Latin Poetry and the Idea of Rome in the Greek Novel

Daniel Jolowicz

Magdalen College

Word Count: 99,094

ABSTRACT of: Latin Poetry and the Idea of Rome in the Greek Novel.

Daniel Jolowicz, Magdalen College. Submitted for degree of D.Phil, Trinity 2015.

My doctoral project focuses on texts known as the 'ancient Greek novels'. I am interested in how the novels—and imperial Greek literature more generally—interact with Latin literature and Roman power. The major claim of the thesis is that the Greek novelists Chariton, Xenophon of Ephesus, Achilles Tatius, and Longus (writing under the Roman Empire in the first three centuries CE) are engaging meaningfully with literature written in Latin, especially Augustan poetry of the first century BCE. The claim has never been systematically explored, and runs counter to received wisdom. The thesis demonstrates that the novelists are invested in Latin literature (especially Vergil and the elegists) and Roman cultural narratives, and potentially lays the groundwork for a major overhaul and re-evaluation of the way we read imperial Greek literature. It draws two major conclusions: (i) that the Greek novels are deeply invested in Latin literature and Roman cultural narratives at the level of poetics, and (ii) that this literary engagement is part of a more subterranean political agenda through which the texts articulate a resistance to Rome and empire.

Chapter 1 explores the novelists' literary and ideological appropriation of the elegiac metaphors of *seruitium* and *militia amoris*. Chapter 2 analyses Chariton's engagement with the *Aeneid*. Chapter 3 pursues Chariton's relationship with Ovid's epistolary and exilic poetry, as well as with Latin elegy more generally. Chapter 4 examines Achilles' use of Latin elegy as part of his redefinition of the novelistic genre. Chapter 5 explores how Achilles mediates his version of Roman foundation narratives such as Romulus' Asylum, and the rapes of the Sabine women, Lucretia, and Verginia. Chapter 6 examines the gamut of Longus' responses to Latin literature and Roman culture, including Vergil, Ovid, the Lupercalia, and Romulus and Remus.

The Appendices tabulate undiscussed allusions.

Acknowledgments

Contents

Introduction

There is not, I believe, from Dionysius to Libanius, a single Greek critic who mentions Vergil or Horace. They seem ignorant that the Romans had any good writers. (Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*).[1]

0.1   The state of the question, and imperial Greek identity politics

The use of Latin literature by Greek writers in the first three centuries of the imperial period has a relatively straightforward history in the tradition of classical scholarship. The orthodoxy has been that, whilst the Romans readily cull from the meadows of Greek literature, the Greeks are not interested in Latin literature.[2] This is a dogma I intend to explode: as I shall go on to suggest, the apparent lack of interest in Latin literature is a strategy bound up with the paradox of Greek elite identity in the imperial period, and buckles under scrutiny—as did the Eurocentric notion of a Greek world resilient to Eastern influence.[3] Yet scholarship has persisted in trafficking in received wisdom exemplified by the words of Gibbon in the epigraph above: we must be aware that 'inherited intellectual categories create blindspots'.[4] In this connection my thesis has two major goals: to demonstrate that the Greek novelists are engaging with Latin literature and Roman cultural narratives in sophisticated ways; and to site

---

[1] Gibbon (1909) vol.1 38 n. 43 (first written in 1776), echoed at the turn of the millennium in Swain (1996) 28: 'One thing we can be sure of: Rome was not a source of inspiration'.
[2] Rochette (1997) 269 explains the relative silence of imperial Greeks towards Latin literature as a result of disinterest.
[3] See the essays in Whitmarsh and Thomson (2013). In the context of the novels see further Barns (1956) and Rutherford (2000) on second-millennium Egyptian influence, and Anderson (1984) on third-millennium Sumerian influence. de Romilly (1993) 283-92 discusses Greek disdain towards other cultures.
[4] Whitmarsh (2013a) 5.

this literary Romanising within its broader socio-cultural context whilst also assessing the extent to which the novels are ideologically implicated in the Roman Empire.[5]

As those who have addressed the question have recognised,[6] the perpetuation of this orthodoxy has resulted in a vicious cycle whereby scholars (a few exceptions aside)[7] either do not read Greek imperial texts with an eye to Latin referents, or, if one is spotted, it is relegated as evidence for a 'lost common source'. This is despite mounting evidence that Second Sophistic authors show an awareness of and meaningful engagement with Latin literature.[8] This thesis will advocate the need for a new reading practice of Greek imperial texts of the period known as the Second Sophistic (which can be roughly periodised as 50-250 CE),[9] and will present the Greek novels of Chariton, Achilles Tatius, and Longus (and to a certain extent Xenophon of Ephesus) as case studies. I shall use the introduction to set out the doxography of the question as it stands, and offer a range of explanations and evidence—cultural, literary, linguistic, inscriptional—that supports my claim that the imperial Greeks are invested in Latin literature and Roman culture.

---

[5] Fuchs (1938), Palm (1959), and Forte (1972) are fundamental on Greek responses to Roman rule.

[6] E.g. Hidber (2006), Hose (2007), Gärtner (2013).

[7] In the context of the novelists the main exceptions are Cataudella (1927) and Tilg (2010) 242-97 on Chariton and the *Aeneid*; M. Jones (2012) *passim* on Achilles and Latin elegy; Hilton (2009) on Achilles and Petronius; Di Virgilio (1991), Di Marco (2000), (2006), Hubbard (2006a), (2006b), Torres Guerra (2007) on Longus and the *Eclogues*. Bowie (2007) 126-8 suggests that Antonius Diogenes may know Petronius and perhaps the *Aeneid*, citing Bowersock (1994) 37-40, who discusses Antonius' potential Aphrodisian connections, as well as his letter to Faustinus who is potentially linked to Martial's patron of the same name.

[8] Rochette (1997) is fundamental. Lucian and Juvenal: Helm (1906) 218-22, Mesk (1912), (1913), Courtney (1980) 551-5, Bozia (2014) 16-51. Lucian and Ovid: Mowbray (2015). Lucian and Horace: J. Hall (1981) 110-21. Pelling (1979) 75 argues for Plutarch's lack of knowledge of Latin literature, though cf. Plutarch's paraphrase of Horace (*Luc.* 39.6; *Ep.* 1.6.40-6) on which see Stadter (2014) 130-48. Plutarch and Cicero/Sallust: Pelling (1988) 137, Moles (1988) 28-31. Cassius Dio and Latin literature (incl. *Aen.* 11.371-3 and Cicero): Millar (1964) 52-5, Baldwin (1987). Alciphron, Aelian, and Philostratus and Latin elegy: Hodkinson (2009). Greek epigram and Latin: G.W. Williams (1978) 124-38 (and cf. Whitmarsh (2004a) on Mesomedes' epigrams as a response to Roman power).

[9] Phil. *V.S.* 481. Whitmarsh (2005a) and König (2009) are useful introductions to the literature and culture of the period; on the history of the phrase 'Second Sophistic' see Whitmarsh (2001a) 41-5.

The current paradigm derives its strength in part from the fact that imperial Greeks are obsessed with the past and market themselves as deriving no inspiration from Roman culture. Perry, Bowie, Anderson, and Swain (for example) see the texts of the period as marked by a linguistically (i.e. Atticising) and culturally archaising impulse, which represents—in what is, in effect, a nostalgic escape fantasy and act of resistance—an attempt to recreate their past glories and shore up their imperviousness to the Roman-controlled present in the face of their own political impotence.[10] On this model, the past functions as a discursive structure that provides a way of coming to terms with or (given a more aggressive spin) resisting the realities of Roman rule.[11] Spawforth, on the other hand, suggests that Greek immersion in the past, and Atticism in particular, is in line with the Augustan ideological agenda, which promoted the Greek past as a repository of ethical paradigms; on this model the Atticising movement is itself a form of Romanisation and the Romans are responsible for scripting Greek cultural identity politics.[12]

Spawforth's model has the advantage of exposing the cultural permeability of the period, and rejects the idea that imperial Greeks lived in a hermetically sealed bubble. Woolf detects the existence of a 'dynamic tension' between Greek and

---

[10] Perry (1950) 296, Bowie (1970), Anderson (1984) 97, (1993) 3, 101, and *passim*, Swain (1996). Anderson (1989) 137 n. 365 cautions against Bowie's generalisation esp. on the basis of the third century historian P. Herennius Dexippus, on whom see Millar (1969). Kennedy (1974) 20 and Russell (1983) 108-9 see Greek declamation as providing a similar 'escape' function, *pace* Bowersock (1969) 15 and Schmitz (1999) 74. On Atticism see Schmid (1887-97), for whom the practice is restricted to literature, *pace* Bowie (1970), who sees it as a wider cultural phenomenon. Perkins (1995) and (2009) contrasts the backward-looking imperial Greeks with the furture-oriented Christians (e.g. Tert. *De Spec*. 30.1-3 on the Lord's *aduentus*).

[11] Anderson (1993) 118-19 prefers the former to the latter. Whitmarsh (2013b) sketches a variety of discursive strategies by which imperial Greeks resist Rome.

[12] Spawforth (2001) 378, (2012) esp. 57, 229, 231; cf. Wisse (1995) 74-81 on the influence of Latin writers on the rhetorical views of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (e.g. *De Orat. Ant*. 3).

Roman cultures in the period,[13] which likewise paves the way for a methodological approach that allows more than just one-way traffic between the Romans and the Greeks. Indeed, there is plenty of evidence that imperial Greeks were not in fact hermetically sealed, but happy to import and utilise a range of Roman cultural and architectural products:[14] public declamation on fictional themes (e.g. in the Agrippeum in Athens),[15] the increasing emphasis on distinguished and divine ancestry,[16] gladiation (especially in the East, often sponsored by priests of the imperial cult or influenced by veteran colonists),[17] horse-racing,[18] amphitheatres and Roman theatres (e.g. at Pergamon),[19] bath-gymnasium complexes (e.g. at Miletus, Aphrodisias, Ephesus, Smyrna, Sardis),[20] baked brick in the Augustan theatre at Roman Sparta,[21] and the open and less restrictive style of houses.[22] Of course, it may be the case that architectural elements did not, for the Greeks, have the same cultural valence as literature; but though there may be an extent to which literature as an institution stands alone as autonomous,[23] it is nevertheless perverse to suggest that the Greeks were content to engage with the gamut of Roman cultural phenomena with the sole exception of literature; it may, however, be the case that their literary Romanising is more disguised.

---

[13] Woolf (1994) 135, though he talks of 'the extreme resistance to Latin in this period' (129) and maintains that 'Greek remained to the end resistant to Latin literary culture' (131).
[14] E. Thomas (2013) explores the question of Romanising elements in Greek architecture.
[15] Spawforth (2012) 39, cf. Graindor (1927) 181, Connelly (2007).
[16] Luraghi (2008) 201, Spawforth (2012) 40. Cf. C.P. Jones (2010) 68-74, who discusses the interest taken by the imperial Greek elite in old heroes, no doubt encouraged by Hadrian's establishment of the Panhellenion in 131/2 CE.
[17] L. Robert (1940) 246-7 with 286 n. 3 on Dio *Or*. 31.122, Wiedemann (1992) 43-4, 141-5; cf. Phil. *V.A.* 4.22 on Apollonius' denunciation of gladiatorial shows.
[18] Cameron (1976) 208, Humphrey (1986) 510-11.
[19] Anderson (1993) 4. Bowie (1970) 202 and n. 99 notes that Herodes Atticus' Odeon probably looked Roman.
[20] Brödner (1983), Farrington (1983), Yegül (1992) 250-313.
[21] Waywell and Walker (2001) 288, Spawforth (2012) 123.
[22] Nevett (2002) 95-6, Spawforth (2012) 46, 54.
[23] On the notion of literature as autonomous see Lansdown (2001).

The notion of disguised or covert engagement is, I suggest, a fruitful heuristic tool. It explains the nature of Greek interaction with Latin literature in the first three centuries CE and is partly explicable in connection with the complex identity politics of the period;[24] indeed, Whitmarsh views imperial Greek texts as 'inherently bound up with the process of negotiation of an identity discrete from Rome', especially in their mimesis of the past and adherence to the canons of *paideia* (which functioned in part as a counter to Roman power).[25] Being a member of the Greek elite in the Roman Empire was no easy business: one had to tread a fine path between, for example, remaining true to one's cultural heritage, and performing one's duties as a Roman citizen, *eques*, senator,[26] imperial advisor, or any other role within the mechanisms of imperial government (e.g. *ab epistulis*)[27]—good examples are Dio Chrysostom and Plutarch,[28] as well as sophists in general.[29] Indeed, many imperial Greeks actively sought promotion within Roman and imperial structures (see e.g. Plut. *De Tranq. An.* 470c).[30] The result is an inevitable tension between being an imperial subject and simultaneously part of the power structure that enabled that subjection. They had to be experts at cultural code-switching and oscillating between subject positions,[31]

---

[24] The essays in Goldhill (2001a) offer a useful range of analyses of identity politics of the period; Kaldellis (2007) 13-41 discusses the increasing complexities of Hellenism when it comes into contact with Romans and Christianity. Cf. Eshleman (2012) who explores the technologies of self-definition utilised by sophists, philosophers, and Christians in the period, and argues that each group strives to construct their identity in opposition to one another; Perkins (2009) detects the simultaneous development of two groups (Christians, and a trans-imperial elite made up of Romans and Greeks).

[25] Whitmarsh (2001a) 2, and 41-130 on mimesis and *paideia*. See the essays in Borg (2004) for a range of responses to imperial *paideia*, and Schmitz (1997) for an explanation of *paideia* as an exclusionary tactic mobilised by the Greek elite as a way of symbolically justifying their position.

[26] On Greek senators under Hadrian, Trajan, and especially the Antonines see Halfmann (1979) 71-81. By Trajan's time, half the non-Italian senators were Greek. See Millar (1977) 477-9 on the shared interests and links between the provincial elite and Rome.

[27] See Millar (1977) 225-8 on *ab epistulis graecis*; Bowie (1982) 57-9 lists Greeks with the title *ab epistulis* or *ab epistulis graecis*.

[28] On the 'double view' experienced by many of the Greek elite see the essays in Madsen and Rees (2014a).

[29] Bowersock (1969) emphasises the political importance of sophists, whilst Reardon (1971) and Bowie (1982) focus on their literary importance.

[30] Plutarch also advises the statesman to have friends among the Roman elite (*Praec. Ger. Rep.* 814c).

[31] See Wallace-Hadrill (2008) 6, 63-4 on cultural code-switching.

resulting in identities that were very much dictated by context.[32] On this model, 'Greek' and 'Roman' are discursively constituted categories created by writers who are desperate to ground their identity in the mechanics of difference and differentiation, precisely at a time when, in an increasingly cosmopolitan world, identity is becoming highly fluid and differentiations are being lost.[33]

In the public environment of the Greek elite, deviation from the Hellenic script is met with abuse. Hence the scholarly chorus that imperial Greeks cannot be engaging with Latin literature, because it would interfere with their projection of Greekness. Apparent ignorance of Latin literature is nominally in line with the fact that Plutarch nowhere alerts us to his Roman citizenship, which we only know by a single inscription identifying him as Lucius Mestrius Plutarchus (*SIG* 829a).[34] Excessive φιλία or κολακεία towards the Romans attracts derision from fellow Greeks, for example the practice of shaving off one's beard in imitation of the Romans (Dio *Or.* 36.17);[35] the Corinthians exhibit hostility towards Favorinus for being too close to the Romans ([Dio] *Or.* 25.6); Aristides completely ignores Roman history and literature in his *Roman Oration* (*Or.* 26);[36] and Apollonius sends a letter to the Ionians rebuking them for their use of Roman names (Phil. *V.A.* 4.5; cf. *Ep.* 71).[37] This is precisely the context into which we should place the literary Romanising of the Greek elite, who would inevitably cloak any debt to the Roman

---

[32] Bowie (1991) 183-4.

[33] The essays in Whitmarsh (2010a) explore the issue of identity and localism ('microidentities') in the imperial period; cf. also Revell (2009). On the material and numismatic perspective see Hingley (2005) and Howgego, Heuchert, and Burnett (2005).

[34] On Plutarch's views on Rome see Swain (1996) 135-86, Stadter and Van der Stockt (2002), and on his 'Roman readers' see Stadter (2014); on Plutarch's 'Roman heroes' see Pelling (1989).

[35] For Dio's position in relation to Rome see Jones (1978) 124-31 (detecting hostility), Quet (1978), Swain (1996) 187-241, Whitmarsh (2001a) 133-246.

[36] Grube (1965) 213 suggests that Greeks refrain from mentioning Latin literature in order to save Romans from embarrassment!

[37] Jones (1971) 127 attributes this to Apollonius' conservative rather than anti-Roman attitude. Bowie (1970) 201 discusses Greek rejection of Roman place-names, measurements, and dating.

literary tradition. It is not, therefore, that they are ignorant of Latin literature, but that they are *affecting* ignorance of it. Nor is it the case that the Greeks do not find Latin literature interesting or are deliberately ignoring it (as Rochette argues),[38] but that their intertextual strategies for mediating it are very different from their use of Homer, say.[39] Scholarship therefore needs to move away from the paradigm that renders Roman interest in Greece as *cultural*, and Greek interest in Rome as *utilitarian*.[40]

The scholarly terrain I have sketched for imperial Greek literature holds true for the Greek novels, which can likewise be seen as complex articulations of Greek identity in a Roman world and as an 'expression of cultural hegemony'.[41] With their emphasis on the classical past,[42] urban elite protagonists, the *polis*, and marriage, the novels are regarded by some scholars as reflecting a culturally regenerative force, symbolically advancing the perpetuation of the Greek elite and their interests, or as providing them with a cultural script in response to Roman domination;[43] others promote a view of the novels as escapist fictions and consolations for the political impotence felt by the Greeks in the post-Hellenistic world.[44]

---

[38] Rochette (1997) 81-3.
[39] On the role played by Homer in the imperial period see Kim (2010).
[40] So e.g. F. Robert (1946) 57-9, quoted in Rochette (1997) 13.
[41] Swain (1996) 101-31, quotation at 106.
[42] Hägg (1987), Bowie (2006a).
[43] Cooper (1996) 20-44, Perkins (2009) esp. 72-5, Whitmarsh (2011) 14, 26 on the earlier romances, Lalanne (2006) on the novels as 'rites de passage'; cf. Frye (1957) 186 on romance as a venue for ideologies of the social elite.
[44] Reardon (1969) and (1991) 29, Scobie (1973) 19, Holzberg (1995) 47, Hägg (1983) 16. Bakhtin (1981) 84-258 views the novels as apolitical, though see Whitmarsh (2005b) for a corrective to this position. Kaldellis (2007) 40 compares the pre-Roman past of the novels with the revival of Hellenism in twelfth-century Byzantium.

As does much of the literary output of the period, the novels also seem to narcotise the presence of Rome.[45] Yet we must avoid reading them in isolation from the wider currents of literary and cultural production and consumption.[46] The Ps.-Lucianic *Onos* is explicitly set in the *prouincia* of *Achaia*, and Iamblichus' *Babyloniaka* is contextualised in the second century amid Roman military operations on the Parthian border;[47] and as I shall argue, Chariton, Achilles, and Longus seed the presence of Rome and Roman cultural narratives into their texts as part of a strategy of resistance. Indeed, there have been isolated suggestions that the novels encode a resistance to Rome. Perkins argues that the novel represents a 'cultural form deauthorised by the changed power/knowledge frames of the Christian empire',[48] therefore making it an ideal base of operations for acts of cultural resistance. As a genre, the novels also appear to fly under the ancient critical radar and the only apparent references to them in antiquity are disparaging (Persius *Sat*. 1.134;[49] Philostr. *Ep*. 66; Julian *Ep*. 89) or prescribe them as a cure for impotence (Theodorus Priscianus *Eupor*. 113.5-12). It is not, however, the case that because Rome is not a surface feature, it is entirely absent; it can be displaced and discursively negotiated through other means. One must be alive to what Edward Said calls a 'contrapuntal reading': 'in reading a text, one must open it out both to what went into it and what its author excluded'.[50]

0.2 Bilingualism, the evidence of the papyri, and word lists

---

[45] Kim (2008) 147-8, Connors (2008) 162, Whitmarsh (2011) 5. Stephens (2008) 70 argues that the presence of Rome in the novels would reduce the status of Greeks to subalterns, and Doody (1996) 28 suggests that the pre-Roman past reminds readers that 'there was a cultural tradition aside from and before the Romans, and thus cultural alternatives'.
[46] As Bowersock (1994) 15 cautions.
[47] On the *Onos* see E. Hall (1995) and Millar (1981); on Iamblichus see Photius *Bibl*. 75b27 and Morales (2006).
[48] Perkins (2009) 11.
[49] See p. 70 with n. 14.
[50] Said (1993) 67.

