptive imperative dictating the appropriate be-haviour with regard to one's life expectancy. Addressing Leuconoe, the poet's *persona* commands: 'Don't ask—it is forbidden to know—what end the gods gave me or you.' The corollary of the initial precept concerns the means by which the forbidden knowledge may be achieved; namely, astrology: *nec Babylonios / temptaris numeros* ('and do not mess with the calculations of Eastern astrologers'). Having established the notion that foreknowledge of one's time of death does little to change the wisdom by which life should be lived (*sapias*), the ode introduces

---

[4] Bakhtin 1981. For a Bakhtinian reading of the episode, see also Dupont 1977, 69-73. For a more comprehensive analysis of genre and the *Satyrica*, see Christesen & Torlone 2002, and Rimell 2005.

its sympotic note: *vina liques* ('filter the wine'); that is, prepare for the drinking. Of course, the symposium provides the poem with a topically Epicurean, privileged social situation, designed to stand in for the larger mythologeme of 'life beyond cares'. The poem, however, soon abandons the semantic field of the drinking party, and closes in on a metaphor connecting time and the language of agriculture: *spatio brevi / spem longam reseces* ('prune down to a short space your long-reaching hope'). The image of pruning, in turn, introduces the final verb in the poem: *carpe diem* ('seize, that is "pluck", the moment—live in and for this very day').[5]

A similar progression, transcribed in a different cultural (social and intellectual) register, may be found in Petronius' *Cena.* The first element is the meditation on life's brevity. When the first wine, the Falernian of Opimian vintage, is brought in, the host makes his first comment on man's short lifespan: *ergo diutius vivit vinum quam homuncio* ('it looks like wine actually lives longer than we mortals', 34,7). The moral thus expounded will be repeated, in epigrammatic form, soon enough, in response to the display of the silver toy-skeleton:

> *Eheu nos miseros, quam totus homuncio nil est!*
> *Sic erimus cuncti, postquam nos auferet Orcus.*
> *Ergo vivamus, dum licet esse bene.* (34,10)

> Oh poor things we are! What a little bunch of nothing are we mortals!
> We all will be just like that thing, once Death will have snatched us away.
> Let's live, then, while we can eat and be well.

As he is wont to do with all cultural artefacts that he (mis)handles, Trimalchio redeploys Horace's themes and language on the lower level of the material body. Thus, Horace's meditation on death is echoed in Trimalchio's home-spun philosophy of eating and living as one and the same: *vivamus dum licet esse bene*.[6] Incidentally, we should note that Trimalchio's penchant for oracles will eventually lead to an exact calculation of his remaining days. In what comes very close to

---

[5] On the tone of the ode, see Grimm 1963, 314 (didactic), Anderson 1992/3, 115 (protreptic) and, with limitations but thorough bibliography, Maleuvre 1998, 76 (*impérieux*). On the social circumstances, West 1995, 50-52; on the potential vaguely Campanian location for the setting, Grimm 1963, 314, confirmed in West (*sed contra* Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, 136, 'derived from some Greek commonplace' and 140, 'the Italian place-name included to add local colour'). For the three, all Campanian, possible locations of Trimalchio's house, see Bagnani 1954.

[6] On the significance of the pun on *esse* as infinitive of both *sum* ('I am') and *edo* ('I eat'), see Schmeling 2011, 126.

being a pointed reference, Trimalchio achieves exactly what Horace's ode forbids. For the benefit of his audience, Trimalchio recounts how Serapa, an astrologer (*mathematicus*), has predicted that he still has precisely thirty years, four months, and two days to live (77,2).

The second point of contact is, again, thematic. While Leuconoe is invited to abstain from consulting horoscopes and attempting to know the number of days in her (and the poet's) life, Trimalchio's faith in astrological responses spills over into his taste for theatrical cuisine, so much so that he will offer his guests a Zodiac-inspired plate as an appetiser. It is a round plate with a large semi-spherical cover, inscribed with the twelve zodiacal signs, to each of which an appropriately punning food is associated: *rotundum enim repositorium duodecim habebat signa in orbe disposita, super quae proprium convenientemque materiae structor imposuerat cibum* (35,2). Trimalchio's commentary on the plate will occupy several paragraphs, but here again the guests have to swallow another of their host's puns. Attempting to inspire his guests to sample from the novelty-dish he has served, Trimalchio regally imposes the law (or extracts the juice) of the dinner: *hoc est ius cenae* (35,7).[7]

The final point of contact with Horace's ode is again based on a pun, and involves a pointed lexical parallel, hinging on the word *carpe*. During the *cena* Encolpius is often disoriented. The first occasion on which he is totally baffled is when he hears a strange, litany-like, repetition of the word *carpe* coming from Trimalchio (36,7):

> *Non minus et Trimalchio eiusmodi methodio laetus: 'Carpe!', inquit. Processit statim scissor et ad symphoniam gesticulatus ita laceravit obsonium, ut putares essedarium hydraule cantante pugnare. Ingerebat nihilo minus Trimalchio lentissima voce: 'Carpe! Carpe!'*

> At that trick Trimalchio looked like a kid in a candy store, and he went: 'Carve 'er!' The carver came forth right away and dancing at that tune cut open the victuals. He looked like a meals-on-wheels gladiator fighting on an organ soundtrack. And Trimalchio kept saying slower and slower, 'Carve'er, Carver!'

The host is clearly addressing the slave in charge of dividing and serving the hors d'oeuvre contained in the zodiac plate, but the pun escapes the narrator. He thus asks his neighbour to explain what he suspects is some sort of a joke (36,7). The

---

[7] On astrology in the dinner, see De Vreese 1927, 14-22 and 30-34. On death, Barchiesi 1981, 134-139.

more experienced fellow-guest is eager to comply and explains that Trimalchio has aptly named this carver *Carpus*: when he calls out his name, the vocative *Carpe* produces a new pun, equivocating with the singular of the imperative of the verb *carpere*.[8] The third pun in the series has again a Horatian connection. What in Horace appeared as a *callida iunctura*, based on the meaning of the verb *carpere* as 'to pluck', is turned by Trimalchio into an alternative juncture, *carpere obsonium,* which recovers the sense 'to tear apart' that the verb originally possessed.[9]

It should be noted that the three sets of signals are arranged in an increasingly specific order: Trimalchio's speech accompanying the workings of the dinner progresses from an extremely general (and topical) theme of sympotic and convivial conversation—death, to a more specific interest in a facet of the discipline of astrology, in which terminological similarities with Horace make their appearance, finally to reach a marked lexical echo through the word *carpe*. On the one hand, it is only the last element in the progression that clinches the allusion and retrospectively involves the previous paragraphs by activating their potential pertinence; on the other hand, the contextual (rather than textual) connections contribute to making the final, most pointed, pun perceivable. Different stages of pertinence prepare the audience's reaction in different ways. In a diffusedly intertextual culture, any literary enunciation potentially resonates with any other: all spheres of language are always involved when a new enunciation is added to them. Contextual framings such as the one we witness in Petronius define the sphere of interdiscursive pertinence for the audience, pre-selecting specific textual areas in which parallels may be drawn and perceived.[10]

One word on the effect of the intertextual connection that I have proposed thus far is in order. As Perkins has convincingly argued, Trimalchio's puns consistently exploit the polyvalence of words to counterpoint their ideological use. Through them, and to the dismay of the learned section of the audience (37), the novel makes the host's voice heard in the polyphony of the text.[11] To the arguments that Perkins advances from a socio-literary point of view one may add a more strictly literary-historical perspective. In the case of the allusive rewriting of Horace's lyric in which Trimalchio's voice is involved, a fine literary point may be at stake. With his final pun on the carver's name, Trimalchio not only reduces

---

[8] On puns in the dinner, see Sullivan 1968, Dupont 1977, 96-99, Newton 1991 and Perkins 2005.

[9] On the semantics of the term, see Grimm 1963 and Traina 1986.

[10] On textual and contextual elements of confluence in allusive discourse, see Hinds 1998, 34-51.

[11] On the nature of such an audience's learning, see Conte 1996, chapter 4.

human life to gastric processes, but also subtly brings into contact Horace's lyrical (sermonising) self with his self-critiquing counterpart in the *Satires*.

In Horace's lexicon the verb *carpere* appears, in fact, also in a technical sense at least once. The pertinent occurrence is in *Satire* 1,3,21:

> *Maenius absentem Novium cum carperet, 'heus tu'*
> *quidam ait 'ignoras te, an ut ignotum dare nobis*
> *verba putas?' 'egomet mi ignosco' Maenius inquit.*
> *stultus et improbus hic amor est dignusque notari.*

> It is just like that one time at dinner, when Maenius was badmouthing Novius behind his back. 'Hey you,' said this dude, 'have you looked yourself in the mirror lately, or you think we do not know who you are?' And Maenius replied: 'I forgive myself; this self-love is foolish and shameless and worthy of censure'.

Two details are worth noting. First, the comment the satiric *persona* makes about Maenius' self-love employs a technical verb of satire: *notare* ('to take note', but also 'point out and indict'). A series of plays on this verb will be at the centre of the poem immediately following, which implicitly connects Horace's Greek comedic models, his father, and eventually his own activity as a satirist through the repeated use of this same verb (*S.* 1,4,5 and 106). Second, the same notion of malignant satire as a degeneration of healthy social and moral critique will be taken up again, in the metapoetic meditation along the same lines in *Satire* 1,4,81 where the verb *carpere* is replaced by *rodere*, with the same force:

> *... absentem qui rodit, amicum*
> *qui non defendit alio culpante, ...*
> *hic niger est, hunc tu, Romane, caveto* (81-85).

> Whoever attacks a friend behind his back… or who does not defend him when others attack… he is the bilious spirit: watch out for him, my fellow Roman.

The sense of *carpere* as a satirical term, of a satire from which all authors claim (and strive) to distance themselves, is not confined to Horace.[12] It is in the same sense that Pliny, in his redeployment (epigrammatic, Martial-like) of the *topos* of the city-country *syncrisis* in *Epistle* 1,9,5, uses the term, when he notes that in the bustle of the city:

---

[12] In addition to *S.* 1,4, see also *sale nigro* in *S.* 2,4,74 and *Ep.*2,2,60.

nihil audio, quod audisse, nihil dico, quod dixisse paeniteat; nemo apud me quemquam sinistris sermonibus carpit, neminem ipse reprehendo, nisi tamen me cum parum commode scribo.

I do not have to hear nor I have to say anything that I will regret: there are no mean gossips at my table, I don't scold anyone except, sometimes, myself, for my careless writing.

It might be worth noting that Pliny too is locating the action of *carpere* at a specific social ritual, the dinner: in the context of the letter, a*pud me* means, of course, at my table. I am not arguing that Pliny should be taken as a third party involved in the delicate literary negotiations going on between Horace and Petronius, even though Pliny's letters have more in common with another peripherally satirical text, Martial's *Epigrams*, than we have been used to thinking; and *carpere*, as counter-satirical verb, comes back in Martial too: *emendare meos, quos novit fama, libellos / et tibi permittis felicis carpere nugas* ('you grant yourself permission to criticise my booklets, valued and famed, / and to attack the success of these trifles,' 6,64). What I am trying to show is, rather, that the connection that we detect in Trimalchio's pun is not as unexpected as it may sound at first. Pliny's parallel text suggests that the term *carpe* has reached the language of the *Satyrica* with convivial, if not even culinary, connotations.[13]

It remains at this point to clarify how the satirical context reconstructed above may be used to enrich our perception of Petronius as a novelist. In *Satire* 1,4, together with an outline of the literary history of the genre, Horace lays out the ground-rules for the production of satirical poetry. We should remember that for him satire barely qualifies as poetry (1,4,40-42):

> *… Neque enim concludere versum*
> *dixeris esse satis; neque si qui scribat uti nos*
> *sermoni propiora, putes hunc esse poetam.*

It is not enough, you'd admit, to round off a line nor you would think that one is a poet if he wrote, like me, lines that border on conversation.

Were it not for its hexametric scansion, allegedly dispensable, satire would be ordinary speech, *sermo merus* (1,4,47-48). Horace's appeal to the category of ordinary conversation is rhetorically motivated; yet the practice of allowing a

---

[13] The first literary-historical connection relates, of course, to the issue of the appropriate tone to be kept in satire. See Freudenburg 2007, 20-21.

dialogue between socially and culturally connoted voices (a dominant feature in
the second book of his satires) extends to the whole corpus of Horace's hexametric
poetry, shattering its potentially monologic diction.[14] In this respect, satire is an
acknowledged antecedent of the novel's polyphony.

It is on this particular aspect of Horace's *Satires*—a feature that Bakhtin will
deem essential to his definition of the novel as un-epic—that Petronius appears to
insist in his allusive game. In the *Cena*, Petronius carefully organises a small clus-
ter of allusions which signal that Horace is a pertinent intertext. Poetic allusions,
the oblique but still audible evocation of connoted language, are signals that the
learned audience may be able to perceive. Once notice of them has been taken,
Petronius' allusions ask to be read as a genealogical marker: they connect Hor-
ace's and Petronius' experiments with different, but not unrelated, areas of the
genre of Satire. In the wide array of satirical techniques available in the Latin
tradition, Petronius has chosen different tools from Horace and brought them into
play in the frame of a novelistic organism—and yet, what he does might have
appeared to his first readers less heterogeneous to satire than it does today.

Bibliography

Anderson, W.S. 1992/93. 'Horace's different recommenders of *Carpe Diem* in C. 1.4, 7, 9, 11',
    CJ 88, 115-122.
Bakhtin, M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl
    Emerson & Michael Holquist, Austin: University of Texas Press.
Bagnani, G. 1954. 'Trimalchio', *Phoenix* 8, 77-91.
Barchiesi, M. 1981. 'L'orologio di Trimalchione (struttura e tempo narrativo in Petronio)', in:
    I moderni alla ricerca di Enea, Rome: Bulzoni, 109-146.
Bodel, J. 1999. 'The Cena Trimalchionis', in H. Hofmann (ed.), *Latin Fiction. The Latin Novel
    in Context*. London. 38–51.
—— 2003. 'Captatio at Croton: Petronius and Horace', in: *O qui complexus et gaudia quanta
    fuerunt. Essays Presented to Michael C. J. Putnam by His Brown Colleagues on the Oc-
    casion of his 70th Birthday,* 1-15. Providence: Brown University.
Christesen, P. & Torlone, Z. (2002). '*Ex omnibus in unum, nec hoc nec illud*: genre in Petro-
    nius', *MD* 49, 135-172.
Conte, G.B. 1996. *The Hidden Author*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
De Vreese, J. 1927. *Petron 39 und die Astrologie.* Amsterdam: J.H. Paris.
Dupont, F. 1977. *Le plaisir et la loi. Du 'Banquet' de Platon au 'Satiricon'.* Paris: F. Maspero.
Freudenburg, K. 2001. *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal.* Cam-
    bridge: Cambridge University Press.
—— 2007. *'La satira a Roma',* in: *Musa Pedestre: Storia e interpretazione della satira in Roma
    antica.* Rome: Carocci, 13-33.
Grimm, E.R., 1963. 'Horace's *Carpe Diem*', *CJ* 58, 313-318.

---

[14] On the socially stratified dialogism, see Knoche 1975 and Freudenburg 2001.

Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Knoche, U. 1975. *Roman Satire*. Bloomington & London: Indiana University Press.

Maleuvre, J-Y. 1998. 'Carpe diem quam minimum (Hor. *Od. I, 11)?' LEC* 66, 73-82.

Mayer, R. 1982. 'Neronian Classicism', *AJP* 102, 305-318.

Marchesi, I, 2005a. 'In memory of Simonides: poetry and mnemotecnics *chez* Nasidienus', *TAPA* 135, 393-402.

— 2005b. 'Traces of a freed language: Horace, Petronius and the rhetoric of fables', *ClAnt* 24, 307-330.

Newton, R. M. 1991. 'Petronian urbanity in the *Carpe, Carpe* joke (Pet. Sat. 35.7-36.8)', *SyllClass* 3, 67-70.

Nisbet, R.G.M, & Hubbard, M. 1970. *A Commentary on Horace Odes, Book I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Panayotakis, C. 2009. 'Petronius and the Roman literary tradition', in: J. Prag & I. Repath (eds.), *Petronius: A Handbook*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 48-64.

Perkins, J. 2005. 'Trimalchio: naming power', in: S. Harrison, M. Paschalis & S. Frangoulidis (eds.), *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel*. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 4. Groningen: Barkhuis, 139-162.

Rimell, V. 2005. 'The satiric maze: Petronius, satire, and the novel', in: K. Freudenburg (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 160-176.

Traina, A. 1986. 'Semantica del Carpe Diem', in: P*oeti latini (e neolatini): note e saggi filologici*. Bologna: Pàtron, 227-251.

Schmeling, G.L. 2011. *A Commentary on the Satyrica of Petronius.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sullivan, J. P. 1968. *The 'Satyricon' of Petronius: A Literary Study*. Bloomington & London: Indiana University Press.

West, D. 1995. *Horace Odes I: Carpe Diem*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Callirhoe's silenced dilemma
(Chariton 6,7,13)

SILVIA MONTIGLIO
Johns Hopkins University

Characters in Chariton's *Callirhoe* like to stop and ponder.[1] *Skepsis*, the careful evaluation of circumstances leading to a decision, is a recurrent term in this novel, with a number of characters engaging in this activity at some point in the narrative: Theron (1,7,2), Callirhoe (2,10,7), Mithridates (4,3,12), Artaxerxes (4,6,6; 6,1,9; 6,3,7), his eunuch Artaxates (6,6,2), Persian women (5,3,1), Polycharmus (7,1,7), the Pharaoh (7,5,7), the Egyptian soldier sent to communicate with Callirhoe when she is a prisoner of Chaereas (7,6,9). Of the various kinds of internal debates dilemmas are particularly dear to Chariton, who employs them to build up pathos at crucial junctures. Three main actors are shown arguing with themselves, prey to conflicting demands.[2] Both Dionysius (2,4,4-5) and Artaxerxes (6,1,8-12; 6,3,8) are torn between their erotic desire for Callirhoe and their wish to preserve dignity and respectability. The most elaborate and decisive dilemma, however, is Callirhoe's own—when, on discovering her pregnancy, she debates within herself whether to dispose of the unborn child or to marry Dionysius, and resolves for the latter (2,9,2-6; 2,11,1-3). That the chief protagonist of the novel stages a fully-developed dilemma bears out the importance of this device in Chariton's narrative technique. Dilemmas are among the 'formulaic' features of this novel.[3]

This paper focuses on a short episode which could have grown into another fully-staged dilemma but does not, because Chariton cuts it short and replaces it with a sudden turn of events. I shall try to show why I believe that the episode

---

[1] This paper was originally delivered at ICAN IV in 2008 and revised for publication in 2011. Its core remains unchanged.

[2] The three dilemmas are identified by Kaimio 1996, 55-56.

[3] On Chariton's formulaic style, see Schmeling 1974, 44, 151 and especially Ruiz-Montero 1994, 1025-1026. On Callirhoe's dilemmas see De Temmerman 2014, 61-73, who notes that in Chariton moral quandaries are frequently used to flesh out a character.

suggests a potential quandary, and discuss Chariton's choice not to resort to one of his favorite narrative devices at this point. What does the intimation of a dilemma, then its failure to materialize, accomplish in the narrative?

The episode is at 6,7,13: the eunuch Artaxates, at a loss as to how to persuade Callirhoe to yield to Artaxerxes' passion, and realizing that she is still in love with Chaereas, tells her: 'I shall allow you time for consideration (*skepseōs*). Think (*skeptou*) not only of yourself, but also of Chaereas. He risks the most pitiful death, for the king will not allow himself to be beaten in love.' Chariton comments: 'these final words affected Callirhoe'. We do not learn anything, however, about her thoughts, because Tyche rushes in to put a quick end to all *skepsis* and talk of love. A war between Persia and Egypt is about to begin.

Several features of the episode build up expectations for the deployment of a dilemma when instead Tyche intervenes. First, Chariton's comment that the eunuch's last words preyed on Callirhoe's mind invites the questions, 'How? What was she thinking?' Had Chariton not wished to suggest the possibility of a quandary, probably he would not have mentioned the strong impression those words made on the heroine. Second, on the level of diction, the recurrence of the term *skepsis* harks back to the scene of Callirhoe's dilemma between the demands of fidelity and those of maternal feelings, for on that occasion *skepsis* is used in an almost identical construction (cf. 2,10,7: *kairon eis skepsin*, and 6,7,13: *skepseōs kairon*). Furthermore, a number of significant thematic and structural correspondences connect our episode to that dilemma. The distribution of the actors is identical: Callirhoe, a slave, and the slave's lovesick master. Both scenes are preceded by the lovesick man's own conflict (Dionysius' in the first, Artaxerxes' in the second) and in both the cunning slave (Plangon and Artaxates respectively) knows that the master is in love but pretends not to know.[4] In both cases Tyche frames the episode: at 2,8,3-4, by revealing Callirhoe's pregnancy, she creates the circumstances that cause the dilemma; at 6,8,1, by suddenly initiating the war, she puts an end to the state of affairs that could have caused the dilemma. Finally, the staging of another quandary in Book 6 is to be expected owing to Chariton's tendency gradually to slow down the tempo of the narrative until it comes to a dramatic standstill. In Bryan Reardon's description,[5] Chariton's technique 'proceeds by means, first, of rapid narrative summarizing a sequence of events; then, by degrees, the tempo slows, and finally, a "scene" materializes, displaying the actions, thoughts, utterances of an important character at an important juncture of events—Callirhoe, for instance, deliberating whether or not to marry Dionysius.'

---

[4] The two episodes have recently been compared by De Temmerman 2014, 61-73, who argues that in the second Callirhoe is more in control of her interlocutor and of her emotions.

[5] See Reardon 1982, 11 (1999, 172-173).

A 'scene' of this kind is precisely what is missing from the last episode with Artaxates in Book 6. We expect it all the more because the previous encounter with Artaxates ends with such a 'scene,' and one which contains, if not a dilemma, a mental fluctuation resulting in a change of plan. Once left alone, Callirhoe urges herself to embrace suicide, then resolves to wait and see whether things get worse: 'Come, Callirhoe, decide on a noble gesture, worthy of Hermocrates. Kill yourself! But—not yet. So far you have had only a first approach, and by a eunuch, but if something more violent should happen, then will be the time for you to show Chaereas, in his presence, your loyalty' (6,6,5).

Why then does Chariton first set the stage for another dilemma and then avoid developing it?

Perhaps he saw that such a dilemma could not be followed through without disgracing his heroine. For where would it take her? In Book 2 both options—to stay loyal to Chaereas or to save their child—are morally acceptable, as Plangon, Dionysius' slave, does not fail to tell her (2,10,8). But in Book 6? The only honorable option would be suicide, which had dawned on her after her previous interview with Artaxates, and which a cultivated reader might see suggested again, during the second interview, in the allusion to the story of Gyges and Candaules in Herodotus, in which Gyges, for having seen Candaules' wife naked, must choose between killing himself or her husband: 'It is then up to you to decide which of these two roads you want to take' (Hdt. 1,11,2, echoed at 6,7,7). Callirhoe could have attempted suicide but been rescued by some incident, as happens to Anthia in Xenophon's novel.

The reader, however, is unlikely to expect the heroine to do violence to herself, for two reasons: first in view of her characterization, for she is not suicidal—even when she contemplates killing herself in her dealings with Artaxates, she qualifies her intention with a 'not yet'—; and, second, given the outcome of her previous dilemma, for which suicide, from an aristocratic moral standpoint, would also have been the most honorable solution, which perhaps for a moment Callirhoe considered, but did not choose.[6] Which solution then can we imagine for the dilemma in Book 6? Surely not that Callirhoe will let Chaereas die. Because that option most blatantly clashes with the *ethos* of this novel and of the genre at large, only betrayal of her marriage is really left as a possibility.

---

[6] Callirhoe says to her unborn baby: 'and you, child, what do you choose for yourself? To die by poison before seeing the sun and to be cast out with your mother, perhaps even without being deemed worthy of a grave?' (2,11,2). Though the phrase 'to be cast out with your mother' is vague and opaque, it seems to suggest that Callirhoe would die with the child: see Trzaskoma 2010, 222. The thought of suicide would build yet another parallel with the episode in Book 6.

Callirhoe's past history and perhaps a certain ambiguity in her marital morals[7]—
which seems to surface even in Babylon, the setting of the suppressed dilemma,
if Dionysius is not merely venting his jealousy when he says that he does not know
which of her husbands Callirhoe prefers (5,10,4)—tickle the reader into thinking
that she might go this way once more. But how would she look if she betrayed
Chaereas again (albeit to save his life), and this time not even by marrying a rival
while she thinks that Chaereas is dead but by committing adultery (the king, she
is told, is interested only in episodic sex) when she knows that he is alive and near
her? The development of a dilemma is impracticable because no option would be
tenable. The intervention of fortune shows that the story has reached an impasse,
that there is need for a *deus ex machina*.[8] Chariton is playing with the idea that
Callirhoe might have betrayed Chaereas again and he is letting the reader imagine
this by setting the stage for a dilemma which, in light of her previous one, could
have resulted in another betrayal, but by preventing this second quandary from
unfolding he preserves the moral stature of his heroine.

The avoidance of a vocalized inner conflict also shows that Chariton is con-
cerned about sustaining his readers' interest now that the novel is past the half-
way point. The readers, likely as they are to expect another dilemma, are taken by
surprise and left 'hungry' by its absence, which might disappoint them (what? no
dilemma this time?), but also pricks their curiosity (what will happen instead?);
though, perhaps, Chariton would have done better if he had whetted the readers'
appetite by sketching the beginnings of the dilemma then suddenly breaking it off,
rather than by not letting it happen at all. He could have shown Callirhoe, as soon
as the eunuch left her alone, asking herself: 'What shall I do now? Yield to the
king's passion or expose Chaereas to death?', and then given her no time to dwell
on the options and us no certainty about her inclinations.

Our curiosity, however, is quickly diverted by the unexpected development,
the outbreak of the war. By suggesting and then avoiding the deployment of an-
other dilemma, Chariton also signals the imminent transition in his narrative to a
radically different mode of action: instead of yet another debate, war; instead of
fights with words, fights with arms. Up to Book 7, discussion in its many forms
and settings—assemblies, trials, deliberations among smaller or larger groups,
and of course within oneself, including dilemmas—has been the dominant mode
of action in Chariton's novel. The end of Book 6 marks the end of such debates:

---

[7] See Biraud 1985, 26.
[8] Though Tyche is a tyrant, Chariton tends to motivate action naturally: see Reardon 2003,
328-329, 335. Reardon, though, cites the end of Book 6 as an instance in which Tyche is
called in 'to solve the insoluble problem of what to do with Callirhoe' (335). I would add,
'and with her feelings'.

the trial is suspended (6,2,3)—and Callirhoe is not allowed to ponder. For her fate is going to be settled on the battlefield:[9] 'I will get judgment in war' (7,1,11), says Chaereas as soon as he joins the Pharaoh's troops; 'war has decided the trial' (7,5,15), claims Artaxerxes as he allots Callirhoe to Dionysius; 'you were going to decide the trial, but I was declared the winner by the fairest judge…war' (8,4,2), writes Chaereas to the king.

This substitution of arms for words as a test for valor goes hand in hand with a change in literary models, from tragedy to epic: the term *drama*, so common in this novel, disappears in Book 7. Because dilemmas are a feature of tragedy, especially Euripides',[10] the absence of one such narrative device where we would expect it aptly prepares for this shift in the action and narrative style from dramatic to epic, from the staging of *agōnes* and psychological conflicts in the manner of Euripides to the display of a military *aristeia* in the mold of the *Iliad*.

The protagonist of this epic feat of arms is Chaereas, who takes his wife's place as the main character in the novel. In addition to preserving Callirhoe's nobility, the suppression of her dilemma marks her temporary disappearance from the narrative. We hardly hear from or about her again until the end of the war, when she rejects marriage with the unknown admiral who will turn out to be Chaereas himself (7,6,8). That the emergence of Chaereas is preceded by the avoidance of a dilemma fits his characterization, for he is the very opposite of Callirhoe in this respect: while she is the queen of quandaries, he has no experience of them. By not allowing Callirhoe's dilemma to unfold as Chaereas is about to take over in Book 7, Chariton both prepares for the transition in literary models from Attic tragedy to the *Iliad* and 'removes' from the narrative a mental behavior alien to the protagonist of the forthcoming epic section of the novel.

Chaereas, unlike his wife, hardly ever engages in *skepsis* (the term is referred to him once, but after the war).[11] Whereas Callirhoe knows how to choose and does so after careful consideration,[12] Chaereas is unable to decide for the better—his typical choice would be suicide, while she never attempts it[13]—or even to think about the available options. The terms *logismos*/*logizomai*, which, in addition to *skepsis*, describe many a character's reasoning over a course of action, are never applied to him. In this respect, once again, he contrasts most sharply with Callirhoe, to whom *logismos* is attributed with more frequency than to any other

----

[9] See Reardon 1982, 9 (1999, 170-171); Lalanne 1998, 524, 531; Guez 2001.
[10] See Kaimio 1996, 55-56.
[11] 8,2,9. See below.
[12] Reardon 1982, 23 (1999, 184).
[13] The contrast is often noted: see, e.g., Konstan 1994, 17; De Temmerman 2014, 85.

character, followed by Dionysius,[14] Chaereas' rival and in many ways his opposite. Mithridates criticizes Chaereas precisely for lacking *logismos* when he requests to be allowed to go immediately to Miletus to claim his wife: the circumstances demand prudent deliberation (*bouleusasthai ... phronimōteron*) and consideration (*skepsis*) whereas Chaereas is acting precipitously, following 'passion (*pathos*) rather than reason (*logismos*)' (4,3,12-4,4,3). The phrase sets Chaereas' impulsive behavior against Dionysius' tormented self-scrutiny as he tries to oppose his love —a 'struggle between reason (*logismos*) and passion (*pathos*)' (2,4,4)—and as he wavers after the trial—'arbitrating on the battle between love (*erōs*) and reason (*logismos*)' (5,10,6).

Chaereas' inability to face dilemmas comes to light most noticeably when he sets out to go in search of his wife the second time: incapable of choosing between his parents' appeal to stay and his inner urge to leave, he attempts suicide (3,5,6). His rushed gesture is described precisely as the dodging of a dilemma: 'he threw himself from the ship into the sea wishing to die, *in order to avoid having to choose between these two options* (ἵνα φύγῃ δυοῖν θάτερον), either not to look for Callirhoe or to upset his parents.' ἵνα φύγῃ δυοῖν θάτερον harks back to ἴσθι ὅτι δεήσει δυοῖν θάτερον, 'know that one of these two things will be necessary' (2,10,4), the words which confront Callirhoe with her dilemma. Chaereas' unreflective behavior contrasts with Callirhoe's thoughtfulness even as she contemplates suicide (6,6,5).

Chaereas' impulsiveness is reminiscent of Achilles'.[15] Whereas Callirhoe is able to restrain her temper (6,5,8) and to ward off the enemy's by cautious behavior, for instance when she pretends to believe Theron's stories (1,11,2), Chaereas shares with Achilles his acting in anger: it is blind with fury that he bursts into his room and upon Callirhoe herself when his jealousy is first aroused (1,3,4), and it is 'dominated by anger' that he kicks his wife (1,4,12: κρατούμενος…ὑπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς). Chaereas' rage is destructive to his own friends, like Achilles'. It 'kills' his wife and upsets the whole city of Syracuse, just as Achilles' ruins many of his fellows.

Chaereas' entry into the war likewise recalls Achilles' return to war in three important respects: both satisfy purely personal needs; both are caused by otherwise unmanageable grief over the loss of the person most dearly loved; and both are suicidal gestures.[16] The similarity extends to the level of detail. When he finds

---

[14] Callirhoe: see 1,8,2; 1,9,4; 2,9,1; 2,9,3; 2,9,6; 2,11,4; 6,5,8; Dionysius: see 2,4,4; 3,2,7; 5,2,9. Other characters who engage in *logismos* are the suitors (1,2,4), Theron (1,7,3), Plangon (2,9,1), Artaxerxes and Statira (6,1,6).

[15] Chaereas is associated with (an image of) Achilles when he is first introduced (1,1,3).

[16] On the suicidal nature of Chaereas' joining the war, see Fusillo 1990, 38; Konstan 1994, 16-17. Konstan calls Chaereas' 'a grand suicidal gesture'. Against this position, Scourfield

out that Patroclus is dead, Achilles pours dirt over his head, disgraces his beautiful face and rends his hair (*Il.* 18,22-27); Chaereas, upon discovering that Callirhoe has allegedly been assigned to his rival, tears his clothes, rends his hair and strikes his chest (7,1,5). Achilles' demeanor makes Antilochus fear lest he take his life (*Il.* 18,34); Chaereas contemplates suicide (7,1,6). Like Achilles when he resumes fighting with full knowledge of his impending death, Chaereas goes to war despising death and seeking revenge. He and his friend have 'love for death' and he lives only to harm the enemy (7,2,4), like Achilles.

Once he enters the fray, Chaereas continues to imitate Achilles, though now with his warlike spirit and might: he leads the Myrmidons, as has been aptly put.[17] When he and his soldiers prepare to storm Tyre, his powerful advance is described by means of a Homeric line that applies to the Myrmidons spurred on by Achilles: 'shield pressed on shield, helmet on helmet, man on man' (7,4,3 = *Il.* 16,215).[18] In the account of the storming, another Homeric line assimilates him to another great fighter, Diomedes: 'he smote left and right, and an awful groaning rose from them' (*Il.* 10,483).[19] This verse, which is followed by a lion simile that Chariton also proceeds to echo, describes Diomedes as he decimates the Thracians while Odysseus clears the ground of their bodies. Chaereas like Diomedes is undergoing a military initiation.

(2003, 16 and 172) argues that 'the action to which it [Chaereas' decision to fight] gives rise is taken with deliberation and thought for the consequences'. Though this interpretation has the merit of highlighting the meaningfulness of the war for Chaereas' maturation, it disregards the explicitness of the text. It is not Chaereas who decides to go to war, but his friend.

[17] De Temmerman 2014, 92. The mournful Achilles, however, is still behind the picture of Chaereas. As Hunter 1994, 1083, n. 139 observes, his refusal to celebrate at 7,4,10 is reminiscent of Achilles' behavior after the death of Patroclus. See also Schmeling 1974, 125. Scourfield 2003, 173 correctly points out that Chaereas' 'second anger', unlike his first, obtains positive results—just the same as Achilles'. For more features shared by Achilles and Chaereas, see Hirschberger 2001, 169-170 and De Temmerman 2014, 82-114.

[18] On the meaningfulness of Homeric allusions in Chariton, see Billault 1981, 210 and 1991, 110-116; Biraud 1985; Fusillo 1990; Ruiz-Montero 1994, 1017 (a review of the bibliography on the subject to date); Robiano 2000, 529; Hirschberger 2001; Baumbach 2011.

[19] While several scholars have recognized the reference (Fusillo 1990, 39; Hunter 1994, 1083; Robiano 2000, 527; Scourfield 2003, 172, n. 44), they have not discussed its implications for the characterization of Chaereas, except for De Temmerman 2014, 94-96, who thinks that the assimilation of Chaereas to Diomedes evokes his behavior prior to Book 7, depicting him as harsh and violent. At the same time, the episode from the *Doloneia* cited by Chariton (7,4,6) and Diomedes' rebuke to Agamemnon, also alluded to (see below), display the self-confidence of a young warrior who has proven himself.

Ancient commentators saw in Diomedes the young warrior acquiring authority as a consequence of his feats of arms. So, for instance, the author of the pseudo-Plutarchean *Life and Poetry of Homer*, a text not too distant in date from Chariton's novel: 'Diomedes, with the boldness of youth and the outspokenness to which he has a right because of his recent display of excellence as a fighter—before demonstrating his own bravery, he had passed over in silence a rebuke from the king—upbraids Agamemnon for having counseled flight and cowardice' (168). Chaereas imitates precisely the character singled out and admired in this passage. Just as Diomedes' courageous plea resolves the dejected silence ensuing from Agamemnon's defeatist proposal (*Il*. 9,29-30: 'Thus he [Agamemnon] spoke, and they all were hushed in silence. For long the sons of the Achaeans, upset, remained silent'), Chaereas' exhortation to be upbeat in war puts an end to the demoralized silence caused by a proposal of withdrawal (7,3,3: '…silence and depression held them all'). Just as Diomedes challenges Agamemnon by volunteering to fight on (*Il*. 9,48-49), Chaereas tells the Pharaoh that he and his friend will never flee but will go into the fray (7,3,5, modifying *Il*. 9,48-49).