Studies in Greco-Roman bilingualism advance the case for Greeks as having at least a working knowledge of Latin. Although Greek-speakers were more likely to learn Latin as adults rather than as children,[51] there is plentiful evidence of Latin-learning tools and materials designed for Greek-speakers.[52] Rochette comprehensively assembles the evidence for Greek elite bilingualism,[53] including the attitude to the Latin language and the use of Latin literary and historiographical sources by a diverse range of imperial Greek authors (for example Strabo, Appian, Josephus)—indeed, Plutarch attests to Latin as a universal language (*Plat. Quest.* 1010d; cf. Aug. *De Civ. Dei* 19.7); in addition, many Greek authors exhibit an explicit interest in the status of Latin in relation to Greek.[54] Adams explores in detail the evidence for bilingualism in a range of social classes in Egypt, through the evidence of (for example) the archives of Tiberianus and Terentianus at Karanis, and that of Abbinaeus at Dionysias.[55] Although Adams works to soften the dogma that Latin was the 'official' language of the army and law courts,[56] it is still primarily the consensus that whilst Romans learned Greek for its cultural capital, Greeks learned Latin for its use value. Yet the vast evidence for the influence of the Latin language on Greek writers and speakers,

---

[51] Cribiore (1996), (2001) and T. Morgan (1998) are fundamental on the mechanics of education in the Roman period in Egypt.

[52] Rochette (1997) 177-206, Cribiore (2003–4) and (2007) 57-62, Gärtner (2005) 16-18. Miguélez-Cavero (2013) 64-6 offers a useful summary. See now Dickey (2012) on the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana. Woolf (1994) 131 observes that the separate educational systems of the Romans and Greeks 'must have contributed to maintaining the separate integrity of each of the two traditions'.

[53] Rochette (1997) esp. 257-326 and the summary table at 264, which tabulates knowledge of Vergil, Horace, Ovid, Seneca, Cicero, Lucretius, Tacitus, Pliny, and Juvenal. On Polybius' Latinisms see Dubuisson (1985).

[54] Dionysius of Halicarnassus sees Latin as halfway between Greek and barbarian (*Ant. Rom.* 1.90.1), in line with his theory of Rome's Greek origins, on which see Hill (1961). Hahn (1906) examines the influence of Latin in the Greek East until Trajan; Rochette (1997) 42-5, 49-83 surveys the ways in which the Greeks talk about Latin and the Romans more generally.

[55] Adams (2003) esp. 527-641 on Latin in Egypt.

[56] Adams (2003) 599-600, and 635-7, 758-9 rejecting the generalisation advanced by Rochette (1997) 116-26 that Latin in Egypt increased after Diocletian, perhaps as part of an official policy.

as well as the evidence I shall set out in the following six chapters, strongly suggests that this is not the full story.[57]

Evidence for bilingualism is not, of course, evidence for a detailed knowledge of Latin literature. There is, however, ample papyrological evidence for the reading of Vergil and Cicero through bilingual lexica.[58] Word lists for Cicero (*LDAB* 554, 556, 559, 558), Juvenal (2559), Sallust (3875, 3877),[59] and Terence (3982, 3983)[60] exist, which are 'specific standard editions intended for circulation in a large number of copies';[61] there is in addition an annotated portion of Seneca's *Medea* (*P. Mich. inv.* 4969).[62] Most of these are from the third century and later, though *P. Jand.* 90 (Cicero) is first century and *Pap. Strass. Lat.* 2 (Vergil) is first/second century; there are also first- and second-century school exercises on Vergil (*P.Oxy.* 3554, *P. Tebt.* 686).[63] This is proof that Latin authors—especially Vergil and Cicero, models of high poetry and prose respectively—were being read in Egypt at this period. The consensus, however, is that these materials were used solely as a means of learning the Latin language rather than offering an opportunity of mastering Latin literature.[64] Again, this thesis will propose that bilingualism and materials such as word-lists and glossaries enabled a deeper engagement with Latin literature than has hitherto been suspected.

---

[57] Recent contributions to the debate about Greco-Latin bilingualism include Adams, Janse, and Swain (2002), Rochette (2010), (2011), Torres Guerra (2011), Mullen (2011), Marganne and Rochette (2013).
[58] On papyri: Rochette (1990), (1994), (1997) 188-204, and (most comprehensively on Vergil on papyrus) Scappaticcio (2013). Rochette (1997) 266 observes that Ovid does *not* survive on papyrus.
[59] Suda z 73 records a Hadrianic Zenobios who translated Sallust's *Histories* into Greek.
[60] Appian also cites the Latin dramatist Pacuvius (*B.C.* 2.146, 611).
[61] Rochette (1997) 196.
[62] On which see Markus and Schwendner (1997).
[63] On which see Cockle (1979).
[64] Though see Kramer (2001) 21, who claims that the major goal of studying Latin was, in fact, to master Latin literature. See Dickey (2012) 15 n. 34 for further bibliography.

0.3   Evidence for the knowledge of Vergil among the imperial Greeks

Vergil is used as a paradigm of Latin for those learning the language, and would have been held in high esteem by the Greeks.[65] Seneca the Elder reports how Lucius Cestius Pius, the Augustan Greek from Smyrna, tried to imitate *Aeneid* 8.26-7 (*Contr.* 7.1.27; cf. also *Suas.* 7.10); Seneca also reports that Claudius' powerful freedman Polybius composed a metaphrasis of Vergil in Greek prose (*Cons. ad Pol.* 8.2); the Suda (a 3867) records a certain Arrian Epopoios who translated the *Georgics*;[66] a scholion to Plato (*ad Phaedr.* 244b) refers to Vergil's naming of the Sibyl as Deiphobe (*Aen.* 6.36); Lucian (*De Salt.* 46) and the author of *A.P.* 16.151 show an awareness of Vergil's treatment of the Dido-Aeneas story; Erycius *A.P.* 6.96 appears to allude to *Ecl.* 7.3f;[67] an Orphic papyrus (*P. Bon.* 4) exhibits proximities to Vergil's Underworld;[68] and Photius knows Vergil's birthday from Hadrian's freedman Phlegon of Tralles (*Bibl. Cod.* 97). In addition to these specific instances, there is ample evidence for Greek translations of Vergil (though mostly dating from the fourth century and later, including Christian interpretations of *Ecl.* 4).[69] Finally, Pisander of Laranda, who wrote a *Heroikai Theogamiai* in sixty books under Alexander Severus, further corroborates the claim that Vergil is being read during the Second Sophistic.[70] He imitated Vergil's narrative of the fall of Troy so closely that Macrobius (*Sat.* 5.2.4) mistakenly believes that Vergil imitated Pisander, which is a chronological impossibility. On the basis of the above, Gärtner concludes that Greeks are only

---

[65] Thus Irmscher (1985), discussing the role of Vergil in later Greek literature; cf. González Senmartí (1985).
[66] Swain (1991) dates him to the early third century and locates him in Pergamon.
[67] For discussion and further bibliography see Lipka (2001) 116-17, Hubbard (2006a) 511 n. 35, Gärtner (2013) 113 n. 99. Wilamowitz (1906) 111 n. 1 thinks Erycius is dependent on Vergil; Bowie (1985) 82-3 posits a common source in Philitas.
[68] Merkelbach (1951), Treu (1954), Lloyd-Jones and Parsons (1978).
[69] See Reichmann (1943), Fisher (1982), Rochette (1997) 302-19.
[70] On Pisander and Vergil see Garstad (2003), who argues that Nonnus derives his Cadmus-Libya narrative thence.

interested in Vergil for the following items or themes: the fall of Troy (especially *qua* Rome's metropolis), the wooden horse, and the relationship between Aeneas and Dido—that is, things that can be seen from a Greek or a romantic perspective.[71] Whilst the interest is clearly true, this is only a partial account.

There is, finally, the on-going question of the extent to which later imperial Greek hexameter poets such as Quintus of Smyrna (late third century), Triphiodorus (third/fourth century), Nonnus (fifth century), as well as Colluthus (fifth century) and Oppian of Cilicia (second century),[72] are reading Latin literature, especially Vergil. The question has encouraged a great deal of scholarly activity, much of it advancing positive arguments in favour of Latin literary influence.[73] Such scholarship is to some extent methodologically analogous to my own undertaking, and provides useful entry points into an enquiry concerning the novelists.[74]

As Rome's national poet, Vergil was known throughout the Greek world.[75] The *Aeneid* is a poem that naturalises the Roman empire, and for that reason—as I shall go on to suggest especially in connection with Chariton and Longus (Ch. 2 and 6)—presents a large target for imperial Greek authors struggling with the realities of the Roman present who want to deconstruct the master narrative epitomised by Vergil's *Aeneid*.

---

[71] Gärtner (2013) 96.

[72] On Oppian and Ovid's *Halieutica* see Rodríguez Pantoja (2007).

[73] Quintus of Smyrna: Gärtner (2005), Cuypers (2005) 607, James (2007), Hadjittofi (2007) 375-80, and James and Lee (2000) 80-2, 91-3 on Ov. *Met*. 13.1-381. Triphiodorus: D'Ippolito (1976), (1990), Gärtner (2013) 101-4, Miguélez-Cavero (2013) 64-71 offers a summary. Nonnus and Vergil: Cataudella (1932) 333, D'Ippolito (1991) 527-32. Nonnus and Ovid: Braune (1935), D'Ippolito (1964), 75 and (2007), *pace* Knox (1988), Shorrock (2001) 110-11, Paschalis (2014). Gärtner (2013) discusses all these poets in connection with their knowledge of Latin literature.

[74] E.g. D'Ippolito (2007), who argues for Nonnus' 'disguised imitation' of Vergil and Ovid.

[75] He receives a statue in Christodorus of Thebes' ecphrastic poem (*A.P.* 2.414-6).

0.4 Further evidence for interest in literary Latin

There is strong anecdotal evidence for a knowledge of Latin literature. Gellius (*N.A.* 19.9) reports an occasion at the birthday party of a young equestrian from Asia.[76] Among those attending were the Spanish rhetor Antonius Julianus, and some learned Greeks who are acquainted with Latin literature (19.9.7). After listening to entertainments consisting of recitals of Sappho, Anacreon, and some recent erotic elegies (19.9.4), the Greeks proceed not only to mock Antonius for his barbarous Spanish accent—their ears are clearly well tuned to the various timbres of Latin—but also to rail at the inferiority of Latin literature in contrast to Greek, with the exception of Catullus and Calvus (19.9.7). There are two major curiosities here relevant to our question. Firstly, the Greeks are well versed enough in Latin literature to be able to detect stylistic differences between Catullus and Calvus (whom they approve), and Laevius, Hortenius, Cinna, and Memmius (whom they denigrate); in this connection the Tarentine Crassicius, who wrote a commentary on Cinna's *Zmyrna* (Suet. *De Gram*. 18), is also relevant.[77] Secondly, they are all responsible for various combinations of erotic-elegiac verse. On this basis Hose argues that the erotic elegies contained in the second century *P.Oxy.* 3723 (= *SSH* 1187) are in fact of the imperial period and modelled on Latin elegy (see p. 20);[78] he likewise points to the presence of erotic elegies in the evening's entertainment as evidence of the contemporary

---

[76] Discussions include Rochette (1997) 267-9, Adams (2003) 16-17.

[77] Suetonius does not say whether the commentary is in Greek or Latin. On Crassicius see Kaster (1995) 196-201.

[78] Hose (1994a), *pace* Morelli (1994); Parsons (1988) notes the resemblance to Propertius but suspects a shadowy Hellenistic model, as does Butrica (1996); the original editors, Parsons and Bremmer (1987), suspect it is contemporary with the papyrus. Lightfoot (1999) 26-8 surveys the issue.

existence and popularity of such poetry. In the chapters that follow I shall argue that the novelists know Latin erotic elegy well.

To the anecdote in Gellius we can add the evidence of the younger Pliny who claims that Greek littérateurs have been so stimulated by his poetry that they have learned Latin (*Ep.* 7.4.9). Two Greek authors are also worthy of mention: the Rhodian Voltacilius Pitholaus (late Republican) wrote Latin epigrams (Macr. *Sat.* 2.2.13); and Eudoxus of Rhodes (Neronian) is said to be an admirer of Latin poetry (ὁ θαυμαζόμενος εἰς Ῥωμαϊκὴν ποίησιν, Suda 3612).[79]

0.5   Inscriptional evidence

There are two items of inscriptional evidence whose relevance has never been discussed or adduced, despite their revolutionary importance for the argument. Firstly, from Aphrodisias there is an inscription recording a list of prizes for musical and athletic contests (*CIG* 2758 = *IAph2007* 11.305; second/third century).[80] Included in the schedule for the musical contest is a category for a ποιητῇ Ῥωμαικῷ (block B, line 3). Secondly, there is a similar inscription from Ephesus (*IEph.* 1149; second/third century). It records a list of victors in a musical competition, among whom is a certain Lucius Sertorius from Daldis who is described as a ποιη[τὴς] [Ἑλλ]ηνικὸς καὶ Ῥωμαϊκ[ὸς] [ὑμνο]γράφος (lines 7-9).[81] Linguistic and inscriptional evidence strongly indicates that the semantic range of the ethnic Ῥωμαϊκός embraces the idea

---

[79] Both mentioned by Rochette (1997) 224, 238.
[80] Discussions include Reynolds (1982) 193 doc. 61, Wörrle (1988) 230-6, Roueché (1993) doc. 52.
[81] Mentioned by Robert and Robert (1981) 441 no. 462, Stephanes (1988) no. 263; on ὑμνογράφοι see Ferrary (2014) 118. *IG* xi.2 133 (second century BCE) refers to a ῥωμαιοτής 'actor of Latin comedies', on which see Robert and Robert (1983) 182 no. 475 and Ferri (2008).

of 'Latin speaking'.[82] Both Aphrodisias and Ephesus are Roman centres in the imperial period, and these inscriptions directly attest to poets performing in Latin alongside Greek.

0.6   Intertextual and cultural methodologies

As the above demonstrates, access to Latin and Latin literature is clearly uncontroversial, especially since imperial Greek literature mostly emanates from those with close ties to Rome. Yet the dominant discourse of Greek elite self-representation generally elides Latin literature and culture from view. Several questions consequently become pressing. The most immediate is intertextual: how can we tell that a text is establishing itself in relation with another text when not only is it in a different language, but the authors also participate in a culture that punishes cultural Romanising and where debts to Latin literature are by necessity covert?[83] And, how do we distinguish between 'knowledge of' and 'sophisticated engagement with'?[84] Firstly, a different model of intertextuality is needed from what we are used to when dealing with texts of this period, where the markers of allusion to classical Greek literature are often overt (such as explicit citations).[85] I shall demonstrate how Chariton, for example, smuggles Vergil into the text by surrounding the Vergilian intertext with Homeric quotations, and how Longus puts Vergil into the mouth of Philetas. Secondly, if the network of allusions can be shown to be mutually

---

[82] E.g. Plut. *Dem*. 2.2, *IGUR* I 62; cf. Rochette (1997) 120-2.
[83] Interestingly, imperial Greeks do not really cite *each other* either, on which see Hose (2007) 338, Bowie (2008) 18. See p. 296-7 below.
[84] Riffaterre (1990) 56-7 distinguishes a reader's 'awareness' and 'detailed knowledge'.
[85] On citation in antiquity see Darbo-Peschanski (2004), on the Greek novels see Robiano (2000), and on Chariton see Manuwald (2000). The lack of markers pointing to Latin intertexts renders some models of intertextuality problematic, e.g. that of Ben-Porat (1976) 109-10: 'the reader has to perceive the existence of a marker before any further activity can take place'; on the marking of intertextuality see further Broich (1985) 31-47.

corroborative and functional—that is, part of the significance and meaning-bearing structure of the text—then we are qualified to proceed. For example, if the putative allusions to the *Aeneid* function to deconstruct the Roman master narrative (as they do in Longus), then we have met the essential criteria. Thirdly, the issue of intertextuality is implicated in the question of readership, which we know in the case of the novels to be highly educated,[86] and potentially (I suggest) Roman.[87] In what follows, I operate with a Kristevan—that is, maximalist—model of intertextuality, according to which intertexts are constituted by the intrusion of one discourse into another, and are a feature of all cultural signification.[88]

Insofar as determining the presence of an intertext is an ideological choice and different 'interpretative communities' may activate the text in different ways,[89] we must nevertheless ask how Latin literature functions in the novels. How are we to weight, for example, the ideological and literary motivations? I shall argue that, especially in the case of *seruitium* and *militia amoris* (Ch. 1), Chariton (Ch. 2), and Longus (Ch. 6), Latin literature is mobilised in order to subvert certain elements of the Roman master narrative, and that allusion to Latin literature is a political act—that is, the narratives of the Greek novels are, in the Marxian Jameson's terms, socially symbolic acts.[90] In addition, if citation or overt allusion functions as a cultural signifier, then the decision to *suppress* allusion to Latin materials serves to delegitimise the referents and freeze them out of the canon. Postcolonial theory neatly theorises this position. For Bhabha, the appropriation of the coloniser's culture can be

---

[86] Wesseling (1988), Stephens (1994), Bowie (1994), (1996), Morgan (1995), *pace* Perry (1967) and Hägg (1994) who argue for a non-intellectual readership.
[87] Lucian *Apol.* 1 depicts the Roman Sabinus as finding his *De Merc. Cond.* amusing.
[88] Kristeva (1968) 311 and key works in Kristeva (1986). On intertextuality and classics see Hinds (1998), Edmunds (2001).
[89] Fish (1980).
[90] Jameson (1981).

a strategy of power, enabling the colonised other to challenge the coloniser's discourse and thereby master it, in a process he calls 'mimicry'.[91] On this model, the Greek novels mobilise Latin literature in order to re-codify it as Greek, strip it of its canonicity, and deconstruct the narrative of the culture that produced it. Scott's notion of the 'hidden transcript' provides another useful heuristic tool by which to understand the dynamic of the novels' engagement with the idea of Rome. The premise is that, in any communicative circuit where there is a power differential (e.g. between master and slave, a Roman and Greek), the mechanics of discourse are affected to the extent that the dominated group cannot speak openly, and must develop strategies for mediating their anti-hegemonic sentiments safely.[92] As Plutarch cautions, there are certain topics (e.g. Persia) that are off-limits in front of a Roman audience (*Praec. Ger. Rep.* 813e).[93] Hence Achilles, as I discuss in Chapter 5, displaces his negative images of Rome into alternative modes of discourse.

0.6   Summary

In Chapter 1 I make the case for the novelists' literary and ideological appropriation of the elegiac metaphors of *seruitium* and *militia amoris*; Xenophon (who does not receive a chapter of his own) as well as Chariton, Achilles, and some of the fragmentary novelists enjoy coverage here. Chapter 2 establishes Chariton's engagement with the *Aeneid*, especially books 1, 2, and 4; then argues that the

---

[91] Bhabha (1994) 112, 120. Burrus (2005) also employs the postcolonial theory of Bhabha to explore the Greek novels for 'commonalities of colonial resistance'.

[92] Scott (1990). On 'figured' language in antiquity see Ahl (1984), Bartsch (1994). MacMullen (1966) 1-45 sketches examples where literature/declamation incurs imperial wrath, e.g. Cremutius Cordus (Suet. *Calig.* 16.1), Carrinas Secundus and Maternus (Cassius Dio 59.20.6; 67.12.5), Hermogenes of Tarsus (Suet. *Dom.* 10.1); on figured speech in front of an emperor see Whitmarsh (2005a) 57-60.

[93] Chariton's focus on Persia, on which see Schwartz (2003), is marked in this regard. On tyrants and the royal house in Chariton see Guez (2009).

relationship between Chaereas and Polycharmus is typologically modelled not only on Aeneas and Achates but also Augustus and Agrippa, and contextualises Chaereas' recapitulation at the end of the novel with the Julio-Claudian monumentalism embodied in the *Res Gestae*. Chapter 3 pursues Chariton's relationship with Ovid's epistolary and exilic poetry (and the tropes contained therein), as well as with erotic-thanatic elements in Propertius. Chapter 4 develops the idea of Achilles (or rather Clitophon) as constituted by a variety of codes derived from Latin elegy, which he deploys as part of his project of generic redefinition. Chapter 5 moves away from Latin literature *per se* and attempts to contextualise Achilles in his Alexandrian (and hence anti-Roman) environment, and explores how he mediates his version of Roman foundation narratives such as Romulus' Asylum and the rapes of the Sabine women, Lucretia, and Verginia. Chapter 6 examines the gamut of Longus' responses to Latin literature and cultural narratives, including Vergil, Ovid, the Lupercalia, and Romulus and Remus. The Appendices tabulate undiscussed Latin intertexts in Achilles and Longus, and offer minimal comment.

Heliodorus and the fragments await separate treatment.

Chapter 1

Seruitium Amoris and *Militia Amoris* in the Greek Novels

1.1   Introduction

In this chapter I hope to demonstrate two things: firstly, that the Greek novelists are engaging intertextually with the Latin elegists; and secondly, that the novelists' appropriation of elements from the Roman literary tradition is ideologically and politically motivated.