Like Diomedes, Chaereas acquires political authority as a result of his military accomplishments. Whereas before the war he hardly decides—even the resolve to participate in it is Polycharmus'— as soon as he enlists he takes the upper hand: it is he who does the talking already when he and his friend introduce themselves to the Pharaoh (7,2,3). The reckless and suicidal youth is now credited with *phronēsis* and *paideia* (7,2,5-6).[20] Whereas at the beginning of the novel his victory against Callirhoe's suitors is no real victory because it costs him no effort (as the suitors themselves point out at 1,2,2), by proving himself on the battlefield he successfully beats back Callirhoe's second set of suitors. Moreover he is ready to become the successor of Hermocrates, whom he is encouraged to imitate (7,5,8), and, like him, he is entitled to make decisions concerning the entire community, not just his private life. He is an adult man, an *anēr*.[21] His initial Achilles-like suicidal gesture thus results in a Diomedes-like accession to full adulthood and

---

[20] On this coupling, see Jones 2007, 123.
[21] See Lalanne 1998, 534; 2006, 91-92, 156-59 and now further De Temmerman 2014, 82-114, who emphasizes that Chaereas also learns how to exert control over others.

power.[22] His transformation into a successful epic hero is underlined by Homeric quotations, since from Book 7 on all but one are applied to him.[23]

The mature Chaereas, however, does not learn to stop and ponder. In the course of the fighting he knows (or thinks he knows) what to do and how to do it. Though he shows a higher degree of self-control than before the war, for instance when he refrains from pursuing the beautiful woman who will turn out to be Callirhoe (7,6,12), and though he even employs Odysseus-like cunning in attacking Tyre, he remains impulsive in so far as he does not take the time to consider various options or the fairness of an action. For him to bring the Persian queen and her retinue to Syracuse as Callirhoe's servants is just the right thing to do. The thought does not occur to him that it might be otherwise, until, upon his wife's exhortation not to do such a thing, he straightaway changes his mind to please her—again, without stopping to think (8,3,1-3). In addition to ignoring dilemmas in moral matters, Chaereas hardly has any experience of them in military matters either. It is his wife's thoughtfulness that guides him even in this domain: at the announcement that the Pharaoh has been killed and that the Persian king is approaching, Chaereas immediately starts off, but Callirhoe restrains him and persuades him to consider the situation (8,2,4). It is only as a result of her advice that he comes up with an intelligent trick and then stops to think and decide on a course of action: 'he was considering (*skeptomenou*) what to do next' (8,2,9). This is the first and only time that the verb *skeptomai* is used about Chaereas and the first and only time Chariton shows him deliberating with himself. But the deliberation is quickly superseded by a boost of self-confidence (*tharrēsas*) at the announcement that the omens are good (*ibid.*).

---

[22] Chaereas' *aristeia*, however, combines Homeric individualism with the hoplite ideal of courage (on the development from one ideal to the other see Smoes 1995, 46-48, 79). The historical setting of this novel is mirrored in Chaereas' behavior as the commander of a hoplite army, modeled on the 300 Spartans at Thermopylae (7,3,9 and 11) and fighting in battle-order: the Homeric line 'shield pressed on shield, helmet on helmet, man on man', which in Homer describes the fierceness of the fray, in Chariton describes the compactness of Chaereas' army (7,4,3). Though fashioned after Diomedes, Chaereas also deploys the rhetoric typical of the hoplite leader ('my ambition is for the common good, not my glory', 7,3,10). The use of the lion simile reveals this combination of models. At *Il.* 10,485-486, the simile prolongs the description of Diomedes' individual *aristeia*: he is the lion slaughtering many sheep. In Chariton, Chaereas' individual heroism, couched in the words of *Il.* 10,483, meets with a *collective* heroic response from his soldiers, who are compared to lions slaughtering cattle: the simile is in the plural (7,4,6).

[23] See Baumbach 2011, 268. The exception is 8,5,2 where *Il.* 19,302 is referred to the Persian nobles in mourning.

By representing Chaereas as a stranger to quandaries even in the area of strategic action, Chariton opposes him to the pirate Theron, the master of prudence, cunning, and calculated thinking. Theron is a degraded copy of Odysseus: his 'Cretan tales', his claims to piety, his cheating his companions (3,3,12), are all perverted allusions to Odysseus.[24] Another feature he shares with Odysseus is the ability to consider every possible course of action. For instance, when he decides to rob Callirhoe's tomb, he stops to deliberate: whom to hire for the job? And he sleeplessly reviews options and risks (1,7,2-3). Once he discovers Callirhoe in the tomb his first thought is to kill her, but then he changes his mind after considering profit, *kerdos* (1,9,6). *Kerdos* is a primary concern for him (1,10,8; 1,12,1), as for Odysseus. Theron's dilemmas, unlike those of Callirhoe, Dionysius and Artaxerxes, are about sheer personal advantage regardless of the morality of the options involved, in this respect again similar to Odysseus'; except, of course, that Odysseus' advantage in Homer is also morally right, whereas Theron's is not. In that he puts his cleverness to the service of immoral deeds, Theron rather recalls the Odysseus of tragedy. This sentence about him brings to mind statements about Odysseus in 5th-century drama: 'he is a cunning rogue (*panourgos*) and clever (*deinos*) at adapting himself to every opportunity' (1,13,2). Chaereas is thus characterized in opposition to his chief antagonists, who experience dilemmas either as moral subjects (Dionysius, Artaxerxes) or to secure success for themselves (Theron).[25]

To conclude: the suppression of Callirhoe's dilemma in Book 6 has the purpose, first, of signaling a transition from a dramatic to an epic style of narrative, and content-wise from tragic-like *agōnes* to an Iliadic *aristeia*, whose protagonist, furthermore, is the character the least prone to dilemmas; and, second, it allows the narrator to circumvent the unsolvable issue of Callirhoe's choice between two unacceptable evils, and thus to preserve the heroine's integrity. But this is not all. The silencing of her quandary has weightier implications,[26] for it spells out the philosophy of this novel, namely, that dilemmas are irrelevant for the course the action will take, since more powerful forces in any case rule the show. The ability to engage in deliberations and make pondered decisions gives humans the illusion that they have some control over their lives, but in fact events follow their course according to the dictates of uncontrollable forces, call them Eros or Tyche. That life's plot is written by them, not by us, comes to light most clearly at the beginning of Book 8, where, as in a Euripidean prologue, Aphrodite designs the action from above, stopping Tyche's plan to push her own. The failure of Callirhoe's last

---

[24] See Kasprzyk 2001, 160.
[25] On Theron as the dominant male character until he dies, see Schmeling 1974, 107.
[26] What follows draws on Montiglio 2010, 32-34.

dilemma to materialize brings out the helplessness of human endeavors in the face of Eros, Tyche, or Aphrodite. It intimates that excruciating pondering is ultimately pointless if those forces work against one's aspirations. Even when they occur, quandaries are shown to be of no avail, since they result in the defeat of *logismos* and the victory of Tyche/Eros. So it is with Dionysius and Artaxerxes. Their *logismos* fails to hold on to its 'beautiful decision' (2,4,5; 6,4,5) because that decision is not in harmony with the plans of those ruling powers. 'Philosophy' cannot compete with Eros (2,4,5: ψυχὴν ἐν ἔρωτι φιλοσοφοῦσαν).

Callirhoe's dilemma in Book 2 is only apparently different. Though she wavers between two more acceptable options, both charged with emotional meaning and both requiring a comparable sacrifice, from the start her 'decision' is framed as the defeat of her *logismos* at the hands of Tyche, who has opposed her resolution to stay loyal to Chaereas (2,8,3) and therefore decides for her. Tyche's attack on Callirhoe's firm resolve is a lesson for us all: it is there to show that human reasoning (*logismos anthrōpou*) as a rule is powerless if not in line with Fortune's plans (*ibid.*). Fortune likes to take a different road from the one mapped out by human deliberation (4,5,3),[27] and to baffle rationality in general (8,1,2).[28]

This stress on Tyche's power to confound human reason resonates with a fragment of Menander which urges us to renounce our intelligence in the face of fortune: 'Give up your reason, for human reason counts for nothing, only that of Fortune does…The foresight of mortals is but smoke, an empty word. Believe what I say and don't blame me for it: everything we think, say, or do is the work of Fortune…' (fr. 417 Koerte-Thierfelder).[29] Chariton seems to echo this fragment at 3,3,8: 'Then human effort turned out to be totally ineffective, and Tyche brought the truth to light, Tyche, without which no action can be accomplished.' The suppression of Callirhoe's dilemma in Book 6 illustrates the uselessness of human reason as stated by Menander and by Chariton himself: as Callirhoe is about to ponder again, Chariton stops her right away to bring in the true director of the action, Tyche. The defeat of human reasoning by Fortune, proclaimed in Book 2, culminates in the silence imposed on the voice of reasoning by the abrupt intervention of Fortune.

---

[27] Fusillo (2003, 284) is correct in pointing out that 'the model of the world expressed by Xenophon [of Ephesus] is quite pragmatic, totally oppressed by Fortune, while that laid out by Chariton gives more space to psychological dynamics.' In the case of dilemmas, however, the characters' 'psychological dynamics', while dramatizing their inner fights, cannot achieve anything without the support of fortune.

[28] See Van Steen 1998, 207. This scholar notes that only once (at 4,4,2) does a character meet the attack of Fortune with a call for deliberation.

[29] The 'reason of Tyche' is of course a paradox. On this fragment, see Vogt-Spira 1992, 73.

Bibliography

Baumbach, M. 2011. '*Paideia* and the function of Homeric quotation in Chariton's *Callirhoe*,' in: T.A. Schmitz and N. Wiater (eds.), *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE,* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 253-271.

Billault, A. 1981. 'Aspects du roman de Chariton', *L'information littéraire* 25, 205-211.

Billault, A. 1991. *La création romanesque dans la littérature grecque à l'époque impériale*, Paris: PUF.

Biraud, M. 1985. 'L'hypotexte homérique et les rôles amoureux de Callirhoé dans le roman de Chariton', *Publications de la Faculté de Lettres et Sciences Humaines de Nice* 29, 21-27.

De Temmerman, K. 2014. *Crafting Characters: Heroes and Heroines in the Ancient Greek Novel*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fusillo, M. 1990. 'Il testo nel testo: la citazione nel romanzo greco', *MD* 25, 27-48.

Fusillo, M. 2003. 'Modern critical theories and the ancient novel', in: G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden: Brill, 277-305.

Guez, J.-P. 2001. 'Pourquoi Théron n'est-il pas amoureux?' in: B. Pouderon (ed.), *Les personnages du roman grec*, Lyon: Maison de L'Orient et de la Méditerranée, 101-110.

Hirschberger, M. 2001. 'Epos und Tragödie in Charitons Kallirhoe. Ein Beitrag zur Intertextualität des Griechischen Romans', *WJA* 25, 157-186.

Hunter, R. 1994. 'History and historicity in the romance of Chariton', *ANRW* II.34. 2, Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1055-1086.

Jones, M. 2007. '*Andreia* and gender in the Greek novels', in: J. R. Morgan & M. Jones (eds.), *Philosophical Presences in the Ancient Novel*, Ancient Narrative, Suppl. 10, Groningen: Barkhuis, 111-136.

Kaimio, M. 1996. 'How to enjoy a Greek novel: Chariton guiding his audience', *Arctos* 30, 49-73.

Kasprzyk, D. 2001. 'Théron, pirate, conteur et narrateur dans le roman de Chariton, *Chairéas et Callirhoé'*, in: B. Pouderon (ed.), *Les personnages du roman grec*, Lyon: Maison de L'Orient et de la Méditerranée, 149-164.

Konstan, D. 1994. *Sexual Symmetry. Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, Princeton: Princeton University Press

Lalanne, S. 1998. 'Récit d'un ΤΕΛΟΣ ΕΡΩΤΙΚΟΝ: Réflexions sur le statut des jeunes dans le roman de Chariton d'Aphrodisias', *REG* 111, 518-550.

Lalanne, S. 2006. *Une éducation grecque. Rites de passage et construction des genres dans le roman grec ancien*, Paris: La Découverte.

Montiglio, S. 2010. '"My soul, consider what you should do": psychological conflicts and moral goodness in the Greek novels,' *AN* 8, 25-58.

Reardon, B. P. 1982 (1999). 'Theme, structure and narrative in Chariton', *YCS* 27, 1-27; reprinted in S. Swain (ed.), *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 163-188.

Reardon, B. P. 2003. 'Chariton', in: G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden: Brill, 309-335.

Robiano, P. 2000. 'La citation poétique dans le roman érotique grec', *REA* 102, 509-529.

Ruiz-Montero, C. 1994. 'Chariton von Aphrodisias: Ein Überblick', *ANRW* II.34.2, 1006-1054.

Schmeling, G. 1974. *Chariton*, New York: Twayne Publishers.

Scourfield, J. H. D. 2003. 'Anger and gender in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*', in: S. Braund and G. Most (eds.), *Ancient Anger. Perspectives from Homer to Galen*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 163-184.

Smoes, E. 1995. *Le courage chez les Grecs, d'Homère à Aristote*, Brussels: OUSIA.

Trzaskoma, S. 2010. 'Chariton and tragedy: reconsiderations and new evidence,' *AJP* 131, 219-231.

Van Steen, G. 1998. 'Destined to be? Tyche in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and in the Byzantine romance of *Kallimachos and Chrysorroi*', *L'Antiquité Classique* 67, 203-211.

Vogt-Spira, G. 1992. *Dramaturgie des Zufalls. Tyche und Handeln in der Komödie Menanders*, Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck.

Literary *mimesis* and amatory rhetoric
in Xenophon of Ephesus

KONSTANTIN DOULAMIS

1. Introduction

Intertextuality is a stock feature of the 'canonical' Greek romance, which is often viewed as exemplifying the practice of literary *mimesis* that is at the heart of the Second Sophistic. Chariton's novel abounds in citations from and references to earlier works, especially Homer;[1] the text of Longus has been recognised as highly allusive;[2] and intertextuality has long been identified as a prominent characteristic of both Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus.[3] By stark contrast, Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaca* is characterised by a complete lack of citations, which has been taken to imply Xenophon's inadequate knowledge of antecedent literature or, at the very least, an inability on his part to allude to earlier texts, and has led scholars to regard Xenophon as an inferior exponent of this sophisticated and self-conscious genre.[4]

---

[1] Chariton 1,4,6, 2,3,7, 2,9,6, 3,3,4, 4,1,3, 4,4,5, 4,5,9, 5,2,4, 5,4,6, 5,10,9, 6,2,4, 6,4,6, 7,3,3, 8,1,17. On the large number of Homeric citations in the Greek novels in general, see Fusillo 1989, 17-109 *passim* and Fusillo 1990; Anderson 1984, 47-49; and Biraud 1986. Robiano 2000 discusses poetic citations in Chariton. Hirschberger 2001 focuses on citations from epic and tragedy in Chariton.

[2] On echoes of antecedent Greek literature in Longus, see Hunter 1983, 59-76, Bowie 1985 and 1994, 451-452, and Pattoni 2004. Morgan 2008, 221-224 contains a brief discussion of intertextuality in Longus. For a more extensive treatment of the topic, see Morgan 2004, esp. 2-8 and 15-17.

[3] Part of the discussion on citation and its function in the Greek novels in Fusillo 1990 is about Heliodorus. Robiano 2000 looks at poetic citation in Heliodorus, among others. See more recently Morgan 2008, 224-226 on Heliodorus, with further bibliography.

[4] Anderson 1984, 47-48 excludes Xenophon from the group of 'literary romancers capable of annexing quotations in a manner which colours the text with wit', in contrast to Heliodorus and Longus who know 'how to make the most of the convergence between their plots and the classical heritage their readers could expect to recognise.' Schmeling 1980 and Anderson 1982, esp. 62-63 both lament Xenophon's numerous 'missed opportunities'

Of course, any study of Xenophon's novel in the past century or so has been conducted in the shadow of the 'epitome theory', developed at length by Bürger.[5] In recent years, Hägg,[6] Ruiz Montero,[7] O'Sullivan,[8] and Chew,[9] each with a different set of arguments and agenda, have raised objections to Bürger's theory and have shown that treating the surviving text of the *Ephesiaca* as the epitomised version of a longer and, presumably, more sophisticated work, may be a convenient way of explaining several perceived inconsistencies in this novel, but nonetheless fails to take fully into consideration important aspects of the text such as narrative technique, style, and features of orality.[10] That is not to say, of course, that there are no noticeable differences between Xenophon's novel and the other four complete-surviving 'ideal romances'; what recent studies have managed to call attention to, however, is that labelling the *Ephesiaca* an epitome cannot explain in a satisfactory manner Xenophon's compositional technique or account fully for the form in which the text has survived.

In any case, it is not my aim here to engage in a systematic review of the arguments that have been advanced in favour of the epitome theory. Nor do I mean to endorse fully any one of the counter-theories mentioned above, even though each of them contains, in my view, several valid points. Rather, I want to take a fresh look at Xenophon's practice of literary *mimesis* by examining prominent examples of amatory rhetoric from the *Ephesiaca* and asking whether - and, if so, to what extent - these can be seen as intertextual. For the purposes of my analysis, and in the absence of conclusive evidence that the surviving text of the *Ephesiaca* is indeed the work of an epitomator, I shall treat this as the complete novel composed by Xenophon.

---

to emulate the skill of the other four authors of 'ideal' Greek novels. Cf. Anderson 1984, 144-148 on Xenophon as an incompetent author in general. Morgan 2008, 221 maintains that Xenophon's novel 'seems the most primitive of the five [extant Greek novels]' in terms of the use that it makes of intertextuality, which is treated as an index of sophistication. See also, however, Robiano 2000, 529, who concludes that quotations drawn from poetry are not 'une nécessité inhérente au genre romanesque' and mentions as an example both Longus and Xenophon, whose novels lack citations.

[5] Bürger 1892.

[6] Hägg 1966 [2004a].

[7] Ruiz Montero 1982.

[8] O'Sullivan 1995, 100-139.

[9] Chew 1998a and 1998b.

[10] Kytzler 1996, 348-350 has also drawn attention to some of the problems arising from the epitome theory. König's 2007 discussion of Xenophon's treatment of orality and writtenness, although not addressing the epitome theory issue directly, strongly suggests that the *Ephesiaca* is more complex than modern scholarship has recognised.

I shall begin by considering briefly Xenophon's ability to evoke and cross-reference sections within his own work, and then I shall concentrate upon passages in direct speech which echo well known earlier texts. This paper springs out of a larger project on rhetoric in the *Ephesiaca*, the aim of which is to examine Xenophon's style against the background of contemporary and near-contemporary rhetorical theory and practice. However, I shall be limiting here my focus to examples of amatory rhetoric, for two important reasons. First, because the theme of love is without doubt one of the most prominent in the Greek novels, a fact to which Xenophon is no exception, and, secondly, because amatory rhetoric has a long and rich tradition in the Greek poetry of the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic periods, and as such provides a sound basis for my analysis.

2. Cross-referencing in Xenophon

Assuming that intertextuality requires two fundamental elements – the ability to correlate passages and a good knowledge of the earlier texts evoked – I propose to look for evidence of these in the *Ephesiaca*.

First, we need to consider Xenophon's internal referencing system, which will allow us to assess the novelist's ability to allude to sections of his own novel. There are numerous instances in the *Ephesiaca* where Xenophon appears to employ effectively the technique of allusion whenever he wishes to draw his reader's attention to earlier episodes in the novel. Chance, who has examined the implications for the development of the plot of Apollo's oracle at 1,6,[11] has demonstrated that both the oracle and its interpretation are exploited throughout the novel in order to move the plot forward; a practice which he compares with the utilisation of Jesus' prophecy at the start of the *Acts of the Apostles* for similar purposes.

Chance brings out the importance of the oracle, of which, he maintains, both the narrator and the characters of the *Ephesiaca* appear to be acutely aware, and argues that the interpretation of the oracle not only contributes to the development of the plot but also actively guides the readers through the story by providing clues as to how the plot might move forward. It is through frequent evocation of the oracle in the course of the narrative that the reader is offered 'a broad outline of the story's progression.'[12] Furthermore, the text of the oracle is repeatedly evoked both by the narrator and by the characters in order 'to remind the reader that the story unfolds in accordance with divine guidance.'[13]

---

[11] Chance 1998, 219-234.
[12] Chance 1998, 227.
[13] Chance 1998, 227.

The evocation of the oracle, then, is utilised by Xenophon for narratological purposes, in however rudimentary a way and despite the imprecision noted in the oracle's eventual fulfilment.[14] This suggests that the author of the *Ephesiaca* was not incapable of creating in his work an *intratextual* dimension by correlating passages and employing allusion effectively. And if we agree that this is indeed the case, then it is only a small step from intratextuality to intertextuality. But this raises another question. Did Xenophon have sufficient knowledge of earlier literature, which would be a prerequisite for any form of intertextuality? I turn to this question in the following section.

3. Xenophon and Greek poetry

The possible influence of Stoic philosophy on the *Ephesiaca*, which has been considered by Perkins[15] and which more recently I have examined in connection with Xenophon's style,[16] is of interest here. There are several sections in the *Ephesiaca* which appear to have a Stoic colour. These include episodes in which emphasis is placed upon the characters' ability to withstand hardship with dignity; scenes where a distinction is drawn between the true nature of things and our judgement or perception of them, or between the vulnerability of the body and the power of the mind; passages where attention is drawn to the deliberate choice of purpose (*proairesis*), which, when at work, does not allow physical experiences to affect the real 'self' of the individual; and, lastly, the idea that resorting to death is an acceptable alternative when to carry on living would be inappropriate or shameful.[17] Of course, there is no way to prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that these are *conscious* allusions to Stoicism. Nonetheless, even if we choose to see them as the result of an indirect influence of Stoic philosophy and, in particular, of the teaching of Epictetus upon the *Ephesiaca*, which, given the chronology that is widely accepted for this novel would certainly make this a possibility,[18] it seems

---

[14] Chance 1998, 226. Schmeling 1980, 89-90 sees certain aspects of the oracle as problematic. Cf. more recently Morgan 2007, 460-461.

[15] Perkins 1995.

[16] Doulamis 2007.

[17] On close parallels between Stoic teaching and the Greek novels, see Perkins 1995, 77-103. On Stoicism and Xenophon in particular see Doulamis 2007, 152-160 and, more recently, Montiglio 2009, 34-40.

[18] There are good reasons for dating Xenophon to the late 1st – early 2nd century CE. See Kytzler 1996, 346-348 and Bowie 2003.

that Xenophon may very well have been familiar with widespread ideas floating around in the philosophical and literary background of his time.[19]

In any case, my concern in this paper is with echoes of earlier literature, not of near-contemporary philosophy. Some work has already been done in that direction,[20] but there are further passages in the *Ephesiaca* which suggest that certain literary *topoi* may have been known to Xenophon. And since the examples of amatory rhetoric I will be considering are from the Homeric epics, tragedy, and Hellenistic poetry, it makes sense to focus upon Xenophon's knowledge of earlier *poetry* rather than prose.

That the author of the *Ephesiaca* was no stranger to poetry in general may be deduced from the presence of verse in his novel. First, two epigrams feature prominently in the story: the short epigram with which the protagonists inscribe a votive tablet dedicated to Helius in Rhodes (1,12,2), and Hippothous' longer 'makeshift epigram' with which the bandit says that he had inscribed a stone in memory of his lover Hyperanthes (3,2,13). Moreover, Apollo's oracle, which is cited in its entirety at 1,6,2 and plays an important role in the plot, consists of nine hexameters, 'the regular metre for oracles.'[21]

As far as the Homeric epics and tragedy are concerned, we know that these were extensively exploited for various types of exercises in primary, secondary and tertiary education in the Graeco-Roman world.[22] An author like Xenophon, whose text, however simple, contains evidence of an above average knowledge of rhetoric and shows familiarity with rhetorical practices,[23] is more than likely to

---

[19] See Doulamis 2007, esp. 159-160 and 172-173.

[20] The exploitation of earlier motifs in the *Ephesiaca* has been studied by Laplace 1994 who, based on a text-by-text comparison of certain passages from Homer, Plato and Greek tragedy, argues that Xenophon may have had in mind a number of well known *topoi* from earlier works, and shows how the novelist deviates from the 'schéma tragique' to lend an anti-tragic character to the story and its protagonists.

[21] Bowie 1989, 225. Oracles can be found also in Achilles Tatius, who uses hexameters too, and Heliodorus, on which see Bowie 1989, 225-229.

[22] See Hock 2001 on Homer in Graeco-Roman education. Cf. Booth 1979 on primary and secondary education in the Roman Empire, and Cribiore 2001, esp. 185-244. See also Hock 2005, esp. 19-26, who discusses Greek education in the Graeco-Roman world *à propos* Chariton's level of education as displayed in his novel *Callirhoe*. Heath 2004, 217-254 is right to point out that Greek education of the Imperial period is nowhere near as regimented and uniform as a modern curriculum.

[23] Ruiz Montero 1982 has argued that Xenophon's use of καί in the narrative sections of the novel betrays knowledge of rhetorical exercises (*progymnasmata*) circulating in the Roman Empire; cf. Ruiz Montero 1994, 1112-1119 on rhetoric and style in Xenophon. Doulamis 2007, 160-169 points out that, despite the apparent simplicity of Xenophon's text, the utterances of certain characters contain elements of stylisation and artificiality. Kytzler

have progressed to the tertiary level of education, where students memorised and interpreted excerpts from Homer and the tragedians, and often treated in compositional exercises themes from these texts.[24] Moreover, Homer and Euripides have been identified as the two writers most cited and alluded to by authors of the Second Sophistic.[25] It is, therefore, inconceivable that an aspiring novelist of the Graeco-Roman period, who must have received rhetorical training and who evidently had the ability to compose in hexameters, should have remained unaware of these two authors. Besides, it is worth noting that Greek tragedy, especially Euripides, is strongly evoked elsewhere in the *Ephesiaca*, most notably in the presentation of Habrocomes as an incredibly handsome young man who, much like Euripides' Hippolytus, scorns the power of Eros and later pays the price.[26]

4. Amatory rhetoric in the Ephesiaca

The language and imagery used in scenes where a character attempts to initiate or terminate a love affair will be our focus here. Gross,[27] who traces the development of the rhetoric of entreaty in the ancient world through an examination of selected passages from Greek and Roman literature, identifies a number of recurrent motifs in the rhetoric of seduction and abandonment, at the level of language, structure and theme. Several of these can be found in Xenophon's novel.

4.1 The language of amatory persuasion

Language is an important vehicle of communication when it comes to amatory rhetoric, and there are certain patterns which the rhetoric of seduction seems to favour throughout the centuries. Naturally, a key word in this context is the verb πείθω ('persuade') and its derivatives.[28]

It is well known that persuasion and love were closely linked in the ancient world, and the association of πείθω with amatory rhetoric is a *topos* that stretches back to the Homeric epics, where it occurs frequently in this context. Some of the

---

1996, 350-351, too, briefly notes that the *Ephesiaca* is not totally deprived of stylisation and that its author seems to hold back from employing extravagant rhetorical figures.

[24] Hock 2001, 77; Cribiore 2001, 220-244.

[25] Bowie 1989, 210-212.

[26] Briefly discussed in Cueva 2004, 36-39 and König 2007, 4-5.

[27] Gross 1985.

[28] For a discussion of several examples from Homer, Hesiod, Sappho, Pindar, Aeschylus and other ancient Greek texts, see Gross 1985, 15-31. For Πειθώ in Greek tragedy, in particular, as well as in other periods of ancient Greek literature, see Buxton 1982.

best known Homeric passages in which πείθω denotes erotic advances include Odysseus' rejection of Calypso's proposition, which is described as an attempt to 'persuade Odysseus' spirit in his chest' at *Od.* 7,258 and *Od*. 23,337;[29] Circe's pass at Odysseus at *Od.* 10,335; and *Od*. 9,33, which mentions both Calypso's and Circe's advances. But the word is not only applied to enamoured characters aggressively pursuing the object of their desire. At *Od*. 23,230, the verb refers to Odysseus persuading Penelope of his true identity.

Another celebrated character in Greek literature and mythology whose seduction was associated with words and, more specifically, with the art of persuasion is Helen. In Gorgias we find a well known, explicit reference to the important role of speech in the legendary seduction of Helen: 'But if it was speech which persuaded her and deceived her heart, not even to this is it difficult to make an answer and to banish blame as follows' (*Helen* 8).

The important role of persuasion in love affairs is marked not only in literature but also in art, where we have several representations of the goddess Πειθώ, Persuasion personified, in the company of Eros or as one of Aphrodite's female companions or with both Eros and Aphrodite.[30] Undoubtedly one of the most celebrated such appearances of Persuasion is on the base of the throne of Pheidias' statue of Zeus at Olympia, where, according to Pausanias' description, the newly born Aphrodite is greeted by Eros and crowned by Persuasion.[31]

In the Greek novels, where secondary characters repeatedly fall in love with the protagonists and vie for their love, it is a commonplace for enamoured third parties to employ persuasion in order to proposition the hero or heroine. In Xenophon both Habrocomes and Anthia are constantly targeted by lustful rival characters, who pursue them quite aggressively. There are two such episodes that stand out. In the first, the pirates Corymbus and Euxinus, who have fallen in love with Habrocomes and Anthia respectively, agree to argue one another's case, and so Euxinus delivers a speech of entreaty to Habrocomes on behalf of Corymbus, while Corymbus approaches Anthia on behalf of his colleague; the former address is given in direct speech (1,16,3-6), while the latter is summarised and presented in the third person (1,16,7). The second episode involves Manto, the daughter of a chief bandit, who writes a love letter to Habrocomes, the object of her desire (2,5,1-2). As the aim of both Euxinus' speech and Manto's letter is to *persuade* Habrocomes to abandon his wife and accept the proposed love affair, perhaps it

---

[29] Cf. Gross 1985, 17 on *Od*. 7,258 and *Od*. 23,230.

[30] On the association of Πειθώ with love in art, see Buxton 1982, 200-201, n. 59; for a discussion of some representative examples of Πειθώ as the goddess of persuasion in love affairs, see Buxton 1982, 45-46. Cf. Gross 1985, 18-20.

[31] Paus. 5,11,8.

is not surprising that the verb πείθω ('persuade') is employed in these passages. What is interesting about the language used here, however, is the frequency with which this verb occurs. In these two episodes alone, including the speeches in question and their narrative context, we find various forms of πείθω as many as ten times. What is more, the verb is not only used for the attempted seduction of *rival* characters but also in the oral communication between the protagonists (5,15,1). There too, it serves to introduce connotations of seduction.[32]

While use of πείθω and its derivatives is not reserved for scenes of amatory persuasion in the *Ephesiaca*, nevertheless it is mainly in this context that this word occurs. Given that the art of persuasion was inextricably linked with rhetoric in the ancient world, as noted above, it is reasonable to conclude that persistent use of this specific verb in this particular context may carry greater significance than modern scholarship has previously recognised. For by employing repeatedly the verb πείθω to mark the discourse of seduction addressed to a prospective lover, regardless of whether the seducer is eventually successful in their advances or not, Xenophon not only displays knowledge of this particular literary *topos*, but may be also knowingly evoking the traditional association of eros with rhetoric that is well-documented in Greek culture.

4.2 The rhetoric of seduction and abandonment: structure and theme

The rhetoric of seduction is not limited to language but also extends to structure and theme. Gross[33] has demonstrated that, notwithstanding the individuality and distinct circumstances of each amatory address, speeches of entreaty in Greek and Roman literature are characterised by specific *topoi*. Three well known *topoi* found in the discourse of seduction, with which I shall be concerning myself in this section, are: a) a statement of passion combined with a list of reasons for which the speaker's request should be granted, b) urging the addressee to consider the consequences of his/her decision, and c) contrasting the positive outcome of an acceptance of the proposed affair with the negative effects of a possible rebuff.

Some of the best-known examples of such speeches of entreaty in Greek literature can be found in the Homeric epics: Paris' attempt to seduce Helen at *Il.* 3,438-446 and Zeus' seduction of Hera at *Il.* 14,313-328, which knowingly evokes Paris' earlier address, are generally regarded as canonical examples of amatory

---

[32] König 2007, 19-20 additionally points out that, if we read into this passage an allusion to Odysseus and Penelope, πείθω here may be taken to imply that Anthia and Habrocomes are omitting details.
[33] Gross 1985.

persuasion throughout antiquity.[34] Both speeches open with an introductory state-
ment relating to the present situation of the speaker and the addressee, followed
by a request for love-making.[35] Central to each speech is a statement of passion,
in which the speaker declares the intensity of his longing before providing a num-
ber of reasons for which his request should be granted. This section, which is
usually considerably longer than the rest of the address, is particularly important,
for it is here that the speaker can construct a strong case. Thus Paris' main argu-
ment is that his present desire for Helen is far greater than the desire he had felt
for her in the past. Similarly, Zeus provides an extended comparison between
Hera and some of his previous erotic partners, aiming to demonstrate, just as Paris
does, that his present desire for Hera is much stronger than the lust he had previ-
ously experienced for other women.[36] The two speeches conclude with a renewed
statement of passion, which serves to affirm and emphasise the ardour of the
speaker's sexual desire. This consists of the same formulaic verse in both cases:
ὥς σεο νῦν ἔραμαι καί με γλυκὺς ἵμερος αἱρεῖ ('For I long for you now and sweet
lust has seized me', (Il. 3,446; Il. 14,328).

Achilles' plea and marriage proposal to Iphigenia in Euripides' *Iphigenia in
Aulis* (1404-1415) is presented in a similar fashion.[37] Here too, we find that the
introduction and the initial request are followed by a list of reasons why the re-
quest should be granted, in this case a list of Iphigenia's praiseworthy qualities,
which also contains the almost obligatory statement of passion. An interesting
additional element is that in the renewed appeal at the end of his address the
speaker stresses the suffering that his desire has brought about and urges Iphigenia
to consider the implications of a possible rejection of his marriage proposal:

… ἄχθομαι τ᾽, ἴστω Θέτις,
εἰ μή σε σώσω Δαναίδαισι διὰ μάχης
ἐλθών. ἄθρησον· ὁ θάνατος δεινὸν κακόν.

---

[34] The entire scene of Zeus and Hera, in particular, must have been well known throughout
antiquity, for it is quoted, although not in its entirety, in Pl. *Rep.* 3,390C, and it is possibly
echoed in Xenoph. 11 and 12 (on which see Lesher 1992, 83-85). Cf. Eust. 988-989 on *Il.*
14,313-328.

[35] See the analysis in Gross 1985, 33-36.

[36] Lines 317-327 of Book 14 of the *Iliad* have been treated as suspect and were in fact
athetised by both Aristarchus and Aristophanes on the grounds that the list of Zeus's for-
mer lovers was more likely to irritate Hera than seduce her. In his commentary, however,
Janko 1992, 201ff. convincingly argues against this.

[37] See Gross 1985, 45-50.

… and, Thetis be my witness, how I grieve to think
I shall not save your life by doing battle with the Danaids.
Reflect, I say; a dreadful ill is death. (trans. E.P. Coleridge)

A closer look at the two erotic addresses targeting Habrocomes in the *Ephesiaca*, the speech delivered by Euxinus on behalf of Corymbus and Manto's letter, reveals that these contain the *topoi* which function as markers of amatory persuasion in the context of an erotic appeal addressed to a prospective erotic partner. Let us examine each address separately.

Like Paris, Zeus and Achilles, Euxinus begins his speech with a statement about the present and the future. He reminds Habrocomes of the plight he finds himself in, which, he points out, necessitates a careful consideration of the situation on Habrocomes' part and the demonstration of love (ἀγαπᾶν) to his new masters (1,16,3-4).[38] This serves to lay the foundation for the actual request: 'You must know that it is in your power to recover your happiness and freedom if you're willing to obey your master, Corymbus…' (1,16,4). The statement of passion which follows occupies the middle of Euxinus' erotic appeal, thus drawing attention to the declaration of love that is central to this entire address: '… because he's passionately in love with you' (ἐρᾷ γάρ σου σφοδρὸν ἔρωτα, 1,16,4). Just as Paris and Zeus in the *Iliad* express their intense sexual desire with the phrase σεο νῦν ἔραμαι, reinforced by the addition of ἵμερος αἱρεῖ, so too Corymbus in the *Ephesiaca* is said to be under the influence of eros (ἐρᾷ σου), the intensity of which is emphasised by σφοδρὸν ἔρωτα. Euxinus then supplies several reasons why Corymbus' request should be granted. These centre around the benefits that will result from an acceptance of the pirate's advances, contrasted with Habrocomes' difficult present situation (1,16,5). The speaker here, like Paris, Zeus, and Achilles in the passages discussed above, concludes with a renewed appeal, which echoes strongly his initial request: 'You must look only to your master and to him show obedience when he has given an order' (1,16,5-6).