The metaphors of *seruitium* and *militia amoris*—the idea that love is a type of slavery and a type of warfare—are best known from Roman love elegy.[1] In this genre they developed a recognisable grammar and served to characterise the generally asymmetrical relationship between the lover and his *domina*. The metaphors also function as a natural pair: both are implicated in the typical sequence of military conquest and territorial subjugation. I shall suggest that the novels of Chariton, Xenophon, and Achilles Tatius—as well as some of the fragmentary authors—are familiar with and develop the metaphors in their elegiac incarnation, and deploy them as part of a suite of conventions governing erotic interpersonal relations between characters in their novels. I shall discuss a range of literary applications of slavery and war, including erotic servitude to Eros and the beloved, the use of the appellation 'mistress' or 'master', Eros as a soldier, and the bravery of lovers. Hindermann has likewise established that these metaphors (especially in their Ovidian conception) are

---

[1] For general treatments of *militia amoris* in Latin elegy see Spies (1930), Murgatroyd (1975), and Drinkwater (2013); on *seruitium amoris* see Copley (1947), Lilja (1965) 76-89, Lyne (1979) and (1980) 78-81, Murgatroyd (1981), Griffin (1985) 42-5, McCarthy (1998), Fitzgerald (2000) 72-8, Fulkerson (2013).

alive and well in the Roman novel of Apuleius composed in the second century CE, proving that they did not fall into disuse subsequent to the elegists;[2] and it has also been suggested that the presence of the metaphor in certain epigrams of Paulus Silentiarius,[3] as well as the potentially imperial elegies transmitted in *P.Oxy* 3723 (see p. 13),[4] point to a knowledge of Latin elegy.

Secondarily, I shall suggest that in certain instances the engagement with these metaphors may be political. In Chapter 5 on Achilles Tatius and Rome I discuss how antagonists can function as negative paradigms of Roman imperial conduct towards provincial Greek elite subjects; here I address how the erotic metaphors of slavery and war may map onto the contemporary imperial discourse that can be seen to run through the novels. As Lavan has extensively demonstrated, the metaphor of slavery offers a model, utilised by both the ruling Roman elite and Greek historians such as Cassius Dio, for Rome's relations with the provinces;[5] in addition, Rome, the Roman people, and the emperor are frequently referred to as 'master'.[6] I shall argue that part of the novelists' agenda is to subvert this discourse (in a process of postcolonial 'mimicry').

---

[2] Hindermann (2009) on *seruitium amoris*, and (2010) 145-176 on both metaphors. She argues that Apuleius is an elegised version of Ps. Lucian's *Onos*; see e.g. *Onos* 8 for Lucius' sexual *seruitium* to Palaestra, on which see E. Hall (1995) 53-4.

[3] *A.P.* 5.248.7 (δέσποινα), 5.230.8 (δεσπότις); see Viansino (1963), and De Stefani (2006), who adds the resemblance of ἀργέτι κούρη at line-end (*A.P.* 5.254.1) to *candida puella* at line-end (Cat. 35.8).

[4] Hose (1994a); Butrica (1996) 300-1 detects elements of *seruitium amoris*.

[5] Lavan (2013a) on Latin historiography, (2013b) on Cassius Dio and Florus; cf. Hose (1994b) 111, 130. Martin (1990) discusses metaphors of slavery in early Christian discourse.

[6] For the emperor as 'master' see the useful summary in Lavan (2013b) 143-5 (e.g. Dio *Or.* 45.1 and Plin. *Pan.* 2.3 on Domitian's demand to be called 'master' and 'god'), and Noreña (2011) on Commodus. See Dickey (2002) 88-94 on *domine* as a polite form of address.

The literary history of the metaphors is made problematic by the loss of so much material, especially Hellenistic and Comic.[7] We can say with relative certainty, however, that it is not until Latin elegy that the tropes become codified as generic markers, used systematically to characterise the unequal dynamic between poet-lover and *puella*. Comedy derives much of its humour from the conventional hierarchy governing free-slave relations,[8] but in Fulkerson's words 'actual *seruitium amoris* does not appear as such in Roman comedy' and it is the elegists who 'seem to have been the first to develop the metaphor'.[9] It is only in elegy, for example, that one of the traditional *paradeigmata* for *obsequium*—Apollo and Admetus—becomes eroticised, where it had lacked the erotic element in Callimachus (Tib. 2.3.11-32, Ovid. *Ars* 2. 239-42, Call. *h*. 2.47-54). The work of Copley, Lyne, and Murgatroyd on *seruitium amoris* in elegy concludes that it serves as a way of debasing the elegiac lover, in contrast to pre-elegiac instances, which emphasise the power of love.[10] Of course, the Qaṣr Ibrîm fragment of Gallus published in 1979[11]—which refers to the beloved as *domina* (line 7)—complicates Lyne's theory of Propertian invention, and encourages the promotion of Gallus as the pioneer of the metaphor in the form we know (see p. 41-2).

Sexual domination (and the military and slavery-related aspects attaching to it) has also been linked to the various *political* thrusts of Latin elegy. For Cahoon, love in

---

[7] *Militia*: Murgatroyd (1975) sees its genesis in Greek New Comedy, despite its comparative rarity in Roman Comedy. See e.g. Men. *Perikeiroumene* 468f, 479, Alexis fr. 234.1-3K, Plaut. *As*. 656 (*amorisque imperator*). Other basic forms at Sappho fr. 1.28, Anacr. 34d, Theogn. 1285f, Soph. *Ant*. 781, Eur. *Hipp*. 525-32, Ap. Rh. *Arg*. 3.296f, Hedylus *A.P*. 5.199.3f, Diosc. *A.P*. 12.37.1f, Pos. *A.P*. 12.120, Plaut. *Pers*. 231f, *Truc*. 230, Ter. *Eun*. 59-61. *Seruitium*: Ruf. *A.P*. 5.22, Mel. *A.P*. 12.81.5, Diosc. *A.P*. 12.169.3f, anon. *A.P*. 5.100.1. Women as slaves to *eros* occur at Eur. *fr*. 132 (Andromeda), Frag. Gren. 28 (ζηλῶ δουλεύειν; cf. 54f; Copley (1947) 289 characterises this as 'women's language').
[8] Discussions of slavery in Comedy include Wiles (1988), Thalmann (1997), McCarthy (2000).
[9] Fulkerson (2013) 190 with n. 30 noting the slavish behaviour of young lovers at Plaut. *Curc*. 1-11, *Poen*. 447f. Copley (1947) 285 is in agreement that the trope is 'rare in extant Greek erotic literature'.
[10] Copley (1947), Lyne (1979), Murgatroyd (1981), who believes we have lost Hellenistic precedents.
[11] Anderson, Parsons, Nisbet (1979).

Ovid's *Amores* is 'inherently violent and linked with the Roman *libido dominandi* and imperial acquisition, providing an exposé of the competitive, violent, and destructive nature of *amor*, an exposé that calls into question fundamental Roman attitudes in both the public and the private sphere'.[12] On this reading, *amor* is a disruptive force which establishes a power differential between lover and beloved and encourages an 'aggressive and acquisitive mode' of courtship,[13] just as in the same way 'colonial desires can give rise to non-consensual and asymmetrical sexual relations'.[14] *Seruitium* in elegy can likewise be read as a response by a marginalised male elite, 'seduced from virile republican *libertas* into an abject state of feminine enslavement', in reaction to the 'progressive realignment of authority around the *princeps*'.[15] Slavery is therefore a useful way of thinking about one's socio-political status.

In many cultures *imperial/colonial* conquest and *sexual* conquest overlap and lay claim to the same store of images and metaphors. Both are structured around such fundamental binaries as active-passive and dominator-dominated, and Roman texts in particular ubiquitously attest to the fact that domination is a constitutive feature in their constructions of sexuality and masculinity.[16] Foucault, for example, has shown how sexuality is a 'dense transfer point for relations in power';[17] related to this, McClintock has demonstrated how the act of colonisation—that is, the exercise of power over a subjected people—is a gendered activity in which the coloniser is male and the colonised is female;[18] in addition, Young has explored the overlap of colonial

---

[12] Cahoon (1988) 294.
[13] Lee-Stecum (2013) 77.
[14] Mattingly (2011) 121.
[15] Wyke (2002) 177 with n. 72 for further bibliography.
[16] Sexuality: Richlin (1983) 77-80. Masculinity: Edwards (1993) 96.
[17] Foucault (1981), quotation at McNay (1994) 9.
[18] McClintock (1995) 1-5. See also Mattingly (2011) 100.

and sexual practices.[19] Tacitus' Calcagus, for example, famously equates Roman butchery and rape with *imperium* (Tac. *Agr.* 30-1). Issues of imperial conquest are thus easily mapped onto the sexual sphere, and erotic interpersonal relations become a productive way of thinking about imperial relations. Porter, Whittaker, and Mattingly have all discussed the imbrication of imperial and sexual relations in the context of the Roman Empire, and especially how frontier space is sexualised and subject to 'phallic aggression'.[20] In Greek imperial prose too, Roman power often becomes translated into terms amenable to provincial discourse,[21] allegorised and sublimated into the sexual sphere[22]—the interaction between Leucippe and Thersandros in Achilles (esp. 6.18-22) is a good example of this (discussed in Chapter 5).

This goes some way to explaining the novels' preoccupation with the integrity of the female body as a space that can thematise the permeability of boundaries and frontiers.[23] For Brooks, the body acts as a 'key token' in cultural and historical narratives,[24] a function confirmed by Roman imperial discourse—including the literary, iconographic, and numismatic. Vout's analysis of Roman imperial power shows how it is regularly 'constructed and contested through the representation of sexual relations': sex and male potency are key conceptual frameworks governing how antiquity thought about power and authority.[25] For example, Suetonius and Cassius Dio report how the soldiers of Julius Caesar sing ribald verses assimilating his military conquest of Gaul to the Bithynian Nicomedes' sexual conquest of Caesar (Suet. *Div. Iul.* 49.4; Dio 43.20.2):

---

[19] Young (1995).
[20] Porter (1986) 232.
[21] Vout (2007) 234.
[22] Whitmarsh (2011) 32.
[23] Douglas (1966) 115; Dougherty (1998).
[24] Brooks (1993) xii.
[25] Vout (2007) 7.

Gallias Caesar subegit, Nicomedes Caesarem:
ecce Caesar nunc triumphat qui subegit Gallias,
Nicomedes non triumphat qui subegit Caesarem.

Καῖσαρ μὲν Γαλάτας ἐδουλώσατο, Καίσαρα δὲ Νικομήδης.

Cassius Dio likewise assimilates Caligula's imperial conquests to his sexual ones (59.25.5):

ἐκ δὲ τῶν μοιχειῶν ὡς καὶ τὴν πᾶσαν Κελτικὴν καὶ Βρεττανικὴν κεχειρωμένος, αὐτοκράτωρ τε πολλάκις καὶ Γερμανικὸς καὶ Βρεττανικὸς ἐπεκλήθη.

In his *Imagines* and *pro Imaginibus*, Lucian's sketch of Lucius Verus' Greek mistress Panthea may also represent 'a personification of a conquered territory' (namely Syria), as well as the 'conquest of Greek culture by Roman' and the 'anxieties of "being Greek under Rome" in Syria in the 160s'.[26]

Visual evidence corroborates this sexualised view of Roman imperialism and military conquest.[27] Trajan's Column commemorates the emperor's Dacian campaign by depicting (among other scenes) the seizure of Dacian women (scene XXIX, 72);[28] these are considered more mild in comparison to those depicted on the Column of Marcus Aurelius, which features a scene of bare-breasted women being dragged along by the hair (scene XCVII; cf. scene XX).[29] The *Gemma Augustea* likewise depicts a scene of Augustus' triumph, at which women are shown weeping and pulled along by

---

[26] Vout (2007) 215, 229, 230.

[27] The following paragraph is especially indebted to Ferris (2000) 55-60, 165-8, Vout (2007) *passim*, Whittaker (2004a), Mattingly (2011) 94-121; Lavan (2013a) 6 also provides a useful summary. On numismatic representations of the provinces see Méthy (1992) and Cody (2003), and Toynbee (1934) on the 'provinces' coin series of Hadrian and Antoninus. On the representation of war and slavery in imperial iconography see de Souza (2011). On the role of Roman imperialism in provincial art see the essays in Scott and Webster (2003).

[28] On the depiction of women on the Columns of Trajan and Marcus see Dillon (2006), and on Trajan's Column and the Dacian wars more generally see Rossi (1971).

[29] See Zanker (2000) 171-3.

their hair. Outside of Rome, the reliefs on the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias in Caria provide corroborative evidence. Here, the *simulacra gentium* (a type-scene originating in Pompey's portico and later Augustus' *Porticus ad Nationes*) include Claudius and Nero standing over the defeated females Britannia and Armenia respectively.[30] In a similar vein, a stone relief from Kula in Lydia depicts a 'Caesar Germanicus' riding on horseback, lance in hand, towards a bare-breasted woman, 'Germania', whose hands are bound behind her back.[31] There also survives a painting from a Roman villa in Boscoreale featuring a personified and masculine-looking female 'Macedonia' launching a spear over the Hellespont into a personified 'Asia' in mourning.[32]

From this sketch it is clear that Roman imperial conquest is framed across a range of media as an event that feminises, sexualises, and enslaves the subject nation. This is precisely the framework in which, I suggest, the metaphors of *seruitium* and *militia amoris* in the novels might be fruitfully activated. I shall demonstrate how, when the metaphors are used to qualify the relationship *between protagonists*, they serve the interests of reciprocal and mutual love that exists between them;[33] when, however, the metaphors qualify the relationship *between a protagonist and an antagonist*, they function to delineate the non-reciprocal and generically unauthorised nature of the relationship—Achilles is an exception to be discussed below. In what follows, I view the difference between 'protagonist' and 'antagonist' as a fundamental heuristic tool in approaching the novels.[34] In addition, one of the generic markers of

---

[30] On the Sebasteion reliefs see Smith (1987), (1988), (2013) esp. 113-21.

[31] Bienkowski (1900) 40.

[32] Noted by Spawforth (2012) 14, and for a full treatment of the painting see Smith (1994); Rodgers (2003) discusses feminisation of provincial 'others' in Roman art.

[33] Konstan (1994) proposes that the Greek novel 'inaugurated a new moment in the representation of *eros*' (35), resulting in 'a departure from the classical paradigm of active and passive partners' (57).

[34] I take 'protagonist' to refer to one or other of the eponymous couple, and 'antagonist' to refer to any character who attempts to obstruct relations between the protagonists.

the novels is the enslavement to which the well-born and elite protagonists are exposed. Slavery—and the sexual submission it entails—is a key theme and plot device in the novels.[35] Many of the narrative situations trade on the irony produced by the interplay of the *physical/actual* slavery of the protagonist and the *metaphorical* erotic slavery of the antagonist. The power differential that defines protagonist-antagonist relationships becomes inverted by the introduction of the metaphor, and the antagonist suffers *metaphorical* erotic enslavement to his/her *actual* slave. The collapse of epistemological boundaries—the real and the metaphorical—contributes to the political reading I am proposing.

This inversion does important work in the creation of a new cultural script for the Greek elite. The prose authors of the Second Sophistic relentlessly traffic in Greek classicism, self-consciously attempting to shore up their claim to cultural superiority in order to make up for their politico-military impotence (see section 0.1). The protagonists' reversal in status from real enslavement to erotic mastery can be read as expressing a desire on the part of the Greek elite to free themselves from their socio-political weakness under the Roman Empire—a natural reading considering the regular sexualisation of imperial relations. Horace articulates a similar status-reversal of the Greeks, who 'capture' (i.e. enslave) their masters: *Graecia capta ferum uictorem cepit et artes/ intulit agresti Latio* (*Ep.* 2.1.156f; cf. Porphyrio *ad loc.*).[36] The verb *capio* is erotically encoded, for example by the programmatic opening of Propertius' first book (*Cynthia prima suis miserum me <u>cepit</u> ocellis*, 1.1.1). The discourse of freedom and slavery is frequently activated in Greek imperial prose vis-à-vis their position of politico-military inferiority to Rome (see p. 20 nn. 5-6). Dio

---

[35] δουλεία and its cognates occur sixty-one times in Chariton, with spikes in book two (14x) and book six (13x); thirty-three in Achilles; nine in Xenophon.

[36] Cf. Ov. *Fast.* 3.101f: *nondum tradiderat uictas uictoribus artes/ Graecia*.

Chrysostom urges the Tarsians that their quarrels over primacy are like those of 'fellow slaves' (ὁμόδουλοι, *Or*. 34.51), and in Lucian's acerbic take on Greco-Roman social relations, apparent φιλία between Greek dependents and Roman patrons is actually δουλεία (χρὴ φιλίαν τὴν τοιαύτην αὐτῶν δουλείαν ἐπονομάζειν, *de merc. cond*. 1; δούλους ἀντὶ ἐλευθέρων *ibid*. 7).[37] Authors of this period, then, are self-conscious that Greco-Roman relations can be expressed in terms of the slave-master model.[38]

Status-reversal is therefore an obvious and powerful fiction for the Greek elite authors of the novels, and provides a convenient way of troping their hopes for political autonomy. The elegiac metaphors of *seruitium* and *militia amoris* contribute directly to this. As such, the novelists are engaged in a sophisticated game at both the literary and political level. They are appropriating the discourse of Latin elegy in order to fashion an alternative reality in which they are no longer 'slaves'. This is part of a wider signifying strategy according to which the novelists' engagement with Latin literature and cultural narratives can be read subversively as doing cultural work in the service of the Greek elite, reflecting a 'hidden transcript' as well as the process of 'mimicry'.

1.2   *Seruitium Amoris* in the novels

In this section I shall sketch two manifestations of *seruitium amoris* in the novels: the servile pose of men firstly to an abstract 'love' and secondly to a female love-object.

---

[37] Courtney (1980) 552-3 links these passages to Juv. *Sat*. 3.125, 5.6f, 5.127, 5.161, 5.173. Analogous to Lucian's position are Propertius and Ovid, who behave like *amici* but are treated as *serui*, on which see Gibson (1995) 74.

[38] For further examples from Greek imperial literature see the summary at Lavan (2013a) 8-10, with Lavan (2007) on Jos. *B.J*. 6.328-50 (Titus' speech to the Jews).

Throughout, I shall indicate how the novels self-consciously parade the metaphor as being in competition with the realities of actual slavery suffered by the protagonists, and how it is the elegiac metaphor of *seruitium amoris* that facilitates this epistemological slippage. I defer discussing the erotic use of the appellation 'mistress' or 'master' until the following section.

Each of the novels under discussion contains at least one explicit articulation of the idea that a male suffers erotic enslavement to the god Eros or the emotion *eros*. The fact that Eros and the actual beloved are in some ways coterminous gains traction when we realise that the beloved functions as an *instrument* of Eros. Morales observes in the context of the Greek novel that whenever Eros is involved there is a 'triangulation of power-play'.[39] Lee-Stecum detects an analogous dynamic in Tibullus: 'the powerful figures of Delia and Marathus, empowered by the poet's *amor* for them, correspond to the divine figures, Venus and Cupid, who embody *amor*'s power'.[40] The power structures reflect the similarities: the lover hangs garlands on Delia's door (1.2.14) just as he does on Venus' door later in the same elegy (1.2.83-4); in the programmatic first poem of Propertius' collection, both Cynthia and Amor are possible grammatical subjects of *deiecit* (1.1.3); and in Chariton, Callirhoe is frequently mistaken for Aphrodite (e.g. 1.1.2, 3.2.14).

Achilles provides generous evidence for this particular incarnation of the metaphor. Clitophon recalls how he used to mock his cousin Clinias for being a 'slave to love' but admits that he too now suffers from the same affliction (1.7.2-3):[41]

---

[39] Morales (2005) 13.
[40] Lee-Stecum (1998) 288 n. 9.
[41] See p. 153-4 for Achilles' knowledge of Prop. 1.7.

> ἔσκωπτον οὖν αὐτὸν ἀεὶ τῆς ἀμεριμνίας, ὅτι σχολάζει φιλεῖν καὶ <u>δοῦλός</u>
> <u>ἐστιν ἐρωτικῆς ἡδονῆς</u>. ὁ δέ μοι μειδιῶν καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐπισείων ἔλεγεν·
> "ἔσῃ καὶ <u>σύ μοι ποτὲ δοῦλος</u>."... "ἔδωκα," ἔφην, "Κλεινία, σοι δίκην τῶν
> σκωμμάτων. <u>δοῦλος γέγονα κἀγώ</u>."