Manto's entreaty, even though it is presented in written form, nevertheless largely shares the typology of Euxinus' (oral) speech. While it is not my intention here to analyse Manto's letter from the point of view of ancient epistolary theory and practice,[39] nevertheless it is worth remarking that her address begins with an opening greeting typical of letter-writing, with which she also flatters Habrocomes by calling him 'handsome' (καλός): 'To the handsome Habrocomes from your mistress, greetings.' (2,5,1). She then gets straight to the point and provides

---

[38] I have used the Greek text in O'Sullivan 2005, and the English translation in Henderson 2009 (occasionally with minor alterations).
[39] For that see Doulamis 2002, 60ff.

the all-important statement of passion, with which she declares her uncontrollable sexual desire in the third person: 'Manto is in love with you (ἐρᾷ σου) and can no longer contain herself (μηκέτι φέρειν δυναμένη).' (2,5,1). Like Euxinus, Manto employs the verb ἐράω to describe her feelings, while the intensity of her passion, which, as we have seen, it is commonplace to emphasise in such situations, is denoted here by μηκέτι φέρειν δυναμένη. We then have the request, introduced quite appropriately with δέομαι, which, for added emphasis, is placed at the end of the clause, followed by two negative imperatives (μή + subjunctive): '…I am begging you (δέομαι); do not disdain (μὴ παρίδῃς) or humiliate (μηδὲ ὑβρίσῃς) me, the girl who has shown you her favour' (2,5,1-2). The reasons for which her request should be granted consist of an outline of the benefits which will ensue from an acceptance of her proposition, contrasted with a brief account of the misfortune that will befall Habrocomes if he rejects her advances (2,5,2). Here, too, the reasons occupy the greater part of the entreaty. The only difference is that Manto's letter concludes with these, which means that her address lacks a renewed appeal or a concluding salutation that would be typical of letter-writing. This abrupt ending may be accounted for by the general brevity that characterises her letter or could be taken as an index of her agitation, also mirrored in the increasingly harsh and threatening tone of the language she employs.

It is noteworthy that both speakers in Xenophon conclude their address by urging the addressee to consider the consequences of a possible rejection, just as Achilles does in his speech of entreaty to Iphigenia. Thus Euxinus tells Habrocomes: 'Consider (ἐννοήσον) your circumstances' (1,16,5). Similarly, Manto concludes with: 'Consider (ἐννόει) what will happen to you…' (2,5,2).

A further point to note is that both Euxinus and Manto employ a technique which involves contrasting the bliss that would result from Habrocomes' positive response with the unpleasant consequences of a rebuff. Euxinus explains that 'nothing unpleasant will happen to you and you will make your master still more kindly disposed to you' but also warns Habrocomes that 'there's no one to help you, this is a barbarian land, your masters are bandits, and there's no escape from their vengeance should you treat Corymbus with disdain' (1,16,5). Similarly, in an even starker antithesis, Manto promises Habrocomes that 'if you say yes, I will persuade my father Apsyrtus to betroth me to you, we will get rid of your present wife, and you will be rich and prosperous', but also threatens him that 'if you say no, think what will happen to you when the mistreated girl takes her revenge, and what will happen to those who abetted your own arrogance.' (2,5,2). We may recognise here a *topos* in the rhetoric of seduction employed at least since the Hellenistic period: that of the two possible responses to an erotic plea. A particularly felicitous example occurs in Theocritus' second *Idyll*, where in a

retrospective reflection the poet first expands on what would happen if his beloved had accepted his advances (124, καί κ᾽, εἰ μέν μ᾽ ἐδέχεσθε, τάδ᾽ ἦς φίλα…; 'and if you had received me, that would have been pleasant') before contemplating the possibility of suffering a rebuff (127-128, εἰ δ᾽ ἄλλα μ᾽ ὠθεῖτε καὶ ἀ θύρα εἴχετο μοχλῷ/ πάντως κα πελέκεις καὶ λαμπάδες ἦνθον ἐφ᾽ ὑμέας; 'but if you had rejected me and kept your door closed with a bar, by every means axes and torches would have come against you').[40]

It is not just the discourse of seduction that is characterised by certain *topoi*; terminating a relationship is too. I conclude this section with an example of the rhetoric of abandonment from the *Ephesiaca*. At 3,6,5 Anthia attempts to kill herself by drinking what she thinks is poison, and addresses a farewell monologue to her (absent) husband Habrocomes, whom she believes dead and hopes to join in the Underworld. Her speech ends with the words καὶ δέχου με ἄσμενος καί μοι πάρεχε τὴν ἐκεῖ μετὰ σοῦ δίαιταν εὐδαίμονα ('welcome me with gladness, and make my life there with you a happy one'), which express the idea of the reunion and 'co-habitation' of husband and wife in life after death. The basic idea in this passage not only evokes Anthia's earlier lament at 2,1,6, where the heroine tells Habrocomes ἕξομεν ἀλλήλους μετὰ θάνατον, ὑπ᾽ οὐδενὸς ἐνοχλούμενοι ('after death we will have each other and be molested by no one'), but, more importantly for my analysis, strongly echoes another Euripidean passage, Admetus' famous speech to his dying wife at *Alcestis* 363-364:

ἀλλ᾽ οὖν ἐκεῖσε προσδόκα μ᾽, ὅταν θάνω,
καὶ δῶμ᾽ ἑτοίμαζ᾽, ὡς συνοικήσουσά μοι

But now wait for me to arrive there when I die
and prepare a home where you may dwell with me (trans. D. Kovacs)

Despite the absence in the *Ephesiaca* of an explicit reference to Euripides, the resemblance of the two texts in terms of both context (a dying character addressing their dead spouse) and content is too striking to take as a mere coincidence.[41]

---

[40] See further Gross 1985, 54-58.

[41] We encounter the same idea in Callirhoe's words at Chariton 3,7,5-6, where the heroine, who also mistakenly thinks her husband dead, exclaims in a monologue: πλὴν οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν ἀφίξομαι πρὸς σέ. εἰ καὶ ζῶντες ἀλλήλων οὐκ ἀπηλαύσαμεν, ἀποθανόντες ἀλλήλους ἕξομεν. ('But before long I shall come to you; even if in life we could not enjoy each other, we shall possess each other in death!'). If we accept that Chariton preceded rather than followed Xenophon, which appears to be the prevailing view amongst modern scholars (see Bowie 2002 on the chronology of the earlier Greek novels), then this could be explained as a direct influence of Chariton on Xenophon. However, it is also possible

We have seen, therefore, that certain passages in the *Ephesiaca* bear similarities to well-known examples from its antecedent literature articulating the rhetoric of seduction and abandonment. This analysis suggests the possibility of Xenophon's familiarity with the language, structure and themes traditionally associated with amatory rhetoric.

5. Allusion in Xenophon and Chariton

Out of the five extant Greek novels, Chariton and Xenophon have a lot in common in terms of narrative technique, plotline, and the treatment of novelistic *topoi*. One area where the two differ, however, is intertextuality, for Chariton's text is laden with *verbatim* quotations from earlier literature. It is worth dwelling on what may be seen as an interesting example of the same intertext being used by both novelists, which might help to shed some light on the difference between Xenophon's and Chariton's practice of literary imitation.

In Book 5 of the *Ephesiaca*, Habrocomes is forced into manual work and bemoans his misfortune (5,8,3-4). His lamentation is addressed to his wife Anthia, who he thinks is dead, and concludes with a direct apostrophe expressing his conviction that Anthia will never forget him, not even after death: … καὶ σὺ που τέθνηκας πόθῳ τῷ πρὸς Ἀβροκόμην· πέπεισμαι γάρ, φιλτάτη, ὡς οὐκ ἄν ποτε οὐδὲ ἀποθανοῦσα ἐκλάθοιό μου ('…and you may have died somewhere of longing for Habrocomes: for I am sure, dearest one, that even in death you would never have forgotten me' 5,8,4). It is very tempting to read in this passage an echo of Achilles' words on the dead Patroclus at *Il.* 22,387-90:

> …τοῦ δ' οὐκ ἐπιλήσομαι, ὄφρ' ἂν ἔγωγε
> ζωοῖσιν μετέω καί μοι φίλα γούνατ' ὀρώρῃ·
> εἰ δὲ θανόντων περ καταλήθοντ' εἰν Ἀίδαο,
> αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ κεῖθι φίλου μεμνήσομ' ἑταίρου.

> I shall not forget him
> while I can keep my feet among the living.
> If in the dead world they forget the dead
> I say there, too, I shall remember him, my friend. (trans. R. Fitzgerald)

---

that we might be dealing here with the result of a common Euripidean influence on Xenophon and Chariton, regardless of who out of the two preceded whom. See Dalmeyda 1926, 42 n.1.

Interestingly, these very Iliadic verses are quoted by Chariton, who has placed them at the conclusion of Chaereas' dramatic monologue addressed to the absent Callirhoe before a suicide attempt (5,10,9):

εἰ δὲ θανόντων περ καταλήθοντ᾽ εἰν Ἀΐδαο,
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ κεῖθι φίλης μεμνήσομαί σου.

Even if in Hades people forget the dead,
even there I shall remember you, my dear. (trans. B.P. Reardon)

Unlike its imitations in Xenophon and Chariton, the Homeric intertext is not about a husband and wife. However, it is hardly surprising that these verses should have been used by the Greek novelists of the Empire in an erotic address to a (presumed) dead spouse, for Achilles and Patroclus had become a canonical homosexual couple at least by the Graeco-Roman period. And since the Greek novels glorify primarily heterosexual union in marriage, both Xenophon and Chariton adapted the Homeric verses to the circumstances of their primary couple. What is interesting here is the way in which each of the two novelists assimilates the Homeric intertext. In Xenophon, there are no clear lexical or other indications pointing towards Homer,[42] except for an echo of the words uttered by a Homeric character in what would have been broadly perceived as a very similar situation in Xenophon's time: an address from a lover to his dead beloved. In Chariton, on the other hand, the quotation is *verbatim*, thus leaving no doubt whatsoever about its intertext, but the Homeric verses have been modified, if only slightly, to fit not only the context of the protagonists' heterosexual relationship, which is the case in Xenophon too, but also the speaker's circumstances.[43] Unlike the Homeric intertext and the passage from Xenophon, in Chariton the addressee is not dead; rather, it is the lover that utters these words and he is *about* to die.

---

[42] Dalmeyda 1926, xxix also notes that Xenophon translates the Iliadic passage 'dans le langage le plus simple' but adopts Garin's view (1909, 423-424, *non vidi*) that Xenophon draws upon Chariton here, and considers less likely the possibility of an independent imitation of the Homeric model by both novelists. However, the problematic chronology of both Xenophon and Chariton make Garin's conclusion an arbitrary one, based entirely on the assumption of a chronological precedence of *Callirhoe* over the *Ephesiaca*. As far as this passage in particular is concerned, the use of a citation by Chariton does not necessarily suggest a precedence in the imitation of the Iliadic passage, but reaffirms, in my view, Chariton's preference for this type of direct reference to earlier works, particularly Homer, which is conspicuous throughout his novel.

[43] On the function of this Homeric quotation in Chariton, see Fusillo 1990, 35-39.

Modern critics, who in recent years have begun to credit Chariton with a higher degree of literary sophistication than Xenophon,[44] would probably tend to regard Chariton's practice of literary *mimesis* in the example discussed above as more sophisticated than Xenophon's. There is, however, a passage in Demetrius' treatise *On Style*, a work that is roughly contemporary with these two novels,[45] which might help us to look at this matter from the ancient rather than the modern perspective. Demetrius recognises that the use of 'poetic diction (τὸ ποιητικόν) in prose adds grandeur',[46] but he draws attention to what he regards as the right way of employing poetic mimesis in prose. He clearly disapproves of those who, like Herodotus, do not imitate but simply transpose the words of poets into their own work, and praises Thucydides' practice of assimilation and appropriation:

> Still some writers imitate the poets quite crudely. Or rather, they do not imitate them, but transfer them to their pages (οὐ μιμήσει ἀλλὰ μεταθέσει) as Herodotus has done. Thucydides acts otherwise. Even if he does borrow something from a poet, he uses it in his own way and so makes it his own property (ἴδιον τὸ ληφθὲν ποιεῖ) (112-113).

Demetrius' advice to aspiring authors to imitate and adapt earlier poets without quoting them word for word strongly suggests that *verbatim* quotations were not always regarded as a marker of literary sophistication, even within the frame of literary and rhetorical *mimesis* of the Graeco-Roman world. This is what the Younger Seneca, too, must have in mind when he points out that the process of literary appropriation, although not referring specifically to the use of poetry in prose, involves 'digestion' and assimilation of the literary model, not just plain copying.[47] Thus, Chariton's practice of quoting Homer may be viewed by modern readers as a sign of erudition, standing in contrast with Xenophon's 'failure' to emulate his fellow-novelist in that respect, but by the standards of ancient theorists such as Demetrius the strong presence of citations in Chariton may have not necessarily been perceived as superior to Xenophon's subtler, more unobtrusive literary borrowing.

---

[44] Although there are notable exceptions. For example, Xenophon is believed to be somewhat more advanced than Chariton in his treatment of embedded narratives, on which see Morgan 2004, 490-492.

[45] Morpurgo–Tagliabue 1980, Innes 1995, 312-321 and Rutherford 1998, 11-12 all seem to be in favour of a 1st century dating. Grube 1961, 39-56 argues for an early 3rd century BCE date, but his views are challenged by Goold 1961, 178-189.

[46] Also at Demetr. 150. See Robiano 2000, esp. 520-521 on quotations recommended by ancient rhetoricians and employed by Greek novelists to showcase their *paideia*.

[47] Sen. *Ep.* 84.3-10. See the discussion in Finkelpearl 2001, esp. 83-84.

6. Is Xenophon's text intertextual?

To sum up, then, we have seen that the *Ephesiaca* contains evidence which suggests, first, that Xenophon had the ability to allude to sections of his own work; secondly, that he likely had knowledge of earlier works which were circulating widely in his own time; and, thirdly, that he may have been familiar with the language, themes and structure of amatory rhetoric, although this familiarity manifests itself neither in direct word-for-word *mimesis* nor in *verbatim* quotation, as it often does in Chariton, but consists in the reworking of well known motifs from earlier poetry which are assimilated to his narrative.

    So can Xenophon's text be viewed as intertextual? In his book *The Rhetoric of Imitation*, Conte argues that greater emphasis should be placed upon the relationship between texts, which, strictly speaking, is what the term 'intertextuality' denotes, rather than the relationship between authors. According to Conte, this minimises the risk of regarding all textual resemblances as products of 'the intentionality of a literary subject whose only desire is to emulate. The philologist who seeks at all costs to read intention into imitation will inevitably fall into a psychological reconstruction of motive, whether it is homage, admiring compliment, parody or to improve upon the original.'[48]

    While by no means do I wish to underestimate the role of the author in all this, nevertheless I agree with Conte that paying attention to textual rather than authorial relationship can open the way to a more fruitful consideration of literary imitation in Classical literature. Sometimes texts echo antecedent texts for reasons other than authorial intention to imitate. As Conte points out about intertextuality in poetry, 'one text may resemble another not because it derives directly from it but because both poets have recourse to a common literary codification.'[49] So where does this leave the author of a text? It seems to me that Finkelpearl, who examines Conte's views on the matter critically and also considers Hinds's position at the other end of the spectrum, namely that the authorial role in creating an allusion should not be downplayed,[50] is right in her conclusion that 'one must make some attempt to distinguish allusion from accidental confluence, yet one must also consider literary memory' and that, consequently, 'both can occur in different instances.'[51]

---

[48] Conte 1986, 27.
[49] Conte 1986, 28.
[50] Hinds 1998, 29-34.
[51] Finkelpearl 2001, 80-81.

Intertextuality, then, is not limited to instantly recognisable allusions which unmistakably and deliberately recall in the reader's mind the source text by means of citation or *verbatim* imitation in its descendant, but may also extend to the type of literary *mimesis* that resides in thematic and structural analogies between the intertext and the imitating text, often complemented by additional echoes at the level of language but rarely depending solely on word-for-word quotation. If we accept that, then Xenophon's text *is* intertextual, at least in its treatment of the amatory themes which have been examined here, in that it appears to subscribe to a long tradition of literary motifs. His is the kind of intertextuality generated by 'literary memory'. What sets Xenophon apart from the other Greek novelists, however, is the fact that he does not advertise allusions or openly draw the reader's attention to them in the way that, say, Chariton does. However, the presence in the *Ephesiaca* of evidence suggesting that Xenophon had both the knowledge and the ability to employ intertextuality in the same fashion as his near-contemporary Chariton, leads me to believe that he may have *chosen not* (rather than failed) to do so.

I would suggest that this practice of 'covert allusion' is also manifest in Xenophon's choice of character names, which appear to have been carefully chosen by the novelist but nevertheless do not consciously evoke the characters' namesakes from antecedent literature. Hägg has shown that the naming of characters in the *Ephesiaca* is far from accidental, and that more often than not the etymology of these names alludes to characters' physical attributes or personality.[52] And yet when it comes to names borrowed from well known earlier authors such as Homer, these do not consistently evoke the original characters. In other words, even though Xenophon's choice of proper names appears to be well thought through, since many of these show awareness of their etymology, nevertheless the novelist seems unwilling to exploit systematically the earlier occurrences of character names for intertextual purposes as, say, (the much later) Heliodorus does.[53]

7. Conclusion

There remains one final question. Why does Xenophon not employ allusion like Chariton or Heliodorus?[54] First, for reasons to do with Xenophon's narrative

---

[52] As is the case of 'Anthia' and 'Habrocomes' but also of secondary characters like 'Corymbus' (possibly referring to some kind of hair style) and 'Euxinus' ('hospitable') according to Hägg 1971b, 38-39 [= 2004b, 210-212].

[53] The allusive use of names in Heliodorus is analysed by Bowie 1995.

[54] For a discussion of examples from Heliodorus (e.g. 2,19,1 evoking *Od.* 17,222, and 3,6,3 paraphrasing Sappho 34 LP(=4 D)), see Fusillo 1990.

technique and general style. As Kytzler has argued, the fast-paced sequence of episodes in what he calls a 'cinematic' plot leaves no room for ostentatious use of impressive rhetorical figures,[55] nor, I would add here, for intertextual games which might distract from the story itself.

A second possible explanation is that, if Xenophon deliberately avoids giving his text a heavily intertextual dimension, he may be doing so for reasons relating to literary ambition. Besides not distracting from the plot, covert, unobtrusive allusion does not make the full appreciation of the story the privilege of the highly intellectual few. Reworking the literature that is floating in the background without relying heavily on it for the story to make sense or become entertaining has the advantage of not excluding a less well educated audience while still enabling more learned readers to find pleasure in recognising motifs from earlier literature. Xenophon's subtle practice of allusion, then, could be part of a deliberate, inclusive strategy of a novelist keen to reach an audience as wide and diverse as possible.

Bibliography

Anderson, G. 1982. *Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play*, Chico, California: Scholars Press.

Anderson, G. 1984. *Ancient Fiction: The Novel in the Graeco-Roman World*, London: Croom Helm.

Biraud, M. 1986, 'L' hypotexte homérique et le rôle amoureux dans le roman de Chariton', in : *Sémiologie de l'amour dans les civilisations méditerranéennes*. Paris : Publications de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines de Nice 29, 21-29.

Booth, A.D. 1979. 'Elementary and secondary education in the Roman Empire', *Florilegium* 1, 1-14.

Bowie, E.L. 1989. 'Greek sophists and Greek poetry in the Second Sophistic', *ANRW* II.33.1, 209-258.

Bowie, E.L. 1994. 'The readership of Greek novels in the ancient world', in: J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 435-459.

Bowie, E.L. 1995. 'Names and a gem: aspects of allusion in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', in: D.C. Innes, *et al.* (eds.), *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 269-280.

Bowie, E.L. 2002. 'The chronology of the earlier Greek novels since B.E. Perry: revisions and precisions', *AN* 2, 47-63.

Bürger, K. 1892. 'Zu Xenophon von Ephesus', *Hermes* 27, 36-67.

Buxton, R.G.A. 1982. *Persuasion in Greek Tragedy: a Study of Peithō*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---

[55] Kytzler 1996. For a full analysis of Xenophon's narrative technique, see Hägg 1971a .

Chance, B. 1998. 'Divine prognostication and the movement of story: an intertextual exploration of Xenophon's *Ephesian Tale* and the *Acts of the Apostles*', in: R.F. Hock, *et al.* (eds.), *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative*, Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 219-234.

Chew, K. 1998a, 'Focalization in Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaka*', in: R.F. Hock, *et al.* (eds.), *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative*, Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 47-59.

Chew, K. 1998b, 'Inconsistency and creativity in Xenophon's *Ephesiaka*', *CW* 91.4, 203-213.

Conte, G.B. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets* (trans. C. Segal), Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Cribiore, R. 2001. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Cueva, E.P. 2004. *The Myths of Fiction: Studies in the Canonical Greek Novels*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Dalmeyda, G. (ed., trans.) 1926. *Xénophon d' Ephèse: Les Ephésiaques,* Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Doulamis, K. 2002. *The Rhetoric of Eros in Xenophon of Ephesus and Chariton: A Stylistic and Interpretative Study*, Ph.D. diss., Exeter.

Doulamis, K. 2007. 'Stoic echoes and style in Xenophon of Ephesus', in: J.R. Morgan & M. Jones (eds.), *Philosophical Presences in the Ancient Novel*, *AN* Suppl. 10, Groningen: Barkhuis, 151-175.

Finkelpearl, E.D. 2001. 'Pagan traditions of intertextuality in the Roman world', in: D.R. MacDonald, (ed.), *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*, Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 78-90.

Fusillo, M. 1990. 'Il testo nel testo: la citazione nel romanzo greco', *MD* 25, 27-48.

Garin, F. 1909. 'Su i romanzi greci', *SIFC* 17, 423-429.

Goold, G.P. 1961. 'A Greek professorial circle at Rome', *TAPA* 92, 168-192.

Gross, N.P. 1985. *Amatory Persuasion in Antiquity: Studies in Theory and Practice*, Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Grube, G.M.A. 1961. *A Greek Critic: Demetrius on Style*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hägg, T. 1966 [2004a]. 'Die Ephesiaka des Xenophon Ephesius – Original oder Epitome?', *C&M* 27, 118-161; translated as 'The *Ephesiaca* of Xenophon Ephesius – original or epitome?', in: Hägg 2004, 159-198.

Hägg, T. 1971a. *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances: Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius and Achilles Tatius,* Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen.

Hägg, T. 1971b [2004b]. 'The naming of the characters in the romance of Xenophon Ephesius', *Eranos* 69, 25-59; reprinted in Hägg 2004, 199-229.

Hägg, T. 2004. *Parthenope: Selected Studies in Ancient Greek Fiction (1969-2004)*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusculum Press.

Heath, M. 2004. *Menander: A Rhetor in Context*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Henderson, J. (ed., trans.) 2009. *Longus:* Daphnis and Chloe*, Xenophon of Ephesus:* Anthia and Habrocomes, Cambridge, Mass. & London: Harvard University Press.

Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hirschberger, M. 2001. 'Epos und Tragödie in Charitons *Kallirhoe*: ein Beitrag zur Intertextualität des griechischen Romans', *WJA* 25, 157-186.

Hock, R.F. 2001. 'Homer in Greco-Roman education', in: D.R. MacDonald (ed.), *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*, Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 56-77.

Hock, R.F. 2005. 'The educational curriculum in Chariton's *Callirhoe*', in: J-A.A. Brant, *et al.* (eds.), *Ancient Fiction: The Matrix of Early Christian and Jewish Narrative*, Leiden & Boston: Brill, 15-36.

Hunter, R. 1983. *A Study of 'Daphnis and Chloe'*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Innes, D.C. (ed., trans.) (1995), 'Demetrius: *On Style*', in: S. Halliwell, *et al.* (eds., trans.), *Aristotle:* Poetics*, Longinus:* On the Sublime*, Demetrius:* On Style, Cambridge, Mass. & London: Harvard University Press.

Janko, R. 1992. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume IV: books 13-16*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

König, J. 2007. 'Orality and authority in Xenophon of Ephesus', in: V. Rimell (ed.), *Seeing Tongues, Hearing Scripts*, *AN* Suppl. 7, Groningen: Barkhuis, 1-22.

Kytzler, B. ²2003. 'Xenophon of Ephesus', in: G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Boston & Leiden: Brill, 336-359.

Laplace, M. 1994. 'Récit d'une éducation amoureuse et discours panégyrique dans les Ephésiaques', *REG* 107, 440-479.

Lesher, J.H. 1992. *Xenophanes of Colophon, Fragments: A Text and Translation With a Commentary*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Montiglio, S. 2009. '"My soul, consider what you should do": psychological conflicts and moral goodness in the Greek Novels', *AN* 8, 25-58.

Morgan, J.R. 2004. *Longus. Daphnis and Chloe,* Oxford: Aris & Phillips.

Morgan, J.R. 2007. 'Xenophon of Ephesus', in: I. de Jong, *et al.* (eds.) *Time in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative, Vol. 2*, Leiden & Boston: Brill, 453-466.

Morgan, J.R. & Harrison, S. 2008. 'Intertextuality', in: T. Whitmarsh (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 218-236.

Morpurgo-Tagliabue, G. 1980. *Demetrio: dello stile*, Rome: Edizioni dell' Ateneo.

O'Sullivan, J.N. 1995. *Xenophon of Ephesus: His Compositional Technique and the Birth of the Novel*, Berlin - New York: Walter de Gruyter.

O'Sullivan, J.N. (ed.) 2005. *Xenophon Ephesius, De Anthia et Habrocome Ephesiacorum libri V*, Munich: Teubner.

Pattoni, M.P. 2004. 'Innamorarsi nella Lesbo di Longo: topoi romanzeschi, reminiscenze epiche e saffiche memorie', *Eikasmos* 15, 273-303.

Perkins, J. 1995. *The Suffering Self: Pain and Narrative Representation in the Early Christian Era*, London - New York: Routledge.

Reardon, B.P. ²2008. 'Chariton, *Callirhoe*', in: B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels,* Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press, 17-124.

Robiano, P. 2000. 'La citation poétique dans le roman érotique grec', *REA* 102, 509-529.

Ruiz Montero, C. 1982. 'Una interpretación del "estilo KAI" de Jenofonte de Éfeso', *Emerita* 50, 305-323.

Ruiz Montero, C. 1994. 'Xenophon von Ephesos: ein Überblick', *ANRW* II.34.2, 1088-1138.

Ruiz Montero, C. 2003. 'Xenophon of Ephesus and Orality in the Roman Empire', *AN* 3, 43-62.

Rutherford, I. 1998. *Canons of Style in the Antonine Age: 'Idea'-Theory in its Literary Context,* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Schmeling, G. 1980. *Xenophon of Ephesus*, Boston: Twayne.

Apuleius, Phaedrus, Martial
and the intersection of genres

S ILVIA M ATTIACCI
University of Siena

To consider these three authors together may, at first sight, seem odd. Actually they have the same problem vis-à-vis their public, namely how to justify choosing a literary genre deemed to be 'minor' and unworthy of serious readers and critics. Fable, epigram, novel, despite the enormous differences between them, share the 'original sin' of conventionally acknowledged inferiority, the defence of which is conducted through strategies of modesty and understatement, and constant dialogue with the reader.[1]

Phaedrus, Martial and Apuleius appear to attach little value to their own works, describing them in terms that suggest the frivolity of a game or insignificant, childish bagatelles: Phaedrus describes his fables as *ioci*, *argutiae*, *neniae*; Martial speaks of his verses as *lusus*, *ioci*, *nugae, ineptiae*; the stories of Lucius and Psyche are presented by the narrating voice of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* as 'pretty stories' and 'old-wives' tales' (*fabulae lepidae* and *aniles*).[2] The self-mockery of these words is obvious. However, the childish 'trifles' of Phaedrus turn out to be very useful for the few who can see beyond appearances and understand what the artist is concealing there.[3] Martial claims his epigrams are less

---

[1] In Apuleius this dialogue is very clear from the prologue, where the speaking voice tries to forestall the reader's criticisms, and then in repeated apostrophes to the *scrupulosus lector* throughout the novel. In Phaedrus and Martial it is evident in the numerous poems on literary polemic generally placed in prominent positions at the beginning or end of a book. .

[2] For the use of this 'reductive' terminology in Phaedrus, see 1, *prol*. 7; 2, *prol*. 5; 3, *prol*. 10 and 37; 4,2,3; 4,7,2; 4, *epil*. 3; *App*. 2,1; for Martial see e.g. 1,4,7; 1,35,13; 4,10,4; 11,1,14; 13,1,5-8, 13,2,4; 14,1,7 (cf. Swann 1994, 47 ff.; Citroni 2004, 136 ff.). On Apuleius, see below.

[3] Phaedr. 4,2,1-7: 'I seem to you to be fooling (*ioculare*), and I do indeed wield the pen lightheartedly (*ludimus*), so long as I have no very important theme. But take a careful look into these trifles (*nenias*); what a lot of practical instruction you will find in tiny af-

frivolous than 'the dinners of Tereus and Thyestes' (4,49,1-4), that is to say than banal mythological poetry full of 'monstrosities' and 'empty shams'; on the contrary, his page 'smacks of humanity' (10,4,1-10). Thus, in both cases, the poetics of 'play' displays a 'serious' face that claims to be a deeper exploration of real human experience.[4] And finally, if we think of the philosophical-religious implications that Apuleius' novel as a whole and the story of Cupid and Psyche in particular have always been understood to carry, we can see that behind the comic deprecation of this work as 'pretty stories and old-wives' tales', whose aim (according to the novel's unreliable narrators) is merely to provide entertainment,[5] the novel combines serious and comic and is clearly connected to the ambiguous space of the *spoudogeloion* and to the satirical tradition.[6] The strategy of self-mockery shared by our three authors, therefore, is designed to fend off the attacks of severe critics and also to entice readers, hinting that they will have much more than the traditional modesty would lead one to believe, that nothing is as it seems and that enjoyment can be a very serious business.

This defensive strategy of self-mockery is particularly prominent in passages where the three authors, in their different ways, present a metaliterary confrontation between the 'low' genres they cultivate and, to use the metaphor that links these passages, the 'high buskin' of tragedy (*cothurnus*)[7] beloved by *lec-*

---

fairs! They are not always just what they seem to be. Many people are deceived by the façade of a structure; it is the unusual mind that perceives what the artist took pains to tuck away in some inner nook'; see also 3, *prol*. 10 ff. On these passages, see Graverini & Keulen 2009, 200.

[4] See Phaedr. 3, *prol*. 49-50: 'it is … my intention … to display life itself and the ways of men and women'; Mart. 8,3,19-20: 'But do *you* dip your witty little books in Roman salt; let life recognise and read of her ways'; 10,4,10-12: 'my page smacks of humanity. But you don't want to recognise your own behaviour, Mamurra [an enthusiast of mythological poetry], or to know yourself: you should read the *Origins* of Callimachus'. On the relationship between Phaedrus and Martial, see Mattiacci 2007, 198 ff. and 2008.

[5] Apul. *Met*. 1,1,1 and 6: 'I would like to tie together different sorts of tales … and caress your ears into approval with a pretty whisper …Pay attention, reader, and you will find delight'; 4,27,8: 'But right now I shall divert you with a pretty story and an old wife's tale'. In the former case, the speaker is an ambiguous *ego*; in the latter, the drunken old woman who narrates the story of Psyche.

[6] As Graverini has shown (2006; 2012, 95 ff.; Graverini & Keulen 2009, 198 ff.), *nenia* and *fabula anilis* are terms that go back to a traditional attitude of self-mockery, which uses the image of a childish pastime as a cryptic clue to guide the reader to a serious philosophical and moral exploration; the archetype of this image is to be found in Plato (e.g. *Grg*. 527a; *Lg*. 10,887c-e; *Resp*. 2,377a; *Tht*. 176b) and it also shows up in the satirical tradition (e.g. Hor. *S*. 2,6,77-78; *Ep*. 1,1,62-63) .

[7] For the metaphor, see also Verg. *Ecl*. 8,10; Hor. *Ars* 80; *Carm*. 2,1,9-12; Ov. *Rem*. 375-376; Quint. *Inst*. 10,1,68; 10,2,22; Mart. 5,30,1; Apul. *Flor*. 16,7; Claud. *In Eutr*. 1,299.

tores Catones. This opposition implies that the genres of fable, epigram and novel can be assimilated to comedy, which is explicitly evoked by the image of the 'sock' (*soccus*) in Martial and Apuleius, and with which they share an affinity with everyday life. Furthermore Thalia, the Muse of comedy, is Martial's Muse,[8] and Macrobius (*In Somn.* 1,2,8) aligns Petronius and Apuleius with Menander and the writers of comedy who imitated him. And, of course, there is much comedy-derived material (in both content and language) in the *Metamorphoses*,[9] and there are also affinities with the comic stage in some of Phaedrus' 'realistic' fables and more generally in the plain style (*sermo cotidianus*) and iambic metre which he uses in rewriting Aesop's prose fables. Given this shared assimilation to the 'humble' tradition of comedy, we shall focus on how the individual authors perceive the relationship with the 'sublime' genre at the opposite end of the spectrum.

I

Phaedrus often presents himself as the object of envy (*livor* or *invidia*); sometimes he claims to pay no heed to criticism and, Horace-like, disdains the 'applause of the unlettered' (4, *prol*. 20), addressing only those able to appreciate his 'learned toil' (2, *epil*. 15; 3, *prol*. 26); while at other times he forces himself to bear the lack of success 'with hardened heart', expressing the hope that the future will bring recognition for his merits (2, *epil*. 18-19). In 4,7 he adopts a different strategy, namely to combat on their own ground the malicious critics who only appreciate serious poetry and who despise his *iocorum genus*:

> *Tu qui nasute scripta destringis mea,*
> *et hoc iocorum legere fastidis genus,*
> *parva libellum sustine patientia,*
> *severitatem frontis dum placo tuae*

---

[8] For the association of Thalia with comedy, see e.g. Stat. *Silv.* 2,1,116; 5,3,98. In Martial she is the Muse of epigram, and is often apostrophised as *nostra* or *mea*: 4,8,12; 4,23,4; 7,17,4; 8,73,3; 9,26,8; 9,73,9; 10,20,3; 12,94,3. A comparison of Mart. 8,3,13 *an iuvat ad tragicos soccum transferre cothurnos* ('or do you wish to exchange your sock for tragic buskins?') with 12,94,3 *transtulit ad tragicos se nostra Thalia cothurnos* ('my Thalia transferred herself to tragic buskins') both shows the equivalence 'Thalia = comedy = epigram', and indicates that 'sock' represents low genres in general, as 'buskin' does high ones.

[9] See esp. May 2006 and Pasetti 2007, the former devoted mainly to content and the latter to language and style.

et in coturnis prodit Aesopus novis: 5
'Utinam nec umquam Pelii in nemoris iugo
pinus bipenni concidisset Thessala,
nec ad professae mortis audacem viam
fabricasset Argus opere Palladio ratem,
inhospitalis prima quae Ponti sinus   10
patefecit in perniciem Graium et Barbarum.
Namque et superbi luget Aeetae domus,
et regna Peliae scelere Medeae iacent,
quae, saevum ingenium variis involvens modis,
illinc per artus fratris explicuit fugam,   15
hic caede patris Peliadum infecit manus.'
Quid tibi videtur? 'Hoc quoque insulsum est' ait
'falsoque dictum, longe quia vetustior
Aegea Minos classe perdomuit freta,
iustique vindicavit exemplum imperi.'   20
Quid ergo possum facere tibi, lector Cato,
si nec fabellae te iuvant nec fabulae?
Noli molestus esse omnino litteris,
maiorem exhibeant ne tibi molestiam.
Hoc illis dictumst qui stultitia nausiant   25
et, ut putentur sapere, caelum vituperant.

You who turn up your nose at my writings and censure them, you, Mr. Crit-ic, who disdain to read jests of this kind, have the patience to put up with my book a little longer, while I try to appease the stern look on your face by bringing Aesop on the stage for the first time in tragic buskins:

    'O, would that never on Mt. Pelion's forest height
    The pine beneath the stroke had fallen of Thessalian axe,
    Nor Argus for that voyage bold, defying death,
    With Pallas' aid had wrought to build the fatal ship
    That first explored the Euxine's hostile shore,
    The source of woe for Greeks and foreigners alike.
    Aye, deeply now the house of proud Aeëtes mourns,
    And Pelias' realm lies stricken by Medea's crime,
    Whose savage will was subtly cloaked in many ways.
    The murdered limbs of her own brother paved her flight
    From Colchis, then on Grecian soil she stained the hands
    Of Pelias' daughters with the blood of parricide.'

What think you of this? 'That, too, is tasteless,' says he, 'and, besides, it's not true history, since long before that time Minos with his fleet had tamed the Aegean seas and so set up the model of an empire governing by law.' What, then, can I possibly do for you, reader Cato, if neither fables nor tragedies suit your taste? Don't meddle with literature at all, lest it confront you with greater annoyance than you bring upon it.

This is said to those who become squeamish on account of their own folly, then in order to get credit for good taste, rail against heaven. (Text and transl. by B.E. Perry)

Phaedrus begins with a sort of *captatio benevolentiae* full of irony, as can be seen in the contrast between the curt apostrophe to the critic, whose attitude is stigmatised in the first line with the heavily satirical term *nasute*, and the understated request to put up with his book with a little patience, because he has now resolved to abandon the frivolous genre of fables and jests and to devote himself to tragedy. This decision, however, is couched in a humorous image which compromises its seriousness from the very outset: humble Aesop who 'comes on stage' (*prodire* is a technical term) wearing the high footwear of the tragic actor: an almost visual oxymoron, whose paradox is highlighted by the attribute *novis* ('unusual'), prominently placed at the end of verse and sentence. In lines 6-16 there follows the tragic passage containing the famous invective against Argo, the first ship: the passage closely echoes the prologue of Ennius' *Medea Exul*, above all in the first two verses, but then continues independently. The result is a specimen of refined literature, in which a dense texture of poetic references (Euripides, Catullus, Ovid) has been recognised, according to the canons of Augustan allusive art.[10] However, the critic also judges this piece of tragedy as absurd and in error, since Argo was not the first ship to cross the seas, as the Cretan king Minos had already sailed the Aegean. With this objection, the adversary emerges as the personification of pedantic philological erudition, while at the same time, paradoxically, he reveals his ignorance, which is mocked with the subtle, learned ambiguity of line 10: *inhospitalis pontus* can mean the sea in general with its dangers (which is how the critic takes it), but also the Black Sea, originally called *Pontus Axinus* 'because of its inhospitable roughness' (Plin. *Nat*. 6,1) and later, by antiphrasis, *Pontus Euxinus*, i.e. 'Hospitable Sea'. No one could deny that Argo had been the first ship to cross the Black Sea.[11] The critic

---

[10] On this 'rewriting' by Phaedrus, see Cavarzere 1973-74; Luzzatto 1976, 45-51; Gärtner 2000 and 2017; Oberg 2000, 174-77; Pellucchi 2004.

[11] See Eur. *Andr*. 863-865. For Argo as the first ship to sail on any sea, see e.g. Catull. 64,11; Sen. *Med*. 301-308; 335-339.

has failed to understand the subtlety and his rigid censorship, which makes him a *lector Cato*, merits only a curt, impatient retort in 21-22. The contrast between 'low' *fabellae* (fables) and 'high' *fabulae* (tragedies) is one of obvious irony, not only because Phaedrus is fully convinced of the dignity of his own poetic *genus* (despite the usual modesty of the diminutive), but also because the diametric opposition is expressed in two terms normally used by the author as synonyms for Aesopic fable.[12] This ambiguity, underlined by the similarity of sound, seems to confuse rather than distinguish: on the one hand it stresses the preconceived and inflexible hostility of critics who look down their noses, and on the other it embodies the generic hybridity (of which the metre is part) of his Aesop in strange tragic buskins.

This composition is an excellent example of the experimentalism with which Phaedrus seeks to restructure the Aesopic genre, beginning with the poetic form. What interests us here is not so much his learned re-elaboration of the tragic prologue, which has already been thoroughly studied, as his attitude. The irony and parody lie less within the tragic passage itself than in the calculated contrast between the deliberately lofty tone of lines 6-16 and the understated modesty of the frame in which the author presents himself as a satirical *persona*. Provocatively, Phaedrus garbs his Aesop in buskins and, with extraordinary mimetic facility, constructs a specimen of high poetry of the kind then in vogue in those same aristocratic circles that made a show of haughty disdain for his *genus iocorum*,[13] encasing it in a polemic marked by metaphors typical of the satirical tradition (such as the lively expressive realism of *nasute*, *destringis*, *severitatem frontis*) and by the striking phrase *lector Cato*.[14] The skill with which the tragedy is reworked demonstrates that Phaedrus' choice of a 'low' genre was not motivated by lack of *doctrina* (of which he had more than his critic!) or of poetic ability, but by a proud ambition to pursue unconventional avenues. So the intersection of 'low' and 'high' genres creates friction, not peaceful co-

---

[12] *Fabula*: e.g. 1, *prol.* 7; 2, *epil.* 13; 3, *prol.* 33; 4, *prol.* 10; *fabella*: 1,2,9; 2,5,6; 2, *prol.* 2; 3, *prol.* 36.

[13] Compare *fastidis* in 4,7,2 with 3, *prol.* 23, *fastidiose ... in coetum recipior.* Phaedrus' targets might include Ovid's lost *Medea*, which was probably the shared model of Phaedrus and Seneca's *Medea*; for the analogies between our passage and these authors, see Cavarzere 1973-74, 106-109, 113-114; Gärtner 2000, 670 and 2017, 47. The issue of the relationship with Seneca is complicated by the fact that Seneca speaks of the Aesopic genre as 'a work unattempted by Roman talents' (*Dial.* 11,8,3, on which see Mazzoli 1968; Champlin 2005, 101-102; Mattiacci 2008).

[14] A particular type of the so-called Vossianic antonomasia (the use of the name of an individual to denote an entire class); cf. Cavarzere 1973-74, 114-119, who identifies Cato as the Cato the Censor rather than the Younger Cato (as also Gärtner 2000, 678; Herrmann 2004).

existence; it is part of a literary project which does not go as far as Martial's openly anti-mythological polemic deriving from satire, but which cannot conceal, here and elsewhere, an impatience with the sublime genres.[15] This is a project that claims novelty and commitment in more than one direction: to fill the last lacuna in Latin literature, turning the humble genre of the fable into a refined and self-standing literary *opus*, a 'learned toil';[16] and to provide a non-superficial entertainment based, in the style of Horace, on the categories of *dulce* and *utile*, showing 'life itself and the ways of men and women' (3, *prol.* 50).[17]

II

Martial, like Phaedrus, claims to know *livor* and *invidia*; but popular success, which had eluded Phaedrus, seems to endow him with a greater measure of self-mocking confidence even in face of the *lectores Catones*, who disdain any poetic *lusus* in the name of austere, committed mythological poetry. To limit ourselves to a few examples that seem to show Phaedrus' influence, we can cite the irony of the ostentatious modesty of 13,2,1-8: 'Your nose may be as large as you please, you may *be* a nose … but you can't say more against my trifles than I have said myself … *I* know that these things of mine are nothing'; or, by contrast, the imperious cry of 'Out you go!' (11,2, *ite foras*) by which, protected by the freedom of the Saturnalia but even more by his fame, as he is now read even by Nerva, he excludes all austere readers with 'gloomy brow and stern countenance of unbending Cato'.[18]

In 8,3 (a long epigram in elegiac couplets, deeply influenced by *recusationes* of the Augustan age) the contrast between 'sock' and 'buskin' and the justification of his own realistic programme are entrusted to the voice of an *alter ego*, his Muse:

---

[15] On poets annoying because of their length to whom Phaedrus opposed his *brevitas*, cf. 4, *epil.*; on fanatics of *antiquitas*, cf. 5, *prol.*

[16] Cf. 2, *epil.* 8-19; 4, *epil.* 5-6.

[17] On the dependence of Phaedrus' literary programme on Horace, see Luzzatto. 1976, 9 ff.; Galli 1983; Hamm 2000; Holzberg 1993, 55; Gärtner 2000, 682 and n. 77.

[18] On the topos of the *lector Cato*, cf. also Mart. 1 *epist.* and the problematically metaliterary lines in Petr. 132,15,1-2 *Quid me constricta spectatis fronte Catones / damnatisque novae simplicitatis opus?* ('Why do ye, Cato's disciples, look at me with wrinkled foreheads, and condemn a work of fresh simplicity?'), on which see Setaioli in Schmeling 2011, 510-514 with bibliography.

'Quinque satis fuerant: iam sex septemve libelli
    est nimium: quid adhuc ludere, Musa, iuvat?
Sit pudor et finis: iam plus nihil addere nobis
    fama potest: teritur noster ubique liber;
et cum rupta situ Messalae saxa iacebunt   5
    altaque cum Licini marmora pulvis erunt,
me tamen ora legent et secum plurimus hospes
    ad patrias sedes carmina nostra feret.'
Finieram, cum sic respondit nona sororum,
    cui coma et unguento sordida vestis erat: 10
'Tune potes dulcis, ingrate, relinquere nugas?
    Dic mihi, quid melius desidiosus ages?
An iuvat ad tragicos soccum transferre cothurnos
    aspera vel paribus bella tonare modis,
praelegat ut tumidus rauca te voce magister   15
    oderit et grandis virgo bonusque puer?
Scribant ista graves nimium nimiumque severi,
    quos media miseros nocte lucerna videt.
At tu Romano lepidos sale tinge libellos:
    agnoscat mores vita legatque suos.   20
Angusta cantare licet videaris avena,
    dum tua multorum vincat avena tubas.'

'Five had been enough; six or seven little books is already too much. Why, Muse, do you wish to frolic further? Let there be some shame, and an end. Fame can confer nothing more on me now. My books are thumbed everywhere; and when Messalla's stones lie broken by decay and the tall marbles of Licinus are dust, I shall still be read and many a stranger shall carry my poems with him to the land of his ancestors.' I had done, when the ninth of the Sisters, whose hair and dress were stained with unguent, thus made answer: 'Ingrate, can you abandon your sweet trifles? Tell me, what better will you find to do in your idleness? Or do you wish to exchange your slipper for tragic buskins or thunder hard-fought wars in equal measures, to be dictated by a pompous schoolmaster's hoarse voice and hated by big girls and honest lads? Let the ultra-serious and the ultra-severe write such stuff, sad fellows looked upon by the midnight lamp. But do *you* dip your witty little books in Roman salt; let life recognise and read of her ways. Never mind if you seem to sing with a narrow pipe, so long as your pipe outmatches many people's trumpets.' (Text and transl. by D.R. Shackleton Bailey)

After seven books and success unbounded in time and space, the poet resolves to bring his epigram-writing career to an end (1-8). His Muse, however, reacts bitterly, like a deceived lover, insinuating that he wants to abandon sweet *nugae* to devote himself to sublime genres (13-14). This is an unhappy choice, she says, one that is decidedly unpopular, because lofty poetry is destined to be restricted to the narrow confines of the school and to be hated by boys and girls; it is the product of writers who are ultra-serious and ultra-severe (and therefore similar to Cato),[19] oppressed by the nightly fatigue of having to compose (15-18). In the end, the Muse confirms the need for poetry in which life recognises itself and its customs, rooted in the Roman tradition of the *sales* (19-20):[20] a 'light' pleasant poetry in the vein of Catullus' brief verses (compare *lepidos ... libellos* in 19 and *dulcis ... nugas* in 11 with Catul. 1,1-4). In the last distich Martial proudly claims the 'victorious' *tenuitas* ('slenderness') of his poetry, with an interesting re-writing of the Callimachean poetics of *leptotēs*[21] in a 'real-istic' key that guarantees popularity and rejects mythology altogether. Thus, for Martial, *tenuitas* consists in choosing the narrow horizon of the everyday life of the 'sock', pursuing an alternative poetical project to the traditional genres which were admired but neither loved nor read (see 4,49,10 'that they praise, but this they read'), while his *libelli* were endlessly and everywhere passed from hand to hand (4).[22]

As in Phaedrus, in Martial 'sock' and 'buskin' are set in marked opposition, renewing the polemic of the importance and worth of the poet's choice of genre. Certainly, as we have noted, Martial's attitude is less defensive and more per-emptory: the shift to 'buskin' is not even attempted; it is only a worrying suspi-cion of betrayal expressed by his Muse/lover, who effectively forbids any exper-imentation. And in 11,90, when, like Phaedrus, Martial seems about to please his critics and leads them to expect an imitation of sublime archaic verses, he cuts their expectation short with an obscene remark: this produces a deliberate lapse in style after the lofty citations of the old poets, and exposes the hypocrisy of those who make a show of having severe tastes by condemning the *mollities*

---

[19] The two adjectives (17 *graves... severi*) allude to epic and tragic poetry respectively; see the examples collected by Schöffel 2002, 114.

[20] Also in 4,23,6-7 Martial indicates *sal Romanus* as the defining characteristic of the Latin epigram compared to the charm of the Greek; it also characterised satire (e.g. Hor. *S.* 1,10,3-4).

[21] See *angusta vena* vs. *tuba*. For the 'narrow pipe', cf. Verg. *Ecl*. 1,2 and 6,8. The trumpet as symbol of epic is not attested before Martial (see also 8,55,4; 10,64,4; 11,3,8).

[22] For Martial's re-use of Callimachean poetics in a realistic key, see Citroni 1968, 281-282; Canobbio 2005, 142 and n. 35; Mattiacci 2007, 193 ff.; see also Schöffel 2002, 98.

of light poetry: 'Do you wish me to imitate the old poets, your poets, Chrestillus? Damned if you don't know the taste of a cock' (7-8).

<div align="center">

III

</div>

In Apuleius' novel there is no open polemic with the supercilious critics, but the dialogue with the reader shows that the author is aware that he has to reckon with the problems posed by the reception of a 'low' genre: the *ego* of the prologue wants to seduce the reader and to forestall possible criticisms, of which a metaliterary echo, symmetrically placed at the end of the work, might be seen in the 'slanders of detractors' (11,30,4 *malevolorum disseminationes*) arising in the Forum from envy of Lucius' industrious learning.[23] In 10,2,4, with a prominent new apostrophe to the reader, the Lucius-ass narrator introduces the story of the stepmother, a new 'Phaedra' in bourgeois clothing, thereby marking the passage from 'sock' to 'buskin':

> 1. *Dominus aedium habebat iuvenem filium probe litteratum atque ob id consequenter pietate, modestia praecipuum, quem tibi quoque provenisse cuperes vel talem.* 2. *Huius matre multo ante defuncta, rursum matrimonium sibi reparaverat, ductaque alia filium procreaverat alium, qui adaeque iam duodecimum annum aetatis supergressus erat.* 3. *Sed noverca forma magis quam moribus in domo mariti praepollens, seu naturaliter impudica seu fato ad extremum impulsa flagitium, oculos ad privignum adiecit.* 4. *Iam ergo, lector optime, scito te tragoediam, non fabulam legere et a socco ad cothurnum ascendere.*[24]

The owner of the house had a young son with a good liberal education, who was consequently unusually obedient and modestly behaved – indeed the kind of son you would wish to have as your own. The boy's mother had died many years before, and the father had remarried. By his second wife he had had a second son, who had just completed his twelfth year. The stepmother, however, held sway in her husband's house more by beauty than by character; and whether naturally unchaste or driven by fate to the unforgivably

---

[23] As Graverini says in Graverini & Keulen 2009, 199: 'I think that it is not too far-fetched to consider those malevolent criticisms against Lucius as a sort of metaliterary echo of the bad reviews that the novel could get, at least in the most highbrow circles'.

[24] This passage is rightly seen in relation to the prologue of the novel by Keulen 2007, 131, who focuses on the active, performative role of the *lector*.

wicked deed, she turned covetous eyes toward her stepson. So now, excellent reader, know that you are reading a tragedy, and no light tale, and that you are rising from the lowly slipper to the lofty buskin. (Text and transl. by J.A. Hanson)

We are told that the tale is in the tragic tradition, which both elevates the tone (*ascendere*) and prompts us to identify the anonymous characters who appear immediately before the apostrophe to the reader (the master of the house, the obedient and modest young son, the beautiful and shameless stepmother in love with her stepson) with the familiar protagonists of the myth of Phaedra and Hippolytus. The rewriting of the tragic *fabula* occupies the first part of book 10 (ch. 2-12) and, in contrast to Phaedrus' experiment with orthodox tragedy, is a significant example of 'genre metamorphosis'. The great tragic theme of Phaedra, stripped of its mythical status and transposed to an everyday reality of scheming slaves and indecisive law courts, is reduced to an episode of 'crime news' in a small provincial town, which can be rewritten in the 'low' code of the tale and novel.[25]

The apostrophe to the reader also draws attention to the fact that perverse stepmothers are found not only in tragedies but also in everyday life, with a probable reference to a famous passage of Juvenal's sixth satire, which mentions matrons who poison stepsons and even sons (6,627-661).[26] In this context the satirist wonders if he is betraying the laws of his genre (the object of satire is the truth of daily reality expressed in the *sermo cotidianus*) by endowing it with the 'high buskin', i.e. by adopting a fictitious subject, a tragic tone and a sublime style:

Fingimus haec altum satura sumente coturnum
scilicet, et finem egressi legemque priorum
grande Sophocleo carmen bacchamur hiatu,
montibus ignotum Rutulis caeloque Latino? (634-637)

I'm making all this up, am I, letting satire put on tragic high heels? I've exceeded the legal limits of my predecessors and I'm ranting with rotundity worthy of Sophocles a grand song that's new to the Rutulian hills and the Latin sky?

---

[25] On this episode, see Fiorencis & Gianotti 1990; Münstermann 1995, 94 ff.; Finkelpearl 1998, 149-183.; Zimmerman 2000, *ad loc*. and Appendix I; Mattiacci 2006; Smith 2007.
[26] See Zimmerman 2000, 69 and 2006, 93.

Juvenal of course denies abandoning the truth (638 'if only this were really non-sense!') and, with the example of Pontia who poisoned her two sons at a single dinner, shows how in his times the extraordinary crimes of a mother/wife no longer belong exclusively to the fiction of myth and tragedy, but can be found in everyday life: they have become reality. Thus, all his satire has done is to adapt itself to this monstrously degraded reality by using a tone and style raised to the sublime of tragedy, because *grandia monstra* (645) demand a *grande carmen* to denounce them.[27] Behind such considerations, there is the rule of stylistic decorum, formulated by Horace:

> *Versibus exponi tragicis res comica non vult;*
> *indignatur item privatis ac prope socco*
> *dignis carminibus narrari cena Thyestae.* (*Ars* 89-91)

A theme for Comedy refuses to be set forth in verses of Tragedy; likewise the feast of Thyestes scorns to be told in strains of daily life that well nigh befit the comic sock.

This rule is repeated by Quintilian[28] and was not unknown to Apuleius, who in the *Florida* (16,7) sings the praise of the comic writer Philemon, because in him there is 'lots of humour: the plots are full of wittily contrived intrigue … the ideas true to life, the jests never unworthy of true comedy (*non infra soccum*), the serious passages never quite on the level of tragedy (*non usque ad cothurnum*)'. Apuleius is thus well aware of genre boundaries and of the need to observe the law of decorum relating to traditional literary genres, as defined in ancient rhetorical practice. By contrast, in the novel, the transition from the 'sock' to the 'buskin' is proposed with no apparent difficulty and with no metaliterary justification of the kind Juvenal had deemed necessary.

In the 'open', 'polyphonic' form of the novel, which constantly feeds on different literary genres and traditions, and shares the hybridity, though not the recognised status of satire, mixing tragedy with comedy is not perceived as a

---

[27] 643-644: 'we have to believe what the tragedians say about the savage woman of Colchis and about Procne'; 655-656: 'every morning you'll run into a granddaughter of Belus and an Eriphyle many times over. There's no street without its Clytemnestra'. The same metaphor, again in connection with the monstrously tragic nature of real life, returns in Juv. 15,27-29.

[28] *Inst*. 10,2,22: 'each genre has its own law, and its own standard of appropriateness. Comedy does not walk tall in tragedy's high boots, nor tragedy amble on in comedy's slippers'. See also Cic. *Opt. Gen.* 1,1: 'in tragedy anything comic is flawed and in comedy anything tragic is unsightly'.

fault.[29] In Phaedrus and Martial, by contrast, the intersection of genres generates friction: it is an element of a literary polemic that opposes 'low' literary forms, flexible but only within limits, to the traditional 'high' ones. These forms may not wear the 'buskin' on pain of forfeiting their identity. The project of re-establishing 'minor' genres such as the fable and the epigram in Latin literature involved emphasising their realism and so excluded contamination by lofty genres, which are far from real life and from the modern sensibility of readers. So the defensive strategy used by writers of fable and epigram tended to be openly ironic, sometimes sarcastic.

However, in Apuleius' novel too there is a subtle, less obvious irony which destabilises the presence of a sublime genre like tragedy, at precisely the moment when it is affirmed: the warning to the reader is entrusted to an unreliable and discredited ass-narrator, who often comes out with disorienting indications.[30] As has often been noted, there is a manifest mismatch in this case between the presentation of the story as a tragedy and its non-tragic outcome thanks to the timely intervention of a wise doctor during the trial. This character, unrelated to the Phaedra-myth, ensures a comedy-like happy ending (10,8-12): the death of the younger son, who by mistake had drunk the potion that the stepmother had intended for her loved-hated stepson, turns out to be only apparent (because the doctor substituted a sleeping draught for the poison); recognition of the innocence of the older son does not come too late; and the perfidious stepmother, comparable to Phaedra at the beginning of the tale, is condemned to exile. So the lofty comment to the 'excellent reader', while it stresses the hybrid nature of the text, is also, at a deeper level and in accordance with the subtle irony at the expense of the unreliable narrator, a sort of bluff. As such, it needs no added metaliterary justification: there is no real ascent from the 'sock' to the 'buskin', both because of the bourgeois vein in which the tragic story is rewritten and because of the dominance of a comic *fortuna*/*Tyche* in the finale:

> *Et illius quidem senis famosa atque fabulosa fortuna providentiae divinae condignum accepit exitum, qui momento modico, immo puncto exiguo, post orbitatis periculum adulescentium duorum pater repente factus est.* (10,12,5)

As for the father himself, his famed and storied fortune received an ending worthy of divine providence: a short while – no, only an instant – after he

---

[29] See May 2006, 274-275.
[30] See Zimmerman 2000, 417-418 with bibliography; Zimmerman 2006, 95 ff.

had been in peril of childlessness, he suddenly became the father of two
young men.

The 'buskinned' Lucius does not seem completely credible, and in his showy
aspiration to the sublime he seems to take on certain features of the 'mythoma-
niac' narrator,[31] whom the author mocks behind his back. This recalls Aris-
tomenes' words in the first tale of the novel, when he reacts to the 'dramatic'
story of his friend Socrates about the extraordinary powers of the magician Mer-
oe: 1,8,5: 'Please … do remove the tragic curtain and fold up the stage drapery,
and give it to me in ordinary language'. Aristomenes' open sarcasm and the
veiled authorial irony in our passage[32] emphasise the degree of ambiguity in the
relation – which would not seem to be problematic – between *hypsos* and *bathos*
in Apuleius' narrative.

Conclusion

The authors examined in this paper share an attitude of self-mockery, which
compares their work to a game or a childish pastime. This is a strategy for re-
vealing the simultaneously pleasant and serious nature of their work, and for
redeeming genres considered marginal and light. But, whereas Phaedrus and
Martial make their self-mockery clear, Apuleius is much more ambiguous, as
can be seen in the passages we have examined on the confrontation between
'sock' and 'buskin'. Instead of the direct polemic and opposition which Phae-
drus and Martial display towards the elevated genres, thus revealing the self-
mockery of the poetics of *lusus*, Apuleius is open to influence from tragedy.
However, unlike Phaedrus, in rewriting his tragic material, he completely 'met-
amorphoses' it and brings it down to the expressive code and to the low material

---

[31] For this term see Conte 1996, 1 ff. In this instance, Lucius is the witness, not the protag-
onist (as is Petronius' Encolpius) of a narrative situation which he assimilates to a heroic
mythical model. On Lucius and Encolpius as 'mythomaniac' protagonists, see Keulen in
Graverini, Keulen & Barchiesi 2006, 134 and 159-160.

[32] Zimmerman 2000, 29 speaks of irony achieved 'because of a marked divergence between
the ideology of the abstract author and the opinions expressed by certain characters in the
work, among them the fictive narrator' (on our passage, see 68-69). According to
Finkelpearl 1998, 151-152, the warning in 10,2,4 is accomplished not by the story of
'Phaedra', which 'has reverted to being a *fabula* after all', but instead by the second sto-
ry, which is connected to the tradition of New Comedy, but has a tragic ending. It is cer-
tainly true that the two stories in book 10 form a unity in which each completes and re-
sponds to the other, and in which a continual metamorphosis of genres is effected; see
also May 2006, 305.

of the novel, which, despite its hybrid character, is substantially rooted, like the fable and the epigram, in the everyday tradition of the 'sock'; and the hidden trace of authorial irony behind the untrustworthy narrator confirms this 'meta-morphosis'.

Bibliography

Canobbio, A. 2005. 'Il libro VIII di Marziale e la ricerca di una identità augustea', in: F. Gasti & G. Mazzoli (eds.), *Modelli letterari e ideologia nell'età flavia*, Pavia: Ibis, 127-162.

Cavarzere, A. 1973-74. 'La trama allusiva di Fedro IV 7', *Memorie Accad. Patavina* 86, 99-119.

Champlin, E. 2005. 'Phaedrus the fabulous', *JRS* 95, 97-123.

Citroni, M. 1968. 'Motivi di polemica letteraria negli epigrammi di Marziale', *DArch* 2, 259-301.

Citroni, M. 2004. 'Martial, Pline le jeune et l'identité du genre de l'épigramme latine', *Dictynna* 1, 125-153 [http://dictynna.revue.univ-lille3.fr/].

Conte, G.B. 1996. *The Hidden Author. An interpretation of Petronius' Satyricon*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Finkelpearl, E.D. 1998. *Metamorphosis of Language in Apuleius. A Study of Allusion in the Novel*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Fiorencis, G. & Gianotti, G.F. 1990. 'Fedra e Ippolito in provincia', *MD* 25, 71-114.

Galli, R. 1983. 'Fedro e Orazio', *Paideia* 38, 195-199.

Gärtner, U. 2000. 'Phaedrus tragicus. Zu Phaedr. 4,7 und seinem Selbstverständnis als Dichter', in: E. Stärk & G. Vogt-Spira (eds.), *Dramatische Wäldchen. Festschrift für Eckard Lefèvre zum 65. Geburtstag*, Hildesheim, Zürich & New York: Olms, 661-682.

Gärtner, U. 2017. 'From Aeschylus to Phaedrus. Fables in tragedy, tragedy in fables', *Itaca* 33, 37-57.

Graverini, L. 2006. 'An old wife's tale', in: W.H. Keulen, R.R. Nauta & S. Panayotakis (eds.), *Lectiones scrupulosae. Essays on the Text and Interpretation of Apuleius' Metamorphoses in Honour of Maaike Zimmerman.* Ancient Narrative Supplementum 6, Groningen: Barkhuis & Groningen University Library, 86-110.

Graverini, L. 2012. *Literature and Identity in The Golden Ass of Apuleius*, transl. by B.T. Lee, Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.

Graverini, L., Keulen, W. & Barchiesi, A. 2006. *Il romanzo antico. Forme, testi, problemi*, Roma: Carocci.

Graverini, L. & Keulen, W. 2009. 'Roman fiction and its audience: seriocomic assertions of authority', in: M. Paschalis, S. Panayotakis & G. Schmeling (eds.), *Readers and Writers in the Ancient Novel.* Ancient Narrative Supplementum 12, Groningen: Barkhuis & Groningen University Library, 197-217.

Hamm, U. 2000. '*Illitteratum plausum nec desidero.* Phaedrus über sich als Dichter', in: J. Styka (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Literary Theory and Criticism*, Kraków: Ksiegarnia Akademicka, 275-296.

Herrmann, K. 2004. 'Ein ganz besonderer Kritikaster: der *lector Cato* in Phaedrus IV 7', *Aevum* 78, 91-96.

Holzberg, N. 1993. *Die antike Fabel. Eine Einführung*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Keulen, W. 2007. '*Vocis immutatio*: the Apuleian prologue and the pleasures and pitfalls of vocal versatility', in: V. Rimell (ed.), *Seeing Tongues, Hearing Scripts: Orality and Representation in the Ancient Novel.* Ancient Narrative Supplementum 7, Groningen: Barkhuis & Groningen University Library, 106-137.

Luzzatto, M.J. 1976. *Fedro. Un poeta tra favola e realtà*, Torino: Paravia.

Mattiacci, S. 2006. 'Da Apuleio all'*Aegritudo Perdicae*: nuove metamorfosi del tema di Fedra', in: C. Santini, L. Zurli & L. Cardinali (eds.), *Concentus ex dissonis. Scritti in onore di Aldo Setaioli*, Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 437-456.

Mattiacci, S. 2007. 'Marziale e il neoterismo', in: A. Bonadeo & E. Romano (eds.), *Dialogando con il passato. Permanenze e innovazioni nella cultura latina di età flavia,* Firenze: Le Monnier, 177-206.

Mattiacci, S. 2008. 'Fedro, Marziale e il nuovo impegno del *lusus* poetico', in: P. Arduini etc. (eds.), *Studi offerti ad Alessandro Perutelli*, Roma: Aracne, 191-203.

May, R. 2006. *Apuleius and Drama. The Ass on Stage*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mazzoli, G. 1968. 'Due note anneane. I. Fedro e Sen. *Cons. ad Pol.* 8,3', *Athenaeum* 46, 355-363.

Münstermann, H. 1995. *Apuleius. Metamorphosen literarischer Vorlagen*, Stuttgart & Leipzig: Teubner.

Oberg, E. 2000. *Phaedrus-Kommentar*, Stuttgart: Steiner.

Pasetti, L. 2007. *Plauto in Apuleio*, Bologna: Pàtron.

Pellucchi, T. 2004. 'Il prologo della *Medea* come paradigma teatrale: il caso di Fedro IV 7', *Aevum (ant.)* n.s. 4, 229-251.

Schmeling, G. 2011. *A Commentary on the* Satyrica *of Petronius*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schöffel, Ch. 2002. *Martial, Buch 8.* Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar, Stuttgart: Steiner.

Smith, S.D. 2007. 'Wonders Beyond Athens: reading the 'Phaedra' stories in Apuleius and Heliodoros', in: M. Paschalis, S. Frangoulidis, S. Harrison & M. Zimmerman (eds.), *The Greek and the Roman Novel. Parallel Readings.* Ancient Narrative Supplementum 8, Groningen: Barkhuis & Groningen University Library, 219-237.

Swann, B.W. 1994. *Martial's Catullus. The Reception of an Epigrammatic Rival*, Hildesheim, Zürich & New York: Olms.

Zimmerman, M. 2000. *Apuleius Madaurensis, Metamorphoses, Book X.* Text, Introduction and Commentary, Groningen: Forsten.

Zimmerman, M. 2006. 'Echoes of Roman satire in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', in: R.R. Nauta (ed.), *Desultoria scientia. Genre in Apuleius' Metamorphoses and Related Texts*, Leuven, Paris & Dudley, MA: Peeters.

Tragedy and paratragedy
in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*

Maria Pia Pattoni
Catholic University of the Sacred Hearth, Milan

I

On the question of the influence of dramatic genres on Longus, critics have generally focused on his novel's numerous and obvious resemblances to New Comedy, while much less attention has been devoted to echoes of tragedy.[1] In this paper I shall deal with some examples of tragic appropriation and analyse how tragic 'presences' are embedded in his narrative.

The passages which show a strong intertextual relationship with tragedy have many features in common, most notably their situational context. A character lamenting the loss of a beloved (person or animal) consistently shows a tendency to use expressive forms taken from the typical patterns of the tragic *thrēnos*: on three occasions Daphnis bewails the loss of Chloe (in 2,22-23 as a consequence of the raids carried out by the Methymnaeans; in 3,26 because he is afraid that she will marry a richer suitor; in 4,28,2-3 because of her kidnapping by Lampis); in 4,8,3-4 Lamon, against the background of his family's despairing cries, utters a proper funeral lamentation for the flowers razed to the ground by Lampis and incorporates all the formal patterns which epic and tragedy employed in lamentations for young men dead on the battlefield; in 3,16,2-4 Lycaenion, playing the role of desperate woman, addresses a speech of supplication to Daphnis, asking him to bring

---

[1] Longus' relation to New Comedy has been studied, among others, by Hunter 1983, 67-71; Billault 1991, 143-151; Crismani 1997, 87-101 (with further bibliographical references); Morgan 2004; Morgan & Harrison 2008, 224. On the influence of Attic tragedy in some episodes of Longus' novel see Pattoni 2004, 84-90; 2005, 9-16. Bowie (2007, 338-352) offers a list of tragic intertexts which might be relevant for Longus, 'argued for on grounds of language or (less often) content' (340). Since he includes a large number of potential cases, they are not all equally convincing, as Bowie's own comments often note (on this see also Battezzato 2009).

back her stolen goose, and again the typical features of high literary genres are reworked for a situation that the reader immediately recognises as fictitious. In all these cases, where reference to tragedy is particularly evident (mostly as a reinterpretation of tragic speech in general, but sometimes as a reworking of specific intertexts), the problem which has provoked the character's suffering is finally overcome in the inevitable happy ending just as in comic genres: and it is with comedy that Longus shares a penchant for parodic distortion of solemn language.

II

An example of this literary situation is Daphnis' reaction to the abduction of Chloe in 2,22-23. The transition from a typically bucolic context (Daphnis was absent because he was cutting green leaves for his goats) to a tragic situation (the discovery of the raid by the Methymnaeans and the violation of the Nymphs' sanctuary, from which Chloe was forcibly snatched) is announced, in the short narrative introduction, by a gesture typical of a tragic actor: Daphnis throws himself to the ground and from there, in an attitude which recalls that which Hecuba often adopts in Euripides' Trojan dramas,[2] he delivers his pathetic monologue:

'ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡρπάσθη Χλόη, καὶ τοῦτο ὑμεῖς ἰδεῖν ὑπεμείνατε; ἢ τοὺς στεφάνους ὑμῖν πλέκουσα, ἡ σπένδουσα τοῦ πρώτου γάλακτος, ἧς καὶ ἡ σῦριγξ ἥδε ἀνάθημα; αἶγα μὲν οὐδὲ μίαν μοι λύκος ἥρπασε, πολέμιοι δὲ τὴν ἀγέλην καὶ τὴν συννέμουσαν. καὶ τὰς μὲν αἶγας ἀποδεροῦσι καὶ τὰ πρόβατα καταθύσουσι, Χλόη δὲ λοιπὸν πόλιν οἰκήσει. ποίοις ποσὶν ἄπειμι παρὰ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα ἄνευ τῶν αἰγῶν, ἄνευ Χλόης, λιπεργάτης ἐσόμενος; ἔχω γὰρ νέμειν ἔτι οὐδέν. ἐνταῦθα περιμενῶ κείμενος ἢ θάνατον ἢ πόλεμον δεύτερον. ἆρα καὶ σύ, Χλόη, τοιαῦτα πάσχεις; ἆρα μέμνησαι τοῦ πεδίου τοῦδε καὶ τῶν Νυμφῶν τῶνδε κἀμοῦ; ἢ παραμυθοῦνταί σε τὰ πρόβατα καὶ αἱ αἶγες αἰχμάλωτοι μετὰ σοῦ γενόμεναι.' (2,22,1-4)

'Chloe was snatched away from you: and could you bear to see this – the girl who used to weave garlands for you, who used to pour you libations of the freshest milk, who offered you these very pipes there? Not a single goat of mine was ever snatched off by a wolf, but now enemies have snatched off the

---

[2] On the act of falling down to the ground in tragedy, see Telò 2002, 9 ff. Hecuba is lying on the ground at the very beginning of *Trojan Women*; she gets up, but then falls down again at 462; in *Hecuba* she falls to the ground at 438; in both dramas, like at 2,22,4, Hecuba expresses the wish that she will never get up again: *Tr.* 466-468 and *Hec.* 501-502.

herd and the girl who helped me look after them. They will skin the goats, sacrifice the sheep – and Chloe will spend the rest of her life in a city! How can I take the steps that will lead me back to my father and mother, without the goats, without Chloe, to be out of work? For I have nothing left to graze. No, I shall lie here and wait for death – or a second war. And you too, Chloe, do you feel like this? Do you remember this plain, these Nymphs, and me? Or are you comforted by the sheep and the goats taken prisoner with you?' (trans. C. Gill)

After a sorrowful apostrophe to the indifferent and uncaring Gods, who failed to protect the pious Chloe (2,22,1; compare E. *Tr.* 1060 ff., 1240 ff., 1287 ff., where responsibility for the fall of Troy is ascribed to the Gods, who forgot the honours they received), Daphnis imagines the girl's future: this is another point of contact with the Trojan dramas, where the captive women, waiting to be deported on Greek ships, indulge in conjectures about their destination (see e.g. *Hec.* 444 ff. and *Tr.* 185 ff.).

However, the solution chosen by Longus – to make Daphnis speak, rather than the captive Chloe – directly recalls the Homeric archetype which is the model of the Euripidean scenes: *Il.* 6,454-463, where Hector predicts Andromache's slavery in a Greek city, working at the loom or carrying water for a foreign mistress. As often with Longus, an epic-tragic motif becomes a bucolic one: the worst destiny that Daphnis, a shepherd, can imagine for Chloe is a city-life *tout court* (no matter what she does or whose servant she is, as in the literary models here recalled), a destiny that he connects to the cruel sacrifice of a sheep or goat: the comparison with the much worse fate of the animals has an obviously ironic effect.