This pose is repeated later. Rejected by Clitophon, the antagonist Melite admonishes him for his own previous subservient stance: ἄπιστε καὶ βάρβαρε, ἐτόλμησας οὕτως ἐρῶσαν γυναῖκα κατατῆξαι, καὶ ταῦτα <u>Ἔρωτος καὶ σὺ δοῦλος ὤν</u>; (5.26.6). Towards the end of the novel, Clitophon rails at the antagonist Thersandros and accuses him of being a 'triple-slave' by virtue of his sexual incontinence: "σὺ μὲν οὖν," ἔφην, "καὶ <u>τρίδουλος</u> καὶ ἐπιμανὴς καὶ μάχλος..." (8.1.2). And in Chariton, Chaereas' friend Polycharmus is explicitly not a 'slave to love' (4.2.3):

> ὁ δὲ Πολύχαρμος, οἷα δὴ νεανίας ἀνδρικὸς τὴν φύσιν καὶ <u>μὴ δουλεύων</u>
> <u>ἔρωτι</u>, χαλεπῷ τυράννῳ, τὰς δύο μοίρας αὐτὸς σχεδὸν εἰργάζετο μόνος.

There are also several instances in Heliodorus: Charikleia is 'enslaved to her passion' (δεδούλωτο... τῷ πάθει, 3.19.1; δεδούλωτο τῷ πόθῳ, 4.4.4); as is Theagenes (δουλεύεις τὸ μόνον ἐλεύθερον καὶ ἀδούλωτον πλὴν ἔρωτος φρόνημα, 5.1.10).

Each of the novels also contains an explicit articulation of the idea that a male suffers erotic enslavement to a female, and it is therefore significant in literary historical terms that one of the major developments of Latin elegy is that *seruitium amoris* applies to a *person* rather than to abstract *amor*.[42] The following lines of Tibullus typify the position (2.4.1-4):

> hic mihi seruitium uideo dominamque paratam:
>   iam mihi, libertas illa paterna, uale.
> seruitium sed triste datur; teneorque catenis

---

[42] Lyne (1979) 118.

et numquam misero uincla remittit amor.

In Xenophon, Habrocomes realises that, because of his high-handed rejection of Eros, he is now abjectly in love with Anthia (1.4.1):

ὁ μέχρι νῦν ἀνδρικὸς Ἁβροκόμης, <u>ὁ καταφρονῶν Ἔρωτος</u>, ὁ τῷ θεῷ λοιδορούμενος <u>ἑάλωκα καὶ νενίκημαι καὶ παρθένῳ δουλεύειν ἀναγκάζομαι</u>, καὶ φαίνεταί τις ἤδη καλλίων ἐμοῦ καὶ θεὸν Ἔρωτα καλῶ.

The passage is interesting for a number of reasons. In the first instance, Habrocomes' erstwhile fastidiousness towards Eros results in his subsequent 'capture' and erotic slavery. This sequence directly mirrors Propertius (1.1.1-4):[43]

Cynthia prima suis miserum me <u>cepit</u> ocellis ...
tum mihi <u>constantis</u> deiecet lumina <u>fastus</u>
    et caput impositis pressit Amor pedibus.

A few lines further (line 8) Propertius frames his situation in the language of compulsion (*cum tamen aduersos <u>cogor</u> habere deos*) just as Habrocomes does (ἀναγκάζομαι).[44] The compulsion to undergo erotic enslavement is even more explicit in Propertius' warning to Ponticus (*seruire dolori/ cogor*, 1.7.6f; see p. 152-3 for Achilles' knowledge of Prop. 1.7). Elsewhere the poet is 'forced' to carry the branded mark of a slave (*nunc in amore tuo cogor habere notam*, 1.18.8), and he warns Gallus that if he continues to interfere he will be 'forced to learn "slavery"'—that is, he will succumb to *seruitium amoris*: *tum grave seruitium nostrae cogere puellae/ discere* (1.5.19f). Indeed, erotic compulsion is a keynote of Propertian love, and he repeatedly uses the verb *cogor* in erotic contexts (1.12.14, 1.16.13, 1.18.30; cf. Ov. *Am.*

---

[43] Loosely modelled on Mel. *A.P.* 12.101.1-4.
[44] Erotic compulsion also features in Manto's letter to Habrocomes: Μαντὼ ἐρᾷ σου, μηκέτι φέρειν δυναμένη· ἀπρεπὲς μὲν ἴσως παρθένῳ, ἀναγκαῖον δὲ φιλούσῃ (2.5.1); Hippothous refers to Habrocomes' wandering in search of Anthia as a 'compulsion' (μεγάλῃ τινὶ ἀνάγκῃ, 3.2.15; cf. 3.6.5). See also Char. 2.4.8, 3.3.7; Ach. 6.19.2.

3.11.52).[45] Of course, the role of compulsion in affairs of the heart had featured in the debate between Araspas and Cyrus in Xenophon of Athens' *Cyropaedia* (5.1.9-17). Araspas asserts that love is a matter of free will (ἐθελούσιον); Cyrus counters that he has seen many people 'enslaved to love objects' (δουλεύοντάς γε τοῖς ἐρωμένοις, 5.1.12) and 'fettered by compulsion' (δεδεμένους ἰσχυροτέρᾳ ἀνάγκῃ, 5.1.12).[46] But it is not until Latin elegy that erotic compulsion becomes a codified generic marker and a way of framing the totalising nature of the poet's erotic-poetic project.[47]

The lexeme ἀνδρικός (applied to Habrocomes above) signifies a preoccupation with masculinity, namely that a servile disposition towards a beloved detracts from one's manhood. There is a parallel instance in Chariton: Chaereas and his faithful sidekick Polycharmus are working in an enforced labour-camp on Mithridates' estate in Caria, but Chaereas is so upset by his separation from Callirhoe that he cannot work, and Polycharmus takes on Chaereas' share (4.2.3 quoted on p. 29). The explanation for Polycharmus' fortitude in adverse circumstances is that he is 'manly' and 'not enslaved to love', unlike Chaereas. As in Latin elegy, where the pose of *seruitium amoris* functions to call into question the masculinity of the poet-lover, here the servile disposition has a feminising effect.

Rohde complains of the weakness and passivity of the male protagonists in the Greek novels (though there have since been several attempts to rehabilitate them as

---

[45] See Pichon (1902) s.v. *cogo*.
[46] Interestingly, Callirhoe is described as being like a queen bee whom everybody follows *voluntarily* (αὐτομάτως, 2.3.10).
[47] James (2003) 147 discusses the voluntary aspects of *seruitium amoris* in connection with Prop. 4.8.82, Tib. 1.6.69-72, and Ov. *Am*. 3.11.

performing a new type of heroism).[48] Masculinity undergoes a redefinition under the conditions of the *Pax Romana*. Traditionally, the main venues in which one might perform masculinity were warfare and athletics; in the new peaceful environment of the Second Sophistic this was now reduced to athletics alone.[49] In his praise of the boxer Melancomas, Dio Chrysostom adds that there is no longer any opportunity for showing off one's ἀνδρεία in warfare: τῶν μὲν γὰρ πολεμικῶν ὅ τε καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν (*Or*. 29.9);[50] likewise to the Rhodians he states that the time for military activities is passed, on account of the fact that they now live in a state of uninterrupted peace (*Or*. 31.104); Plutarch discourses on the fact that certain historical models (such as Marathon, Eurymedon, Plataea) are no longer appropriate, having been made redundant by the *Pax Romana* (*Praec. Rep. Ger.* 814b-c); and Aelius Aristides' *Roman Oration* (*Or*. 26) lists as one of the benefits of the *Pax Romana* the fact that inter-*polis* rivalry now only relates to public works (*Or*. 26.97). Bowie's analysis of the textual and inscriptional evidence concludes that imperial Greeks were disinclined to pursue a career in the Roman military (see p. 102-3).[51] Read within this framework, the transformation of Chaereas from erotic slave to military hero in the final two books of Chariton's novel potentially plugs into the contemporary self-consciousness felt by the imperial Greeks and vicariously redeems them (see p. 61-2)[52]—especially as his feats of military virtue are conducted against the Persians who can be viewed as surrogates for the Roman imperial machine.[53]

---

[48] Rohde (1960) 356; Konstan (1994) and Haynes (2003) 81-100 seek to rehabilitate the novels' male protagonists. M. Jones (2012) is a book-length study of constructions of masculinity in the novels.
[49] On war in the Greek novels see Hilton (2005).
[50] See Connolly (2003) on the imperial period as not offering opportunities for ἀνδρεία in battle, and Scanlon (2002) 14 for athletics as a venue for ἀνδρεία.
[51] Bowie (2014).
[52] When Chaereas first hears that Callirhoe has been awarded to Dionysius, he first contemplates suicide, but Polycharmus suggests they get revenge on the King and die 'like men' (ὡς ἄνδρες, 7.1.8).
[53] Schwartz (2003).

The metaphors of *seruitium* and *militia* function differently depending on whether they characterise protagonists or antagonists. A group of antagonists (the suitors) in Chariton are marked by their self-confessedly servile disposition towards Callirhoe. Much to the annoyance of the scheming suitors, Chaereas marries Callirhoe, and they voice their grievances among themselves (1.2.3):

ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐτάθημεν αὐλείοις θύραις προσαγρυπνοῦντες καὶ κολακεύοντες τίτθας καὶ θεραπαινίδας καὶ δῶρα πέμποντες τροφοῖς. πόσον χρόνον δεδουλεύκαμεν;

Here the suitors complain about certain erotic conventions including paraclausithyra and *seruitium amoris*—that is, those activities that mark a relationship as unequal.[54] Tibullus also tropes these behaviours as servile: *me retinent uinctum formosae uincla puellae,/ et sedeo duras ianitor ante fores* (1.1.55f). The position of the antagonist Thersandros in Achilles is even more explicit: ὁ Θέρσανδρος οὖν, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐλπίζων εἰς τὸν ἔρωτα εὐτυχήσειν, ὅλος Λευκίππης δοῦλος ἦν (6.20.1). Connors treats the passage in passing, claiming that 'in contrast to elegy's well-known focus on the "servitude of love" in the context of elite male households in the city of Rome, Achilles associates love with enslavement to and hubristic treatment by a tyrant'.[55] This is precisely the point of Chapter 5 on Achilles and Rome, to demonstrate among other things that Thersandros is available to be read as a constellation of negative elements associated with Roman imperial behaviour. As he is an antagonist who potentially represents negative aspects of Greco-Roman imperial relations, the metaphor serves to *reverse* the claim of Roman political power over the Greek elite.

---

[54] Cf. Pausanias' speech in Plato *Symp*. (183a).
[55] Connors (2008) 171.

Konstan's major thesis is that the *eros* obtaining between the protagonists represents a new type of 'sexual symmetry' (in contrast to previous formulations, all of which are defined by a power differential). He marks this symmetry off from the 'aggressive and asymmetrical' modes of courtship attaching to the antagonists.[56] Even in Achilles, for whom the conventional rules of the genre (including reciprocal love between the protagonists) do not apply (see Chapter 4), erotic aggression becomes more and more associated with antagonists and rivals as the novel goes on.[57] Jones well observes that novelistic antagonists (and Achilles' protagonist Clitophon) think of love as being in the *competitive* sphere, and that they therefore misunderstand the generic conventions: namely, that *reciprocal* relations are the only authorised erotic mode.[58] The tyrant of Rhegium in Chariton, for example, likens love to an athletics competition (ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς γυμνικοῖς ἀγῶσιν..., 1.2.2-4); Dionysius kisses Callirhoe and is like a besieged city, i.e., he markets his love as a type of warfare (ἐκπεπολιορκημένος, 2.8.1); and when we are told that Tyche intended to make Callirhoe a spoil of war (λάφυρον, 8.1.2), Aphrodite intervenes, representing a rejection of the agonistic model of Eros in favour of a reciprocal one. Jones goes on to assert that 'true, reciprocal love cannot be forced into being by metaphorical (or even literal) warfare',[59] but as I have suggested, and as I shall go on to discuss, the claim does not stand up: *militia* and *seruitium* can indeed be ways of troping the erotic disposition of the protagonists, as long as it is *reciprocated*.

I have already alluded to the way in which *seruitium amoris* subtly confuses epistemological boundaries between real and metaphorical, just as in Latin elegy it

---

[56] Konstan (1994), esp. 41 and 45.
[57] Konstan (1994) 69.
[58] M. Jones (2012) 162-3.
[59] M. Jones (2012) 163.

forces open a space of irony between the elite (or, rather, equestrian) rank of the elegist and the servile position he affects.[60] This interplay is an active ingredient in one of the central themes of the novels, that of (the fluidity of) status. Despite their high birth, protagonists become literally enslaved; their captors routinely fall in love with them and become metaphorically enslaved. This is the model of Greco-Roman relations that determines Horace's *Graecia capta* sentiment (*Ep*. 2.1.156f, quoted above). Chariton's Dionysius, the most important man in Ionia (Διονύσιον πλούτῳ καὶ γένει καὶ παιδείᾳ τῶν ἄλλων Ἰώνων ὑπερέχοντα, 1.12.6)[61] adopts a pose of total subservience to Callirhoe: the slave Plangon tells Callirhoe how Dionysius will grant her anything she might ask for (παρέξει γάρ σοι Διονύσιος ἡδέως αἰτουμένῃ χάριν πρώτην 2.7.3); and he later defers to her in everything and makes her 'mistress' of his house (κἀκεῖνος ὑπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς πάντων παρεχώρησε τῇ γυναικὶ καὶ δέσποιναν αὐτὴν ἀπέδειξε τῆς οἰκίας, 3.7.7).[62] In Achilles, the antagonist Charmides falls in love with Leucippe (see 51-5 below), and revels in receiving 'erotic instructions': χαίρουσι γὰρ οἱ ἐρῶντες εἰς τὰ ἐρωτικὰ προστάγματα (4.10.2). Total obedience and obeisance to a beloved—who is technically of an inferior station—is one of the defining characteristics of *seruitium amoris* in Latin elegy, and the beloved is frequently described as having metaphorical legislative power (Ov. *Am*. 1.7.30, 1.8.70, 2.17.23f; Prop. 3.20.15f, 4.8.81; Tib. 1.6.69, 2.4.52) and *regnum* over the lover (*Am*. 2.17.11, 2.19.33; *Rem*. 15; Tib. 1.9.80; 3.11.4 [=Sulpicia]; Prop. 3.10.18),[63] and Ovid explicitly advises the prospective lover to show *obsequium* and play the part of the *cliens* (*Ars* 2.177-32).

---

[60] E.g. Propertius mocks Ponticus for being a slave to a slave-girl: *ecce iaces supplexque uenis ad iura puellae,/ et tibi nunc quaeuis imperat empta modo* (1.9.3f).

[61] Achilles' antagonist Thersandros is analogous: γένει δὲ πρῶτος ἁπαντων τῶν Ἰώνων (6.12.2).

[62] Kapparis (2000) argues that the situation here is modelled on that of Lysias' Euphiletus (1.6), who hands over control of the farm to his wife after the birth of their son.

[63] For further references see Murgatroyd (1980) 276 *ad* Tib. 1.9.80, and McKeown (1998) 371 *ad* Ov. *Am*. 2.17.11f.

The lines between real and metaphorical *seruitium* become even more blurred in the case of Chariton's Persian King Artaxerxes, who is regularly referred to as master over a servile population: the letter from the satrap Pharnaces addresses Artaxerxes as 'his master' (ἰδίῳ δεσπότῃ χαίρειν, 4.6.3) and refers to Dionysius as his 'slave' (Διονύσιος ὁ Μιλήσιος δοῦλός ἐστι σός, 4.6.4; cf. 4.6.8); the Carian satrap Mithridates likewise describes himself as the 'slave' of the King (ὁ σὸς δοῦλος, 5.2.2); both Chaereas and Dionysius are his 'humble slaves' (δούλων ἐμῶν ἀδόξων, 6.1.11); and elsewhere Chaereas is characterised as the only free person in Babylon (βασιλέως γὰρ δοῦλος οὐκ ἦν, ἀλλὰ τότε μόνος ἐν Βαβυλῶνι ἐλεύθερος, 7.1.1). Yet the King is metaphorically 'captured' by Callirhoe (ἀληθῶς δὲ ἑάλωκα, 6.3.2).[64] His eunuch Artaxates explicitly asks him what beauty has captured him, the man to whom everyone and everything else is a slave: "ποῖον" ἔφη "κάλλος δύναται τῆς σῆς κρατῆσαι, δέσποτα, ψυχῆς, <u>ᾧ τὰ καλὰ πάντα δουλεύει</u>, χρυσός, ἄργυρος, ἐσθής, ἵπποι, πόλεις, ἔθνη;" (6.3.4).[65] The irony of his disposition is underscored by Artaxates' deferential mode of address (δέσποτα).

The slippage between real and metaphorical planes of slavery becomes even more explicit in the dialogue between the eunuch Artaxates and Callirhoe. Artaxates tries to persuade her to submit to the lust of the king, and asks her how many slaves kneel before her (πόσοι δοῦλοί σε προσκυνοῦσι, 6.5.4). The implication is that *nobody* currently fawns upon her, but that if she submits to the King she will become his partner in power and receive *proskunesis* from all her subjects. But another

---

[64] It is curious that the adverb ἀληθῶς is used to qualify an obviously metaphorical idiom.

[65] This makes for an interesting comparison with *P.Giss.* 3.5-6, which is a script for a dramatic performance at Alexandria in celebration of the accession of Hadrian, in which the god Apollo addresses the emperor 'to whom everything is a slave' (ᾧ πάντα δοῦλα . . . χαίροντες), discussed at Lavan (2013b) 145.

reading is made available by the potential *metaphorical* referents: she has in fact been fawned upon by a sequence of metaphorical slaves (the suitors, Chaereas, Dionysius, and now Artaxerxes). What follows confirms the metaphorical coding of slavery. In response to Artaxates, she pretends not to understand what he means, and Artaxates rephrases, clarifying that Callirhoe will no longer have 'slaves and beggars' as lovers; instead she will have the King, who will freely give her all the lands she pleases (6.5.7):

> αὐτὸ τοῦτο εὐτύχηκας, ὅτι οὐκέτι δούλους καὶ πένητας ἔχεις ἐραστὰς ἀλλὰ τὸν μέγαν βασιλέα, τὸν δυνάμενόν σοι Μίλητον αὐτὴν καὶ ὅλην Ἰωνίαν καὶ Σικελίαν καὶ ἄλλα ἔθνη μείζονα χαρίσασθαι.

Of course, the intended referents here are the *actual* slaves of the King (the likes of Chaereas and Dionysius), but Artaxates fails to understand the irony of the statement and forgets that the 'slavery of love' is an established elegiac topos to which his own master, the Persian King Artaxerxes, is now subject. It is also a generic hallmark of elegy that the poet-lover is poor (e.g. Tib.1.1, 1.5.61-6; Prop. 1.14, 3.2; Ov. *Am*.1.10). Artaxates' position is further ironised by the fact that here he is playing the role of the elegiac bawd as typified by Propertius' Acanthis (4.5) or Ovid's Dipsas (*Am*. 1.8). He thus remains oblivious to the generic codes to which he owes his existence.

Artaxerxes' metaphorical slavery ends up determining the outcome of the narrative. It puts in motion a causal chain resulting in the physical enslavement of his whole empire; indeed, we are encouraged to link the two events. The metaphorical subjection of the king and the physical subjugation of the Persians are framed in the same lexical terms: ἀπηλλαγμένοι... δουλείας Περσικῆς, οἱ δὲ ἑαλωκότες Περσῶν δεσμὰ καὶ μάστιγας καὶ ὕβρεις καὶ σφαγὰς προσεδόκων (7.6.5; cf. 6.3.2 quoted

above). The semantic equation forges a direct causal path between the real and metaphorical slavery in such a way as to suggest that metaphor can determine the outcome of the physical. Chaereas himself explicitly acknowledges the potential slippage between these epistemological categories. At the end of the novel, after Chaereas and Callirhoe have been restored to their rightful stations in Syracuse, Chaereas recapitulates the events of the narrative to the Syracusans in the assembly (8.7.1). He reassures the audience that Callirhoe never in fact became Dionysius' slave, but vice-versa: οὐκ ἐδούλευσεν· εὐθὺς γὰρ τὴν ἀργυρώνητον αὐτοῦ δέσποιναν ἀπέδειξε (8.7.10).[66] I shall have more to say on the use of the lexeme 'mistress' (δέσποινα) in the next section, but here my focus is on the competing claims of the real and the metaphorical. At the end of the novel, Chaereas privileges *metaphorical* slavery—that is, *seruitium amoris*—over the reality of Callirhoe's *actual* slavery.[67] Here, metaphor displaces reality to the extent that it informs Chaereas' reading of the whole narrative: the metaphor is reified and refutes the actual state of affairs. In this regard I suggest that the use of the metaphor *seruitium amoris* functions as an expression of Greek elite wish-fulfilment, used to characterise the non-reciprocal relations between protagonist and antagonist. Greek 'slaves' are now metaphorical 'masters'/ 'mistresses'. In Chariton's novel it is this metaphorical mode that becomes canonised in Chaereas' official version of events at the ἐκκλησία in Syracuse: by imposing his own fictions on the world, Chaereas, and the Greek elite he represents, reclaim a modicum of power, in a process that constitutes a 'hidden transcript'.[68]

---

[66] This is remarkably similar to Propertius' Ponticus, in love with a girl he has bought (1.9.4, quoted at p. 35 n. 60).