Daphnis' thoughts return to Chloe at the end of the monologue: he imagines her in the company of sheep and goats, which share her captivity and offer her their consolation. This is another typical situation in Euripides' Trojan dramas, where a chorus of captives stands by the main character, sharing her sorrow and offering support. The analogy with a dramatic chorus is explicitly recalled by the narrator himself at the end of the episode: when Chloe is released with her animals, they gather around her 'like a chorus, jumping and bleating, and showing signs of happiness' (2,29,1). So the sympathy of a 'humanised' chorus of animals changes from the initial kommatic song of sorrow to a final joyful hyporchema, in keeping with the happy ending.

If the references to Chloe are drawn from the literary model of the captive Trojan women,[3] when Daphnis says that he escaped slavery but lost his flock Longus resorts to a different dramatic model. In particular, the question Daphnis poses at 2,22,2, 'How can I take the steps that will lead me back (ποίοις ποσὶν ἄπειμι; literally 'with what feet shall I return') to my father and mother, without the goats, without Chloe, to be out of work?' echoes the words uttered by the Sophoclean Ajax after he discovers the slaughter of the flocks:

> καὶ ποῖον ὄμμα πατρὶ δηλώσω φανεὶς
> Τελαμῶνι; πῶς με τλήσεταί ποτ' εἰσιδεῖν
> γυμνὸν φανέντα τῶν ἀριστείων ἄτερ; (*Aj.* 462-464)

> And what eye shall I show appearing to my father Telamon? How will he bear to look at me when I appear naked, without the trophies?

Just as Ajax, having lost his *aristeia*,[4] was ashamed to meet his father, so Daphnis, having lost his goats, is ashamed to go home empty-handed: and as the Sophoclean hero stresses the concept of deprivation in a double construction of clear Iliadic origin (γυμνὸν … τῶν ἀριστείων ἄτερ, see *e.g. Il.* 21,50 γυμνὸν ἄτερ κόρυθός τε καὶ ἀσπίδος; 'naked, without helmet or shield'), Daphnis translates the duplication into the symmetrical, anaphoric style beloved of Longus (ἄνευ τῶν αἰγῶν, ἄνευ Χλόης; 'without the goats, without Chloe'). And the two solutions to the predicament which Ajax then figures out – fighting his enemies or death (*Aj.* 466-468) – are precisely those that Daphnis imagines for himself: 'I shall … wait for death – or a second war'. However, in relation to his model, Longus introduces a subtle but important variation which creates a parodic effect. The formulation used by tragic heroes contains references to the ὄμμα ('eye' or 'face'), as we find,

---

[3] In the wider context, there are also are many analogies between the Trojan myth and what happens on the Methymnaeans' ship. In 2,25, for example, after describing their festive revelry after the raid (2,25,3 'they drank and played around and held a kind of victory celebration'), Longus uses a narrative pattern frequently found in the tales of the Trojan war: a sudden night assault against an unconscious army during a feast. But here the motif is 'bucolised' by Longus with the presence of Pan himself as a warrior god: it is a sort of revenge of the pastoral world on the raiders from the city. And the Methymnaeans' bewilderment as to the reason for Pan's wrath, as no shrine of his has been looted (2,26,5), can be interpreted as a reference to another literary *topos* of the Trojan myth, Athena's wrath for the pillage of her temple at Ilium: the night storm which assailed the Greek fleet is here represented by the inversion of the natural elements which strikes the sailor men of Methymna returning with their spoils.

[4] The reference is here to the arms of Achilles, which Odysseus gained without deserving them.

in addition to *Aj.* 462, in the reuse of the same motif by the Sophoclean Oedipus in *OT* 1371-1373.[5] Daphnis here, on the contrary, has replaced the words ποίοις ὄμμασιν ('with what eyes') with the atypical ποίοις ποσίν ('with what feet'): the change of reference from eyes to feet produces an almost comical lowering of the stylistic tone.[6] And the lowering to a realistic register is also stressed by the reference to Daphnis' future as 'out of work': the epic word γυμνός, indicating nudity, in the Iliadic sense of 'lacking weapons',[7] the idea which concerned Ajax, is replaced by the otherwise unattested λιπεργάτης, indicating the fear of 'lacking a job' and thus the means of subsistence. The aristocratic ideals of the epic-tragic heroes are replaced by the more modest desires of the humble characters of the bucolic world.

In Daphnis' case, as we also saw with Chloe, ironic distance has the function of anticipating the happy ending of the story, where the tragic patterns of the Sophoclean Ajax are reversed. If Ajax was hated by the gods,[8] Daphnis is supported by Pan, Eros and the Nymphs, who visit him in dreams to give their reassurance:

τοιαῦτα λέγοντα αὐτὸν ἐκ τῶν δακρύων καὶ τῆς λύπης ὕπνος βαθὺς καταλαμβάνει. καὶ αὐτῷ αἱ τρεῖς ἐφίστανται Νύμφαι, μεγάλαι γυναῖκες καὶ καλαί, ἡμίγυμνοι καὶ ἀνυπόδετοι, τὰς κόμας λελυμέναι καὶ τοῖς ἀγάλμασιν ὅμοιαι. καὶ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐῴκεσαν ἐλεοῦσαι τὸν Δάφνιν· ἔπειτα ἡ πρεσβυτάτη λέγει ἐπιρρωννύουσα. 'μηδὲν ἡμᾶς μέμφου, Δάφνι· Χλόης γὰρ ἡμῖν μᾶλλον ἢ σοὶ μέλει. ἡμεῖς τοι καὶ παιδίον οὖσαν αὐτὴν ἠλεήσαμεν καὶ ἐν τῷδε τῷ ἄντρῳ κειμένην [αὐτὴν] ἀνεθρέψαμεν. καὶ νῦν δὲ ἡμῖν πεφρόντισται τὸ κατ' ἐκείνην, ὡς μήτε εἰς τὴν Μήθυμναν κομισθεῖσα δουλεύοι μήτε μέρος γένοιτο

---

[5] ὄμμασιν ποίοις βλέπων / πατέρα ποτ' ἂν προσεῖδον εἰς Ἅιδου μολών, / οὐδ' αὖ τάλαιναν μητέρ(α); ('What sort of eyes would I need to look at my father when I meet him in Hades, and at my poor mother?').

[6] The formulation, so atypical that it is usually ignored by translators (cf. e.g. Lowe 1908, 83: 'how shall I dare to go home to father and mother'; Thornley 1916, 97-98: 'with what face can I now come into the sight of my father and my mother'; Schönberger 1989[4], 107: 'wie soll ich denn vor Vater und Mutter treten'; Balboni 1973, 565: 'chi mi darà la forza di tornare da mio padre e da mia madre'; Monteleone 1987, 256: 'come ardirò tornare da mio padre e da mia madre'; Burlando 1997, 61: 'con quale coraggio mi presenterò a mio padre e a mia madre'; Morgan 2004, 69: 'how can I go home to my father and mother'), is justified by the specific context: it is functional both to the verb ἄπειμι (the initial idea to return home involves the reference to the motor organ, the feet) and to the decision, expressed shortly thereafter, to remain lying in the same place.

[7] For the epic formula γυμνός (or γυμνωθείς) with the meaning of 'deprived of [his armour]' see also *Il.* 13,389; 16,312, 400 and 815; 18,122, 693 and 711; 18,21; 22,124, etc.

[8] S. *Aj.* 457; see also 450--456 where Athena's hatred for the hero is emphasised.

λείας πολεμικῆς. καὶ τὸν Πᾶνα ἐκεῖνον τὸν ὑπὸ τῇ πίτυϊ ἱδρυμένον ὃν ὑμεῖς
οὐδέποτε οὐδὲ ἄνθεσιν ἐτιμήσατε, τούτου ἐδεήθημεν ἐπίκουρον γενέσθαι
Χλόης; συνήθης γὰρ στρατοπέδοις μᾶλλον ἡμῶν καὶ πολλοὺς ἤδη πολέμους
ἐπολέμησε τὴν ἀγροικίαν καταλιπών· καὶ ἄπεισι τοῖς Μηθυμναίοις οὐκ ἀγα-
θὸς πολέμιος. κάμνε δὲ μηδέν, ἀλλ' ἀναστὰς ὄφθητι Λάμωνι καὶ Μυρτάλῃ,
οἳ καὶ αὐτοὶ κεῖνται χαμαί, νομίζοντες καὶ σὲ μέρος γεγονέναι τῆς ἁρπαγῆς·
Χλόη γάρ σοι τῆς ἐπιούσης ἀφίξεται μετὰ τῶν αἰγῶν, μετὰ τῶν προβάτων,
καὶ νεμήσετε κοινῇ καὶ συρίσετε κοινῇ· τὰ δὲ ἄλλα μελήσει περὶ ὑμῶν Ἔ-
ρωτι'. (2,23,1-5)

While he was talking in this way, a deep sleep took him out of his tears and
pain. The three Nymphs appeared to him as tall, beautiful women, half-naked
and barefooted, their hair flowing free – just like their images. First of all,
they seemed to be feeling sorry for Daphnis. Then the eldest spoke, encour-
aging him. 'Don't blame us, Daphnis. We care about Chloe even more than
you do. We were the ones who took pity on her when she was a child, and
when she was lying in this cave, we saw to it that she was nursed. Even now
we have paid attention to her situation and made sure she won't be carried off
to Methymna to become a slave and won't become part of the spoils of war.
You see Pan over there, his image set up under the pine, who's never received
from you even the honor of some flowers – well, we've asked him to be
Chloe's protector. He's more used to army camps than we are, and he's al-
ready left the country and fought a number of wars. And when he attacks the
Methymneans, they won't find him a good enemy to have. Don't make your-
self anxious. Get up and show yourself to Lamon and Myrtale. Like you,
they're lying on the ground, thinking that you are part of the plunder too.
Chloe will come to you tomorrow, with the goats, with the sheep, and you
will graze together and play the pipes together. All your other affairs will be
taken care of by Love". (trans. C. Gill, slightly adapted)

In predicting to Daphnis that 'Chloe will come … with the goats, with the sheep',
the Nymphs use the asyndetic and anaphoric expression μετὰ τῶν αἰγῶν, μετὰ τῶν
προβάτων, which reverses the dicolon ἄνευ τῶν αἰγῶν, ἄνευ Χλόης ('without the
goats, without Chloe') of Daphnis' lament at 2,22,3. And if there the dicolon was
immediately followed by the prospect of 'losing his job', here, in a symmetrical
and reverse way, the dicolon is followed by the prospect of *keeping* his job as a
shepherd together with the beloved Chloe (νεμήσετε κοινῇ καὶ συρίσετε κοινῇ
2,23,5).

A similar reversal can be seen with Daphnis’ parents, who are represented as the antithesis of Ajax’ father. In Sophocles’ play, we are told that Telamon has an irritable temper: Teucer expresses profound fear at having to face his father and break the news of Ajax’ death to him: a father ‘who, even when good fortune befalls him, is not wont to smile more brightly then before’ (*Aj.* 1010-1011), ‘a choleric man, harsh in his old age, who loses his temper even without a cause’ (1017-1018). Telamon’s stern reaction, which Teucer predicts in *Aj.* 1019-1021 (he will be banished from home, and cast off) perfectly coincides with the mythical tradition. In reversing the tragic pattern of the severe father, unable to accept his son’s defeats, the Nymphs take care to stress that Lamon and Myrtale are overwhelmed by pain, no less than Daphnis, for they think that he is part of the Methymnaeans’ spoils; ‘they also are prostrated on the ground’ (2,23,5 οἳ καὶ αὐτοὶ κεῖνται χαμαὶ 2,23,5). Through this unnecessary, and therefore significant, detail, the narrator establishes a comparison with Daphnis’ despair, which was expressed by the same ‘tragic’ gesture (2,21,3 ‘there he threw himself down on the ground’, ἐνταῦθα καὶ ἔρριψεν ἑαυτὸν χαμαὶ; 2,22,4, ‘I’ll go on lying here’, ἐνταῦθα περιμενῶ κείμενος). Encouraged by the Nymphs, Daphnis stops weeping, picks up the foliage he had cut (the reprise of this motif, which marked the beginning of the episode at 2,20,2, warns the reader that the tragic parenthesis ends here and Daphnis returns to his usual role of bucolic character) and comes back to his parents, who receive him with open arms (2,24,3). With the inevitable happy ending back on track, any tragic echo definitively fades away.

III

After Chloe is abducted for the second time, by Lampis (4,28), Longus gives Daphnis a pathetic soliloquy:

Ὁ δὲ ἔξω τῶν φρενῶν γενόμενος οὔτε εἰπεῖν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ἐτόλμα καὶ καρτερεῖν μὴ δυνάμενος εἰς τὸν περίκηπον εἰσελθὼν ὠδύρετο ‘ὦ πικρᾶς ἀνευρέσεως’ λέγων· ‘πόσον ἦν μοι κρεῖττον νέμειν; πόσον ἤμην μακαριώτερος, δοῦλος ὤν. τότε ἔβλεπον Χλόην, τότε <ἤκουον Χλόης λαλούσης >. νῦν δὲ τὴν μὲν Λάμπις ἁρπάσας οἴχεται, νυκτὸς δὲ γενομένης <καὶ συγ>κοιμήσεται. ἐγὼ δὲ πίνω καὶ τρυφῶ καὶ μάτην τὸν Πᾶνα καὶ τὰς αἶγας καὶ τὰς Νύμφας ὤμοσα” (4,28,2-3).

He went out of his mind; but he didn’t dare to speak to his father; nor could he bear it either, and so he went to the yard and expressed his misery in these

words: 'How horrible it is that I've been recognized! How much better it was for me to be a herdsman! How much happier I was when I was a slave! Then I looked at Chloe; then <I listened to Chloe chattering>. Now Lampis has carried her off and gone away with her; and when night comes, he'll sleep with her too! While I'm drinking and living in luxury – and my oath to Pan and to the goats is worth nothing'. (trans. C. Gill)

Daphnis' outburst has some interesting points of contact with two Homeric monologues characterised by the most distinctive dramatic contexts: *Il.* 21,273 ff. (Achilles is about to be killed by the river Xanthus) and *Od.* 5,299 ff. (Odysseus, while escaping from Calypso on his raft, is hit by a sea storm).[9] After a narrative introduction in which the character's dismay is stressed by a verb of lamenting (ᾤμωξεν, *Il.* 21,272; ὀχθήσας, *Od.* 5,298; ὠδύρετο, Long. 4,28,2), the monologue begins with a deprecatory formula – half way between *indignatio* and *thrēnos* – on the present situation (*Il.* 21,273-274, *Od.* 5,299-300, Long. 4,28,2-3); with a flashback to the past, the character claims that he would prefer to go back to his previous condition, which, although negative, nonetheless had advantages that the present one does not, rather than be in the present condition: 'I'd rather have died hit by the hand of Hector', claims Achilles at *Il.* 21,279-280, 'at least a brave man would have killed me'; 'I'd rather have died fighting at Troy', claims Odysseus at *Od.* 5,308-311, 'at least I would have received funeral rites and the Achaeans would have honoured me'; 'I'd rather have lived as a servant, a shepherd of flocks', claims Daphnis at 4,28,3, 'at least I could have stayed with Chloe'. Finally, after the wishful flashback, through the transitional formula νῦν δέ ('but now'),[10] the character returns to a more desperate lament for his present sadness. In this case, as in the first of Daphnis' solos in 2,22, the narrator seems to smile and keep his distance, because what is under threat here is not the character's life itself, as in both the Homeric models, but the love between Daphnis and Chloe, in accordance with the common Hellenistic reductive process of transforming heroic themes into erotic ones. However, the happy ending is soon restored: in the Homeric models thanks to a god who hears or sees the hero in distress (Poseidon and Athena in the case of Achilles in *Il.* 21,284-297, Ino Leucothea in that of Odysseus in *Od.* 5,332-353); in Longus the salvation comes from a comic version of the *deus ex machina*, namely Gnathon: after he has eavesdropped on Daphnis'

---

[9] On the features shared by these two monologues, in which the main character believes that he will soon die, see Pattoni 1998, 29-31.

[10] *Il.* 21,281 = *Od.* 5,312 νῦν δέ με λευγαλέῳ θανάτῳ εἵμαρτο ἁλῶναι ("instead, now it's my wretched fate to perish miserably"); Long. 4,28,3 νῦν δὲ τὴν μὲν … ἐγὼ δέ ("instead, now she … and I").

monologue, in a typically comic dramatic device, he changes from parasite into soldier and with a lightning raid he brings Chloe back to Daphnis' arms (4,29). The vivid narration of Gnathon's *Blitz* is also constantly enriched by parody: military terms are applied to a bucolic context (for example in 4,29,3 the narrator suggests that Lampis would have been bound and carried off 'as a prisoner from a war', if he had not managed to escape in time).

<div align="center">

IV

</div>

Another place characterised by the parodic rewriting of motifs from 'high' literary genres is when Lamon's family weeps for the garden razed to the ground by Lampis:

ἰδὼν δὲ πᾶν τὸ χωρίον δεδῃωμένον καὶ ἔργον οἷον ἐχθρός, οὐ λῃστής, ἐργάσαιτο, κατερρήξατο μὲν εὐθὺς τὸν χιτωνίσκον, βοῇ δὲ μεγάλῃ θεοὺς ἀνεκάλει, ὥστε καὶ ἡ Μυρτάλη τὰ ἐν χερσὶ καταλιποῦσα ἐξέδραμε καὶ ὁ Δάφνις ἐάσας τὰς αἶγας ἀνέδραμε· καὶ ἰδόντες ἐβόων καὶ βοῶντες ἐδάκρυον. καὶ ἦν μὲν καινὸν πένθος ἀνθῶν· ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν πτοούμενοι τὸν δεσπότην ἔκλαον· ἔκλαυσε δ' ἄν τις καὶ ξένος ἐπιστάς· ἀποκεκόσμητο γὰρ ὁ τόπος καὶ ἦν λοιπὸν γῆ πηλώδης. τῶν δὲ εἴ τι διέφυγε τὴν ὕβριν, ὑπήνθει καὶ ἔλαμπε καὶ ἦν ἔτι καλὸν καὶ κείμενον. ἐπέκειντο δὲ καὶ μέλιτται αὐτοῖς συνεχὲς καὶ ἄπαυστον βομβοῦσαι καὶ θρηνούσαις ὅμοιον. ὁ μὲν οὖν Λάμων ὑπ' ἐκπλήξεως κἀκεῖνα ἔλεγε· 'φεῦ τῆς ῥοδωνιᾶς, ὡς κατακέκλασται· φεῦ τῆς ἰωνιᾶς, ὡς <κατα>πεπάτηται· φεῦ τῶν ὑακίνθων καὶ τῶν ναρκίσσων, οὓς ἀνώρυξέ τις πονηρὸς ἄνθρωπος. ἀφίξεται τὸ ἦρ, τὰ δὲ οὐκ ἀνθήσει· ἔσται τὸ θέρος, τὰ δὲ οὐκ ἀκμάσει· μετόπωρον, τὰ δὲ οὐδένα στεφανώσει. οὐδὲ σύ, δέσποτα Διόνυσε, τὰ ἄθλια ταῦτα ἠλέησας ἄνθη, οἷς παρῴκεις καὶ ἔβλεπες, ἀφ' ὧν ἐστεφάνωσά σε πολλάκις; πῶς δείξω νῦν τὸν παράδεισον τῷ δεσπότῃ; τίς ἐκεῖνος θεασάμενος ἔσται; κρεμᾷ γέροντα ἄνθρωπον ἐκ μιᾶς πίτυος ὡς Μαρσύαν· τάχα δὲ καὶ Δάφνιν, ὡς τῶν αἰγῶν ταῦτα εἰργασμένων.'

   δάκρυα ἦν ἐπὶ τούτοις θερμότερα, καὶ ἐθρήνουν οὐ τὰ ἄνθη λοιπόν, ἀλλὰ τὰ αὐτῶν σώματα. ἐθρήνει καὶ Χλόη Δάφνιν εἰ κρεμήσεται καὶ ηὔχετο μηκέτι ἐλθεῖν τὸν δεσπότην αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμέρας διήντλει μοχθηράς, ὡς ἤδη Δάφνιν βλέπουσα μαστιγούμενον. (4,7,5-9,1)

He saw the whole place devastated, in a way an enemy, not a thief, would have gone to work. At once he ripped his tunic in pieces and called on the gods with a great shout, so that Myrtale dropped what she was doing and ran

out, and Daphnis left his goats and ran up. Seeing it, they shouted, and, shout-
ing, they wept: a new kind of mourning – for flowers. They cried from fear of
what their master would do; but even a stranger would have cried if he had
been there, for the place was completely ruined, and all the ground was now
a muddy mess – except that any flowers that had escaped the assault still kept
some bloom and shine and were still lovely even as they lay on the ground.
The bees hung over them too, making a continuous, ceaseless humming, as
though mourning. Lamon was shocked and said: 'Oh, the bed of roses – how
they've been broken down! Oh, the bed of violets – how they've been tram-
pled down! Oh, the hyacinths and narcissi, that some evil man has dug up!
Spring will come, and they will not flower. Summer will come, and they will
not reach full bloom. Another autumn will come, and they will not form a
garland for anyone. Lord Dionysus, didn't you feel sorry for these poor flow-
ers? You used to live beside them and look at them, and I often made you
garlands with them. How shall I show the garden to the master now? And
what will be his reaction when he sees it? There's an old man he'll string up
on one of the pines, like Marsyas; and perhaps he'll think that goats did this
and string up Daphnis too!'

    At this there were even hotter tears, and now they were not mourning for
the flowers, but for their own bodies. Chloe mourned too at the thought that
Daphnis would be strung up, and prayed that their master might no longer
come, and lived through days of utter misery, as though she was already see-
ing Daphnis being whipped. (trans. C. Gill)

The context of this episode shares several features with the narrative situation of
2,22: Lamon, who was about to begin his daily work, like Daphnis in 2,20,2, sees
his garden destroyed and gives expression to his despair with tears, desperate acts
(as Daphnis threw himself to the ground, Lamon tears off his tunic), and direct
speech. The key to reading the whole passage is in the introductory statement by
the narrator at 4,7,5: the whole place was devastated 'as an enemy, not a thief,
would have gone to work'. Dionysophanes' garden after Lampis' raid is thus com-
pared to a battlefield after an armed fight: flowers which lie dead on the ground
(κείμενον 4,8,1) correspond to young soldiers fallen in war, reversing the view-
point of the literary tradition, where the image of a cut-off flower is introduced as
a simile for mortally wounded warriors.[11] And as the soldiers fallen on the

---

[11] See. Hom. *Il.* 8,306-308, 17,53 ff.; Stesich. fr. S15, col. II 14-17 Davies; A.R. 3,1396-403;
Verg. *Aen.* 9,435-437, 11,68-71; Nonn. *D.* 11,280 ff., Q.S. 1,659 ff. (for an application of
this image to erotic contexts see Sapph. fr. 105c V., Cat. 11,22-23 and 62,39ff.). Cf. also
Lazzeri 2006,145-158, with further bibliographical references.

battlefield are given a ritual lament, so the destroyed flowers also receive a regular *thrēnos*, which translates into bucolic language the formal patterns of funeral lamentation, already fixed by a rich literary tradition starting from the *Iliad* and continuing, through tragic versions, into the rhetorical treatises of the Second Sophistic.[12]

The literary models are clearly perceivable in the narrative frame too. The reaction of this peasant family to the destruction of flowers recalls the distraught response of the Trojan royal family to the death of Hector at *Il.* 22,405 ff. (see also Myrtale's reaction to Lamon's 'great shout' at 4,7,5: 'Myrtale dropped she was doing and ran out', just like Andromache at *Il.* 22,448, who drops her spindle when she hears the loud screams). In the Iliadic models there is also constant reference to the community which echoes the family mourning: it could be a ritual lament of women,[13] or the whole city of Troy.[14] In Longus, as also when Dorcon is buried at 1,31,4, the relatives are joined in their lament by animals sympathetic to the dead: bees in the case of the flowers. And for the bees humming, just as for Dorcon's cows bellowing, the narrator makes an explicit comparison to funeral lamentations: bees 'humming, as though mourning' (4,8,2); 'that was the cows' way of mourning for the dead cowherd' (1,31,4).

Finally, in the literary models, the general situation of lamentation gives prominence to the voices of the closest relatives in the form of direct speech: here the same role is played by the gardener Lamon, whose *thrēnos* is based on epic-tragic laments. After the introductory series of three lamenting interjections, which are a parodic echo of similar tragic formulae ('Oh, the bed of roses – how they've been broken down! Oh, the bed of violets – how they've been trampled down! Oh, the hyacinths and narcissi that some evil man has dug up!'), Lamon grieves over the fact that the flowers will not blossom again in spring, nor grow in summer nor decorate anybody's head in autumn. The bucolic situation requires an adaptation of a typical motif of funeral lamentation (regret for the future happiness that they dead person will never know), particularly appropriate for young people dead before their time,[15] to whom the flowers are here assimilated (the

---

[12] See Birchall 1996, 2-7.

[13] Expressed by the formula ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γυναῖκες, *Il.* 19,30, etc.

[14] For example, *Il.* 22,408-409 ('The dear father gave a pitiful groan, and the people around him were weeping throughout the city'; *Il.* 24,776 'So [Helen] spoke in tears, and the huge crowd joined in lament'.

[15] See Alexiou 2002²; premature death is frequently associated with denied nuptial rites or with the joy of having kids, as in Antigone's lament for herself at S. *Ant.* 814 ff. and 867, or in Hecuba's lament for Astyanax at E. *Tr.* 1169. A parodic reprise of the motif is Luc. *Luct.* 13.

chronological sequence of the seasons mentioned here by Lamon is a common analogue for the stages of human life, from early youth to full maturity).

The next section of the *thrēnos* has many points in common with Daphnis' lament in 2,22: after an apostrophe to Dionysus, in which the god is blamed because he had no mercy for the unfortunate flowers (4,8,4; compare Daphnis' reproach of the Nymphs at 2,22,1), Lamon asks himself how he will dare to show the garden to his master, whose angry reaction he fears (compare Daphnis' fear of his parents at 2,22,3). In fact, as the narrator has pointed out in introducing the lament, it is precisely the fear of punishment by Dionysophanes that gives rise to the unusual lament ('they cried from far of what their master would do'); the same motive is confirmed in the final epilogue ('they were mourning not for the flowers but for their own bodies'). Here Longus is consciously and somewhat ironically reworking an almost constant characteristic of epic-tragic funeral laments, where, besides mourning the dead, the survivors grieve for themselves because of the tragic doom which awaits them.

Chloe too participates in the collective weeping (4,9,1): her anguish is described by Longus with the verb *diantleō*, a nautical metaphor (from *antlos*, 'hold of a ship', or 'bilge-water') found in various forms in many tragic texts.[16] However, as usual in Longus, the inevitable happy ending soon arrives: in this case, with an interesting reversal of the tragic norm, thanks to the arrival of an atypical messenger. If in tragedy the entrance of a messenger is usually connected to some painful news, here Dionysophanes' messenger – reassuring in his very name (Eudromus, 'the good runner') and well disposed towards Daphnis from the beginning – in announcing the arrival of his masters, promises to give them all possible support in resolving the situation positively, and ensuing events completely bear out his promise.

<p style="text-align:center">*V*</p>

In contrast to the parodic rewritings of tragedy in episodes characterised by a happy ending, in the only section of the novel which deals with a real death – the killing of Dorcon in the first book – the narrator downplays the pathos of the situation as far as possible and instead exploits not the tragic but the epic dimension of the character. Like some of the major Homeric heroes, Dorcon dies at the end of an *aristeia*, a rustic one of course, in keeping with the character's status: when he lies on the ground, mortally wounded, he tells Chloe that the pirates tore him

---

[16] See e.g. A. *Pr* 84, 375; E. *Andr.* 1216, *HF* 1373, *Ion* 927, fr. 454.3 Kn., *Cycl.* 10, 110; Enn. *Trag.* fr. 103 R.³ *quantis cum aerumnis illum exanclavi diem).*

to pieces like an ox, while he was fighting to defend the herd (1,29,1). It is a bucolic version of the simile that in the *Odyssey* evokes Agamemnon's death, in an analepsis as in Longus, at first narrated by Proteus at 4.534-535, then by Agamemnon himself at 11,409-411: 'Aegisthus … killed me … as one cuts down an ox at his manger'.

In Longus' version, the Homeric simile, which compares a king slain in the dining room to an ox slaughtered in a cattle-shed, is transferred to a new rustic context and applied to a herdsman, and so becomes even more appropriate: much more legitimately than Agamemnon, Dorcon can say of himself that he has been cut down 'like an ox'!

The end of this episode maintains the epic tone of the beginning. Like the great heroes of epic poetry, Dorcon is granted the honour of a solemn burial: a tumulus is erected, and many trees are planted all around it (1,31,3). This narrative detail recalls the exceptional funeral honours given to Eetion, Andromache's father and king of Thebe, by Achilles and the mountain Nymphs:[17] 'Achilles piled a grave mound over it (the body), and the nymphs of the mountains … planted elm trees about it' (*Il.* 6,419-420). After the offerings (all of pastoral nature, of course), the ceremony ends with the atypical funeral lament of Dorcon's cows:

ἠκούσθη καὶ τῶν βοῶν ἐλεεινὰ μυκήματα καὶ δρόμοι τινὲς ὤφθησαν ἅμα τοῖς μυκήμασιν ἄτακτοι· καὶ ὡς ἐν ποιμέσιν εἰκάζετο καὶ αἰπόλοις, ταῦτα θρῆνος ἦν τῶν βοῶν ἐπὶ βουκόλῳ τετελευτηκότι. (1,31,4)

They heard the cows mooing sadly and saw them running wild while they mooed. And they supposed, shepherds and goatherds as they were, that this was the cows' way of mourning for the dead cowherd. (trans. C. Gill, slightly adapted)

This scene may be viewed as the bucolic equivalent of the funeral rites of some of the greatest epic characters (Patroclus, Hector and, in the *Aethiopis*, Achilles himself). The mournful note of the corresponding epic scenes is now fading in the bucolic elegy: if at 1,29,1 Dorcon was compared to an ox, leader of the herd, here the cows themselves are humanised and take the role that, in the funeral laments of epic poems, was attributed to the comrades of the dead. It is thus a case – as so often in Longus – of contamination between homologous situations in different

---

[17] In addition to the echo of the verb φυτεύω ('plant') both funeral scenes are introduced by reference to the honour paid to the dead (τιμῆσαι in Long. 1,31,3 and σεβάσσατο at *Il.* 6,417). A parodic reprise of the motif of the trees planted around the hero's grave is found in Trimalchio's will at Petr. 71,7.

genres: the *pathetic fallacy* typical of pastoral poetry on the one hand,[18] and, on the other, the funeral lament of the fellow-soldiers and the relatives of the hero who died on the battlefield. The running of the cows and their mournful bellowing are the bucolic version of the funeral honours for Patroclus in *Il.* 23,13-16 and for Achilles in *Od.* 24,68-70: as a last homage paid to their leader, the warriors, on foot or on horseback, joust around the funeral pyre, raising high their lament.[19] And, as at the beginning of the episode with the ox-simile, at the end the reprise of the epic model implies an inevitable distance from the model, dispelling pathos with a smile.

Bibliography

Alexiou, M. [2]2002 (1974). *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, revised by D. Yatromanolakis & P. Roilos, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Andronikos, M. 1968. *Archaeologia Homerica*, Bd. 3 *Totenkult*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Balboni, G. 1973 (1958). 'Le avventure pastorali di Dafni e Cloe', in: Q. Cataudella (ed.), *Il romanzo classico*, Firenze: Sansoni editore, 525-615.

Battezzato, L. 2009. Review of C. Kraus, S. Goldhill, H. P. Foley & J. Elsner (eds.), *Visualizing the Tragic. Drama, Myth, and Ritual in Greek Art and Literature. Essays in Honour of Froma Zeitlin*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007, http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2009/2009-05-47.html (accessed 11/01/2020).

Billault, A. 1991. *La création romanesque dans la littérature grecque à l'époque impériale,* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Birchall, J. 1996. 'The lament as a rhetorical feature in the Greek novel', *GCN* 7, 1-17.

Bowie, E. 2007. 'Pulling the other? Longus on tragedy', in: C. Kraus, S. Goldhill, H.P. Foley & J. Elsner (ed.), *Visualizing the Tragic. Drama, Myth, and Ritual in Greek Art and Literature*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 338-352.

Buller, J.L. 1981. "The pathetic fallacy in Hellenistic pastoral', *Ramus* 10, 35-52.

Burlando, A. 1997, *Longo Sofista. Le avventure pastorali di Dafni e Cloe,* Milano: Garzanti.

Crismani, D. 1997. *Il teatro nel romanzo ellenistico d'amore e di avventure*, Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Dick, B.F. 1968. 'Ancient pastoral and the pathetic fallacy', *Comparative Literature* 20, 27-44.

Gill, C. [2]2008. Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe*, in: B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels,* Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press, 285-348.

Hunter, R.L. 1983. *A Study of Daphnis & Chloe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lazzeri, M. 2006. 'I papaveri di Verg. *Aen.* 9.436, Omero Stesicoro e Ovidio (con una nota a Servio)', *Seminari Romani di cultura greca* 9, 145-158.

Lowe, W.D. 1908. *The Story of Daphnis and Chloe. A Greek Pastoral by Longus*, Cambridge & London: Bell (rpt. 1979, New York: Arno Pr.).

Morgan, J. R. 2004. *Longus. Daphnis and Chloe*, Oxford: Oxbow Books.

---

[18] See Dick 1968, 27-44, and Buller 1981, 35-42.

[19] On this ritual see Andronikos 1968, 14-15.

Morgan, J.R. & Harrison, S. 2008. 'Intertextuality', in: T. Whitmarsh (ed.), *The Greek and Roman Novel*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 218-236.

Monteleone, C. 1987. 'Longo Sofista. Dafni e Cloe', in: O. Vox, C. Monteleone, G. Annibaldis, *Storie d'amore antiche. Leucippe e Clitofonte, Dafni e Cloe, Anzia e Abrocome,* introduzione di Luciano Canfora, Bari: Dedalo. 213-325.

Pattoni, M.P. 1998. 'ὤ μοι ἐγώ, (τί πάθω;). Una formula omerica e i suoi contesti', *Aevum(ant)* 11, 5-49.

Pattoni, M.P. 2004. 'I *Pastoralia* di Longo e la contaminazione dei generi. Alcune proposte interpretative', *MD* 53, 83-124.

Pattoni, M.P. 2005. *Longo Sofista. Dafni e Cloe,* Milano: Rizzoli.

Schönberger, O. [4]1989. *Longos, Hirtengeschichten von Daphnis und Chloe*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Telò, M. 2002. 'Per una grammatica dei gesti nella tragedia greca (I): cadere a terra, alzarsi; coprirsi, scoprirsi il volto', *MD* 48, 9-75.

Thornley, G. 1916. *Daphnis & Chloe by Longus*, with the English translation of G. Thornley, revised and augmented by J. M. Edmonds, Cambridge, Mass. & London: Harvard University Press.

From Dolon to Dorcon:
echoes of *Rhesus* in Longus

VAYOS LIAPIS
Open University of Cyprus

Ancient Greek novelistic narratives often appropriate the language of tragedy and evoke the world of the theatre in general. Already in the late 19th century, Walden (1894) offered an extensive discussion of the stage-terms (*drama, theatron, skēnē, epeisodion*) used by Heliodorus in relation to the setting and action of his novel. Later scholars have also identified, in the Greek novels, specific allusions to tragic passages. To begin with Heliodorus, *Aethiopica* 1,10,2 appears to allude to Euripides' first *Hippolytus*; 1,2,4 to Euripides' *Alcestis* 273-279; and 1,12,3 to Aeschylus' *Choephori* 896-898 and to Sophocles' *Electra* 1410-1412.[1] Comparable allusions may also be found in Achilles Tatius, where the obviously theatrical episode of Leucippe's sham immolation (3,15) seems to evoke Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*, and the Tereus and Procne narrative in 5,3,4-6 may preserve chunks from Sophocles' *Tereus*.[2]

   This paper will examine a case of intertextual dialogue between novel and tragedy which does not seem to have attracted sufficient scholarly attention.[3] The passage in question is Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* 1,20-21, where the herdsman Dorcon, who lusts after Chloe, disguises himself as a wolf in order to frighten the girl and rape her. His stratagem, however, proves to be misconceived: Chloe's dogs, taking Dorcon for a real wolf, attack and maul him. As was first seen by Valckenaer, the disguise scene seems designed to evoke a corresponding passage in *Rhesus*, a play which, for Longus and his audience, would have been the work of Euripides (see below).[4] In *Rhesus* 201-215, Dolon, who has offered himself as

---

[1] See, respectively, Merkelbach 1957; Galli 1994, 198-200 and 204-5.

[2] See, respectively, Mignogna 1997 and Liapis 2006 (corrections and further material in Liapis 2008).

[3] The only exception I am aware of is Pattoni 2004; see n. 4 below.

[4] Valckenaer 1767, 102; cf. also Vater 1837, *ad* 209. As indicated above, the only scholar known to me to have offered a detailed and sensitive discussion of the echoes of *Rhesus* in

a volunteer to spy into the Greek camp, explains that he intends to put on a wolf's skin and crawl on all fours so that the enemies may take him for a wolf on the prowl; indeed, he even promises to bring back the heads of Odysseus and Diomedes as proof that he has accomplished his mission (219-223). However, Dolon will be intercepted and killed by, precisely, the two Greeks he had intended to behead (cf. 572-576, 591-593).

Both Dolon and his near-namesake Dorcon are tricksters who move stealthily, disguised as wolves, in order to achieve their purpose—Dolon in order to spy on the Greek camp, Dorcon in order to rape Chloe. In both cases, their wolf-disguise fails to protect them against danger—Dolon's because it is apparently inadequate, Dorcon's because it is too successful an imitation of the real thing.[5] But the parallelisms between the two characters are not only thematic: they extend to the level of verbal allusions in Longus' text, as a juxtaposition of the relevant *Rhesus* and *Daphnis and Chloe* passages will show (verbal similarities are underlined in both passages):

λύκειον ἀμφὶ νῶτ' ἐνάψομαι δορὰν
καὶ χάσμα θηρὸς ἀμφ' ἐμῷ θήσω κάρα,
βάσιν τε χερσὶ προσθίαν καθαρμόσας   210
καὶ κῶλα κώλοις τετράπουν μιμήσομαι
λύκου κέλευθον πολεμίοις δυσεύρετον
             ([Euripides,] *Rhesus* 208-212)

On my back I shall fasten a wolf's hide, and I shall fit the beast's gaping mouth around my head. I shall also adjust its [*sc.* the wolf-skin's] fore-paws to my arms and its (hind) legs to my own legs, and mimic a wolf's four-footed gait, hard for enemies to track down.

… ἐπιτεχνᾶται τέχνην ποιμένι πρέπουσαν. [2] λύκου δέρμα μεγάλου λαβών, ὃν ταῦρός ποτε πρὸ τῶν βοῶν μαχόμενος τοῖς κέρασι διέφθειρε, περιέτεινε τῷ σώματι, ποδῆρες κατανωτισάμενος, ὡς τούς τ' ἐμπροσθίους πόδας ἐφηπλῶσθαι ταῖς χερσὶ καὶ τοὺς κατόπιν τοῖς σκέλεσιν ἄχρι πτέρνης καὶ τοῦ

Longus is Pattoni 2004, 100-105, whose remarks the present paper seeks to complement by examining verbal intertextuality and inter-generic play (see below). Cf. also Burlando 1997, 71 n. 81; Bowie 2019, 126 (*ad* 1.15.1), 140 (*ad* 1.20.2). In an earlier publication, Bowie (2007, 344-345) had posited E. *HF* 361-362 as the immediate intertext for the Longus passage; but it will be argued below that the similarities, in Longus, with the *Rh.* passage, itself modelled after the *HF* lines (see Liapis 2012, *ad* [E.] *Rh.* 209), are more substantial.

[5] See further on this point Pattoni 2004, 104-105.

στόματος τὸ χάσμα σκέπειν τὴν κεφαλήν, ὥσπερ ἀνδρὸς ὁπλίτου κράνος· [3] ἐκθηριώσας δὲ αὐτὸν ὡς ἕνι μάλιστα κτλ. (Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe* 1,20,1-3)

[Dorcon] came up with a stratagem fit for a herdsman. He took the skin of a big wolf (a bull had killed him with his horns, fighting to protect the cows),[6] and stretched it tight all over his body so that it covered his back down to his feet; its fore-paws were spread over his arms and hands, while its hind legs stretched along his own legs down to the heels; as for its gaping mouth, it covered his head like a hoplite's helmet. So, having transformed himself into a beast as best as he could etc.

Here is a summary of the verbal correspondences in list form:

1. *Rh*. 208 λύκειον … δοράν ~ Longus 1,20,2 λύκου δέρμα
2. *Rh*. 208 ἀμφὶ νῶτ' ἐνάψομαι ~ Longus 1,20,2 ποδῆρες κατανωτισάμενος
3. *Rh*. 209 χάσμα θηρός ~ Longus 1,20,2 τοῦ στόματος τὸ χάσμα
4. *Rh*. 210 βάσιν τε χερσὶ προσθίαν καθαρμόσας ~ Longus 1,20,2 ὡς τούς τ' ἐμπροσθίους πόδας ἐφηπλῶσθαι ταῖς χερσί
5. *Rh*. 211 καὶ κῶλα κώλοις ~ Longus 1,20,2 καὶ τοὺς κατόπιν τοῖς σκέλεσιν ἄχρι πτέρνης.[7]

The specific manner in which Dorcon's plan is foiled—he is attacked and mauled by dogs—also seems designed to evoke a later scene in *Rhesus* (780-798), where Rhesus' charioteer has a dream in which a pack of wolves appear to attack and maul Rhesus' splendid horses. As it soon turns out, at the very moment when Rhesus' charioteer was having this ominous dream, Rhesus himself was being murdered by the oneiric wolves' real-life counterparts, the Greek spies Odysseus and Diomedes. In keeping with the parodic spirit of his rewriting, Longus has transformed *Rhesus*' majestically fierce wolves into mundane, perhaps even ignoble shepherd dogs.[8]

---

[6] On the ways this detail attunes an episode derived from tragedy to the bucolic ethos of the narrative see Epstein 1995, 60; Pattoni 2004, 101-102. As the actual wolf had been attacked by a bull protecting the cows, so Dorcon the fake wolf will be attacked by dogs guarding the herd.

[7] The verbal correspondences are also set out, more concisely, in Liapis (2012) 121 (*ad* [E.] *Rh*. 208-215).

[8] For negative connotations attaching to dogs in Greece see Mainoldi 1984, 104-109, 161-165, 176-179. Epstein (1995, 60 with n. 7) prefers to see Longus' dogs as both set in opposition to and equal to wolves.

Longus' parody of *Rhesus* should be taken as an acknowledgement of that play's canonical status as a genuine Euripidean work: parody relies for its effectiveness on the parodied text being easily recognizable. We may safely assume that, by Longus' time, the anonymous ancient scholars who had doubted the authenticity of *Rhesus* (see the ancient Hypothesis b 23-26 Diggle) had sunk into oblivion — as is indeed suggested by the numerous echoes and quotations of the play in later literature.[9]

It is remarkable that Longus chose to parody a *Rhesus* episode which was apparently considered bizarre, if not downright laughable, by at least some ancient critics. In *Iliad* 10 (the primary model for *Rhesus*) Dolon simply throws a wolfskin around his shoulders, as if it were an overcoat (334 ἕσσατο δ' ἔκτοσθεν ῥινὸν πολιοῖο λύκοιο). In *Rhesus*, however, the character actually dons a wolf-skin and even crawls on all fours like a wolf. This seemed to some ancient critics to go unnecessarily over the top:

> ἀπίθανον τετραποδίζειν αὐτὸν ὡς τοὺς λύκους· οὐδὲ γὰρ Ὅμηρος διὰ τοῦτο τὴν λυκῆν αὐτῷ περιτίθησι (scholia to [Euripides'] *Rhesus* 210, II 331.8-9 Schwartz)

> It is implausible that [Dolon] should crawl on all fours like a wolf; nor is this the reason why Homer has him clad in a wolf-skin.

Much as ancient critics may have baulked at Dolon's stratagem in *Rhesus*, donning a wolf-skin to deceive the enemy is far from an isolated oddity; on the contrary, it is attested in other times and cultures. Flavius Josephus in his *Jewish War* (3,192) mentions scouts sneaking out of Jotapata / Jodfat (a Jewish garrison besieged by Vespasian in 67 CE) under orders 'to crawl by the sentinels for the most part and to cover their backs with fleeces, so that even if someone caught sight of them in the middle of the night, they might be taken for dogs.' Almost eighteen centuries later, a painting by George Catlin entitled 'Buffalo Hunt under the Wolf-skin Mask' (1832-1833)[10] depicts the artist and his Plains Indian guide stealing up on a herd of buffalo, bow in hand, covered with white wolf-skins. More germanely to our theme, Dolon's wolf-disguise is already attested in three early-5th-century vases. Firstly, on a red-figure Attic cup attributed to the Dokimasia painter (*ca*. 490-480 BCE), Dolon, bow and arrows in hand (cf. his Iliadic counterpart carrying his bow around his shoulder, 10,333), appears dressed in a wolf-skin; the wolf's head, mouth agape, is fitted around Dolon's head, exactly as described in

---

[9] See Liapis 2012, lxviii-lxix; Fries 2014, 44-45.
[10] Smithsonian American Art Museum, no. 1985.66.414.

Rhesus 209.[11] Secondly, an Attic black-figure oenochoe attributed to the Athena painter (*ca*. 500-490 BCE) shows Dolon clad in wolf-skin, with the animal's mouth agape and, again, fitted around his head.[12] Thirdly, and most remarkably, an Attic red-figure lekythos of about 480-470 BC depicts Dolon not only clad in a wolf-skin but also crawling on all fours, just as he proposes to do in *Rh*. 210-13.[13]

It would appear, then, that the author of *Rhesus* did not intend to cast his Dolon as a grotesque, ridiculous or undignified personage; still, if the aforementioned ancient scholium to *Rhesus* is anything to go by, his disguised character is likely to have struck Hellenistic and later critics as oddly unconvincing, perhaps even laughable. It is not too great a leap to assume that this is probably how Dolon would have been perceived by Longus' audience too. If this is true, then Longus' strategy of intertextual appropriation turns out to be considerably shrewder than may perhaps appear at first sight. The text Longus chooses to adapt came from a tragedy but had slightly comic resonances for his contemporary audiences. Despite tragedy's unquestionable cultural prestige in Longus' time,[14] the author's intertextual nod to the tragic tradition is not intended to lend decorum to his narrative. On the contrary, Longus renegotiates his tragic model in order to enhance the spectrum of stylistic registers that inform his narrative. By reading the Dolon episode in *Rhesus* as mildly ludicrous, Longus opens up his text to the comic mode, thus enabling himself to enhance the wry irony of his bucolic ethos.

Let us examine a few specific examples of this process. As pointed out above, Dorcon is targeted by ignoble dogs rather than by majestic wolves; the irony is hinted at by Longus himself (1,22,1):

καὶ ὁ μὲν κινδύνου παρὰ τοσοῦτον ἐλθὼν καὶ σωθεὶς ἐκ κυνός, οὐ λύκου, φασί, στόματος…

---

[11] St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum, ST879; *ARV²* 413.23; *LIMC* III.1, 662 no. 13; Beazley archive database no. 204505. See Lissarrague 1980, 9-11 (with figs. 6-8), 18-19, 20, 22, 24-25.

[12] Oxford, Ashmolean Museum V226; *ABV* 527.25; Beazley archive database no. 330814; *LIMC* III.1, 662 no. 12. See Lissarrague 1980, 7 (with fig. 4), 18, 19-20, 22, 24.

[13] Louvre CA 1802; see *LIMC* III.1, 661 no. 2. The vase was first published by Lissarrague 1980, 11 (with fig. 9), 18, 20-2. Dolon is also depicted wearing an animal skin over his head and back and carrying a bow on a 3rd-cent. BC (?) terracotta plaque: *LIMC* III.1, 662 no. 3. For the vase paintings cf. also Liapis 2009, 289-291; Liapis 2012, xxx-xxxi.

[14] For tragedy's prestige in Imperial times, including Late Antiquity, see most recently Webb 2019.

[as for Dorcon], after coming so close to danger, he was saved not 'from the
wolf's mouth', as the saying goes, but from the dog's…

Moreover, Dorcon's ruse is dismissed by the narrator himself as 'a trick fit for
shepherds' (Longus 1,20,1), whereas Dolon's identical stratagem in *Rhesus* had
been praised for its resourcefulness (*Rh.* 206, 242-263). The subtle humour of
Longus' adaptation is also underlined by Dorcon's name, which was chosen not
only for its obvious similarity to Dolon's, itself a speaking name (*dolos*, 'deceit'),
but also because it evokes keen eyesight (*derkomai*, 'to see clearly')—and thus
belies Dorcon's eventual failure to discern the danger that his disguise involves.
The irony is further compounded by the fact that *Dorkōn* also evokes *dorkas*,
'roe'.[15] Rather than being the aggressor that his wolf-disguise is supposed to turn
him into, Dorcon ends up being a helpless victim. The Dolon of tragedy, a char-
acter who, though doomed, is admired for his bravery and shrewdness (*Rh.* 158-
160, 195-200, 206-207, 242-252), is transmogrified into Dorcon the ill-starred
lover and blundering loser.

An awareness of the Dolon scene in *Rhesus* is key to fully appreciating the
Dorcon episode in Longus. On one level, the sustained tragic allusions serve as
(inter)textual pointers, which enact a juxtaposition of the erotic and the military:
the doomed enterprise of a lovelorn Dorcon is set against the spying mission of a
battle-hardened Dolon. Significantly, Longus takes care to specify that 'the wolf's
gaping mouth covered Dorcon's head like a hoplite's helmet', ὥσπερ ἀνδρὸς
ὁπλίτου κράνος (1,20,2). The detail may not be pure invention: Plutarch (*Life of
Marius* 25,10) mentions warriors wearing κράνη εἰκασμένα θηρίων φοβερῶν
χάσμασι, 'helmets shaped like terrifying beasts, their mouths agape'. It is of
course a commonplace (especially in Latin love poetry) to express amatory pur-
suits in military terms,[16] but Dorcon fails both as a 'warrior' setting a love-ambush
and as a lover struggling to conquer the object of his desire.

In conclusion, an awareness of the intertextual play between the Dorcon episode
in *Daphnis and Chloe* and the Dolon episode in *Rhesus* enables the reader to ap-
preciate the former more fully. The appropriation of the tragic model is a two-
edged one, since Longus simultaneously both sets up the Dolon precedent as a
canonical model predetermining his own plot-development and banalizes it into a
mere rustic game. The result is a complex interplay between appreciably different
genres, literary traditions, and stylistic registers.

---

[15] Cf. Epstein 1995, 59; Pattoni 2004, 101 n. 43.
[16] For just one among numerous examples cf. e.g. Ovid, *Amores* 1.9.1-3; see further e.g. Spies
      1930; Rissman 1983.

Bibliography

Bowie, E. 2007. 'Pulling the other? Longus on tragedy', in: C. Kraus, S. Goldhill, H. P. Foley & J. Elsner (eds.), *Visualizing the Tragic: Drama, Myth, and Ritual in Greek Art and Literature. Essays in Honour of Froma Zeitlin*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 338-352.

Bowie, E. 2019. *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe* (Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burlando, A. 1997. *Reso: i problemi, la scena*. Genova: Università di Genova, Facoltà di lettere, Dipartimento di archeologia, filologia classica e loro tradizioni 'Francesco Della Corte'.

Epstein, S. J. 1995. 'Longus' werewolves', *CPh* 90, 58-73.

Fries, A. 2014. *Pseudo-Euripides*, *'Rhesus': Edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 114), Berlin & Boston: de Gruyter.

Galli, L. 1994. 'Amarsi come Alcesti e Admeto (un'allusione ad Euripide in Eliodoro)', *SIFC* 12, 197-207.

Liapis, V. 2006. 'Achilles Tatius as a reader of Sophocles', *CQ* 56, 220-238.

Liapis, V. 2008. 'Achilles Tatius and Sophocles' *Tereus*: a corrigendum and an addendum', *CQ* 58, 335-336.

Liapis, V. 2009. '*Rhesus*: myth and iconography', in: J. R. C. Cousland & J. R. Hume (eds.), *The Play of Texts and Fragments: Essays in Honour of Martin Cropp*, Leiden: Brill, 273-291.

Liapis, V. 2012. *A Commentary on the* Rhesus *Attributed to Euripides*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lissarrague, F. 1980. 'Iconographie de Dolon le loup', *Revue Archéologique*, 3-30.

Mainoldi, C. 1984. *L'Image du loup et du chien dans la Grèce ancienne d'Homère à Platon*. Paris: Ophrys.

Merkelbach, R. 1957. 'Heliodor I 10, Seneca und Euripides', *RhM* 100, 99-100.

Mignogna, E. 1997. 'Leucippe in Tauride (Ach. Tat. 3, 15-22): mimo e 'pantomimo' tra tragedia e romanzo', *MD* 38, 225-236.

Pattoni, M. P. 2004. 'I *Pastoralia* di Longo e la contaminazione dei generi', *MD* 53, 83-123.

Rissman, L. 1983. *Love as War: Homeric Allusion in the Poetry of Sappho.* Konigstein: Hain.

Spies, A. 1930. *Militat omnis amans: ein Beitrag zur Bildersprache der antiken Erotik*, diss. Tübingen.

Valckenaer, L.C. 1767. *Diatribe in Euripidis perditorum dramatum reliquias*. Leipzig: Joan. Luzac et Joan. Le Mair.

Vater, F. (ed.), 1837. *Euripidis Rhesus cum scholiis antiquis*. Berlin: Ferdinand Duemmler.

Walden, J. W. H. 1894. 'Stage-terms in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', *HSCP* 5, 1-43.

Webb, R. 2019. 'Attitudes towards tragedy from the Second Sophistic to Late Antiquity', in V. Liapis & A. K. Petrides (eds.), *Greek Tragedy after the Fifth Century: a Survey from ca. 400 BC to ca. AD 400*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 297-323.

The village of Chemmis in the *Aithiopika*:
Heliodorus' rewriting of historiographical tradition

M. Teresa Clavo Sebastián
Universitat de Barcelona

This paper considers Heliodorus' reasons for choosing the village of Chemmis, in the Nile Delta, as the setting for the extensive analepsis that reveals the heart of the story in the *Aithtiopika*. The episode as a whole is set in the home of the Greek trader Nausicles, where the preceding adventures are narrated at symposia and feasts.[1]

The calculated and artful composition of Heliodorus' novel suggests that the name of Chemmis was not chosen at random, although there is archaeological evidence for the existence of a settlement in the appropriate geographical area. Egyptian documents show that there were various types of settlement with this name,[2] and the same is true of the Greek evidence. These documents suggest that the name of Chemmis, whether or not it is a real place, possesses connotations that go beyond its mere location, and its basic features remain constant despite the varied nature of the episodes associated with it and of the authors who mention it. Other sources may have been lost; our conclusions will therefore be subject to necessary caution arising from possible gaps in the transmitted evidence.
The ancient historiographers Hecataeus and Herodotus both refer to a surprising Egyptian *logos*. According to the former,

> In Buto, next to the temple of Leto, there is an island called Chemmis, sacred to Apollo, and the island is suspended and sails and moves on the water. (FGH 1 F 305)

---

[1] Hypertextual relations to the Phaeacian episode and Odysseus' analeptic narrative in the *Odyssey* have been rightly noted. Cf. for instance, Fusillo 1989, 28-33, Futre Pinheiro 1991, 69-70, nn.5, 6; Morgan 2004.
[2] Lloyd 1988, 142-143.

The simple declaratory style and the insistence on terms that express the island's unusual floating quality are in contrast to the reference in Herodotus, who distances himself from the information, attributing the story to the Egyptians:

> …astonishing is the island called Chemmis. This lies in a deep and wide lake near to the temple at Buto, and the Egyptians say that it floats. For myself, I never saw it float, nor move at all, and I thought it a marvellous tale, that an island should truly float… The story (*logos*) told by the Egyptians to show why the island moves is this: when Typhon came seeking through the world for the son of Osiris, Leto… received Apollo in charge from Isis and hid him for safety in this island which was before immovable but is now said to float… for the aforesaid reason (say the Egyptians) the island is made to float. (2,156, trans. Godley)[3]

Clearly the logic of the tale emphasises a causal relationship between the salvation offered by Leto and the fact that the island began to float, avoiding a clearly defined position in order to conceal Apollo. In short, protective mobility is chronologically the first connotation of the name.[4]

At another point Herodotus mentions 'a great city called Chemmis, in the Theban province, near Neapolis'. His story is preceded by this general warning: 'The Egyptians shun the use of Greek customs', but there is an unusual case in Chemmis:

> In this city is a square temple of Perseus son of Danae, in a grove of palm trees…there is a shrine with an image of Perseus standing in it. The people of this Chemmis say that Perseus is often seen up and down this land, and often within the temple, and that the sandal he wears is found, and it is two cubits long; when that is seen, all Egypt prospers … And their doings in honour of Perseus are Greek… When I asked why Perseus appeared to them alone, and

---

[3] Herodotus is aware of, but does not attempt to resolve, the problem of reconciling the conflict between the myth (the island floats) and empirical observation (it does not float), a problem that was alien to symbolic thought. According to Lloyd 1988 'the obvious explanation is that (this Chemmis) is essentially a mythical symbol comparable to the primeval hill or Osiris' grave…' (p.143) Greek travellers, such as the Ionians from Naucratis, could have transferred the Greek myth of the floating island of Delos into the Egyptian tradition (p. 144).

[4] The mixture of Greek and Egyptian names is explained as follows: Demeter (Isis) and Dionysus (Osiris) are the parents of Apollo (Horus) and Artemis (Bubastis), with Leto as their nurse (Hdt.2,156). The tale about the island inverts the relationship between moving and protecting, since the Greek Delos floated *before* Apollo's birth.

why, unlike all other Egyptians, they celebrated games, they told me that Perseus was by lineage of their city; for Danaus and Lynceus, who voyaged to Greece, were from Chemmis; and they traced descent from them down to Perseus." (Hdt. 2,91, trans. Godley)[5]

The exceptional nature of this celebration in Egypt, where there was a reluctance to practice Greek customs, is explained by the aetiological myth that places the ancestors of the Argive Perseus in Chemmis. The city is therefore the opposite pole to Argos in the migratory movement linking Greece with Egypt by means of this legendary dynasty. Herodotus also refers to a combination of cultural practices based around Perseus: on one hand, gymnasticic *agōnes* and other Greek rites; on the other, the Egyptian tradition of epiphanies and the power of the daemon, symbolised by the sandal of the temple.[6]

Some notable features of Chemmis emerge from the combination of the two *logoi* in Herodotus: a space associated with movement, a floating island, migratory exchange, a prodigious sandal as a sign for establishing a path.

However, these characteristics do not explain the name of the place. Two Greek authors of the Imperial Period provide an explanation by translating the name of Chemmis as Panopolis, since Che-Min means 'home or place of Min' in Egyptian, and according to these same sources, Min is identified with the Greek god Pan.[7] Diodorus and Plutarch agree in explicitly placing this god in the area of Chemmis. The former does so when he refers to the civilising expedition by Osiris to other lands (1,18), and says that he was accompanied by his brother Apollo and his two sons, as well as Pan 'who is held in special honour by the Egyptians; for the inhabitants of the land have not only set up statues of him at every temple but have also named a city after him in the Thebaid, called by the natives Chemmo, which when translated means City of Pan'. When they arrived in Ethiopia, Diodorus continues, the race of the Satyrs, of whom it was said that they 'have hair upon their loins', was presented to the god, 'for Osiris was laughter-loving

---

[5] For a discussion of this passage, with objectives and conclusions different from mine, see Lloyd 1969.

[6] In *Aithiopika* 3,12-13 the Egyptian Calasiris speaks at length about divine epiphanies and the traces of their passing, alluding to *Il.* 13,71-72: gods and *daemons* advance without moving their feet, which explains why the feet on Egyptian statues are fused together. Perhaps this idea is associated with the singular 'sandal that [Perseus] wears' in Herodotus.

[7] Modern philologists accept this etymology. See Burton 1972, 83-84 and notes; cf. Lloyd 1988, 142; on the antiquity and importance of Min in Egypt, cf. Hdt. 2,56; 145. Burton, 1972, 83-84, concludes 'By classical times Min was chiefly worshipped as the protector of the road and of travellers". See Boardman 1981, 939: relief A.D.II, no. 291, dedicated to *Pan theos megistos*, 'shown as the Egyptian phallic god Min'; Borgeaud 1988, 181.

(φιλογέλωτα) and fond of music and the dance'.[8] A mark of the privileged relationship of these beings with Osiris is the information from Plutarch that 'the Pans and satyrs that inhabited the region of Chemmis were the first to know and divulge the *pathos* of Osiris' (*Is.* 14, 356d). Despite the brief and casual nature of the report, it seems significant that it was these Chemmitai who, before Isis herself, discovered the death of the god, the centrepiece of his cult.[9] In any event, these stories are sound evidence for the association of Pan with the place called Chemmis, and of both Pans and satyrs with the Egyptian Dionysus, Osiris.[10] To sum up, by combining the testimony of Hecataeus and Herodotus with that of Diodorus and Plutarch, three main features of Chemmis can be identified: mobility, hospitality and, later, the presence of Pans and satyrs.

In Heliodorus Chemmis first appears as a meeting point for travellers;[11] but the general impression conveyed by most of the episode set there is of a Dionysiac mood that adds a new dimension to the hospitable aspect of the place. I shall briefly enumerate its main features:

1.   As we have seen, ancient historiographers connect its general hospitality with the specific quality of being a place where Greek and Egyptian culture are combined. In the *Aithiopika* too, Nausicles' home is, as it were, an Egyptian Greece; but particular emphasis is placed on disguise, and identities are exchanged repeatedly as the theme develops in theatrical, mostly comic, games.[12]

2.   The sojourn comprises a series of situations, basically consisting of symposia, feasts and weddings. These festivities provide structure and context for the long conversations, whose pleasantly humorous tone is

---

[8] Translation by C.H. Oldfather (Loeb); for these characteristics of Pan, cf. *h Hom. Pan* 37 (ἡδυγέλωτα); Hes. fr.123 MW.

[9] Cf. Diod. 1,22; 88. There is evidence for plural 'Pans' from Ar. *Eccl.*1069 and in ceramics from the 5-4 century BCE; on the gradual contamination of the two groups (Pans and satyrs) in the iconography, cf. Boardman 1981, 927.

[10] Cf. Hdt. 2,42; 144; 156, etc.

[11] Theagenes and Chariclea arrange to meet Cnemon there when they separate; apart from Theagenes, who is captured by the Persian Mitranes, they all enjoy hospitality in the home of a Greek trader from Naucratis, Nausicles, where Calasiris has already found shelter. After some days the group splits up and they depart in different directions: the Greeks to Greece; Calasiris and Chariclea in search of Theagenes and towards Ethiopia.

[12] Disguises, 2,21,1-6; 5,1,7; 6,10,3-4; notably Thisbe's role, which leads to a comic horror scene at 5,2-4; cf. 6,1,3-4.

reinforced by the vocabulary of play or joking exchanged by the partici-pants.[13]

3. The main gods to be honoured are Dionysus and Demeter, as well as Hermes, the patron of Nausicles. Repeatedly, *logoi* are associated with Dionysus and their content is frequently presented as a dramatic perfor-mance.[14]

4. The power of Eros, in its most varied forms, is the subject of the stories told and is considered as the driving force behind the adventures.[15]

5. Both the Athenian and the Egyptian intrigues are in contrast to the con-cept and practice of love of the main characters. Note that Theagenes, the 'chosen' Greek, does not pass through Chemmis, while the chaste Char-iclea enters and leaves the town in disguise, and, though she is the focus of the stories told there, remains physically on the sidelines of the activ-ities during her stay. Even with this precaution, she suffers a passionate crisis of a maenadic nature (6,8,3).

In this Dionysiac and erotic context, one episode warrants particular attention since it may provide a link with Pan, who is otherwise absent from his own city in Heliodorus' narrative: the encounter with an unnamed peasant from Chemmis. It takes place as follows: Cnemon and Calasiris, accompanied by Nausicles, begin an expedition to a nearby village in search of Theagenes. They talk about women and laugh and joke with each other, particularly about the effect of Thisbe's name. At this point

> they ran into an acquaintance of Nausicles and asked him where he was going to in such a desperate hurry. 'Nausicles', he replied, 'you ask the reason for my haste as if you did not know that at the moment my whole life is directed towards a single end – namely, doing as I am bidden in the service of my lady, Isias of Chemmis … Now I am on my way to my beloved posthaste with a particular bird she demanded I should bring her – this Nile flamingo you can see here … It is her way to make fun of me and what I do for her'. (6,3,1-3, trans. Morgan)

---

[13] Symposium, 2,23; 5,16; 6,6; festival, 5,15-16; wedding, 6,8,2-3; jokes: *passim*.

[14] For instance, the daimon plays (*paizei*) with the protagonists as if performing a play, but they can change its *tragikē poiēsis* and compose the end of their own *drama* (5,6,3-4). On generic syncretism and hybridity cf. Alaux & Létoublon 1998, 151-161.

[15] Eros causes even the travelling of the sages Calasiris (2, 25, 1-6) and, indirectly, Charicles (2, 29, 5).

After giving them the news that Theagenes has been sent to Memphis, he runs off and, as he goes, adds:

> 'I must not keep Isias waiting … at this very moment she may be peering around impatiently for me, and I should not want the progress of my love to be obstructed by unpunctuality'. (6,4,1, trans. Morgan)

Morgan discusses this curious episode as providing a contrast between the man's passionate relationship with Isias and the noble love of the main characters.[16] This is a good point, but there are other elements that concern us. One of them is the haste of the man from Chemmis in his desire to serve his lover and in particular, the detail that 'even before these words were out of his mouth, he was hurrying on his way'. Philippe Borgeaud notes that a characteristic feature of the tradition of Pan is 'his unlucky love affairs'; he is *dyserōs*, an adjective describing a situation of desire in search of an object, represented in iconography by the motif of the *erōtikos dromos*,[17] of which the character of the Chemmite could well be a parody. Following Jucker, Borgeaud also emphasises the unusual nature of the 'gesture known as *aposkopein*: while running away, he turns back the face to watch'.[18] The iconographic series in LIMC shows some Pans depicted with a bird in their hand or with various offerings.[19] Taken together, these motifs - a man running, in love, with a bird, who acts as an informer (cf. Plutarch above) and turns his head while running - suggest that it was the intention of Heliodorus to project a likeness of a Pan onto the figure of the Chemmite, imitating in a literary form the gesture that iconography had established as a characteristic of the god.

Even if it remains hypothetical, this erudite reference to 'Pans' as the inhabitants of the 'land of Pan' (a *Chemmite* from *Chemmis*) would increase the mocking tones of the Panic-satyric world. But Heliodorus' interest in these daemons may also follow a different and more philosophical path. Let us focus our attention on the frontiers of Chemmis, and on the narrative details of entering and leaving.

As he approaches Chemmis, Cnemon, who had travelled dressed as a bandit, changes his appearance for that of an elegant Egyptian in order to enter the town (2,21,1). On the banks of the Nile he sees an old man walking up and down 'as if he wanted to make the river share his thoughts'; he is so distracted that he walks in front of the youth without noticing his presence; the old thinker is dressed 'in

---

[16] Morgan 1989, 106-107.

[17] Borgeaud 1988, 155; on Pan's incessant mobility see *h Hom. Pan* 8-11.

[18] Borgeaud 1988, 134-135, quoting Jucker, I., *Der gestus des aposkopein* (1956); cf. Boardman 1981, 923 'In the Hellenistic poets [Pan] is often described looking into the distance for his flock, *aposkopeuōn*, a remark possibly encouraged by art.' Cf. *HHP,* 14.

[19] LIMC.112, 263; see Boardman 1981, 941.

the most Greek manner' (*hellēnikōteron*). Cnemon approaches him curiously, and the initial dialogue concerns the subject of appearance and identity:

> 'Are you Greek, foreigner, or where are you from?'
> 'Neither Greek nor foreign, I am from here, Egyptian'
> 'And why do you dress as a Greek (*hellēnizeis*)?'[20]
> 'Misfortunes made me adopt this appearance.' (2,21,4)

Similarly, the old man says that Cnemon's appearance is that of a Greek whose form has been changed by fortune, and asks how he comes to be speaking Greek in Egypt. The reply has clear Platonic echoes: 'it is laughable (*geloion*) that you want to know without first answering my questions…'

It is time to turn to the beginning of Plato's *Phaedrus* as the hypotext, or paratext, of this scene.[21] I shall start with the characterisation of Calasiris by means of the hapax *hellēnikōteron*: at *Phdr.* 230c, the unusual superlative *atopōtatos* describes a Socrates who is totally out of place in the country; despite his sedentary and urban habits the philosopher says he would travel around the world after listening to Lysias' *logos* on love; the young Phaedrus adds 'you seem like a foreigner and not from this country'. There are evident echoes of this first scene from the *Phaedrus* in the *Aithiopika*, although Heliodorus inverts or changes the order of the factors:

1. Calasiris acknowledges that he feels 'birth pains' in his eagerness to talk (2,21,6); Socrates guesses Phaedrus' wish to deliver the speech by Lysias and he shows a desire to listen to it (*Phdr.* 228 a-b).

2. They all decide to look for a cooler place to talk: Calasiris and Cnemon leave the riverbank for the village: 'let us leave the Nile, as this place burnt by the sun at midday is not sweet for hearing long stories and let us go to the village on the other side'; on the other hand, Socrates and Phaedrus leave the city for the river, and walk along it until they find the appropriate *locus amoenus,* a temple of Achelous and the nymphs (230c), where they shelter from the midday heat (242b).

3. In their respective locations (the house in Chemmis, the shade by the river) the older men discourse, encouraged by the tireless young listeners, (*Phdr.* 242a-b).

---

[20] A parodic rewriting of the 'Hellenising' theme common in literature of the Imperial period may be perceived here. On the new modalities of identity in this period and its expression by the exile or *xenos* figure, cf. Whitmarsh 2001, 270-275.

[21] Direct concerns with the *Phaedrus* are argued for, among others, by Laplace 1992, 225-229, Whitmarsh 1999, 121-122.

4. The allusion by Calasiris to the myth of Midas complements the series of Platonic references in this introduction to Chemmis. This reference is significant since the punishment referred to was imposed as a result of the mythical king's worship of Pan. The appeal to Midas in the *Phaedrus* (264 c-e) leads the young man to exclaim: 'you mock the logos!' Mocking and games are a topic of both episodes,[22] probably the hermeneutic key to the one at Chemmis. For their final departure from the place, Calasiris and Chariclea disguise themselves as beggars and exchange jokes and mock each other (6,12). Similarly the *Phaedrus* finishes with a prayer addressed to Pan and the Nymphs:[23] 'grant to me that I be made beautiful in my inside and that the external features I have be in accord with the inner ones' (279b-c). This recalls the words of Alcibiades in the *Symposium*: Socrates looks like a statue of Silenus, whose inner nature, like Pan's, is a daemon. In both Platonic dialogues, the context evokes images of 'Satyrs and Pans', the same daemons that we find as the inhabitants of Chemmis in Imperial authors. Furthermore, we find an echo of this Socratic prayer to reach a correspondence between inner nature and outer appearance in one dialogue in Chemmis. Calasiris confides to Cnemon this truth about Homer: that he was Egyptian, supposedly the son of a priest but in reality of Hermes, because of which he 'bore on his person a token of this anomic union, for, from the moment of his birth, one of his thighs was covered with a shaggy growth of hair'. Due to this deformity, he was expelled by his human father during *ephēbeia* 'after the mark he bore on his body had led to the realisation of his illegitimacy'" (3,14-15). Hermes' son, like Pan, was anthropomorphic but with an animal feature (thick hair covering one of his legs); this Homer is a 'mixed' being like the goat-legged Pan. Like Pan, his disfigured appearance also leads to him being abandoned.[24] He then travels the world (ἀλητεύων) performing his poetry, as if 'by concealing his true place of origin he was claiming the whole world as his own' (πᾶσαν ... πατρίδα μνώμενος). The same verbs define the movement of the wise Calasiris and his protégée 'who out of love, wanders, so to speak, all over the world' (πᾶσαν ὡς εἰπεῖν ἐπὶ γῆν … ἀλώμενον, 6,15,4).[25] The figure of the Egyptian Homer is a reflection of the wandering Pan, who is himself a musician and then a poet from the Hellenistic period onwards, and is in turn projected, as in a *mise en abîme*, on to Chariclea, with her

---

[22] Cf. the lexical coincidences such as παίζειν, χαίρειν, χλεύειν, σκώπτειν, γελᾶν, μειδιᾶν etc. (*Phdr* 236b *passim*). In Dionysiac context, Ar. *Frogs* 374-7, 392 etc. Clavo 1997:172-175.

[23] In fact, these daemons from the place have inspired Socrates' *logos*: 279b-c, cf. 263d. See Brisson 2000, *ad loc.*

[24] Pan's mother flees when she sees he is deformed, *h Hom. Pan* 38-39; cf. Hdt. 2,64, goat figured.