[67] The programmatic passage at the beginning of the last book of the novel announces that there will be no more δουλεία (8.1.4)—although ostensibly referring to *actual* enslavement, a metaphorical reading is no doubt available: from this point onwards, there will only be *reciprocal* relations.

[68] See Greenblatt (1980) on the notion of 'improvisation', whereby the ability to impose one's own narrative or fiction is a constituent of power.

Achilles is equally aware of the potential slippage between real and metaphorical slavery. In Chapter 5 I discuss how Callisthenes' abduction of Calligone in the second book replays Romulus' abduction of the Sabine women. At the end of the novel, however, Callisthenes undergoes a remarkable character-shift from brigand to civically minded gentleman (8.17.5-10).[69] He addresses Calligone as 'mistress', and tells her to consider him—despite his high status—as her slave (8.17.3):

'δέσποινα,' εἶπε, 'μή με νομίσῃς λῃστήν εἶναί τινα καὶ κακοῦργον· ἀλλὰ γάρ εἰμι τῶν εὖ γεγονότων, γένει Βυζάντιος, δεύτερος οὐδενός. ἔρως δέ με λῃστείας ὑποκριτὴν πεποίηκε καὶ ταύτας ἐπὶ σοὶ πλέξαι τὰς τέχνας. δοῦλον οὖν με σεαυτῆς ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρας νόμιζε.

Here an obvious irony obtains between Callisthenes' elite status and his erotic enslavement. His participation in the discourse of *seruitium amoris*, which I have suggested functions as a marker of Greek elite wish-fulfilment when it attaches to an antagonist, corroborates my position—especially when his admission of 'piracy' (λῃστείας) nods towards Romulus' Asylum (discussed in Chapter 5).

Iamblichus' fragmentary *Babyloniaka* is another interesting case. Fragment 35 is entitled 'A master accuses his slave of adultery with his wife' (Δεσπότης δούλου κατηγορεῖ ἐπὶ μοιχείᾳ τῆς οἰκείας γαμετῆς ἐξηγησαμένης). In his summary to the magistrate, the cuckolded husband recognises that the slave-mistress hierarchy, which should have obtained between his wife and the slave, has been inverted (fr. 35.12-7 S-W):

ὁ γὰρ μοιχὸς δοῦλός ἐστι καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ταπεινός, κἂν ταύτῃ καλὸς εἶναι δοκῇ· δοῦλος δὲ οὐδὲ ἄλλου τινὸς ἀλλ' ἐμός· ἔδει δὲ καὶ ταύτης δοῦλον αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ μὴ δεσπότην εἶναι. ποιεῖ δὲ τὴν μοιχείαν περιττὴν καὶ μᾶλλον

---

[69] Repath (2007) explores Callisthenes' transformation.

αἰσχρὰν ἄμφω συνελθόντα, ἡ τῆς μεμοιχευμένης δόξα καὶ ἡ τοῦ μοιχεύσαντος ἀδοξία.

For the adulterer is a slave, a soul of low status—even if he does appear handsome in her eyes—and he is not another's slave but my own. He ought to have been her slave too, not her master. What makes the adultery extraordinary and the more shameful is the coincidence of these opposites: the adulteress' social distinction, the adulterer's lowly station.

Here, as in Chariton, the speaker not only acknowledges that the normative hierarchy governing slave-master relations has been subverted by *seruitium amoris*, but he also privileges the metaphorical over the actual, thereby allowing a literary trope to bleed into and take control of real life. Later in the same fragment the cuckold explains to the magistrate how he used to witness his wife and the slave exchanging nods: τηρήσας δὲ εἶδον ἀμφοτέρων αὐτῶν <u>νεύματα,</u> τὸ μὲν παρ' αὐτοῦ πεμπόμενον, τὸ δὲ παρ' ἐκείνης συναντῶν (fr. 35.45-7 S-W). The exchange of nods between illicit lovers is a generic marker of Ovidian erotodidaxis.[70] To this we can add the cuckold's admission that, by his frequent praise of the slave's good looks, he 'taught [his wife] to love him' (ἐδίδασκον ταύτην ἐρᾶν, fr. 35.33f S-W). The combination of *seruitium amoris*, surreptitious nods, and erotodidaxis, is a good indicator that Iamblichus is either writing in a self-consciously Roman erotic mode, or is a reader of an author who did—perhaps even Achilles.

Riffaterre discusses the tensions that can arise when the same word or concept takes on both a literal and figurative meaning, and classes the phenomenon as 'syllepsis'.[71] He likewise characterises as 'intertextual syllepsis' the result of a tension between *con*textual and *inter*textual meaning.[72] Selden detects a type of cultural

---

[70] Discussed at length in Chapter 4. S-W *ad loc.* note the Ovidian connection to this passage, citing *Am.* 1.4.17f.
[71] Riffaterre (1980).
[72] Riffaterre (1979).

syllepsis as the master trope of the Greek novel, on the basis of the culturally bivalent reading available at the beginning of Achilles' novel.[73] Slavery in the novels, I argue, participates in all three sylleptic modes: the tension between literal and metaphorical slavery; the tension between the narrative context and the elegiac code-model; and the tension between an ostensibly Greek world and the potentially Roman imperial context.

1.3 'Mistress' and 'master' in erotic speech acts

Another constitutive feature of *seruitium amoris* and the poet-lover's debasement in Latin elegy is the sustained homology between *domina* and *puella*, complementing that between *seruitium* and *amor*.[74] Traditionally, the lexemes *domina* and *dominus* are used to denote slave-owners—hence their suitability as part of the nexus of images binding love to slavery.[75] The earliest extant use of a configuration of δεσπότης in an erotic context occurs in an epigram by Dioscorides in the late third century BCE: Ἀριστοκράτει δὲ λατρεύων/ μυρία, <u>δεσπόσυνον</u> καὶ τρίτον ἐκδέχομαι (*A.P.* 12.169.3f). Here we find a unique pre-elegiac Greek example of the combination of erotic slavery (λατρεύων)[76] and mastery (δεσπόσυνον) in a homoerotic setting. In the Roman ambit, Catullus uses the word *era* 'mistress' to refer to Lesbia (68.136). Miller observes that 'the poet's complete subjection (*seruitium amoris*) to a single mistress… is unprecedented in ancient Greek poetry of any era'.[77] The Qaṣr Ibrîm fragment of

---

[73] Selden (1994).
[74] Murgatroyd (1981). For a convenient list of references, see Pichon (1902) 134 s.v. *domina* and *dominus*.
[75] On the nuances of *domina* in earlier literature and elegy see Lilja (1965) 81-6. Fulkerson (2013) 186 observes that Ovid uses the word *domina* more frequently than the other elegists, but with less detailed description.
[76] Cf. *A.P.* 5.100.1 λάτρις Ἔρωτος.
[77] Miller (2004) 4. On the Catullan instances, Lyne (1979) 121 suggests that 'Catullus is stressing forbearance not humiliation', and Courtney (1993) 267 that 'the concept [of *seruitium amoris*] is not

41

Gallus marks a milestone in the literary history of *seruitium amoris*, in which the poet clearly refers to his lover Lycoris as *domina*: *... tandem fecerunt c[ar]mina Musae/ quae possem domina deicere digna mea* (fr. 2.6f Courtney). We can be reasonably sure, then, that Gallus instantiated the trope as part of the idiomatic landscape inherited by the later elegists.

The Greek novels exhibit the continued use and development of 'master' or 'mistress' in speech acts connoting erotic enslavement, most frequently in the form of δέσποινα and δεσπότης (and less frequently κυρία).[78] My first example comes from Achilles, where the slave Satyros advises Clitophon on how best to court Leucippe. His precepts are stuffed with erotodidactic conventions familiar from Latin elegy and he explicitly instructs Clitophon to address Leucippe as 'mistress' and kiss her neck: σὸν ἔργον ἤδη δέσποινάν τε καλεῖν καὶ φιλῆσαι τράχηλον (2.4.4). The deployment of δέσποινα in an erotodidactic context is quickly thematised: Clitophon follows Satyros' advice and addresses Leucippe as 'mistress', but Leucippe demurs and asks him to refrain from such discourse,[79] and Clitophon goes on to cite the mythological *exemplum* of Hercules and the Lydian Queen Omphale (2.6.1-2):

> "χαῖρε," ἔφην, "δέσποινα." ἡ δὲ μειδιάσασα γλυκὺ καὶ ἐμφανίσασα διὰ τοῦ γέλωτος, ὅτι συνῆκε πῶς εἶπον τὸ 'χαῖρε, δέσποινα,' εἶπεν· "ἐγὼ σή; μὴ τοῦτο εἴπῃς." "καὶ μὴν πέπρακέ μέ τίς σοι θεῶν ὥσπερ τὸν Ἡρακλέα τῇ Ὀμφάλῃ."

---

developed'. There is a precedent in the Roman satire of Lucilius fr. 738 Warm. (*cum mei me adeunt seruuli, non dominam ego appellem meam?*). Had Lucilius employed the trope in a sustained manner, we might expect evidence of this in Horatian Satire.

[78] Dickey (1996) 98-100 discusses δέσποινα as a form of address, concluding that it is mostly reserved for goddesses; she also observes that its use in the novelists is equivalent to the Latin *domina*. Dickey (2002) 77-91 discusses *dominus* and *domina*.

[79] On Leucippe's reaction generally see De Temmerman (2014) 194-5.

This is a key passage for my overall argument. Not only is Clitophon's erotic use of δέσποινα thematised, but Leucippe is said to 'understand' (συνῆκε) the import of the speech act, that is, she 'understands' the generic codes of elegy, an understanding that Clitophon imputes to her elsewhere (συνῆκε, 2.7.2, 2.9.3). The fact that it is something to be decoded marks the passage as a moment of extreme literary self-reflexivity, meditating on its own generic conventions. There is also the added irony of Satyros—an actual slave—advising the use of metaphorical *seruitium* as a courtship strategy.

Clitophon's immediate response to Leucippe's rebuff is proof that we are dealing with *seruitium amoris* in its codified form. He cites the precedent of Hercules and Omphale ("καὶ μὴν πέπρακέ μέ τίς σοι θεῶν ὥσπερ τὸν Ἡρακλέα τῇ Ὀμφάλῃ."), a myth co-opted by elegists to exemplify elegiac *seruitium*. Propertius' poem on powerful females opens with an image of erotic *seruitium* (*quid mirare, meam si uersat femina uitam/ et trahit addictum sub sua iura uirum...?,* 3.11.1f) and later in the poem Omphale is cited as an example (3.11.17-20). Ovid includes the pose of *seruitium amoris* in his raft of courtship strategies and, again, Hercules and Omphale provide a paradigm: *paruit imperio dominae Tirynthius heros* (*Ars* 2.221).

In Chapter 4 I discuss how Clitophon's use of elegiac codes is part of Achilles' project of generic redefinition: he loads his protagonist with tropes that render his relationship with Leucippe *non-reciprocal*. His pose of sexual slavery (by referring to Leucippe as δέσποινα) is *not* reciprocated, and this is something that Achilles later makes explicit. In Ephesus, Clitophon writes Leucippe a letter in which

he again addresses her as 'mistress': χαῖρέ μοι, ὦ <u>δέσποινα</u> Λευκίππη (5.20.5).[80] The letter is precipitated by one he had previously received from Leucippe in which she had addressed him as 'master': Λευκίππη Κλειτοφῶντι τῷ <u>δεσπότῃ</u> μου (5.18.2). The greeting is immediately proceeded by an explanation of *why* she has addressed him thus—*not* because she is erotically enslaved to him, but because she has found out that he is supposedly married to Melite, into whose hands Leucippe has fallen as a slave: τοῦτο γάρ σε δεῖ καλεῖν, ἐπεὶ καὶ τῆς δεσποίνης ἀνὴρ εἶ τῆς ἐμῆς (5.18.3). Again, the trope is being thematised in a sophisticated way. Leucippe makes as if to participate in the erotic discourse of Clitophon (see e.g. 5.18.4), but then backtracks. Where Clitophon is engaging in a brand of erotics that is generically anathema, Leucippe hews to the normative conventions of the genre and requests that he not address her as 'mistress' ("ἐγὼ σή; μὴ τοῦτο εἴπῃς."): she clarifies what she means when she addresses him as 'master', thereby resisting Clitophon's attempt to redefine novelistic female protagonists as elegiac *puellae*.[81] She knows the rules of Clitophon's game, and refuses to play.

Leucippe is not the only character to 'explain' her metaphorical use of the appellation 'master'. The antagonist Melite begs to have sex with Clitophon, if only once. In her supplication, she addresses him as 'master' and explains the import of her lexical choice: ἀλλὰ δέομαι, Κλειτοφῶν <u>δέσποτα</u> (<u>δεσπότης γὰρ εἶ ψυχῆς τῆς ἐμῆς</u>), ἀπόδος σεαυτὸν τήμερον πρῶτα καὶ ὕστατα (5.26.7). As before, at this self-reflexive moment, generic codes are brought into focus, and Melite explicitly indicates that she is speaking in metaphorical terms. Melite had earlier adopted an identical pose, and

---

[80] Clitophon also alludes to Leucippe as his 'mistress' when, weeping for the loss of Clinias, he refers to him as his 'master after Leucippe': τὸν μετὰ Λευκίππην ἐμὸν δεσπότην (3.23.3).

[81] On the asymmetry that defines relations between Clitophon and Leucippe see Bouffartigue (2001), and on Melite (and Longus' Lycaenion) as dominant females, see Robiano (2002).

addressed Clitophon ὦ δέσποτα (5.16.4; cf. 5.14.2). There is corroborative evidence in the Latin tradition of female *seruitium amoris* and specifically the use of *dominus* in a sexual sense: when Ovid suffers from impotence, in her attempts to rouse him the girl engages in dirty-talk and calls him 'master' (*dominumque uocauit*, *Am.* 3.7.11); Pasiphae refers to the bull as her 'master': *a quotiens uaccam uultu spectauit iniquo/ et dixit 'domino cur placet ista meo?'* (*Ars* 1.313f); and Byblis refers to her brother, with whom she wants to have sex, as 'master' (*dominum appellat*, *Met.* 9.466).

Leucippe's response to being addressed as δέσποινα makes for an interesting contrast to that of Calligone in Achilles.[82] After Callisthenes mistakenly kidnaps her he falls in love with her. He prostrates himself before her, addressing her as 'mistress' and offering himself as her slave: 'δέσποινα,' εἶπε, 'μή με νομίσῃς λῃστὴν εἶναί τινα καὶ κακοῦργον ... δοῦλον οὖν με σεαυτῆς ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρας νόμιζε (8.17.3). We then hear that he made the girl 'more amenable' with his eloquence and persuasiveness, with the result that he succeeds in winning her (8.17.4):

> καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν καὶ ἔτι τούτων πλείονα εὐαγωγοτέραν τὴν κόρην αὐτῷ γενέσθαι παρεσκεύασεν. ἦν δὲ καὶ ὀφθῆναι καλὸς καὶ στωμύλος, πιθανώτατος ... ὥστε καὶ αὐτὴν ἡρήκει τὴν κόρην ἤδη.

Callisthenes' exhibition of *seruitium amoris* has the intended outcome, and he is (in this respect) a successful version of Clitophon.

A brief mention should be made of the use of 'master' in a homoerotic context. Clitophon's cousin and erotodidaskalos Clinas falls obsessively in love with the young Charikles and buys him a horse. Charikles is unfortunately dashed against a

---

[82] De Temmerman (2014) 196 notes the difference.

tree and killed on his first riding-trip (see Appendix 1). When the message is reported to Clinias, he cries out that he has destroyed his 'master': ἐγώ μου τὸν δεσπότην ἀπολώλεκα (1.14.1). There is also a subtle indication that Clitophon, when he weeps for the loss of Clinias at sea, and refers to him as his 'master after Leucippe' (τὸν μετὰ Λευκίππην ἐμὸν δεσπότην, 3.23.4), sexualises him in the same way as he does when he refers to Leucippe as δέσποινα. Aside from the Dioscorides epigram mentioned above (*A.P.* 12.169.3f), it is only in Martial that we find *dominus* used regularly to define the sexual enslavement that the master suffers to his slave-boy (11.70.2, 12.66.8, 13.69.2; cf. also 5.57, where he suggests that the appellation *dominus* has lost its significance).[83]

Of the extant novelists, Achilles is the only author explicitly to make *seruitium amoris* a rhetorical strategy. This is not the case in Chariton or Xenophon, to whom I shall now turn. Though there is less evidence for the use of 'master' or 'mistress' as an erotic speech act in Chariton and Xenophon, the evidence we *do* have is unassailable. In Chariton, after Chaereas has gone to inspect Callirhoe's tomb (having apparently killed her) and found it empty, he proceeds to lament his own fate and suggests that suicide might be the answer (3.3.6).[84] He then has a change of heart and offers a defence for staying alive, addressing the absent Callirhoe, who 'compels' him to live, as his 'mistress': ἀπολογοῦμαί σοι, δέσποινα, τῆς ἐμῆς ψυχῆς. σύ με ζῆν ἀναγκάζεις (3.3.7). We have already seen the combination of a signifier of *seruitium amoris* (δέσποινα) and the language of compulsion (ἀναγκάζεις) in the case of Habrocomes in Xenophon (1.4.1, quoted on p. 30) and it is possible that one author is reading the other. There is the added bonus that the sequence of words δέσποινα τῆς

---

[83] Cassius Dio provides useful parallel material, reporting that Nero's castrated 'wife' Sporus was called 'lady', 'queen' and 'mistress': κυρία καὶ βασιλὶς καὶ δέσποινα ὠνομάζετο (62.13.2).
[84] On Chaereas and suicide see p. 87 n. 65.

ἐμῆς ψυχῆς can be activated as 'mistress of my soul', which, as will become clear, is another way of expressing this type of *seruitium amoris*. Towards the end of the novel, after Chaereas has captured the Persian train (including Artaxerxes' wife Statira) on the island of Aradus,[85] Callirhoe tells Chaereas that she does not want Statira as her slave, and bids him return her to the King (8.3.1-2). Chaereas agrees, and promises to do whatever Callirhoe wants, assuring her that she is both 'mistress' of all the spoils and, especially, of his soul (8.3.3):

> "οὐδέν ἐστιν" ἔφη Χαιρέας, "ὃ σοῦ θελούσης οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ ποιήσαιμι· σὺ γὰρ <u>κυρία</u> Στατείρας καὶ πάντων τῶν λαφύρων καὶ πρὸ πάντων <u>τῆς ἐμῆς ψυχῆς</u>."

The passage is evidence for the explicit slippage between literal and metaphorical slavery, which I have already suggested is a constituent feature of slavery in Chariton.[86]

The evidence for this type of speech act in Xenophon is equally compelling. Whilst in Chariton the use of 'mistress' or 'master' is typically gendered as a *male* speech act, in Xenophon it is generally restricted to Anthia. The only exception to the rule is the antagonist Perilaus, who declares to Anthia that she will be everything to him, his 'wife, mistress, and children': ἔλεγεν οὖν πρὸς τὴν Ἀνθίαν ὡς πάντα ἂν αὐτὴ γένοιτο Περιλάῳ, γυνὴ καὶ <u>δεσπότις</u> καὶ παῖδες (2.13.7). All four of the other examples are spoken by Anthia to Habrocomes. She twice calls him 'master' of her heart: ἀλλὰ δέομαι σοῦ, <u>τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς δέσποτα</u> (2.4.5); ἀλλ' ἥκω σοι τοιαύτη, <u>τῆς ἐμῆς ψυχῆς</u> Ἀβροκόμη <u>δέσποτα</u> (5.14.2). And she twice addresses him as

---

[85] On the erotic implications of Aradus see Calvet-Sébasti (2005).
[86] There are other instances in Chariton where Callirhoe is referred to as δέσποινα/κυρία in a not overtly sexual way, but where an erotic reading is available (2.2.1, 2.3.10, 2.5.12, 2.6.5, 3.6.4, 3.6.5). Ovid allows for a similar slippage between metaphorical and literal *domina* at *Am*. 1.6.20.

'master': "δέσποτα" εἶπεν... (2.7.4); περιλαβοῦσα ἡ Ἀνθία τὸν Ἀβροκόμην ἔκλαεν "ἄνερ" λέγουσα "καὶ δέσποτα..." (5.14.1).[87] Whilst reciprocal relations between the protagonists in Chariton and Xenophon are not in doubt, the particular brand of *seruitium amoris* which involves the appellation 'mistress' or 'master' appears to be a gendered discourse: in Chariton it is *male* speech act, and in Xenophon a (predominantly) *female* one. In Achilles, of course, it is both (Clitophon, Callisthenes, Clinias, Melite; Leucippe explicitly disavows it).