[25] Cf. ξένον καὶ ἀλήτην βίον, 5,2,7 and 7,13,2; cf. 3,14,3; 6,15,4; 8,3,7; πλαν-, 6,7,2; 6,8,3; 6,8,4.

ebony mark on her arm.[26] But this question goes beyond the scope of this paper. By inserting the Platonic dialogue about Love in his 'land of Pan', Heliodorus stresses the secret motor of the novel, Eros.[27] But Heliodorus goes beyond the living *logos* of his model in making the form generate the substance: the painted image of Andromeda shaped the figure of Chariclea at the moment of her conception;[28] real body is the fruit of art, and art is *mimesis*. Contemporary theories about creation are in play.

The literary representation of Chemmis in the *Aithiopika* does not exhaust itself in narrative devices and intertextual games. Heliodorus has appropriated the meanings provided by historiographical and Platonic texts, and then he reconfigures the meaning in accordance with the cultural fashions of his age. We thus witness the transformation of the ancient mobility of Delos into *atopia* as the space of the wise man; the wandering of the guests at Chemmis into migration, exile and a way of teaching and learning; the legendary Greek-Egyptian exchange updated in the transnational and cross-cultural approach of Antonine intellectuals; then, we see Platonic views turning into a scholarly game about literary creation and authorship, a subject of particular interest in the aesthetic and rhetorical theories of the Second Sophistic.[29]

Bibliography

Alaux, J. & Létoublon, F. 1998. '*Athlothetousa tyche*. Les vicissitudes des choses humaines dans le roman grec: l'exemple des *Éthiopiques*', *Cahiers du Gita* 11, 145-170.

Boardman, J. 1981. 'Pan', *LIMC* 7, 923-941.

Borgeaud, Ph. 1988. *The Cult of Pan in Ancient Greece*, Chicago & London: Chicago University Press.

Brisson, L. 2000. *Platon, Phèdre. Traduction, introduction et notes*, Paris: Flammarion.

Burton, A. 1972. *Diodorus Siculus, book I. A Commentary*, Leiden: Brill.

Clavo, M. 1997. 'La poética de Hédilo (E.G. VPage)', *Actas del XII Simposi de de la Secció Catalana i I de la Secció Balear de la S.E.E.C.*, 171-175.

Fusillo, M. 1989, *Il Romanzo greco: polifonia ed eros*, Venice: Marsilio, 1989.

---

[26] The relationship between this *symbolon* and the *synthēma* (10,15,2) of Chariclea has indeed been observed, cf. Whitmarsh 1999, 111-112.

[27] Heliodorus also develops the complementary themes of the *Phaedrus*: the usefulness of writing – invented by Hermes-Theuth in the Egyptian Naucratis in the tale referred to by Socrates - and the superiority of the living *logos*, able to defend itself (*Phdr.* 274-276), whose affiliation and process of maturing is embodied in Chariclea.

[28] On related scientific and philosophical theories in Heliodorus' times, see Suarez de la Torre 2004.

[29] Cf. Laplace 1992, 216-217; Whitmarsh 1999, 118-119.

Futre Pinheiro, M. 1991. 'Calasiris' story and its narrative significance in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', *GCN* 1991, 69-83.

Laplace, M. 1992. 'Les *Éthiopiques* d'Héliodore, une *panegyris* de l'amour', *REA* 94, 199-230.

Lloyd, A.B. 1969. 'Perseus and Chemmis (Herodotus II, 91)', *JHS* 89, 79-86.

Lloyd, A.B. 1976. *Herodotus, Book II*, *comm.1-98,* Leiden: Brill

Lloyd, A.B. 1988. *Herodotus, Book II*, *comm.99-182*, Leiden: Brill.

Morgan, J.R. 1989. 'The story of Knemon in Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*', *JHS* 109, 99-113.

Morgan, J.R. 2004. 'Heliodorus' in: I.de Jong, R. Nünlist & A. Bowie (eds.), *Narrators, Narratees and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*, Leiden: Brill, 523-543.

Suarez de la Torre, E. 2004, 'La princesa etíope que nació blanca: la mirada y la contemplación en las Etiópicas de Heliodoro', *Cuadernos de Filología clásica*, 14: 201-233.

Whitmarsh, T. 1998. 'The birth of a prodigy: Heliodorus and the genealogy of Hellenism' in: R. Hunter), *Studies in Heliodorus*, Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 93-124.

Whitmarsh, T. 2001 '''Greece is the world": exile and identity in the Second Sophistic', in S. Goldhill (ed.) *Being Greek under Rome*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 269-305.

The mother-daughter romance and heroic *nostos* in Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*

AARA SUKSI
University of Western Ontario

As Tim Whitmarsh has compellingly argued, Heliodoros' *Aithiopika* challenges the Hellenocentrism of earlier Greek narratives, in particular that of the *Odyssey*, even while it emulates them. Cunning, resourceful, long-suffering and much-travelled Charikleia, with her talent for self-disguise, has much in common with her polytropic antecedent Odysseus; but Charikleia's *nostos* inverts that of the *Odyssey*'s hero, in taking her from her birthplace in Ethiopia, a place that is a byword for the farthest edge of the world, to Delphi, the centre of world according to Greek myth, and then back home again to Meroe, Ethiopia's capital. The *Aithiopika* thus turns the geographic perspective of the *Odyssey* inside out, and so issues a challenge to the Hellenocentric worldview of received Greek epic and the classical literature that followed, and thus to that of the educated reader as well.[1] This paper argues that, in a way that is similar to its contestation of the Hellenocentrism of earlier Greek narrative models, the *Aithiopika* also alludes to and ironically subverts their investment in and celebration of a an overwhelmingly patriarchal power structure.

The stories of the origins of heroes in early Greek myth typically highlight strange and miraculous conceptions. A pertinent example is the impregnation of Danae, whose father Akrisios tried to prevent her conceiving a child by locking her up in an enclosed space. Zeus, taking the form of a rain-shower, easily penetrated this barrier, as he did Danae herself, so that she bore his son Perseus, a Greek hero whose own *nostos* narrative, taking him from the center of Greece to the edges of the earth and back again, had a foundational role to play in the legendary past of Heliodoros' Ethiopian royal house (4,8,3) before he became king

---

[1] Whitmarsh 1998. See also his expanded discussion in Whitmarsh 2011, 108-138.

in Argos.[2] There is also the case of Theseus' mother Aithra, who slept with Aigeus the king of Athens and then, on the same night, during a post-coital bath in the sea, conceived her heroic son by Poseidon. Likewise Zeus tricked Herakles' mother Alkmene into sleeping with him, disguised as her husband, before she had intercourse with her actual husband, Amphitryon, also in a single night. She subsequently bore twins, Herakles to Zeus and Iphikles to Amphitryon, themselves also both descended from the line of Perseus.[3]

This story pattern of miraculous and divine conception does the important work of preserving the chastity of the hero's noble mother, while at the same time making it possible for the hero, by means of a double paternity (mortal and divine), to be able to claim, on the one hand, the right to inherit a political throne as a king among mortals, and on the other hand, a divine father, from whom he inherits exceptional abilities and qualities and whose protection and championship he can expect to enjoy, further authorizing, by means of a potent form of double-determination, the hero's claim to rule.

In Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*, Charikleia, the Ethiopian heroine, like the male Greek heroes who are her predecessors in received Greek myth, has her origins in a double conception. Her mother Persinna (whose name echoes that of Perseus), who will advise her daughter that chastity is the only mark of virtue in a woman (4,7,3), only ever has sexual intercourse with her husband, Hydaspes, the king of Ethiopia. In spite of this sexual chastity, at the moment of the conception of her daughter during intercourse with Hydaspes, Persinna is also impregnated, through her open gaze, by the painted image of her heroic ancestor Andromeda, who is depicted in the painting at the culminating moment of her own love story. The hero Perseus, who will claim her as his wife, is just in the act of rescuing her, naked, from the rocks where her father has set her as a sacrifice to a sea monster. As a result of Persinna's reception of the painted image through her gaze, she subsequently gives birth to a daughter who is identical in form to her illustrious foremother Andromeda. Charikleia's double conception is the explanation for the problematic phenomenon of her white skin, which matches that of the painted

---

[2] Greek sources for the myth of Zeus' impregnation of Danae include: Pi. *Py.*12,17-18, *N.*10,11, Pherecydes *FGH*3 F10. All three tragedians treated the story of Perseus, and, though only fragments of these plays remain, clearly Danae's conception of the hero fathered by Zeus was a feature of at least some of these, as in S. *Ant.* 144-150. See Gantz 1993, 300-303.

[3] Apollodoros (3,15,7) and Hyginus (*Fab.* 37) tell the story of Theseus' double conception, bringing together the two traditions about his father as either Aigeus or Poseidon in earlier extant Greek sources. For the conception of Herakles, we have references in the Hesiodic *Ehoiai* (fr 195 MW), and Pi. *N.* 10,13-18 and *I.* 7,5-7. There are a few lost tragedies treating Alkmene and/or Amphityron, but their specific plots are not certain.

image of Andromeda, rather than that of the black-skinned people of Ethiopia, including the royal couple from whom she will eventually inherit the throne at Meroe. Ironically, while Persinna fears that her infant daughter's white skin will be seen as evidence of sexual infidelity, in the end it will be the demonstration of Charikleia's visual likeness to the painted image in the private space of the royal bedroom that will prove her to be the daughter of Persinna and Hydaspes and thus the true and proper heir to the throne.

Persinna's role in this reiteration of an old mythic story pattern can be compared with that of Kreousa, the hero's mother in Euripides' *Ion,* a play about the Athenian royal house. *Ion* offers another instance, albeit somewhat ironized, of a story of a hero's double paternity, similar to the type outlined above. While my argument does not necessitate the claim that Heliodoros is directly alluding to any particular of the text or plot of Euripides' play, it is obvious from several allusions in the *Aithiopika* that he knew the Euripidean corpus in general very well, including *Ion* in particular.[4] It is rather that the parallels to be observed between the story of *Ion* and that of Heliodoros' novel invite the reader to compare the two, while the divergences exemplify how the *Aithiopika* introduces inversions of the earlier Greek models exemplified by Euripides' play and challenge their traditional world-view with its focus on paternity.

The story of *Ion* hinges on the fact that Apollo secretly raped Kreousa, an Athenian princess and daughter of the autochthonous king Erechtheus, before she was married. Afraid of the consequences of discovery, and in accordance with Apollo's will, Kreousa concealed her scandalous pregnancy and then, when she gave birth to a son, exposed him along with identifying tokens, in hopes that the god would provide for him. The tokens consisted of textiles woven by her own hand, trinkets identifying the baby's royal lineage, and a miraculously preserved olive branch.[5] Apollo does provide, arranging for Hermes to take the infant from the cave in Athens, where he was conceived and exposed, to Apollo's sanctuary at Delphi, where Ion has grown up and come of age in the temple and service of the god. As the steward of the temple, he employs his bow and arrows, weapons also carried by Charikleia, to drive away the birds that flock there. In the meantime, Kreousa's father has given her in marriage to a foreign prince, Xouthos, who

---

[4] For Heliodoros' use of Euripides in general, see Paulsen 1992, 53-75; for *Ion* in particular, see Pletcher 1998 and Clavo 2003, who are, however, interested in different points of comparison from those being drawn here.

[5] The trinkets that Kreousa lays out with her child include snakes of beaten gold (*Ion* 24), that seem to correspond to Charikleia's gold breast-band in the shape of two snakes, highlighted in the ekphrasis at 3,4; similarly the clasp of Theagenes' cloak, which depicts Athene with the gorgon's head breastplate (3,3,5) echoes the gorgon woven by Kreousa on the cloth she exposed with Ion (*Ion* 1421).

through this union has become king of Athens. The royal couple remains childless for many years, so that finally they make the journey to Delphi to consult the oracle about their lack of an heir to the throne. In Delphi, Kreousa and Xouthos meet Ion separately. First, Kreousa approaches the temple in private, pursuing her own secret agenda as a mother to consult the oracle about the fate of her lost child. Although there is an immediate and sympathetic connection between them, Kreousa and Ion fail to recognize their relationship to one another, in spite of the clues in their life-stories that they could be mother and son. Xouthos then consults the oracle about his lack of an heir and Apollo manipulates the response, leading Xouthos to believe that Ion is his own son, the issue of a night of festivities near Delphi before his marriage. The unquestioning Xouthos is overjoyed to recover this son and he makes plans to bring Ion home to Athens as his heir. Kreousa, however, feels threatened by what she considers to be a usurpation of the Athenian throne by an outsider, and she comes close to killing Ion with a plot to have him poisoned. Her plan is discovered, and Ion in turn insists that she be put to death. This matricide is happily prevented when the tokens left by Kreousa with the infant are produced and recognized. Mother and son are joyfully reunited, and the Athenian-born son of Apollo becomes heir to the throne, while the foreigner Xouthos is allowed to continue in the pleasant delusion that he is Ion's real father.

It is clear from this brief summary that there are significant parallels between the plots of Euripides' tragedy and Heliodoros' novel: in both stories, an extraordinary conception drives an innocent mother to expose her child in order to save them both from a fatal scandal of sexual transgression. Both children consequently reside at Delphi in the service of Apollo, come of age, and are eventually recognized, reunited with their mothers and their mothers' royal husbands, and restored to their birthplaces. In *Ion*, Kreousa, by bearing Apollo's son and then, through her marriage, providing Ion with an earthly father so that he inherits the Athenian throne, provides an admittedly ironized example of the common double paternity motif that allows a Greek male hero to be both the son of a god and heir to a mortal king's throne.

Heliodoros, in his own deeply ironizing response to the familiar Greek mythic story pattern in which the male hero has two fathers, invents instead a story of a female hero with two mothers. Charikleia, born in wedlock by the queen Persinna, is thus heir to the Ethiopian throne. At the same time Charikleia can also be considered the direct offspring, not of a *god*, but of an artistic representation of her own mythical female ancestor Andromeda. This substitution of a work of art for a hero's divine father at the moment of extraordinary conception is a daring and arresting innovation in the established story pattern. The innovation seems apt for the culture of the Second Sophistic and the novels it produced, obsessed as they

were with spectacle and the power of the visual to make an erotic and generative impression on the soul.[6] Indeed, just as the novels of Longus and Achilles Tatius each present themselves as originating from their primary narrator's response to a painting that has made a deep impression on him, in Heliodoros it is the heroine herself, Charikleia, who is begotten from Persinna's gaze at a painted image. The text that Persinna will generate as a result of her encounter with the painting is marked as a parallel for the novel in which it is embedded, even as the daughter she produces in response to the painting is herself a sign, a text to be read and interpreted.[7] The painting itself is a scene from an old and familiar romance, the myth of Andromeda and Perseus, a story so well-known that Persinna need only allude to it for readers to be able to recognize and fill in the details.[8] Charikleia is thus herself not only an embodied visual replica of a visual representation of Andromeda, she is also an embodied text to be read and interpreted, a story that echoes in so many ways that of the Ethiopian princess Andromeda from whose union with the Greek Perseus the Ethiopian royal line itself has sprung (4,4,3).

Michael Anderson (1997) has demonstrated in full the centrality to the *Aithiopika* of Persinna's script, answering, as it does, the major question of Charikleia's identity at just the opportune moment in the heroine's life. Nevertheless, Persinna herself as an active subject has been largely left out of many of the major discussions of Heliodoros' novel.[9] Her central role in the relational dynamics of the Ethiopian royal family, as in the novel's narrative structure, will reward further focused attention. The *Aithiopika's* frequently noted obsession with fatherhood is expressed in Charikleia's relationships with a series of four father figures: Sisimithres, Charikles, Kalasiris and Hydaspes. On the other hand no alternative mother figure takes the place of Persinna between the time when she first exposes her infant daughter by the road, swaddling her in the text that holds the secret to her identity, and the moment, years later, when mother and daughter are joyfully reunited. Furthermore, Charikleia's mother Persinna is far more instrumental than her father Hydaspes in determining, preserving, and revealing Charikleia's identity.

---

[6] There is a great deal of scholarly discussion of this topic. Especially pertinent are the studies by Goldhill 2001 and Elsner 2007. Reeve 1999 collects the evidence for the belief that a pregnant woman's visual experience could affect the form of her child.

[7] On this see Morgan 2013.

[8] See Whitmarsh 2002, and Zeitlin 2013, who considers the intriguing implications, for a reading of Charikleia, of the popularity of Andromeda as a long-standing subject in both art and literature.

[9] A notable exception is Olsen 2012, who explores the generative implications of the erotic triangulation of Persinna, Hydaspes, and the painting, but emphasizing contexts and outcomes different from those pursued here.

It is of course Charikleia's identity that is the core question driving the narrative from the novel's first pages. The girl is first presented to us as a nameless image, part of a perplexing tableau that raises all sorts of questions about what events can have led to it, and about the origins of its two surviving figures. The difficulty that the reader experiences in interpreting the opening scene is replicated by the *aporia* of the internal audience consisting of the bandits who are advancing from over a hill. Finally the omniscient narrator's voice breaks the flow of the narrative at 1,2,9, and identifies the pair on the beach as lovers by means of a prescriptive *sententia* declaring:

> So genuine longing and pure love overlook all pains and pleasures coming from without and compel the mind to see and to concentrate on one single thing; what one loves. [10]

This observation, presented authoritatively as a universal rule, explains the behavior of the unknown girl, who offers an exemplary model of such ideal love, as she sits on the beach surrounded by fresh corpses and advancing bandits, but never allows her eyes to leave the face of her beloved:

> A noise [from the brigands] filled the air, and their shadow fell across the girl's eyes so that she raised her head, and when she saw them, looked down again, not in the least distracted by the unusual color or the bandit's look of the armed men; rather she turned herself entirely to caring for the man who lay there (1,2,8).

The young man's gaze also, in spite of his wounds, has not wavered from the face of the young woman.

The omniscient narrator leaves many questions about the identity of the pair on the beach unanswered, but at least his *sententia* confirms for the novel's readers that the two figures are the typical pair of lovers expected of Greek prose romances. Furthermore, both the *sententia* and the example provided by the loving pair prescribe and model the importance of the faithful and undistracted gaze as an indicator of ideal love.

Persinna, it turns out, no matter how much we admire and sympathize with her, does not conform to this ideal. She tells us in her own written narrative of the occasion of Charikleia's conception that, during sexual intercourse with her husband, in the undisturbed privacy of their royal bed-chamber, at some point she allowed her gaze to stray from her consort, and to focus instead on a painting on

---

[10] All translations are my own.

the wall, the image of the naked Andromeda. Persinna's wandering gaze, though presented as quite innocent, nevertheless defies the authorial and authoritative *sententia* that at the start of the novel 'lays down a law' about the proper looking behavior of true lovers.[11] Persinna's errant glance results in the scandalous and wondrous conception of a daughter who not only replicates visually (in her adult form) the artistic representation of her female ancestor, but whose life-story will, in many ways, repeat the mythic narrative of Andromeda (though with some typically Heliodoran inversions). Like Andromeda, Charikleia will travel from Ethiopia to Greece, will narrowly escape being sacrificed by her father, and will live happily ever after with her husband, a Greek heroic figure.[12] Although Persinna's own text presents her as being as innocent as any Greek female chosen by a god to be the mother of his son (*ouden adikousa*, 4,8,2), and although as readers we are quite disposed to agree to her innocence, Persinna nevertheless, in her moment of looking elsewhere during an erotic encounter with her husband, has broken a law laid down in the first pages of the novel and thus herself causes the ensuing scandal of her infant daughter's white skin, which in turn seems to defy a law of nature.[13] She responds to the scandal by taking action in secret from her husband and by lying to him about the fate of their daughter.

In contrast, Kreousa in Euripides' *Ion*, like many of her counterparts in Greek myths about the origins of heroes, is an unwilling, helpless, and passive victim of Apollo's rape ('Unwillingly (*akousa*) I formed an unhappy union with Phoibos', *Ion* 941), and under these conditions she conceives her heroic son Ion. If she admits to concealing her pregnancy, it is because this was the will of the god (*Ion* 14), not any strategy of her own. It is Apollo who, when Ion comes of age, manipulates the oracle at Delphi to trick the foreign king of Athens, who is completely without skepticism and more than ready to believe he has found a lost son. In *Ion,* it is the divine father who determines the course of events at each turn,

---

[11] On the function of *sententiae* to 'lay down the law' in the ancient novel (particularly Achilles Tatius) see Morales 2000.

[12] See Whitmarsh 2011, 11-17, who points out that unlike Andromeda, Charikleia returns from Greece with her consort to reside in Ethiopia. It is also significant that while Andromeda was rescued by Perseus from a sacrificial death, Charikleia, without the help of Theagenes, actively participates in stage-managing her own deliverance from the sacrifice her father seemingly intends for her, by winning over the will of the people to her cause with her spectacular costume and by publicly pleading her own case.

[13] Anderson 1997 insists on the text's achievement of maintaining the chaste innocence of Persinna, even in the context of an erotic narrative, and of course this is important for the reader's sympathetic acceptance of her character. At the same time, as Olsen argues, Persinna is not entirely passive in her behaviour here or elsewhere in the novel, and she takes responsibility for her actions in the story she writes to explain them.

even when events unfold in a way contrary to his supposedly omniscient expectations.

In Heliodoros' novel, however, it is Persinna who is instrumental in managing and manipulating the safe *nostos* of her daughter to her rightful place on the Ethiopian throne, (and Hydaspes is anything but gullible; he is notably cautious about believing that Charikleia is his daughter (10,14), and even once convinced, he pretends to continue to be skeptical). Not only does Persinna, like Kreousa, lay out tokens of recognition with her exposed child, she also composes a text in a language that will only be understandable by a person in a position to help Charikleia get home to Meroe. The story of Charikleia's identity, the central question of Heliodoros' *Aithiopika,* is revealed in the narrative inscribed by Persinna on a ribbon that she wraps around her infant daughter when she exposes her:

> I made up a story for my husband that you had died at birth and, in secret, without telling anyone, I exposed you, placing beside you as much wealth as I could, as a reward for the person who might save you. I adorned you with many items, but most importantly I swaddled you with this ribbon, a pitiful account of both you and myself, which I imprinted (*ekharatton*) with the tears and blood I shed for you, since I was at the same time both a first-time mother and a mourner. (4,8,6).

Persinna's account on the ribbon is inscribed in Ethiopian hieroglyphs, or, as Kalasiris says, in *Aithiopika grammata,* (4,8,1) so that the text she authors and Heliodoros' novel, the *Aithiopika*, are designated by the same term. She did not use the demotic script, which might be read by many people, but the royal one, which is similar to the Egyptian hieroglyphs used by priests. Kalasiris, though he at first appears Greek and speaks Greek fluently, is himself an Egyptian and also a priest, so he is the character uniquely qualified in the novel to read Persinna's writing. Furthermore, it turns out that Kalasiris, at least as he tells it, did not arrive at Delphi by mere chance, or simply to spend time, as a holy man, at the sacred center of the Greek world. He tells Charikleia that he has travelled to Ethiopia himself; there he met Persinna and it was she who told him the whole story of Charikleia's birth and begged him to travel to Delphi to arrange her daughter's return home (4,12,1-2).[14] So it seems that, just as Heliodoros' *Aithiopika* is deciphered by the

---

[14] Much discussion has focussed on whether Kalasiris, is telling the truth about having been to Ethiopia and having met Persinna there. See Bretzigheimer 1998, Baumbach 1997, Morgan 2004, and Kruchió 2017. Kalasiris is certainly mendacious, and we see that he flags himself as such at specific moments, but he does not do so in referring to his story of an encounter with Persinna. So even if the story is a lie, it nevertheless occupies an embedded narrative that is believed by the internal audience, Charikleia, and probably also by the

learned and interpreting reader, so too Persinna has arranged to have her own *Aithiopika* be ultimately decoded by the learned and wise polyglot Kalasiris. His translation of Persinna's script solves the riddle of Charikleia's identity, initiating her *nostos* and the eventual restoration of her proper status in the royal house at Meroe.

In her text on the ribbon, Persinna exhorts her daughter, should she survive, to be mindful of (*memnēsēi*) her noble birth and to honor *sōphrosynē* as the quality that marks, inscribes, or characterizes (*kharaktērizei*) a virtuous woman (4,8,7). Persinna's script thus establishes a close link between Charikleia's chastity and her identity as a princess of Ethiopia. And indeed, obeying her mother's instructions, in her subsequent adventures with Theagenes, despite their love and desire for one another, Charikleia insists that they remain sexually chaste. Several characters in the novel marvel at Charikleia's *sōphrosynē* and conclude from it that she is of noble birth, confirming that her chastity signifies an important aspect of her identity. One might compare Persinna's use of the similar verb *ekharatton* when she relates how she inscribed her text with her own blood and tears, creating a script uniquely produced from her own body, just as her daughter was (4,8,6, cited above). Likewise, at the beginning of her text Persinna set upon it her authorial *sphragis*, fully identifying herself, where the same verb of inscribing is used in the statement of identity:

> Persinna the Queen of the Aithiopians to the one who was my daughter only for as long as my labour pains, whatever she shall be called, as my final gift I inscribe (*kharattō*) this written lament (4,8,1).

Persinna also includes among the treasures she leaves with her exposed infant daughter a ring:

> But above all the other possessions that were set out with you, remember to look for and to keep safe a certain ring, which your father gave to me during our courtship. It is engraved on the hoop with a royal symbol and endowed with a secret holy power in its collet by a pantarbe stone. (4,8,7)

Ciocani sets out the correspondence between the ring and Charikleia herself. Both are a sign of the marriage bond between Hydaspes and Persinna, both are

---

reader, at least until a contradiction is noted, so that, at one narrative level at least, it cannot be completely discounted as a plausible story of how Persinna might act. As Olsen 2012 points out (n.3), 'its significance for the novel cannot be completely elided.'

inscribed with signs of royal status, and both have the hidden power of being impervious to fire. Persinna's exhortation to Charikleia, to be mindful to keep the ring in her possession, repeats the verb (*memnēsēi*) she used to exhort her to remember to remain chaste.[15] Persinna's instruction to be mindful to keep the ring safe with her will save the girl's life later in the novel when Arsake tries to have her burned at the stake (8,9), just as her exhortation to Charikleia to preserve her *sōphrosynē* will save her from being harmed during the test of walking on the brazier at Meroe (10,9)[16]

When Charikleia, after all her Odyssean trials and adventures, at last arrives at home in Ethiopia, her mother (unlike Kreousa in *Ion)* recognizes her first, her suspicions confirmed by Charikleia's display of her tokens of identity. On the other hand, her father, the king (unlike Xouthos in *Ion)*, in spite of his personal longing for a child of his own, expresses a sustained skepticism in the face of Charikleia's claim to be his daughter. Charikleia's own cleverness is on spectacular display in her public performance, in full and dazzling costume, of the proof of her virginity and in her rhetorical brilliance as she overcomes (with Sisimithres' help) her natural father's reluctance to believe that she is his own daughter. Essential to Charikleia's success in achieving this spectacular *nostos* is the fact that, in spite of the love she shares with Theagenes, she has followed Persinna's written instructions to remain sexually chaste. Although her chastity proves her eligibility as a sacrificial victim, it is her chastity, along with her beauty, that so moves the watching crowd that they call upon the king to change the customary laws of the land, whereby humans are sacrificed to the gods.

Euripides' Kreousa, like Persinna, exposed her infant but the child's acceptance by a false but very gullible father is engineered entirely by Apollo's divine intervention. This takes place in spite of Ion's own reluctance to return home to his birthplace in Athens and in spite of Kreousa's initial failure to recognize her son and even her subsequent attempt to murder him as an intruder into the privileges of the royal house. In the Classical Athenian story of *Ion*, both heroic identity and *nostos* come from the divine father; in Heliodoros' *Aithiopika,* on the other hand, Charikleia inherits the throne in spite of a father who takes so much care not to be taken in by the proofs offered of his daughter's identity and who, once convinced, nevertheless publicly declares an intention to put her to death. As a part of Heliodoros' subversive play with the patriarchal models from the Greek literary canon, both Charikleia's mythic-heroic identity as the double descendant of Andromeda and the script that is the pivotal device enabling her

---

[15] Ciocani 2013, 231-233.
[16] See Morgan 1998, 70.

nostos are created by a mortal mother who directs her erotic gaze to the artful romance painted on the wall of her bedroom and who eloquently writes her own *Aithiopika*.

As an epilogue we might observe that paintings depicting scenes from the *Aithiopika* that date to the first decades of the 17th century, are almost exclusively limited to series' of works decorating royal residences, often commissioned on the occasion of a marriage.[17] Among the most notable is the early baroque cycle of fifteen paintings on the walls of the bedchamber in which Marie de Medici, wife of Henry IV of France, gave birth to Louis XIII at Fontainebleau. The paintings, by Ambrose du Bois, depict scenes from the *Aithiopika*. In Holland, Abraham Bloemaert, influenced by the school of Fontainebleau, painted two scenes from the *Aithiopika* for Frederik Hendrik of Orange, probably on the occasion of his wedding. We can add to this list Horions' treatment of the novel in paintings possibly commissioned by the king of Denmark, or Mosnier's cycle in the king's bedroom at Chateau Cheverny.[18] Considering what happened in the *Aithiopika* when the queen gazed at the art hung in the royal bedchamber, we can only wonder what these 17th-century European royal houses hoped might result from the placement of these scenes from the *Aithiopika* in their own queens' bedrooms.[19]

Bibliography

Anderson, M.J. 1997. 'The ΣΩΦΡΟΣΥΝΗ of Persinna and the romantic strategy of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica.*' *CP* 92, 303-322.

Baumbach, M. 1997. 'Die Meroe-Episode in Heliodors Aithiopika', *RhM* 140, 333-341.

Bretzigheimer, G. 1998. 'Die Persinna-Geschichte--eine Erfindung des Kalasiris?', WS 111, 93-118.

Chew, K. and Benton, M. 2018. 'Heliodorus in France: Mosnier's seventeenth-century representations of the *Aethiopica*', in K. Chew, J.R. Morgan & S.M. Trzaskoma (eds), *Literary Currents and Romantic Forms. Essays in Memory of Bryan Reardon. Ancient Narrative* Supplementum 26. Groningen: Barkhuis 2018. 307-324.

Ciocani, V. 2013. *Virginity and Representation in the Greek Novel and Early Greek Poetry.* PhD. Diss. University of Toronto.

Clavo, M.T. 2003. 'Comunicare a Delfi: lo *Ione* e le *Etiopiche* di Eliodoro', in M. Guglielmo & E. Bona (eds.), *Forme di comunicazione nel mondo antico e metamorfosi del mito: dal teatro al romanzo.* Torino: Edizioni dell' Orso. 299-321.

---

[17] See the survey by Stechow 1953 and the analysis by Crewe 2009.

[18] On this last example, see Chew & Benton 2018.

[19] I owe a great debt of gratitude to John Morgan and Marília Pinheiro for their very helpful suggestions. I take full responsibility for any flaws that remain in spite of their valuable advice.

Crewe, J. 2009. 'Drawn in color: *Aethiopika* in European painting', *Word & Image* 25, 129-142.

Elsner, J. 2007. *Roman Eyes: Visuality and Subjectivity in Art and Text.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gantz. T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth.* vol. 1. Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Goldhill, S. 2001. 'The erotic eye: visual stimulation and cultural conflict', in S. Goldhill, (ed.) *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 154-194.

Hunter, R. (ed.). 1998. *Studies in Heliodorus. Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, suppl. vol. 21. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.

Kruchió, B. 2017. 'What Charicles knew: fragmentary narration and ambiguity in Heliodoros' *Aethiopica*', *AN* 14, 175-194.

Morales, H. 2000. 'Sense and sententiousness in the Ancient Greek Novels', in A. Sharrock & H. Morales (eds.), *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 67-88.

Morales, H. 2005. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Cleitophon.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morgan, J.R. 1991. 'Reader and audiences in the *Aithiopika* of Heliodoros', *GCN* 4, 85-103.

Morgan, J.R. 1998. 'Narrative doublets in Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*', in Hunter 1998, 60-78.

Morgan, J.R. 2004. 'Heliodorus', in: Bowie, de Jong, & Nunlist (eds) 2004, 523-543.

Morgan, J.R. 2013. 'The erotics of reading fiction: text and body in Heliodoros', in C. Bréchet, A. Videau, and R. Webb (eds.), *Théories et pratiques de la fiction à l'époque impériale.* Paris: Picard, 225-237.

Olsen, S. 2012. 'Maculate Conception: Sexual Ideology and Creative Authority in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', *AJP* 133. 301-322.

Paulsen, T. 1992. *Inszenierung des Schicksals. Tragödie und Komödie im Roman des Heliodors.* Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag.

Pletcher, J.A. 1998. 'Euripides in Heliodoros' *Aithiopika* 7-8', *GCN* 9, 17-27.

Reeve, M.D. 1989. 'Conceptions', *PCPS* 35, 81-112.

Stechow, W. 1953. 'Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* in art', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtaud Institutes* 16, 144-152.

Winkler, J. 1982. 'The mendacity of Kalasiris and the narrative strategy of Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*', *YCS* 27, 93-158.

Whitmarsh, T. 1998. 'The birth of a prodigy: Heliodorus and the genealogy of Hellenism', in Hunter 1998, 93-124.

Whitmarsh, T. 2002. 'Written on the body: ekphrasis, perception and deception in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica'*, *Ramus* 31, 111-125.

Whitmarsh, T. 2011. *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel: Returning Romance.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zeitlin, F. 2013. 'Landscapes and portraits: signs of the uncanny and illusions of the real', in M. Paschalis & S. Panayotakis (eds.), *The Construction of the Real and the Ideal in the Ancient Novel. Ancient Narrative* Supplementum 17. Groningen: Barkhuis. 61-87.

Traditional poetic elements in Byzantine verse novels, especially Niketas Eugenianos, *Drosilla and Charikles*

EDWIN D. FLOYD
University of Pittsburgh

1. Byzantine metrical practice

The genre represented by two 12ᵗʰ-century AD verse novels, namely Theodoros Prodromos' *Rhodanthe and Dosikles,* and Niketas Eugenianos' *Drosilla and Charikles*, may be unfamiliar to most Classicists. Outside of our field, though, the verse novel is a recognized genre, exemplified, for example, by Pushkin's *Eugene Onegin*; also, in the last twenty years or so, there have been quite a few examples in English, with Vikram Seth's *The Golden Gate* being closely modeled, in terms of meter, on Pushkin, while Anne Carson's metrically looser *Autobiography of Red* has a classical background in the story of Geryon.

The dodecasyllabic meter used by Theodoros and Niketas should not, actually, be all that unfamiliar to the Classicist. Apart from an almost obligatory accent on position 11, it is fundamentally the quantitatively based iambic trimeter of the Classical era. However, the meter is strictly isosyllabic: each line consists of exactly twelve syllables and resolution of a long position is simply not allowed. Instead, quantities can be arbitrarily altered in order to fit into the pattern of

$$\breve{\underline{}} \; \underline{} \; \breve{} \; \underline{} \; \breve{\underline{}} \; \underline{} \; \breve{} \; \underline{} \; \breve{\underline{}} \; \underline{} \; \breve{} \; \breve{\underline{}}$$

For example in a word such as ἀγαθός ('good'), either the first or second syllable is lengthened, producing *āgathos* or *agāthos*, whereas in the classical iambic trimeter, where a long position could be resolved into two short syllables, ἀγαθός, with its initial sequence of two short vowels could be treated as part of a tribrach, dactyl, or anapaest.

Modern scholars' judgment of Byzantine practice in this regard tends to be fairly negative.[1] Actually, though, it might be fairer to say that Byzantine poets simply made different choices vis-à-vis metrically intractable words. The epic word ἀκάματον, for example, is scanned in Homer as *ākamaton*; the initial alpha privative ought to be short, but, as this makes it impossible to accommodate the word in a dactylic hexameter, Homer and other epic poets artificially lengthened it. The Byzantine solution, by contrast, was artificially to lengthen the second alpha.[2] If one approaches Byzantine metrics with a sympathetic eye, I would say this scansion is no less legitimate than Homer's. In fact, most of Niketas' lines are metrically regular by Classical standards; on average fewer than 5% of syllables show any quantitative irregularity.[3] In view of the pervasive importance of quantity in the metrical structure, it is reasonable to posit that this was reflected in some kind of prolonged pronunciation of long syllables in recitation, despite the fact that vocalic length was not a phonological phenomenon of Byzantine Greek, which was basically pronounced like Modern Greek. The result might seem to be doubly artificial, but, while there are some 'mistakes' (such as *Okeānou* at *Drosilla*, 1,3), most of the long vowels are 'correct' in Classical terms.[4]

---

[1] For example, West 1982, 185: 'quantity ceased to be significant and the [ancient] patterns dissolved'.

[2] As at *Drosilla*, 9,91; also Manuel Philes, *Carmina*, 2,126,10.