1.4   *Militia amoris* in the novels

Though there are scattered precedents in earlier Greek literature, the metaphor of *militia amoris* becomes fully worked out and systematised in Latin elegy (for details see p.21 n. 48), where the military and erotic spheres are conflated in a number of ways: lovers are brave; lovers are (triumphant) soldiers; *Amor/Eros* himself is a (triumphant) soldier; and love is a war against rivals or *Amor/Eros* himself. The conventions are deeply engrained in the erotic discourse of all the elegists, and are most fully elaborated in Ovid *Amores* 1.9, which famously opens with the sentiment that 'every lover is a fighter' (*militat omnis amans... militat omnis amans*, *Am*. 1.9.1f);[88] and in his erotodidactic work he announces that love is a type of war not fit for the lazy (*militiae species amor est: discedite, segnes... Ars* 2.233-6).[89] It has not escaped Jones' attention that the novels may be engaging with Latin elegy in this regard; for her, 'Latin elegy might be thought a suitable comparandum for the novels, because it shares with them a conventionalized erotic system that is ironic in its

---

[87] Konstan and Ramelli (2014) 187 adduce these passages in their discussion of Christian narratives.
[88] Cf. *Ars* 1.36 (*miles in arma*) and 3.559 (*hic rudis et castris nunc primum notus Amoris*).
[89] Cf. *Am*. 1.9.31 where the lover cannot be accused of *desidia*. Tibullus prefers the lazy life (*tecum/ dum modo sim, quaeso segnis inersque uocor*, 1.1.58) and a life of peace (1.10; cf. Prop. 3.5.1).

exploitation of war as a metaphor', though she seldom presses the claim further.[90] In this section, I shall explore Achilles', Chariton's, Xenophon's, and the *Ninus* author's use of military metaphors in an erotic context. As in the case of *seruitium*, I argue that the novelists are directly aware of the elegiac codification of the metaphor; when it characterises an antagonist, it serves to highlight the unreciprocated nature of the relationship; and that it is possible to see in the antagonists' unsuccessful military campaign a hint at a new Greek elite cultural script in which Romans are unsuccessful in their military conquest of the Greek world.

In Achilles, evidence of *militia amoris* clusters in Books one, two, and four. This is because in the first two books Clitophon is engaged in his courtship of Leucippe, and in Book four we meet the antagonist Charmides, who is an actual military general whose attempted seduction of Leucippe is framed in military terms. The erotodidaskaloi Clinias and Satyros are equally complicit in this type of language: Clinias refers to a lover's initial attempts as 'skirmishes' (ἀκροβολισμούς, 1.10.4); and Satyros counsels direct attacks using a 'siege-engine' (πρόσαγε τὴν δευτέραν μηχανήν, 2.4.3).[91] In response to Satyros, Clitophon acknowledges that he has been given good advice, but worries that he lacks the necessary courage: "πιθανῶς μέν," ἔφην, "νὴ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν, ἐς τὸ ἔργον παιδοτριβεῖς· δέδοικα δὲ μὴ <u>ἄτολμος</u> ὢν καὶ <u>δειλὸς</u> ἔρωτος ἀθλητὴς γένωμαι." (2.4.4).

Clitophon's anxiety over a perceived lack of courage can be ranged with similar elegiac preoccupations. Satyros attempts to buoy Clitophon's spirits, asserting

---

[90] M. Jones (2012) 105.
[91] See *LSJ* I.1, 2 s.v.

that Eros 'brooks no cowardice' and indicating Eros' 'warlike' and 'brave' appearance (2.4.5):[92]

> "Ἔρως, ὦ γενναῖε," ἔφη, "δειλίας οὐκ ἀνέχεται. ὁρᾷς αὐτοῦ τὸ σχῆμα ὡς ἔστι στρατιωτικόν· τόξα καὶ φαρέτρα καὶ βέλη καὶ πῦρ, ἀνδρεῖα πάντα καὶ τόλμης γέμοντα. τοιοῦτον οὖν ἐν σεαυτῷ θεὸν ἔχων δειλὸς εἶ καὶ φοβῇ; ὅρα μὴ καταψεύδῃ τοῦ θεοῦ..."

In this nexus of imagery the lover is a soldier (as in Tibullus: *hic ego dux milesque bonus*, 1.1.75), fighting under the command of Eros (as in *Am*. 1.2, 1.9, and 2.9), in a campaign to win a sexual conquest. Left on his own, Clitophon girds himself for the battle to come, asking himself why he is 'unmanly' and a 'cowardly soldier of a brave god': ἤσκουν ἐμαυτὸν εἰς εὐτολμίαν ἐπὶ τὴν παρθένον. "μέχρι τίνος, ἄνανδρε, σιγᾷς; τί δὲ δειλὸς εἶ στρατιώτης ἀνδρείου θεοῦ;" (2.5.1).[93] For Clitophon, seduction is 'bravery', and it would be 'cowardice' not to respond to Eros' call to action. Eros then speaks to Clitophon from within, threatening him with military force: ναί, τολμηρέ, κατ᾽ ἐμοῦ στρατεύῃ καὶ ἀντιπαρατάττῃ; ἵπταμαι καὶ τοξεύω καὶ φλέγω· πῶς δυνήσῃ φυγεῖν; (2.5.2). Tibullus and Ovid likewise recognise the madness in fighting against Amor: *iussit Amor: contra quis ferat arma deos?* (Tib. 1.6.30);[94] *audeat inuito ne quis discedere Amore* (Tib. 1.3.21); *quidquid Amor iussit, non est contemnere tutum* (Ov. *Her*. 4.11). Eros as a military commander is also the dominant image in *Am*. 1.2, where Cupid is a Roman *triumphator* celebrating a triumph over the poet's submission to him; and in *Am*. 2.9 Cupid is presented as a commanding officer shooting arrows at his own soldiers when they request demobilisation.

---

[92] In Plato *Symp*. 178e, 196c love promotes ἀνδρεία.

[93] De Temmerman (2014) 163 observes that Clitophon appropriates the military imagery used by Satyros.

[94] Cf. Plaut. *Cist*. 300 (*caue sis cum Amore tu umquam bellum sumpseris*), noted in Maltby (2002) 270 *ad loc.*

Military discourse runs throughout Clitophon's description of a subsequent approach towards Leucippe. He and Satyros 'lie in ambush' for Leucippe and Clio (ἐφηδρεύομεν, 2.10.2),[95] and once they arrive he bides his time until the sun has gone in and moves in for an 'attack' (2.10.3):

> ἐπιτηρήσας οὖν ὅτε τὸ πολὺ τῆς αὐγῆς ἐμαραίνετο, πρόσειμι θρασύτερος γενόμενος πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐκ τῆς πρώτης προσβολῆς, ὥσπερ στρατιώτης ἤδη νενικηκὼς καὶ τοῦ πολέμου καταπεφρονηκώς· πολλὰ γὰρ ἦν τὰ τότε ὁπλίζοντά με θαρρεῖν· οἶνος, ἔρως, ἐλπίς, ἐρημία.

Clitophon is now a real soldier who has a victory under his belt (στρατιώτης ἤδη νενικηκὼς), fighting a war (πολέμου) in the army of Eros. In elegy the lover's assault, or subsequent success, is marketed as a military triumph: *non ita Dardanio gauisus, Atrida, triumpho es* (Prop. 2.14.1); *i nunc, magnificos uictor molire triumphos... clamet 'io, forti uicta puella uiro est!'* (Ov. *Am.* 1.7.35-8); *ite triumphales circum mea tempora laurus:/ uicimus* (Ov. *Am.* 2.12.1f). Considering Clitophon's extensive elegiac repertoire elsewhere, I suggest that here too he apes the characteristics of an elegiac *amator*.[96]

The antagonist Charmides is the other figure in Achilles who participates in this type of erotic discourse. What makes Charmides distinctive, however, is that he is actually a soldier, or rather, a 'general' στρατηγός (in much the same way that Satyros, who is actually a slave, advocates *seruitium amoris* as a courtship strategy). We are first introduced to the general in Book 3 when he rescues Clitophon from the Boukoloi and invites him to dinner to tell his story (3.14.1-2). Reunited with Leucippe, she and Clitophon lodge in camp in a tent near the general's (4.1.1); he sees

---

[95] Callisthenes and the pirates led by Zeno similarly 'lie in ambush' for the women prior to the kidnap of Calligone (ἐφήδρευε, 2.15.1, 2.17.3).

[96] Christenson (2000) links the military discourse with the Greek elegiac poet Callinus' exhortations to martial valour in contrast to the sexual motives of Clitophon and Satyros.

her and is immediately smitten (εὐθὺς ἑαλώκει, 4.3.1). There happens to be a hippopotamus in the vicinity, and Charmides exploits the spectacle as an opportunity to dilate on how the hippopotamus is captured (4.3.1-5). In this respect Leucippe and the hippopotamus are assimilated to each other as spectacles to be gazed at and animals to be caught—both are types of horse (river-horse and white-horse).[97] Charmides also takes his cue from the Ovidian *amator* who seizes on the opportunity of a triumph, with all its exotic spectacles, as a way of impressing the girl (*Ars* 1.213-28). Charmides attempts to suborn Menelaus to procure Leucippe for him (4.6.1-4) and they decide not to refuse outright, but to agree on the proviso that Charmides give them a few days respite, in order to buy some time (4.7.1-2).

Charmides' response to the request for a delay is veined with the language of literal and metaphorical *militia*; indeed, he explicitly thematises the difference between his role as a military man and the erotic war being waged in his heart (just as Leucippe thematises the difference between actual and erotic slavery). His language serves as a repository of *militia amoris* in a variety of modulations (4.7.3-5):[98]

> ἐν πολέμῳ δὲ τίς ἐπιθυμίαν ἀναβάλλεται; στρατιώτης δὲ ἐν χερσὶν ἔχων μάχην οἶδεν εἰ ζήσεται; τοσαῦται τῶν θανάτων εἰσὶν ὁδοί ... ἐπὶ πόλεμον νῦν ἐξελεύσομαι βουκόλων· ἔνδον μου τῆς ψυχῆς ἄλλος πόλεμος κάθηται. στρατιώτης με πορθεῖ τόξον ἔχων, βέλος ἔχων. νενίκημαι, πεπλήρωμαι βελῶν· κάλεσον, ἄνθρωπε, ταχὺ τὸν ἰώμενον· ἐπείγει τὸ τραῦμα. ἅψω πῦρ ἐπὶ τοὺς πολεμίους· ἄλλας δᾷδας ὁ Ἔρως ἀνῆψε κατ' ἐμοῦ· τοῦτο πρῶτον, Μενέλαε, σβέσον τὸ πῦρ. καλὸν τὸ οἰώνισμα πρὸ πολέμου συμβολῆς ἐρωτικὴ συμπλοκή. Ἀφροδίτη με πρὸς Ἄρεα ἀποστειλάτω."

Charmides begins by complaining about the fact that *real* war makes the future uncertain, and that he should not therefore have to delay his desires (as does Ninus,

---

[97] See Morales (2004) 197-9 on this passage. On exotic beasts in Achilles see Dubel (2011).
[98] M. Jones (2012) 169 n. 240 observes the density of military language in this passage.

see p. 62-4). Ovid makes precisely the same point in his poem on *militia amoris*: *Mars dubius, nec certa Venus* (*Am.* 1.9.29). He then alludes to another war (ἄλλος πόλεμος) in which he is defeated (νενίκημαι) and in which Eros is a soldier (στρατιώτης). Charmides wishes to engage in sexual congress as a good omen before war on the grounds that Aphrodite would be sending him out to Ares (Ἀφροδίτη με πρὸς Ἄρεα ἀποστειλάτω; see again *Am.* 1.9.29). As I have suggested throughout this chapter, the novelists thematise the slippage between epistemological modes of reality and metaphor.

As a soldier who participates in both literal and metaphorical *militia*, Charmides not only reifies the metaphor through his own career, but he also resembles the military men Gallus and Tibullus, who frame their erotic adventures in military terms. Gallus in particular—the man broadly canonised as the first of the Latin elegists and inventor of the genre as we know it—[99]makes for a curious comparandum with Charmides: much of our evidence for him is extrapolated from Vergil's tenth *Eclogue*, from which we are able to suppose that he codified staple elegiac metaphors such as *militia* and *medicina amoris* (see p. 151). There are several points of correspondence between Charmides in the passage quoted, and Gallus in the tenth *Eclogue*. In the first instance, Gallus is dying of an unreciprocated love (*indigno cum Gallus amore peribat, Ecl.* 10.10) just as 'many roads of death' lie open to Charmides (τοσαῦται τῶν θανάτων εἰσὶν ὁδοί) and his feelings towards Leucippe are unreciprocated; and Apollo tells Gallus that his girlfriend Lycoris has gone off to the camp of another soldier (*tua cura Lycoris/ perque niues alium perque horrida castra secuta est, Ecl.* 10.22f), just as Leucippe is currently billeted in Charmides' camp but

---

[99] Ov. *Tr.* 4.10.53, 2.1.445, 5.1.17, *Am.* 1.15.29f; Prop. 2.34.91; Quint *I.O.* 10.1.93-4; Mart. 8.73.6.

unavailable to him. Crucially, Gallus then frames the relationship between himself and Lycoris in terms of *militia amoris* (*Ecl.* 10.44f):

> nunc insanus <u>amor duri</u> me <u>Martis</u> in armis
> tela inter media atque aduersos detinet hostis.

Here it is ambiguous whether his 'love of war'—that is, his actual duty as a soldier—keeps him from Lycoris and armed among the enemy, or whether his 'love' *is* Lycoris, and his relationship with her a war (if the latter, *Martis* is dependent on *in armis*).[100] Slippage between metaphorical and actual *militia* therefore putatively plays a key role in Gallus, and is subsequently thematised by Charmides. Further, the collocation of *amor* and *Mars* is reflected in Charmides' desire for a good erotic omen in his upcoming battle (Ἀφροδίτη με πρὸς Ἄρεα ἀποστειλάτω); and Charmides' complaint that he is engaged in a real war echoes Gallus' claim to be 'detained among the enemy' (*inter ... aduersos detinet hostis*; cf. *Ninus*, A.III.20-30 S-W).

The following sequence of lines in the *Eclogue* (10.46-9) resembles a propempticon for Lycoris who is leaving to join another soldier (cf. Prop. 1.8.5-8). The fear that the beloved may elope with a military man is a peculiarly elegiac fear, which, on the evidence of *Eclogue* 10, may well derive from Gallus. Indeed, commenting on line 46 of *Eclogue* 10 Servius states *hi autem omnes uersus Galli sunt, de ipsius translati carminibus*. While it is uncertain to which lines this comment refers—opinion ranges from the 'propempticon' (46-9) to the whole of Gallus' speech (31-69)—[101]the crucial point is that this part of the *Eclogue* is engaging closely with Gallan elegy, to both of which Achilles may well have had access. Hence, when

---

[100] See Clausen (1994) 304 *ad loc.*
[101] On this question see Lipka (2001) 88-9.

Charmides says he 'will go' (ἐξελεύσομαι) to a war against the 'Herdsmen' (βουκόλων), might it be possible that Achilles is manipulating a Gallan (or Vergilian?) line in which Gallus says he 'will go' and modulate his previous poems to the pipe of the Sicilian 'herdsman' (*ibo et... carmina pastoris Siculi modulabor auena*, 50f)?[102] If so, this is evidence of a neat pun on the Egyptian Boukoloi and Latin pastoral poetry.

There is further evidence of a connection between Charmides and Gallus (in *Ecl*. 10). Gallus says he enjoys shooting arrows as a 'cure' for his madness (*Ecl*. 10.59f):

> libet Partho torquere Cydonia cornu
> spicula—tamquam haec sit nostri medicina furoris.

Conversely, Charmides refers to the soldier Eros attacking him with his bow and arrows (στρατιώτης με πορθεῖ τόξον ἔχων, βέλος ἔχων ... πεπλήρωμαι βελῶν), in response to which he calls for someone to come and heal him (κάλεσον, ἄνθρωπε, ταχὺ τὸν ἰώμενον). It is quite possible that in the tenth *Eclogue* 'Gallus' is quoting Gallus,[103] and is responsible for the elegiac metaphor of *medicina amoris* (Prop. 1.2.7f, 1.5.27f, 2.1.57f),[104] which would explain Charmides' request for a doctor. Charmides also admits that he has been 'defeated' (νενίκημαι), just as Gallus' speech ends with a famously 'Gallan' tag on Amor's ability to conquer everything: *omnia uincit Amor: et nos cedamus Amori* (*Ecl.* 10.69; cf. Appendix 5).[105]

---

[102] Skutsch (1901) 25 thinks that Gallus' four books of *Amores* contained pastoral material, and argues that Servius' comments should be extended to the whole of Gallus' speech.
[103] Clausen (1994) 309 *ad loc*.
[104] See Ross (1975) 66-8. Sex is a 'cure' elsewhere in Achilles at 6.1.1, and at Ov. *Ars* 2.489.
[105] Longus' prologue (*pr*. 4) articulates a similar sentiment. There is a Greek precedent in Soph. *Ant*. 781f; cf. Macr. *Sat*. 5.16.7; Otto (1890) 17.

There is a final point about Charmides' Egyptian nationality. Cornelius Gallus the elegist was also the *praefectus Aegypti* in the new province of Egypt after Actium (Cassius Dio 51.17.1).[106] He appears in an inscription on the Vatican obelisk, which stood in Alexandria until 37CE and its removal to Rome, that records his construction of a Forum Iulium. This inscription has been inscribed over by another (*CIL* vi. 882), by virtue of his forced suicide and *damnatio memoriae* in 26 BCE (Cassius Dio 53.23; Suet. *Div. Aug.* 66.2). There is also the trilingual inscription at Philae (*CIL* iii. 14147 = *ILS* 8995) in which he proudly describes his exploits in quelling a rebellion and of carrying his arms further south than the Ptolemies or the Romans have done before him.[107] Charmides likewise leads an army and subdues the Boukoloi (at least initially). Could Charmides represent a faint vestige of Cornelius Gallus' military activities in Egypt, coupled with an evocation of his literary portfolio? Hilton suggests that the Egyptian soldiers in Books 3 and 4 exhibit many of the characteristics of Roman soldiers who would have been billeted in Egypt at the time.[108] The Qaṣr Ibrîm fragment proves that papyri of Gallus' poetry may have been in circulation in Egypt, in this case at the site of an occupying Roman army. Cassius Dio's account of his downfall refers to Gallus having erected statues of himself throughout Egypt, even inscribing his deeds onto the Pyramids. His name, deeds, and poetry might (despite his *damnatio memoriae*) therefore have been available to those in Egypt with an interest in such things. In Chapter 5 I suggest that Achilles' Alexandrian identity may explain some of his subversive literary moves against Rome. This echo of Gallus—

---

[106] Courtney (1993) 259-60 and Hollis (2007) 224-9 are useful summaries of Gallus' biography; see Boucher (1966) for a fuller account.

[107] Adams (2003) 533, 637-41 offers discussion and translation of this document.

[108] Hilton (2009) 103-4: heavily armed phalanx (3.13.1), floor-length shields (3.13.2), army doctor (4.10.2), billeting near an Egyptian village (4.1), the general is bribed (4.13.4), payment of gold coins (4.6.2).

plunged into oblivion by imperial decree—may well be a small cog in Achilles' anti-Roman machine.

After Achilles, it is Xenophon who makes the most liberal use of *militia* in an erotic context. Whilst Achilles invests the Egyptian general Charmides and his generically iconoclastic protagonist Clitophon with this type of discourse, in Xenophon the protagonist Habrocomes is the only character to speak in such terms. We should not, however, worry that this establishes a power differential between himself and Anthia: as I have demonstrated above, she receives the lion's share of *seruitium amoris*. The arrogant Habrocomes initially spurns Eros, who is incited to anger and arms himself against the young man (1.2.1):

> μηνιᾷ πρὸς ταῦτα ὁ Ἔρως· φιλόνεικος γὰρ ὁ θεὸς καὶ ὑπερηφάνοις ἀπαραίτητος· ἐζήτει δὲ τέχνην κατὰ τοῦ μειρακίου· καὶ γὰρ καὶ τῷ θεῷ <u>δυσάλωτος</u> ἐφαίνετο. <u>ἐξοπλίσας</u> οὖν ἑαυτὸν καὶ πᾶσαν δύναμιν ἐρωτικῶν φαρμάκων περιβαλόμενος <u>ἐστράτευεν</u> ἐφ' Ἁβροκόμην.

The theme is familiar from mythical prototypes such as Euripides' *Hippolytus* and Theocritus' Daphnis (*Id.* 1), and, as in Chariton, Eros is described as 'antagonistic' φιλόνεικος (1.1.4). The military terminology characterises him as a soldier marching against Habrocomes, who becomes his prisoner of war: ὁ δὲ αὐτὸν ἐδεδώκει πρὸς τὴν θέαν καὶ ἦν <u>αἰχμάλωτος</u> τοῦ θεοῦ (1.3.2). Ovid too had been 'booty' in Cupid's triumph: *tua sum noua praeda, Cupido* (*Am.* 1.2.19); *praeda recens* (*Am.* 1.2.29). The imagery is sustained at the moment Anthia and Habrocomes first see each other: ἐνταῦθα ὁρῶσιν ἀλλήλους, καὶ ἁλίσκεται Ἀνθία ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἁβροκόμου, ἡττᾶται δὲ ὑπὸ Ἔρωτος Ἁβροκόμης (1.3.1). What is interesting here is that whilst Anthia is 'captured' by Habrocomes, Habrocomes is 'defeated' by Eros. The distinction is subtle, but nevertheless suggests that Habrocomes' 'war' is fought against Eros rather

than Anthia, in contrast to (for example) Clitophon who campaigns against Leucippe (e.g. 2.10.2-3).

There are further subtle differences between Xenophon and Achilles. Habrocomes struggles to come to terms with the fact that he has fallen in love with Anthia. At first he decides to recognise the power of Eros and accepts defeat (1.4.1):

> ὁ μέχρι νῦν ἀνδρικὸς Ἀβροκόμης, ὁ καταφρονῶν Ἔρωτος, ὁ τῷ θεῷ λοιδορούμενος ἑάλωκα καὶ νενίκημαι καὶ παρθένῳ δουλεύειν ἀναγκάζομαι.

Aside from the pose of erotic enslavement (already discussed), it is significant that Habrocomes hitherto considered himself 'manly' (ἀνδρικός) for *resisting* Eros, whereas Satyros and Clitophon consider it manly to *submit* to Eros (Ach. 2.4.4-5.2). In both novels ἀνδρεία is at stake, but remarkably they are constituted by diametrically opposite behavioural modes,[109] thus giving an insight into the different generic codes and world-views governing the different protagonists. Clitophon's language (μέχρι τίνος, ἄνανδρε, 2.5.1) directly recalls Habrocomes (ὁ μέχρι νῦν ἀνδρικός), suggesting that Achilles is consciously inverting the ethical paradigm to which Habrocomes adheres. To this we can add the detail that Anthia accuses Habrocomes of cowardice for *not* admitting his feelings to her sooner (ἄνανδρε καὶ δειλέ, 1.9.4), which ranges her ethically and lexically with Clitophon (ἄνανδρε... δειλὸς εἶ, 2.5.1).[110]

Charging himself with cowardice, Habrocomes then changes his mind and resolves to resist and defeat Eros (1.4.2-3):

---

[109] De Temmerman (2014) 163 spots the difference.
[110] Cf. M. Jones (2012) *passim*, who argues that Clitophon's discourse unwittingly feminises him.

> ὦ πάντα <u>ἄνανδρος</u> ἐγὼ καὶ πονηρός· οὐ καρτερήσω νῦν; οὐ μενῶ
> γεννικός; οὐκ ἔσομαι καλλίων Ἔρωτος; νῦν οὐδὲν ὄντα θεὸν <u>νικῆσαί</u> με
> δεῖ... οὐκ ἂν Ἔρως ποτέ μου <u>κρατῆσαι</u>.

Again, at stake is Habrocomes' masculinity, which he feels will be jeopardised unless he 'defeats' Eros and prevents him from having power over his personhood. With yet another volte-face, Habrocomes finally decides to submit, imagining Eros setting up a trophy, and he begs him for mercy (1.4.4-5):

> ρίψας ἑαυτὸν εἰς γῆν "<u>νενίκηκας</u>", εἶπεν, "Ἔρως, μέγα σοι <u>τρόπαιον</u>
> ἐγήγερται κατὰ Ἀβροκόμου <u>τοῦ σώφρονος</u>· <u>ἱκέτην</u> ἔχεις. ἀλλὰ σῶσον τὸν
> ἐπὶ σὲ καταπεφευγότα τὸν πάντων δεσπότην. μή με περιίδης μηδὲ ἐπὶ
> πολὺ τιμωρήσῃ τὸν θρασύν. ἄπειρος ὤν, Ἔρως, ἔτι τῶν σῶν
> ὑπερηφάνουν· ἀλλὰ νῦν Ἀνθίαν ἡμῖν ἀπόδος· γενοῦ μὴ πικρὸς μόνον
> ἀντέχοντι, ἀλλ' <u>εὐεργέτης ἡττωμένῳ θεός</u>."

Firstly, the image of Eros erecting a trophy over his defeated enemy is analogous to the extended imagery of Amor/Cupid as a *triumphator* in *Am*. 1.2 (esp. 25-52) where Ovid is a prisoner of war in Cupid's triumph, and *Am*. 2.9 where Cupid is a commanding officer in triumph (*triumphus*, 16) shooting his own men; and Propertius asks whether it is any wonder that Amor triumphs over him (*mirum, si de me iure triumphat Amor*, 2.8.40). In *Am*. 1.2, having recognised Cupid's victory Ovid admits defeat and begs for forgiveness (*porrigimus uictas ad tua iura manus... pacem ueniamque rogamus*, 20f) just as Habrocomes does (νενίκηκας... σῶσον τὸν ἐπὶ σὲ καταπεφευγότα τὸν πάντων δεσπότην). In addition, Habrocomes characterises himself as 'of sound mind'/'chaste' (Ἀβροκόμου τοῦ σώφρονος), just as *Mens Bona* and *Pudor* are paraded as spoils in Cupid's triumph (*Mens Bona ducetur manibus post terga retortis/ et Pudor*, *Am*. 1.2.32; cf. Prop. 3.24.19).[111] Habrocomes is also

---

[111] *Mens Bona*/σωφροσύνη and *Pudor*/αἰδώς are both enemies of Cupid, cf. Mel. *A.P.* 12.23.4, 12.117.3; on the issue see McKeown (1989) 49.

described as throwing himself on the floor (ῥίψας ἑαυτὸν εἰς γῆν) and offering himself as a suppliant (ἱκέτην ἔχεις), which is precisely the language in which Propertius reproves the previously haughty Ponticus: *ecce* *iaces supplexque* *uenis ad iura puellae* (1.9.3; cf. p. 153-4).

Throughout these examples in Xenophon, it is predominantly Habrocomes who uses the military metaphors (in direct speech), rather than the narrator. On this basis we can safely pronounce that in Xenophon the presence of *militia amoris* functions as a means of characterisation. To this we can add that it is gendered: whilst *seruitium amoris*—or at least the use of 'master' in an erotic sense—is the province of Anthia, *miltia amoris* is the province of Habrocomes.

Chariton's employment of *militia amoris* differs from both Achilles and Xenophon, insofar as he delimits its effect to the antagonists alone. Unlike Clitophon and Habrocomes, Chaereas nowhere in his own voice articulates his relationship with Callirhoe in military terms. This is in contrast to the suitors in the first book: they 'fight' amongst one another until Envy assumes the lead in their 'war' against Chaereas (μαχόμενοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους ... ἐστρατολόγει δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὸν κατὰ Χαιρέου πόλεμον ὁ Φθόνος, 1.2.1); and the Agrigentine tyrant likewise canvasses to be voted in as a 'general' in their 'war' against Chaereas (χειροτονήσατέ με τοῦ πρὸς Χαιρέαν πολέμου στρατηγόν, 1.2.5). Elsewhere, after Chaereas is revealed in the Persian court to be alive (thus dashing the hopes of Dionysius) the narrator gnomically states that 'war between love-rivals is normal and spontaneous' (συνήθης μὲν οὖν καὶ πρόχειρος πᾶσι τοῖς ἀντερασταῖς πόλεμος, 5.8.4; cf. 5.8.6). There is an analogous use of *militia amoris* in Latin elegy, where love-rivals are 'enemies' (*hostes*) engaged in a war

against each other (Ov. *Am*. 1.9.18, 1.9.26, 2.10.16, 3.11.16; *Her*. 1.106, 6.82, 12.182; *Rem*. 791f; Prop. 1.11.7).

The antagonist Dionysius also indulges in the erotic metaphor, though in his case it serves to characterise his suit for Callirhoe as a war against *her*, rather than against any of his rivals. This ranges him with the likes of Clitophon rather than, for example, Habrocomes. Co-opting his servant Plangon in his suit for Callirhoe, Dionysius markets his attempt to woo her as a 'campaign' ("τὰ μὲν πρῶτά σοι" φησὶν "ἐστρατήγηται", 2.8.1) and offers himself as Plangon's 'ally' (σύμμαχον, 2.8.2; cf. Sappho fr. 1.28). Callirhoe, however, remains 'unconquered' (ἀήττητος, 2.8.2) whilst Dionysius is 'besieged on all sides' (πανταχόθεν δὲ ἦν ἐκπεπολιορκημένος, 2.8.1). In Chariton, then, *militia amoris* pervades firstly the discourse of the suitors who are at war with Chaereas (i.e. a rival), secondly the discourse of Dionysius who is at war with Callirhoe (i.e. a beloved), and thirdly the discourse of the narrator who endorses both types.

Further discussion is required in the case of Chaereas who eventually fights an actual war, joining the Egyptians in their revolt against the Persians after he is tricked into believing that Artaxerxes has awarded Callirhoe to Dionysius (7.1.3-8). The war, which ultimately results in the restoration of Callirhoe to Chaereas, literalises the series of metaphorical wars that have raged throughout the narrative. In this respect, Chariton sets the actual and the metaphorical into counterpoise, as he does with *seruitium*. And whilst Chaereas had not *himself* previously participated in the discourse of *militia* to characterise his erotic relations, here he spectacularly plays the role of *miles amoris*. At the beginning of the novel the narrator had likened Chaereas'

condition after seeing Callirhoe to a 'hero wounded in war' (ὥσπερ τις ἀριστεὺς ἐν πολέμῳ τρωθείς, 1.1.7),[112] proleptically signalling Chaereas' future military role. Only when war becomes *real* does Chaereas explicitly say that he will decide 'in war' who will win Callirhoe (δίκας <u>ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ</u> λήψομαι παρὰ τοῦ δικαστοῦ, 7.1.11). When he elects to lead the small contingent of three hundred men to sack Tyre, he is hailed as 'general' by the men ("ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἐπιθυμῶ στρατηγίας"... πάντες ἐπεβόησαν "σὺ στρατήγει.", 7.3.10). Unlike Achilles' antagonist Charmides, however, who conflates his actual and metaphorical military careers, Chaereas is a protagonist whose love for Callirhoe is reciprocated.

Ninus makes for a productive comparandum with Chariton. The protagonist of this novel, Ninus, is an actual soldier who departs to take up military duties against the Armenians (B.I.27; B.II-III contain material about troop deployment, and at B.III.32 he addresses his men before battle).[113] He also articulates his feelings for Semiramis in military terms.[114] His discourse constitutes a mixture of metaphorical and literal slavery and warfare. There is a fragmentary hint at erotic enslavement (δουλω-, A.I.25), and Ninus tells his aunt Derkeia (Semiramis' mother) that, as 'master' over many people, he could have extorted sexual relations from any of his subjects (A.II.8-15):

> διελθὼν γὰρ τοσαύτην γῆν καὶ τοσούτων <u>δεσπόσας</u> ἐθνῶν ἢ δορικτήτων ἢ πατρῴωι κράτει θεραπευόντων με καὶ προσκυνούντων ἐδυνάμην εἰς κόρον ἐκπλῆσαι πᾶσαν ἀπόλαυσιν·

> Having traversed so much land and become master of so many peoples who submitted to my spear or because of my father's power served me

---

[112] Cf. Clitophon's 'erotic wound' when he first sees Leucippe (Ach. 1.4.4); also Hel. 7.10.2, where Arsace tells Cybele that her first sight of Theagenes engenders a 'war'.

[113] S-W (1995) 23-71 treat the fragments. Line numbering and translations are from this edition.

[114] With more of the *Sesonchosis*, we might know whether the soldier Sesonchosis uses military metaphors in an erotic context.

and paid obeisance to me, I could have taken my full satisfaction of every pleasure.

Ninus' traversing of the land and mastery over subject peoples is assimilated to the potentially coercive sexual relations that determine the dynamic between empire and its subjects.[115] Ninus admits that he is 'conquered by Eros' (ὑπ[ὸ] τοῦ θεοῦ νικῶμαι, A.II.18f) and is Semiramis' 'prisoner of war' (νῦν δὲ τῆς ὑμετέρας θυγατρὸς... [αἰ]χμάλωτος ἄχρι τίνος ἑαλωκὼς ἀρνήσομαι; A.II.27-31). This ranges Ninus with Habrocomes who describes himself as an αἰχμάλωτος of Eros (Xen. 1.3.2); it also assimilates him to those antagonists who exercise physical mastery but are metaphorically enslaved, as well as those who engender a slippage between real and metaphorical epistemological modes. If we had more of the text, we could ascertain to what extent he is in dialogue with the 'historical' Ninus, imprisoned by his courtesan Semiramis who takes the throne (Diod. Sic. 2.20.3; Plut. *Erot.* 753d-e), and is then killed by her (Ctesias *ap.* Diod. Sic. 2.5.2). Indeed, Diodorus is explicit that Ninus himself was erotically enslaved to Semiramis: συνέβαινε τὸν ἄνδρα τελέως ὑπ᾽ αὐτῆς δεδουλῶσθαι (2.5.2; cf. Prop. 3.11.21-8).[116]

Ninus' language bears some resemblance to the soldier Charmides in Achilles. As part of his petition to Derkeia, Ninus alludes to the imminent wars he must fight against the Armenians and the uncertainties war brings as urging a hasty marriage to Semiramis (A.III.20-30):

---

[115] Interestingly in this context, there is a basilica in Aphrodisias (previously called Ninoë after its founder Ninus) depicting Ninus in Roman imperial garb, on which see Erim (1986) 25-7.
[116] The *Ninus* is the only novel, fragmentary or extant, whose protagonists are explicitly mentioned by the Latin elegists; is it possible, therefore, that the novel predates the elegists, who are in turn aware of the novel?

ἀλλὰ ναυτιλίαι μ' ἐκδέχονται καὶ <u>ἐκ πολέμων πόλεμοι</u> καὶ οὐδὲ <u>ἄτολμος</u> ἐγὼ καὶ βοηθὸν ἀσφαλείας <u>δειλίαν</u> προκαλυπτόμενος... σπευσάτω τὸ ἀστάθμητον καὶ ἀτέκμαρτον τῶν ἐκδεχομένων με χρόνων.

Sea journeys await me, and wars upon wars; and I am certainly no coward nor as an assistant to my safety will I hide behind a veil of cravenness... Let the uncertainty and incalculability of the times that lie ahead of me urge haste.

Like Charmides, Ninus presses the need for immediate congress (or, in this case, marriage) on the basis of the uncertainties of war. He also participates in the discourse of masculinity, claiming to be no coward (ἄτολμος; δειλίαν). Elsewhere, Ninus' mother Thambe asks Semiramis in rhetorical disbelief whether Ninus has raped her 'like a warrior returning from victories and triumphs': ἀπὸ τῶν κατορθω[μάτων] καὶ τροπαίων ἐπανε[λθὼν] οἷ[α πο]λεμιστής (A.V.17-9). Ninus is therefore linked to the actual and erotic military sphere both by himself and others.

1.5   Conclusion

In this chapter I hope to have established that the novelists exhibit a predilection for metaphors of slavery and war—metaphors that are codified as generic signifiers by the Latin elegists—and appropriate them in order to characterise erotic interpersonal relations between characters. As such, the evidence I have presented indicates that the novelists are not only aware of the generic precedent set by the elegists, but also that they are developing it. Nor is their use of the metaphors unilateral; rather, they modulate them in a variety of ways.

Seruitium amoris in the novels functions to destabilise reciprocity. Hence, when it attaches to an antagonist, it is not reciprocated. The exception, of course, is

Clitophon in Achilles, whose literary agenda is clearly one of generic re-orientation. Though aware of the generic code informing Clitophon's strategy of courtship, Leucippe is explicit about the fact that she does *not* want to be called a 'mistress', i.e., she does *not* want to participate in the discourse determining Clitophon's elegiac world-view. The metaphor also serves to disturb and collapse the boundary between the real and metaphorical. This happens whenever the issue is thematised (as it is by Leucippe in Achilles), and when one mode is privileged over the other (as when Chaereas canonises the metaphorical mode in his official account at the end of the novel). I have also suggested that this can be read in the context of Greco-Roman imperial relations: the Greek elite may prefer to imagine a world in which their metaphorical (cultural) power over Rome trumps Rome's actual power over them.

Militia amoris likewise takes on a range of hues. Clitophon (and his slave Satyros) casts his suit for Leucippe in military terms; and, in a sophisticated fusion of actual and metaphorical, the soldier Charmides thematises the real and figurative wars he must wage (as does Ninus). I have tentatively suggested that Charmides the Egyptian may well owe something to the putative father of Latin elegy Cornelius Gallus, whose poetic and military career may have been known in Egypt. In Xenophon, where *seruitium amoris* is a gendered discourse—it is predominantly the female Anthia who addresses Habrocomes as 'master'—*militia amoris* seems to be the preserve of the male Habrocomes. Likewise in Xenophon it is primarily the direct speech of the protagonist Habrocomes, rather than the narrator, that markets him as a metaphorical soldier; this is in contrast to Chariton where it is only the antagonist Dionysius who characterises himself as such (fighting a war against Callirhoe) and the narrator who characterises Chaereas as such (fighting a war against love-rivals). I

have also suggested that the military metaphor taps into contemporary ideas about what it means to be a 'man' in the Second Sophistic under the *Pax Romana*.

In many cases the use of *seruitium* and *militia amoris* confirms not only intertextual connections between the novels and the code-model of Latin elegy, but also between the novels themselves. I hope that the exploration of the subtle range of similarities and differences between the novels in this regard has served as an entry point for a better understanding of their sophisticated literary strategies (and socio-cultural positions) vis-à-vis Latin literature and Roman power.

Chapter 2

Chariton, Vergil, and Rome

2.1   Introduction

Chariton begins his novel by announcing himself as a native of Aphrodisias (Χαρίτων

Ἀφροδισιεύς, 1.1.1), the chief city of Caria in Asia Minor. Aphrodisias and Rome

enjoyed extremely close relations in the late Republican and Imperial periods, a

relationship from which Aphrodisias derived much benefit.[1] Augustus' freedman C.

Julius Zoilus instituted a rebuilding programme in the city, which included a temple

of Aphrodite; and a Sebasteion, begun under Tiberius and finished under Nero

(including a major phase under Claudius), featured images of Roman military

conquest (see p. 25 and 208).[2] A number of arguments have therefore been advanced

to the effect that Chariton's novel encodes aspects of the relationship between Rome

and Aphrodisias (and the Greek elite more generally). Laplace, for example, detects in

Chaereas' and Callirhoe's son the figure of Aeneas, and therefore an aetiology of the

Julio-Claudian clan;[3] Edwards argues extensively that the novel reflects Aphrodisian

civic pride, on the basis of the dominant role allotted to Aphrodite (and her human

surrogate Callirhoe) in the narrative, and the importance of Venus Genetrix for the

Julio-Claudians.[4] Whitmarsh suggests that 'Chariton's celebration of Aphrodite as a

---

[1] See Reynolds (1982), Erim (1986) esp. 28-32, 80-3, 106-30, 136-8, Tilg (2010) 24-5 and 283-5.
[2] On the monument of Zoilus see Smith (1993); on the Sebasteion reliefs see Smith (1987), (1988), (1990), (2013). On the Cult of Aphrodite in Aphrodisias see Brody (2007); on ruler cult in Aphrodisias see Reynolds (1996).
[3] Laplace (1980) 121-5.
[4] Edwards (1991), (1994), (1996), (1998), Biraud (1996), Alvares (1997) on the importance of Aphrodite in the novel. Edwards (1991) 200 observes that Josephus, Chariton, and the author of the *Luke-Acts* are all from the Greek East, and 'all use religion as a power base that implicitly or explicitly redefines for their audience the "web of power" existing between Rome and members of the Greek East'; likewise, Josephus represents the Jewish God as standing behind Roman success and power in the Jewish Wars; he also notes (194) that 'during the Imperial period it was common for women in

benevolent power reuniting the lovers despite their trials and sufferings offers itself as an analogy at the divine level to the Roman emperor's governing of the empire at the political', whilst Connors presents the case for reading the novel as an allegorical reinforcement of Augustus' legitimacy as a ruler; for her, the 'son' of Dionysius (that is, the biological son of Chaereas and Callirhoe) serves as a fictional surrogate for Dionysius I of Sicily;[5] by identifying Augustus with the positive tradition of Dionysius I transmitted by the court historiographer Philistus of Syracuse (*FGrH* 556 F 57, 58)—whom we know Augustus to have read—Chariton authorises Augustus' autocratic rule.[6] Others detect in the novel a *criticism of* rather that *accommodation with* Rome.[7] In addition, the presence of Rome has been felt in Chariton's depiction of Persia,[8] as well as in other anachronistic features.[9]

---

major political families (most notably those of the emperors) to be associated with deities such as Aphrodite', for example Caligula's mother and sister Drusilla were the 'New Aphrodite' (on which see Magie (1950) vol.1.512), and at Assos in Turkey a bath was dedicated to Julia Aphrodite (Livia).

[5] Whitmarsh (2011) 55; Connors (2002).