[3] I am not aware of any published figures concerning this, but some sense of the situation can be provided by the following observations: in *Drosilla*, 1,1-125 there are 1000 syllables whose quantity is metrically fixed: positions 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 are long, while positions 3, 7, and 11 are short, for a total of eight syllables per line, while positions 1, 5, 9, and 12 are anceps. In these 1000 syllables, the distribution is that about 41 syllables (just over 4% of the total, in about 30% of the lines) are 'wrong', viz., syllables in lines 3, 5, 14, 17, 22, 27, 32 (bis), 33, 38, 40, 43, 53, 59, 63, 67, 68, 72, 74, 75, 79 (bis), 80, 81, 83, 84, 85, 89, 93, 96 (bis), 99, 105, 106, 107 (bis), 108, 113 (bis), 115, and 119. (Actually, some of the cited instances are questionable, as they involve proper names; also, an exact parallel for the short iota in καλλίων, 1,74, which would be long in Attic, is provided by Semonides, fr. 7,31.)

[4] Just such a carry-over from a previous linguistic situation finds a fairly close modern parallel in the reliance of some forms of French verse on the pronunciation of many now silent e's. Not only are these 'silent' e's important in a theoretical fashion, but they are audible in some styles of recitation, even as the phonology is modern, and even as some pronunciations (such as third plural -ent as simply a schwa instead of including an audible –nt) seem fundamentally artificial. For this sort of pronunciation, cf. Apollinaire's own reading, available online, of his poems *Marie, Le Pont Mirabeau,* and *Le Voyageur.*

2. The archaism of isosyllabism

The strict isosyllabism of Byzantine poetry may not be as great an aberration in Greek as one might initially imagine. Elsewhere in Indo-European, it is a feature of Rig-Vedic verse, and Meillet 1923 correlates various Vedic meters with the Aeolic meters of Sappho and Alcaeus. From Meillet's presentation, then, it appears that isosyllabism was a feature of long standing in Greek metrics.

Such a conclusion is also supported in West's handling of Semonides (seventh century BC), as he reports (1982, 41) that there are no examples of resolution in Semonides' 180 iambic lines.[5] As a result, it appears that some ancient poets, such as Semonides, avoided words such as ἀγαθός, with its initial sequence 'short vowel, consonant, short vowel', altogether. Conversely, others, such as Solon, appear to have underused such words. Solon, for example, uses forms of ἀγαθός seven times in his hexameter and pentameter verse (about 210 lines), but the word as such does not appear in Solon's 59 trochaic or iambic lines. The word was not, however, considered semantically inappropriate to iambic, inasmuch as κἀγαθῶι, with crasis, is found in Solon's iambics at fr. 36,18.[6]

3. Classical allusions in Niketas Eugenianos' novel: the Indo-European dimension

Conca's edition of Niketas' novel contains a list of parallels, roughly half of which are Classical or Late Antique, including 56 from Homer (37 from the *Iliad* and 19 from the *Odyssey*).[7] In this section I shall explore one particularly interesting example: the motif of 'oak and rock'.

The underlying pattern is first adumbrated at 1,343, where Drosilla, in a soliloquy, says Charikles is subject to human emotions, not being born of oak (οὐκ ἀπὸ δρυῶν ἔφυς). This passage does not mention rocks, but Niketas uses the full combination at 4,244, when Charikles, telling a false story to his rival Kleinias, relates how he fell in love with a beautiful girl, 'for I was not born from an oak or descended from rocks' (μὴ γὰρ δρυὸς προῆλθον ἢ πετρῶν ἔφυν).' In his note on

---

[5] Besides their reliance on isosyllabism (although in different ways), another parallel between Semonides and Niketas is the scansion of καλλίων; cf. the conclusion of n.3 above.

[6] Something comparable is also observable in fifth-century-BC Attic, inasmuch as forms of ἀγαθός with resolution appear in Aeschylus' and Sophocles' iambics just four times (A. *Th.* 610; S. *OT* 687 and 934, *Ant.* 31), whereas forms with crasis appear eleven times (A. *Th.* 595, *Eu.* 881; S. *Aj.* 964, *Ant.* 275 and 671, *Tr.* 511, *Ph.* 119, 421, 456, 873, and 1050. (The listing does not include any fragments, since the scansion of these is often uncertain.)

[7] Conca 1990 (276-289).

1,343, Conca cites a number of passages which combine 'oak' and 'rock', beginning with Homer, *Odyssey* 19,163 and *Greek Anthology* 10,55,2-3, and proceeding to various Byzantine instances.[8]

However, the ancient use of the pattern is more varied and more complex than suggested by Conca's citations. Two other early epic instances are Hesiod, *Theogony* 35 (where the poet's account of his encounter with the Muses ends enigmatically with 'What has this to do with oak or rock?': ἀλλὰ τίη μοι ταῦτα περὶ δρῦν ἢ περὶ πέτρην) and Homer, *Iliad*, 22,126 (where Hector says that he cannot chat with Achilles from an oak or a rock, ἀπὸ δρυὸς οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρης, like a maiden and a youth). Concerning the semantic significance of these passages, commentators, such as West (1966, 167-169) and Richardson (1993, 119-120) respectively, reach no definitive conclusion. West's counsel of despair that the solution 'is lost in antiquity' (169) is, however, countered by Watkins 1995, who posits an answer in the prehistory of Greek. Citing two Avestan parallels (*Yasht* 13,99 = *Yasht* 19,85), he argues that there was some ancient association of the combination of 'oak or rock' with the idea of truth, still evident in Greek passages such as Plato, *Phaedrus* 275b8, where Sokrates attributes the influence of the oracle at Dodona to the naiveté of earlier generations, who 'were simple-minded enough to be quite satisfied with messages from an oak or a rock if only they were true' (ἀπέχρη δρυὸς καὶ πέτρας ἀκούειν ὑπ' εὐηθείας, εἰ μόνον ἀληθῆ λέγοιεν).[9]

Besides the word for 'oak' (or, more generally, 'tree'), there is a second element in both the Greek and Avestan poetic patterns: Avestan *pauruuan* ('mountain') and Greek *petrē* ('rock'). These words are not directly cognate with one another. A likely etymology for *petrē,* though, is from *piptein* ('to fall').[10] Plausible semantic motivations for this development are that rocks cause one to stumble and fall and the fact that in a region such as Greece, which is subject to many earthquakes, rocks often fall from cliffs.

An etymological connection of *petrē* and *piptein*, along with an association with 'falling' or 'deception', is attractive in dealing with Hesiod, *Theogony* 35. Not only truth, but also falsehood is included in the Muses' proclamation of their repertoire, a few lines previously (27-28). Against this background, then, the rhetorical question at line 35 ('what has this to do with oak or rock?') falls into place as an inquiry, through a poetic formula, as to what the Muses' claim concerning truth and falsehood really is. Similarly with *Iliad* 22,126, when Hector says he

---

[8] Constantine Manasses, *Aristarchos and Kallithea*, 1,17,2-3; 2,42,6; 4,71,8, and Theodoros Prodromos, *Rhodanthe,* 8,95. Conca adds a reference to *Anthology* 7,10,7-8 in his note on *Drosilla* 9,11.

[9] Watkins 1995, 161-164, drawing on observations by his student J. Schindler.

[10] Porzig *apud* Frisk 1960-72, 2, 523.

cannot speak from oak or rock to Achilles like a maid and youth, we might catch an allusion to a kind of insouciance concerning the truth, as the man and maid, perhaps a courting couple, lead each other on with playful banter, and so provide a stark contrast with Hector's current situation vis-à-vis Achilles.

Of course, no one in Greece, even as early as Homer or Hesiod, will have known directly of the Indo-European background of the combination 'oak and rock'. Rather, the words and their patterning are inherited, and early poets will have drawn on a long-standing oral tradition concerning their usage. We should also realize that the prehistoric oral tradition may have undergone considerable development. Judging by the Avestan evidence, the original connection was simply of 'tree and mountain' with 'truth'; then, at some point in the prehistoric development of Greek poetics, 'rock' and an association with 'falsehood' appear to have been superimposed on this. Later, though, once such patterns were fixed in written form in texts such as Homer's *Iliad* and Hesiod's *Theogony*, subsequent authors, from the Classical through the Byzantine era, could draw on the Homeric and Hesiodic usage.

In Niketas Eugenianos' novel, the 'oak … rock' pattern is variously developed, from 1,343 through 4,244 and then also at 6,13-21, 6,229-231, and 9,11. In the first passage, there is just 'oak'. Then, at 4,244, the full combination is used, and the context also adumbrates its ancient background more fully. In the story which Charikles tells, Drosilla is ostensibly his sister, and he fell in love with someone nameless, but of course he is actually speaking about Drosilla; thus the passage illustrates a mixture of truth and falsehood, as Charikles conceals his true emotions from his interlocutor Kleinias, who is also in love with Drosilla. Next, in Book 6, both passages (6,13-21 and 6,229-231) refer to how Drosilla fell as waves struck rocks, and she was rescued by a piece of oak, which carried her to shore. Rock, then, is presented as something treacherous, while oak has positive associations. Finally, at 9,11, there is a different application of the pattern in the fact that even inanimate and naturally hard objects such as oak and rock lamented the untimely death of Charikles' friend Kleandros.

4. A parallel with Sappho

At *Drosilla* 6,662-663, Charikles bewails the coming of dawn by suggesting that the aged Tithonos has driven Eos from his bed. As Conca notes, this clearly echoes *Greek Anthology* 5,3. Both refer to daybreak in terms of Tithonos' age; presumably, if he were still young, he would keep Dawn with him longer and so delay the march of time.

There is another important *comparandum*: the 'new' Sappho, published in 2004.[11] The Sappho passage refers to Eos as *akoitis* ('bedfellow') of Tithonos, and *Drosilla* 6,662-663, the only reference to the goddess in the novel, uses the equivalent word *eunetis* of her. Additionally, Sappho fr. 58,10, although the papyrus is extremely fragmentary at this point, seems to contain the word *depas* ('bowl'), which would fit with a reference to Okeanos, such as we will get in connection with Dawn, some ten lines later, at *Drosilla* 7,4; for the association of the bowl of the Sun with Okeanos, compare Stesichorus, fr. 8,1-2 (Page).[12]

Nor is there any problem about positing a Byzantine allusion to Sappho fr. 58. Though undoubtedly less read than Homer, Sappho was still known in 12th century Byzantium. Conca (1990, 285) lists four Sappho passages.[13] Not surprisingly, some of these are well-known book citations; however, 2,3-4 and 96,6-9 are from fragments unearthed in modern times (like the Tithonos poem), rather than from the tradition of citations which has come down to us.

In the now familiar 'new' Sappho, the speaker is old. This finds a parallel in the mention of the aged Baryllis or Maryllis at *Drosilla* 6,667, just five lines after the reference to Tithonos. The association with Sappho fr. 58 continues in a later scene in the novel (7,270-332), as the old woman gets tangled up in dancing. This recalls Sappho's lament (fr. 58, 5-6) about no longer being able to dance as she once could. The association may seem unexpectedly parodic. It is, however, readily paralleled in Niketas' treatment at 7,264, just a few lines previously, of the Biblical 'let no man put asunder …' which is similarly handled with a mixture of parody and positive allusion.[14]

It is also significant that, if we read the old woman's name as Baryllis, it resonates with Sappho's word *barus* ('heavy'), found at fr. 58,5. This is, I submit, an important textual result, providing welcome corroboration for Conca's diffidently expressed preference for the spelling *Baryllis* rather than *Maryllis*.[15] It also finds support in the fact that the old woman's name first occurs at 6,667, more than 400 lines after her initial appearance at 6,236. This postponement of the mention of her name suggests that it is particularly significant in the context where it occurs,

---

[11] For this, see Gronewald & Daniel 2004a and 2004b.

[12] Here and elsewhere, my citation of line numbers in the 'new Sappho' works from the assumption that the poem begins with Sappho's address to young girls, in connection with the beautiful gifts of the Muses, although this is line 11 in the earlier, more fragmentary text printed by Voigt 1971.

[13] Frs. 2,3-4; 96,6-9; 115; and 130,2, echoed at *Drosilla* 3,357; 3,336-337; 9,50; and 2,217 respectively; in addition, Burton (1998, 203, n. 60) cites fr. 105a in connection with 6,570-573

[14] Cf. Burton 1998, 203-204

[15] Conca 1990, 26.

the reference to the aging Tithonos as the consort of Eos. Overall, Conca's argument for the name *Baryllis* is based on the coarseness of the scene at 7,270-332, in which the old woman falls, injures her head, and thrice breaks wind. All this could perhaps be correlated with a name derived from *barus*, and now, with Sappho fr. 58 as part of our dossier, we can also hear a more general allusion to this poem, in the form of the speaker Sappho's despondency concerning her inability to dance as she once could.

Moreover, despite the obvious coarseness of a passage such as 7,280-292, an allusion to Sappho in connection with the old woman is in place. First, at 6,236-238, there is the contrast of the young Drosilla and the old woman, as lines 1-4 of the 'new' Sappho contrast young girls with the aged poetess. Then there is the more direct allusion at 6,662-663 noted above. There is also an important connection between the beginning of Book 7 and the beginning of Book 9. The opening phrase of Book 7 (Ἤδη μὲν ὄρθρος καὶ …; 'Now it was morning') is repeated at the next occurrence of Dawn, in the first line of Book 9.[16] In the scene in Book 9, the reference to oak and rock lamenting for Kleandros (9,11) produces an image familiar from the story of Orpheus. Another poem in the same section of the *Anthology* as the one cited by Conca in his note on this passage (7,10,7-8) refers specifically to the Muses, described as the daughters of Mnemosyne, as bewailing Orpheus' death (7,8,5-6), and, just a few lines previously (7,8,1), evokes Orpheus' ability to charm oak and rock. Thus the scene at the beginning of *Drosilla* Book 9, in which Baryllis, along with Drosilla, is one of the mourners for Kleandros, involves a connection of both old and young with the Muses and so fills out the outline of the portrayal of Sappho at the beginning of fr. 58.

5. The hexameters in Barbition's songs in Book 3

There are three hexameter sections in *Drosilla*: 3,264-288; 3,297-322; and 6,205-235, constituting a total of 83 lines. The sections in Book 3 are songs by Barbition, cajoling the lovely Myrto to yield to his entreaties, and the passage in Book 6 is a lament by Drosilla concerning the supposed death of Charikles.

As noted by Conca, the reference at *Drosilla* 3,301 to a good runner (Syrinx) fleeing a better one (Pan), echoes *Iliad* 22,158, where the two figures are Hector and Achilles. The Homeric phrasing is πρόσθε μὲν ἐσθλὸς ἔφευγε, δίωκε δέ μιν μέγ' ἀμείνων ('a good man fled in front, but a much better one pursued him'), and

---

[16] The four-word combination, though it might seem a commonplace formula, occurs in *Drosilla* in only these two passages, and a search of TLG indicates that it does not occur anywhere else either.

Niketas' adaptation of this is ἐσθλὴ πρόσθε πέφευγε, δίωκεν ὄπισθεν ἀμείνων ('a good woman has fled in front, but someone better pursued from behind'). In comparing the Byzantine adaptation with the Homeric original, I submit that, although the race and the probable outcome of failure to escape (rape by Pan or death at Achilles' hands) are no less seriously regarded by Syrinx than by Hector, Barbition subtly suggests that Syrinx's position is less dire than Hector's, as he refers to Pan as simply 'better', in place of Homer's 'much better', and so puts pursuer and pursued on a more equal footing.

A comparable manipulation of an epic source appears at *Drosilla* 3,316, where the phrase μιγήμεναι οὐκ ἐθέλουσαν ('one unwilling to mingle in love') quotes (with change of case) *Iliad* 6,165. The contexts are similar – a request to consummate a relationship –, but the *Iliad* passage is part of the lying story told by Proitos' wife, to the effect that Bellerophon had propositioned her, while the Byzantine version is part of Barbition's wheedling request to Myrto. The *Iliad* parallel is easily recognized and, with the allusion to the wife's lie, Niketas can again be heard as suggesting a note of deviousness about his character Barbition.

6. The hexameters in Drosilla's lament in Book 6

Three books later, at 6,208, Drosilla, who mistakenly believes that her beloved Charikles has perished, laments her μοῖρα … δυσώνυμος ('ill-named fate'). This is a Homeric usage, but it appears that the adjective carried a traditional association with deception, disguise or false belief. Niketas has taken the exact phrase from *Iliad* 12,116, a foreshadowing of Asios' 'ill-named fate'. Before considering this particular Homeric passage, though, it will be helpful to see how previous Iliadic occurrences of 'ill-named' lead up to it.

At *Iliad* 6,255, Hecuba uses the plural form of the adjective in reference to the Greeks. The broader context is that Hector has returned to Troy, to invoke divine aid against the Greek onslaught, which has been exemplified in the *aristeia* of Diomedes; and one aspect of this *aristeia* is the idea, expressed by Pandaros at *Iliad* 5,184-185, that Diomedes himself might be a disguised god.

Correspondingly, in Books 12-13, the eventual fulfillment of the reference to Asios' 'ill-named fate' at 12,116 - his death at 13,383-393 - comes just after a scene in which Poseidon has appeared in human form and has been concealing his activities from Zeus (13,354-357).[17]

---

[17] Something of the same sort of resonance (divine disguise, etc.) is also evident in Sanskrit, as at *Rig-Veda* 10,162, where the cognate word *durṇāma* (of basically similar meaning) is used in a context of a woman mistaking a demon for her husband, brother, or lover. Of

Niketas also develops the theme of confusion or misprision on Drosilla's part through the way in which, at 6,229-231, another use of the combination of oak and rock is presented. The hexameter passage develops an earlier, narrative passage (6,13-21), which had related Drosilla's falling into the sea and being battered on rocks, and then being rescued by oak. Drosilla's exact words are φλοιός μ' ἐξεσάωσεν ἀπὸ δρυὸς ὅς κεν ἐτύχθη. The first part is clear enough ('some bark saved me'); the concluding phrase is mysterious, but seems to introduce some uncertainty, describing the bark as something 'which would have been made of oak', or 'which I imagine was of oak'.[18]

A couple of lines later, at 6,234, Drosilla's phrase πολὺν χρόνον ἄλγεα πάσχω ('for a long time I have suffered griefs') is an obvious echo of the last four words of *Iliad* 3,156-157, where Helen appears before the Trojan elders:

οὐ νέμεσις Τρῶας καὶ ἐϋκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοὺς
τοιῇδ' ἀμφὶ γυναικὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἄλγεα πάσχειν·

'Surely there is no blame on Trojans and strong-greaved Achaians
If for long time they suffer hardship for a woman like this one.'

This passage of the *Iliad* is a famous *locus classicus* for the power of indirection. Focusing just on Helen's effect on others, the Homeric lines are effective as a statement of her beauty in a way that, perhaps, no overt description could be. The echo at *Drosilla* 6,234 thus reminds the reader of Helen's beauty and indirectly equates Drosilla to her. It is not absolutely clear, though, whether we should read the allusion as belonging to Drosilla, so that she is praising her own beauty, even

---

course, it should once again be stressed that neither Homer nor subsequent Greek writers will have known anything directly of this Vedic usage. Rather, the oral tradition, drawn on by both Homer and the Vedic seer, will have maintained, over many centuries of independent linguistic development, the same sort of resonance for 'ill-named'. An association of δυσώνυμος with confusion or uncertainty concerning divine matters may also be corroborated, for the Byzantine period, by Christian literature, in which, in perhaps as many as 115 passages, the word appears as a term of opprobrium for heretics and heresies (The figure comes from a preliminary *TLG* search). This resonance, which is consistent with the earlier, Homeric usage, is also picked up in Byzantine verse by Theodoros Prodromos at *Carmina Historica* 59,136, where he defends himself against a charge of heresy; moreover, the word comes in a specific context claiming that Theodoros' opponent is confused.

[18] Burton (2004, 119) does not translate this phrase at all. Jeffreys (2012, 418) offers 'an oak trunk which chanced to be there', presumably suggesting that Niketas mistakenly connected the form ἐτύχθη with τυγχάνω rather than τεύχω.

as she laments her fate, or whether it is the narrator's, implying this beauty, independently of his character's attitude.[19]

Drosilla's hexameters conclude at 6,236, with the phrase σελασφόρον ἀστέρα λεύσσειν ('to behold the light-bringing star'). In this, the reference to the sun, which Drosilla eschews in her misery, recalls Christodoros' description of Menander as σελασφόρος … ἀστήρ, the 'light-bringing star' of comedy, who used ἰάμβους 'iambic verse' (*Greek Anthology*, 2,362 and 364). Appropriately, then, as the passage alludes to Menander and his iambic poetry, it leads us back to iambic dodecasyllables, which resume in the next line, at 6,236.

Niketas' consistently isosyllabic lines, though, are quite unlike Menander's, inasmuch as the comic poet allows resolution more than half the time (53% of his lines, according to West 1982, 89). Accordingly, we should perhaps also look for some additional resonance here, namely in Sappho's poetry. This was metrically more archaic than Menander's in its isosyllabism, and the developing parallelism with Sappho, latent in the contrast of the young Drosilla and the old woman at 6,236ff., will become clearer as the novel progresses. In fact, Drosilla's phrasing at 6,235, introducing this section, may already adumbrate the Tithonos poem, for although the 'new' Sappho is now generally thought to conclude with fr. 58,12, there is actually good evidence to suggest that it goes on for four more lines.[20] These conclude with a reference to brilliance and the sun and, apparently, the speaker's love of life, expressed in the word ἀελίοιο, 'sun'; conversely, Drosilla, using the Attic form ἥλιον at 6,235, forswears any wish to see the sun.

Bibliography

Apollinaire, G. [poems, read by the author], at https://www.wheatoncollege.edu/
    Academic/academicdept/French/ViveVoix/Resources/parauteur.html.
Burton, J. B. 1998. 'Reviving the pagan Greek novel in a Christian world', *GRBS* 39, 179-216.
Burton, J. B. 2004. *A Byzantine Novel: Drosilla and Charikles, A Bilingual Edition*, Wauconda, Illinois: Bolchazy-Carducci.
Conca, F. 1990. *Nicetas Eugenianus: De Drosillae et Chariclis Amoribus*, Amsterdam: Gieben.

---

[19] Possibly, another Byzantine allusion to *Iliad* 3,156-157 may be helpful in dealing with this question. At Psellus, *Chronographia* 6,61,9, there is an account of a remark made at the imperial court concerning the Emperor Constantine IX's mistress Skleraina: the two words οὐ νέμεσις. No more was needed to make clear the allusion to the *Iliad*, and everyone present understood, except, it would appear, Skleraina herself; at least, she proceeds to inquire about it, as if unfamiliar with the source. Likewise, it may be that Niketas, at 6,234, is presenting Drosilla as being somehow detached from the actual Homeric allusion which she makes.

[20] Cf. Edmunds 2006, along with Puelma & Angiò 2005, 14.

Edmunds, L. 2006. 'The new Sappho: Ἔφαντο (9)', *ZPE* 156, 23-26.

Frisk, H. 1960-1972. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Gronewald, M. & Daniel, R. W. 2004a. 'Ein neuer Sappho-Papyrus', *ZPE* 147, 1-8.

Gronewald, M. & Daniel, R. W. 2004b. 'Nachtrag zum neuen Sappho-Papyrus', *ZPE* 149, 1-4.

Jeffreys, E. 2012. *Four Byzantine novels.* Translated Texts for Byzantinists 1. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Meillet, A. 1923. *Les origines indo-européennes des mètres grecs*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Puelma, M. & Angiò, F. 2005. 'Sappho und Poseidippos: Nachtrag zum Sonnenuhr-Epigramm 52 A.-B. des Mailander Papyrus', *ZPE* 152, 13-15.

Richardson, N. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary, Vol. 6*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Voigt, E.-M. 1971. *Sappho et Alcaeus. Fragmenta*. Amsterdam: Athenaeum.

Watkins, C. 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

West, M. L. 1966. *Hesiod, Theogony, Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

West, M. L. 1982. *Greek Metre*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Abstracts

Recognition in the Greek novels
ALAIN BILLAULT

Recognition (*anagnôrisis*) is the retrieval of a knowledge which had been lost. For some heroes of the Greek novels, this knowledge is about their own identity.The latter is not permanently unquestionable. It may be forgotten or ignored, it may waver and disappear for a while. The loss of identity is one of the many sufferings the heroes have to endure. They may ignore their own identity which will be restored and proclaimed in the course of their story. It may also be forgotten or misunderstood even by their closest companions. In both cases, recognition reestablishes an order which had disappeared. and at the same time creates confusion which reveals the frailness of human identity, the power of chance and the disorder of human life as the Greek novelists describe it.

'Similar to Artemis or to the Golden Aphrodite':
Topoi of nuptial poetry and rhetoric in the Greek novel
CECILIA NOBILI

This paper aims at analysing the intertextual connection between the Greek novels and the nuptial literature, from its earliest poetic forms (see Sappho's *epithalamia*), to its rhetoric evolution in the imperial age. At this regard, a difference may be detected among the earlier novelists and the later ones. In Heliodorus, Achilles Tatius and Longus the intermediary role of the Sophistic and the rhetoric literature is clearly attested; on the other side, Xenophon of Ephesus and Chariton show a more direct relationship with their poetic sources and offer a plenty of nuptial *topoi* that seems more directly inspired by the literary memory of archaic wedding songs than by the sophistic *progymnasmata*. They thus exhibit an interesting case of 'narrativisations' of their lyric models.

Carpe diem, Carpe:
Horace, Petronius, and the satirical rhetoric of the novel
ILARIA MARCHESI

This paper argues that three scenes of the *Cena Trimalchionis* evoke specific details of Horace's *Carmina* 1,11: the theme of impending death, the futility of astrology, and the gnomic conclusion of the ode. Petronius' interest in, and rewriting of Horace, contributes to the construction of the generic identity of his novel. It is not coincidental that the threefold allusive episode culminates with a pun on *carpere*, that in Horace comes close to being a technical term of the lexicon of Satire (*S.* 1,3,21). In redeploying a key-word in Horace's lyrical and satirical poetry, obliquely and through the voice of Trimalchio, the *Satyrica* re-establishes the centrality of the genre of satire and stakes a claim to its inheritance. When Petronius' novel asks to be read intertextually and targets satire as the intertext of choice, it also offers itself as an omnivorous genre, capable of digesting and reproducing any language, lyric included.

Callirhoe's silenced dilemma (Chariton 6,7,13)
SILVIA MONTIGLIO

Several important characters in Chariton's novel are shown prey to dilemmas, the most elaborate of which is Callirhoe's, when, on discovering her pregnancy, she debates within herself whether to dispose of the unborn child or to marry Dionysius (2,9,2-6; 2,11,1-3). Dilemmas are almost formulaic in Chariton. This paper focuses on a short episode (6, 7, 13) which could have grown into another dilemma but does not, because it is cut short by the outbreak of a war. Chariton's choice signals a transition from a dramatic to an epic style of narrative, and content-wise from tragic-like *agônes* to an Iliadic *aristeia*, whose protagonist, Chaereas, is the character the least prone to dilemmas. Additionally, the suppression of the dilemma allows the narrator to circumvent the unsolvable issue of Callirhoe's choice between two evils, and thus to preserve the heroine's integrity. Finally, the silencing of the quandary spells out that human deliberation is ultimately irrelevant for the course of the action, since more powerful forces, call them Eros or Tyche, rule the show.

Apuleius, Phaedrus, Martial and the intersection of genres
SILVIA MATTIACCI

Phaedrus, Martial, and Apuleius are aware that their works belong to a 'low' literary genre, and they all react with self-mocking understatement and constant dialogue with the reader. This strategy of defence is particularly prominent in passages where a metaliterary intersection with 'high' genres is proposed: Phaedr. 4,7; Mart. 8,3; Apul. *Met*. 10,2. The paper focuses on these passages and examines the meaning and function that the shift from 'sock' to 'buskin' – to use their metaphor – has for the three authors. This comparison shows that Apuleius does not share Phaedrus' and Martial's open irony and polemic against lofty, 'anti-realistic' poetry, and does not exclude the presence of elevated genres, such as tragedy, in the open form of the novel. However, in Apuleius, tragedy is brought down to the expressive code of the novel, and the veiled trace of authorial irony confirms the 'metamorphosis' of genre.

Tragedy and paratragedy in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*
MARIA PIA PATTONI

In the syncretism of literary genres which underlies the sophisticated text of Longus' novel also tragic models play an important role. In most cases, it is a question of generic reuse of expressive forms or motifs borrowed from the tragic genre; sometimes, it is possible to recognize different types of allusions to specific tragic hypotexts. The analysis of these passages highlights that Longus' adoption of paratragic mechanisms is not very differenti from the comic genre.

From Dolon to Dorcon:
echoes of *Rhesus* in Longus
VAYOS LIAPIS

Ancient Greek novels often engage with the world of Greek tragedy, sometimes down to the level of specific intertextual allusions. The present paper discusses one such case, namely the Dorcon episode in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* 1,20-21, which seems to be modelled on the Dolon subplot in ps.-Euripides' *Rhesus* both thematically and in terms of verbal allusions.

The village of Chemmis in the *Aithiopika*:
Heliodorus' rewriting of historiographical tradition
M. TERESA CLAVO SEBASTIÁN

On their journey to Ethiopia, Chariclea and Calasiris find hospitality in the house of the Greek merchant Nausicles in the Egyptian area called Chemmis. Greek historiographers coincide in linking this place with Delos, characterizing it by its mobility and hospitality; contribution of the Antonine culture is the presence of Pan and satyrs, assistants of Isis and Osiris. Heliodorus's Chemmis also cleverly reconfigures the Platonic *Phaedrus* idea: a 'panic' environment and a dialogue about Eros. This results in a Dionysian space in which a humorous game of costumes leads to passional *crisis* and the revelation of the identity of the protagonists. From there, Calasiris leads Chariclea towards a double objective: to occupy the throne of Ethiopia and to embody the *living logos* devised by Plato in the Phaedrus (274-76).

The mother-daughter romance
and heroic *nostos* in Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*
AARA SUKSI

Heliodoros' *Aithiopika* adapts many plots from earlier literature, especially Homer and Euripides. It often subverts the classic plots as part of its program of deconstructing established cultural values. This article argues for the role of Persinna as part of this program, comparing her with Kreousa in Euripides' *Ion*. In both texts an extraordinary conception compels an innocent mother to expose her child to save them both from a fatal scandal of sexual transgression. The child consequently resides at Delphi, comes of age, and is eventually recognized and reunited with their royal family. Kreousa bears Apollo's son Ion, who, because of her marriage to the king, inherits the throne, in a typical example of the double paternity motif allowing a Greek male hero to be both the son of a god and heir to a throne. The *Aithiopika's* recasting of this plot offers instead a double maternity, with Persinna as mother of Charikleia who is thus heir to the Ethiopian throne, but also the daughter, not of a god, but of a romantic artwork.

Traditional poetic elements in Byzantine verse novels, especially Niketas Eugenianos, *Drosilla and Charikles*

EDWIN D. FLOYD

The genre of the verse novel, as practiced by a Byzantine poet / novelist such as Niketas Eugenianos, involves archaism in both metrical practice and intertextual allusions. Though based on the Classical iambic trimeter, the Byzantine dodecasyllabic line reflects still more ancient Indo-European metrical patterns, observable in Sanskrit in the Rig-Veda and in archaic Greek poets such as Sappho and Alcaeus. Also important are various ultimately Indo-European poetic patterns, such as a combination of oak and rock, used a number of times in *Drosilla*, and the resonances of the word δυσώνυμος (*Drosilla*, 6,208). Within Greek, Niketas makes a number of important allusions to Sappho, especially fr. 58 (Voigt), e.g., her use of βάρυς at fr. 58,5, which lends support to the reading Baryllis (instead of Maryllis) in Niketas' novel. Also, in a dactylic hexameter section of *Drosilla*, line 3,303, referring to Pan and Syrinx, parallels Homeric references to Achilles and Hector.

Contributors

ALAIN BILLAULT is Emeritus Professor of Greek at Sorbonne Université, Paris. His main fields of research are the Greek novel and the Greek prose of the Roman period. He also works on Hellenistic poetry and ancient literary theory.

M. TERESA CLAVO SEBASTIÁN, Associate Professor of Classics at the University of Barcelona (Spain). She is co-editor of *Pensament I Diàleg en scene* (*Itaca*'s monograph n.20, 2004) and *Teatre grec: perspectives contemporànies* (Barcelona 2007). She has published articles on Greek Literature, especially on Greek tragedy and its relationship with ancient novel, historiography and iconography.

Having studied Latin at Fort Collins High School in Colorado, EDWIN D. FLOYD turned to Greek at Yale University (B. A., 1958) and Princeton University (Ph. D., 1965), along with a year (1960-61) at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. He taught for four years at the College of William and Mary (where he met his wife Mary B. Floyd), and then for 48 years at the University of Pittsburgh, retiring in 2014. His teaching and research has focused mainly on Homer, Sappho, and Pindar, with a particular emphasis on their maintenance of Indo-European poetic patterns. He has also written on Linear B and other linguistic topics.

VAYOS LIAPIS is Professor of Ancient Theatre and Its Reception at the Open University of Cyprus. He has published broadly in the areas of classical and modern Greek literature, theatre, and language. He has taught at Universities in Canada, Cyprus, France and Greece, and has been a Member of the Institute of Advanced Study (Princeton). His latest book is *A Commentary on the Rhesus Attributed to Euripides* (Oxford 2012). His latest co-edited books is *Greek Tragedy after the Fifth Century* (Cambridge University Press 2018) and *Adapting Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge University Press, forthcoming). He is the recipient of the 2018 National Prize for the Translation of Ancient Greek Literature into Modern Greek (Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sports).

ILARIA MARCHESI is Professor of Classics and Comparative Literature at Hofstra University, where she directs the Classics program. In 2008, she published *The Art of Pliny's Letters: A Poetics of Allusion in the Private Correspondence*, a monography on the intertextuality in the letters of Pliny the Younger (Cambridge), for which she received a National Endowment for the Humanities Grant. She also edited and contributed to the book *Pliny the Book-Maker: Betting on Posterity in the* Epistles (Oxford 2015). Beside epistolography, her research interests include Latin satirical poetry and the ancient novel. She has published articles on Horace, Petronius, Martial, and on the reception of classical authors in Petrarch. In collaboration with Simone Marchesi, she has published *Live in Pompeii*, an essay in narrative form on the cultural value of the archeological past for the young generation (Garzanti 2016).

SILVIA MATTIACCI is associate professor of Latin Language and Literature at the University of Siena. She has published commented editions of the fragments of the *poetae novelli* (Rome 1982), Tiberianus (Florence 1990) and Apuleius (*Metamorphoses* IX, Florence 1996). She has studied Martial in connection with neoteric poetry (Pisa 2007), Phaedrus and the interactions between fable and epigram, the Latin epigram in late antiquity with particular reference to Ausonius and to the relationship between words and images. She is preparing a commentary on the seventh book of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, which will be published in the «Greek and Latin Writers» series of the Fondazione Lorenzo Valla.

SILVIA MONTIGLIO is the Gildersleeve Professor in Classics at Johns Hopkins University. She is the author of several books, among which *Love and Providence: Recognition in the Ancient Novel* (2013) and most recently, Musaeus, *Hero and Leander: Introduction, Greek Text, Translation and Commentary* (2020).

CECILIA NOBILI is Researcher in Greek Language and Literature at the University of Bergamo. She has published extensively on archaic Greek poetry (epic and lyric), local traditions, and the Greek Novel. Her most recent volume is *Corone di gloria. Epigrammi agonistici ed epinici dal VII al IV sec. a.C.* (Alessandria 2016).

MARIA PIA PATTONI, who completed her studies at the Scuola Normale Superiore in Pisa, is Full Professor of Ancient Greek Literature at the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart in Brescia. She is in the editorial board of the reviews Dionysus and Aevum antiquum. Her main interests are focused on Attic theater with a special consideration for tragedy, epic tradition, Aristotle's *Poetic*,

Hellenistic poetry, ancient Greek novel. Among her publications there are: *L'autenticità del `Prometeo Incatenato' di Eschilo*, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa 1987; *Longo Sofista, Dafni e Cloe*, Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli, Milano 2005; *Euripide - Wieland - Rilke - Yourcenar - Raboni: Alcesti. Variazioni sul mito*, Marsilio, Venezia 2006. She is editor of the volumes *Sacrifici al femminile: Alcesti in scena da Euripide a Raboni*, Comunicazioni sociali XXVI 2004, pp. 273-577; (with E. Medda and M.S. Mirto) *Komodotragodìa. Intersezioni del tragico e del comico nel teatro del V secolo a.C.*, Pisa 2006), *Prometeo: percorsi di un mito tra antichi e moderni,* Aevum antiquum n.s. XII-XIII, 2012-2013, pp. 1-700, Milano 2015.

Aara Suksi is an Associate Professor of Classics at the University of Western Ontario, and Associate Director of the School for Advanced Studies in Arts and Humanities. She teaches and publishes in the field of Greek literature and culture.

Indices

*Index locorum**

——————

  * This index offers only a selection of passages referred to.

General index