[6] See Sordi (1984) on Augustus as a reader of Philistus. Tilg (2010) 294 observes that Augustus calls his place of *otium* 'Syracuse' (Suet. *Aug*. 72).

[7] Swain (1996) 101-31, Lalanne (2006), Alvares (2001-2), (2007), Haynes (2003) 161-2, Smith (2007) *passim*; Tilg (2010) 292 argues that friendly Roman-Aphrodisian relations militate against such a view.

[8] Schwartz (2003) argues that Persia and its trappings signifies Rome: the King's φίλοι reflect the *amici principis*, and his armed escort the *cohors praetoria*; cf. also Baslez (1992) 202-4, C.P. Jones (1992) 165. See Karabélias (1990) 393-5 on Roman administrative practice in the Babylonian court in Books 5-6. The estate of the Carian satrap Mithridates bears a resemblance to Roman-era *latifundia* (Alvares (2001-2) 121-2, (2007) 12); the crucifixions that take place there (4.2.5-6) perhaps recall the notorious incident in which four hundred household slaves were crucified (Tac. *Ann*. 14.42). The role of 'freedmen' in the Persian court (5.4.6) and the influence of the eunuch Artaxates over the King (6.3.4-8, 6.4.10, 6.5.5) may well reflect the *familia Caesaris*, and perhaps even more specifically the power of freedmen over Tiberius, Claudius, and Nero (Alvares (2001-2) 122 n. 38, Schwartz (2003) 387). On the influence of *amici* and freedmen see Millar (1977) 69-83, 119-20.

[9] The Temple of Homonoia in which Dionysius and Callirhoe get married (3.2.16) belongs to the Hellenistic and Roman eras, but is especially associated with Tiberius' temple and the political rhetoric of Vespasian, Trajan, and Hadrian (see Plepelits (1976) 174 n. 81, Alvares (1997) 619, Ruiz-Montero (1989) 114; cf. Bowie (2006a) 3). Homonoia features on Aphrodisian coins, cf. Reynolds (1982) doc. 1, 6-7. For the link between *Concordia* and marital harmony in imperial iconography see e.g. Levick (2014) 91-118.

Of course, the issue is more ideologically complex than a case 'for' or 'against', as all the scholars I have cited realise.[10] In this chapter I shall not only demonstrate that Chariton is engaging closely with Vergil, Ovid, and a spectrum of Roman imperial themes, but also how these engagements contribute to his socio-political agenda, namely, that of negotiating one's Greek identity under the Roman empire.

Over the past century, three scholars have explicitly endorsed a direct connection between Chariton and Vergil. Cataudella chose the fourth book of the *Aeneid* because of its erotic content as the basis for a short study in which he lists a number of correspondences between the two works (which he classes as 'undeniable'). Tilg is the most recent scholar to build on these suggestions: he focuses on the role of Rumour in the *Aeneid* and Chariton (as well as the fragmentary *Chione*), and establishes two larger-scale connections between the narratives (that of a second marriage and a baby, and the complexly worked out psychologies of Dido and Callirhoe). He ultimately disavows any political implications, and prefers to see Chariton as simply re-writing *Aeneid* 4 in a romantic vein with a happy ending. One might add in the context of knowledge of Dido and Aeneas that the Athenian grammarian Ateius, brought from Athens to Rome as a prisoner (probably in 86 BCE), composed a work entitled *An amauerit Didun Aeneas* (Charisius *GL* I p.127, 18 K).[11] Lastly, Scourfield's work on the emotion of anger as a plot-motor in Chariton briefly proposes a connection between Juno's *ira* in the *Aeneid* and Aphrodite's in Chariton; both become reconciled with the protagonists at the end of their respective

---

[10] Smith (2007) 198 is representative: 'exalting the power of Venus Aphrodite, the πάθος ἐρωτικόν pays literary tribute to the ruling dynasty at Rome, but with its depiction of the erotic undoing of the Persian King, Eros' supreme victim in the narrative, Chariton's novel also offers a vision, however temporary, of imperial power dissolved... The narrative also yields evidence of resistance to empire.'

[11] On Ateius' acquisition of Latin see Rochette (1997) 222.

narratives.[12] I shall not rehearse the evidence set forth by these scholars (most extensively by Tilg) except in those cases where I think the argument should be developed. The net will be cast wider than the fourth book of the *Aeneid*, and in the process I shall, *pace* Tilg, stake out some of the political ramifications of Chariton's engagement with Vergil and attempt to place them within a wider ideological framework.

Dating Chariton's novel is a difficult task because we are forced to rely (in the main) on internal criteria, on which basis it is usually dated somewhere between the late first century BCE and the early second century CE.[13] The external evidence is equally shaky. The Roman satirist Persius recommends a work called *Callirhoe* for weak readers (*Sat*. 1.134), though this may well refer to a range of things other than Chariton's novel (for example a pantomime or a prostitute);[14] and Philostratus' letter (*Ep*. 66) to a certain Chariton refers to his λόγοι in a negative context, though again we cannot be sure that he means Chariton of Aphrodisias.[15] If we accept the identification of Philostratus' reference then we have a *terminus ante quem* of the

---

[12] Cataudella (1927), quote at 312, Scourfield (2003) 167-8, Tilg (2010) esp. 242-97, with Hardie (2012) 115 on Rumour in Chariton and Achilles 6.10.2-6. Irmscher (1985) 282 agrees with Cataudella; Hunter (1983) 77 and Ruiz-Montero (1994) 1009 acknowledge Cataudella's findings, but ultimately disavow the possibility of direct allusion. Reviewing Tilg (2010), Montiglio (2011) 161 thinks that 'the hypothesis of Virgil's influence on Chariton seems at odds with the novelist's careful avoidance of everything Roman'. Tilg (2010) 146-7, 149-55 suggests that the second-marriage motif may well derive from the type of narrative typified by Aristides' *Milesiaka*, on which see Harrison (1998) in the context of the Roman novels, and Fakas (2005) on the Sybaritic connection in Chariton. Johne (1987) and (1996) 170 argues that Dido and Heliodorus' Charikleia are characterologically similar. Hutchinson (2013) 184-6 discusses several stylistic/rhetorical resemblances between Chariton and declaimers in Seneca the Elder.

[13] Reardon (1996) 312-19, Anderson (2014) 13. Papanikolaou (1973) 160-3 argues for a first century BCE date on linguistic grounds, with cautionary remarks in Giangrande (1974). Alperowitz (1992) 153-4 suggests a BCE date, linking Chariton with the promotion of the cult of Venus by Julius Caesar and Augustus. See Ruiz-Montero (1989), (1991), (1994) 1008-12 for arguments for a CE date on linguistic grounds. Tilg (2010) 36-79 reviews the evidence, settling on a date between 19 BCE and 62 CE; cf. Bowie (2002) 55.

[14] Tilg (2010) 69-78 surveys the evidence. Goold (1995) 4-5, Reardon (1996) 315-17, and Bowie (2002) 54, 58 do think that Persius refers to Chariton's novel, *pace* Morgan (2009) 44. Connors (2002) 24 suggests that Persius' barbed comment towards Callirhoe could reflect his anti-imperial sentiments.

[15] Perry (1967) 98-9, Bowie (1994) 444-5, (1996) 102, Reardon (1996) 313 all argue for the identification with our Chariton. Tilg (2010) 79-80 reviews the evidence.

early third century CE. Broadly speaking two camps have emerged: those favouring a Neronian date, and those favouring a Flavian/Trajanic/Hadrianic date. Those in support of a Neronian date point, among other things, to Chaereas' 'murder' of his wife with a kick to the belly: this could be a live issue after Nero's killing of his pregnant wife Poppaea in similar circumstances (Suet. *Ner.* 35.2), though it is also a historiographical trope attaching to tyrants.[16] In support of a later date the most frequent argument put forward is the homonymy between Chaereas' love-rival Dionysius of Miletus and the Hadrianic sophist Dionysius of Miletus whom Hadrian made governor (Philostr. *V.S.* 524; cf. Cassius Dio 69.3.4-5).[17] None of the arguments in this chapter hinge on a precise date, though I shall in fact argue that Chariton is interested in Augustus as the first Princeps.

Chariton's access to Latin (and the *Aeneid* more specifically) needs to be addressed. Tilg argues that Chariton could have read the *Aeneid* in the original Latin or in Greek translation, or that he could have seen a pantomime depicting Dido and

---

[16] See Hunter (1994) 1080 on this issue, and Ameling (1986) for other historiographical instances; to this evidence I would add that both Callirhoe and Poppaea are known for their beauty and had sumptuous funerals (Char. 1.6.2-5; Tac. *Ann.* 16.6), on the latter of whom see Champlin (2003) 105. Bowie (2002) 55 also adduces the homonymy of Chariton's Chaereas and the commander of the praetorian guard, Cassius Chaerea, who assassinated Caligula: both he and Chaereas are known for their anger (Cassius is *animi ferox*, Tac. *Ann.* 1.32). For Chariton's complex relationship with actual historical events (including the role of Sicily, Hermocrates, Dionysius I, and the Egyptian revolt) see Naber (1901), W. Bartsch (1934), F. Zimmerman (1961), Salmon (1961), Perry (1967) 77-8, Schmeling (1974) 51-56, 76-80, Plepelits (1976) 16-17, Bompaire (1977), Billault (1981), (1989), Alvares (1993), Hunter (1994), Luginbill (2000), Liviabella Furiani (2010).

[17] C.P. Jones (1992), Baslez (1992), *pace* Bowie (2002) 54 who argues that Chariton would be offending a powerful man in *prouincia Asia*; Morgan (2007a) 24 n. 3 thinks that no such offence would be incurred. In many respects Chariton's Dionysius is representative of the Greek elite of the imperial period and their relationship with Rome from the Flavian period onward. For example his house is built to receive the Persian King (1.13.1), and emperors like Hadrian often stayed with members of the high aristocracy in their travels (Alvares (2001-2) 128 n. 63); his grand train of wagons, horses, and large number of freedmen (2.3.3) may reflect Polemo in Philostratus (*V.S.* 532; Bowie (1977) 93-4); Mithridates' and Pharnaces' interactions with Dionysius reflect the way Roman imperial officials deal with Greek elites (Edwards (1994) 703-12, Alvares (2001-2) 121); Pharnaces petitions the Great King on behalf of Dionysius (4.6.4), reflecting letters of appeal and recommendation sent to the emperor (Schwartz (1998) 68-71); Artaxerxes' promotion of Dionysius (7.5.15) reflects Hadrian's appointment of Dionysius as equestrian governor (C.P. Jones (1992) 165).

Aeneas. He tentatively concludes that his access was through a Greek translation.[18] In the following chapter I shall argue for Chariton's direct knowledge of Latin erotic and exilic elegy, and in this chapter I shall make the case for Chariton's direct knowledge of the *Aeneid* (though of course he may in addition have encountered the *Aeneid* in other languages and media—could the ποιητὴς Ῥωμαϊκός in the inscriptions from Aphrodisias and Ephesus (see section 0.5) suggest a performance?). Living in the Roman centre of Aphrodisias he would certainly have been exposed to Latin.[19]

Finally, and significantly in the context of the *Aeneid*, the Sebasteion is again relevant, and offers definitive proof of an awareness of the Aeneas legend in Aphrodisias: among the group of dedications to the imperial family, a statue base has been recovered in honour of 'Aeneas son of Anchises': *uacat* Αἰνή[αν ? *uacat*] / *uacat* Ἀγχίσ[ου] ? *uacat*] (*IAph2007* 9.35);[20] and the reliefs of the south portico feature the flight of Aeneas from Troy (probably flanked by a Poseidon story and the birth of Eros from Aphrodite).[21]

2.2   Callirhoe in Syracuse and Ionia

Over the course of the first four books of the novel there are a number of passages that echo Vergil. These appear in a variety of contexts and in connection with a number of

---

[18] Tilg (2010) 285-91.

[19] Though Aphrodisias has not yet produced any Latin inscriptions from the first and second centuries CE, Chaniotis (2003) 250-1 with n. 4 discusses Latin borrowings in Aphrodisian inscriptions.

[20] See Reynolds (1986) 112. Cf. also the epitaph of Herodes Atticus' Roman wife Regilla, which describes her as ἣ δὲ πολυκτεάνων μὲν ἔην ἐξ Αἰνεαδάων,/ Ἀγχίσεω κλυτὸν αἷμα καὶ Ἰδαίης Ἀφροδίτης (*IGUR* 3.115 lines 4-5).

[21] For the reconstruction of the possible order of reliefs, see Smith (1987) 133. Cf. the altar to the *Gens Augusta* in Carthage (dedicated by P. Perelius Hedulus), which contains images of Apollo, Roma, and the flight of Aeneas, on which see Poinssot (1929).

characters, and it is therefore hard to systematise the Vergilian allusions into any sort of cohesive pattern.

Callirhoe's relations with Chaereas precipitate a number of Vergilian correspondences. In the first instance, after Callirhoe's marriage to Chaereas has (unbeknownst to her) been arranged, she swoons: ἡ δὲ παρθένος οὐδὲν εἰδυῖα τούτων ἔρριπτο ἐπὶ τῆς κοίτης ἐγκεκαλυμμένη, κλαίουσα καὶ σιωπῶσα (1.1.14); and after Chaereas has kicked Callirhoe in the stomach, she falls, and has to be propped onto her bed by her maids: ἐρριμμένην δὲ αὐτὴν αἱ θεραπαινίδες βαστάσασαι κατέκλιναν ἐπὶ τὴν κοίτην (1.4.12). Cataudella detects an analogous situation after Dido has issued a curse to Aeneas: *suscipiunt famulae conlapsaque membra/ marmoreo referunt thalamo stratisque reponunt* (4.391f; cf. *conlapsam aspiciunt comites*, 4.664).[22] In addition, Chaereas is said to prefer that his 'dead' wife Callirhoe is cremated along with his belongings: ἐπεθύμει γάρ, εἰ δυνατὸν ἦν, πᾶσαν τὴν οὐσίαν συγκαταφλέξαι τῇ γυναικί (1.6.4). This seems to me to be a direct allusion to Dido's self-immolation on the pyre along with the *dulces exuuiae* (4.650), which signify her relationship with Aeneas. In Chariton this is obviously impossible as Callirhoe is alive and he cannot burn the female protagonist alive at the beginning of the novel. Chaereas' preference therefore gestures towards the tragic ending of Dido and Aeneas' affair, but it is a narrative alternative that Chariton shuts down.[23]

---

[22] Cataudella (1927) 305, Tilg (2010) 273. Cataudella (1927) 307 also notes the general correspondence between Callirhoe's angry suitors who feel insulted and band together (1.2.1) and Iarbas in the *Aeneid* (4.198-218). Tilg (2010) 274 n. 3 suggests that the *Odyssey* may be a more suitable model. I would also suggest that, as in the case of the *Chione* narrative, spurned suitors are a plot motor in the second half of the *Aeneid*. Both Livy (1.2.1, 1.3.1) and Dion. Hal. (*Ant. Rom.* 1.59-60, 64, 70) include the Lavinia motive in their accounts, but Vergil goes back to an earlier version (Cato *ap.* Serv. *ad* Aen. 1.267, 4.620) in which Turnus joins the Latins against the Trojan incomers, and combines it with the story about Lavinia.

[23] Tilg (2010) 108, 277-8 briefly adverts to Parthenope's potential death by fire, adducing Bārtānubā's suttee at the end of the Persian version of *Metiochus and Parthenope* (*M.S.P.* 9.3). Cf. Evadne at Eur. *Suppl.* 990-1071.

Dreams of 'dead' spouses are another recurrent area in which Chariton owes something to Vergil and the motif of a second marriage.[24] Dionysius is overwhelmed with grief at the death of his wife and recounts to his servant Leonas a dream he has had in which his 'unlucky wife' (τῆς ἀθλίας, 2.1.2) appeared to him 'larger' and almost real, as she was on their wedding day (2.1.2):

καὶ γὰρ εἶδον αὐτὴν ὄναρ ἐναργῶς μείζονά τε καὶ κρείττονα γεγενημένην,
καὶ ὡς ὕπαρ μοι συνῆν. ἔδοξα δὲ εἶναι τὴν πρώτην ἡμέραν τῶν γάμων.

Leonas, having recently purchased Callirhoe, tells Dionysius that his dream does indeed portend marriage (2.1.3). During the destruction of Troy Aeneas is met by his dead wife Creusa's 'unlucky ghost' who appears 'larger' than before: *infelix simulacrum atque ipsius umbra Creusae/ uisa mihi ante oculos et nota maior imago* (2.772f).[25] In her speech to him, she tells him of a future royal bride (Lavinia, the *regia coniunx*, 2.783), just as Leonas assures Dionysius that his dream portends marriage with Callirhoe.

There is another relevant dream replete with Vergilian echoes. Contemplating the abortion of her unborn child, Callirhoe falls asleep and dreams that the ghost of Chaereas, whom she believes to be dead, addresses her. Chariton describes his appearance through a direct quotation of an Iliadic passage in which the ghost of Patroclus appears: πάντ' αὐτῷ μέγεθός τε καὶ ὄμματα κάλ' ἐϊκυῖα, καὶ φωνήν, καὶ

---

[24] See Auger (1983) for the structural importance of dreams in Chariton.
[25] See Austin (1964) and Horsfall (2008) *ad loc*. The larger size of ghosts is conventional in Latin literature, e.g. Ov. *Fast*. 2.503, Suet. *Claud*. 2, Pliny Ep. 7.27.2, Tac. *Hist*. 4.83.1, Juv. 13.220f. Laplace (1980) 113 reports Odyssean instances in which humans look bigger (though never in the context of ghosts or dreams).

τοῖα περὶ χροῒ εἵματα ἔστο (2.9.6; cf. Hom. *Il.* 23.66f).[26] Chaereas advocates the preservation of his son: "παρατίθεμαί σοι" φησίν, "ὦ γύναι, τὸν υἱόν." (2.9.6).[27] This is an exact reflection of the words spoken by Creusa's ghost to Aeneas: *iamque uale et nati serua communis amorem* (2.789; cf. Prop. 4.11.73);[28] and the idea of a 'child in common' recurs as a factor in Artaxerxes' adjudication in the trial (τέκνον ἔχουσι κοινόν, 6.1.3).[29] In Callirhoe's dream, Chaereas is described as wanting to continue speaking but, eager to embrace him, Callirhoe leaps up (dissolving the dream and Chaereas' presence therein): ἔτι δὲ βουλομένου λέγειν ἀνέθορεν ἡ Καλλιρόη, θέλουσα αὐτῷ περιπλακῆναι (2.9.6).[30] Aeneas is likewise described as wanting to continue to speak, but Creusa's image deserts him as he attempts to embrace her (2.790-2):

> haec ubi dicta dedit, lacrimantem et multa uolentem
> dicere deseruit, tenuisque recessit in auras.
> ter conatus ibi collo dare bracchio circum...

The attempt to embrace a ghost is obviously conventional,[31] but the detail of 'wanting to speak' further is not. Lyne coins the 'cut-off technique' as a motif peculiar to Vergil, and argues that it serves to characterise the disrupted and frustrated nature of Aeneas' interpersonal relations throughout the poem.[32] What is interesting here is that, whereas in Vergil it is Aeneas who wants to say more to the ghost of Creusa, in

---

[26] On Chariton's engagement with Homer, see Papanikolaou (1973) 14-16, Müller (1976) and (1981), Biraud (1985), Fusillo (1989) 27-8, Robiano (2000), Manuwald (2000).

[27] At 2.11.3 Callirhoe quotes these words of Chaereas in an effort to justify her decision to marry Dionysius. She reuses a similar verb in her letter to Dionysius at the end of the novel: τὸν κοινὸν υἱόν, ὃν παρακατατίθημί σοι ἐκτρέφειν (8.4.5). Schwartz (1999) 33 discusses the use of the verb in Callirhoe's letter.

[28] Eur. *Alc.* 375, 377 presents a similar situation. For other literary and inscriptional comparanda see Hutchinson (2006) 244-5 *ad* Prop. 4.11.73.

[29] Canace's child is a nasty reminder of her incestuous affair with her brother Macareus: *nate, parum fausti miserabile pignus amoris* (Ov. *Her.* 11.113).

[30] Other characters want to say more at 2.7.5, 3.8.9, 7.1.11.

[31] E.g. Hom. *Il.* 23.99-101, *Od.* 11.206-8, Verg. *Aen.* 6.700-2.

[32] Lyne (1987) 146. Cf. also *Aen.* 4.390f, 10.554f.

Chariton it is the ghost of Chaereas who wishes to say more to the live Callirhoe. This is a neat reversal of a Vergilian moment, which has been smuggled in under the cover of a nearby Homeric quotation.

In addition, Chaereas' speech act directly recalls that of the ghostly Hector, who appears (in a bedraggled state) to Aeneas in a dream and tells him that Troy commends the Penates to him: *sacra suosque tibi commendat Troia penatis* (2.293).[33] If, as Laplace argues, Callirhoe's child is in some sense a reflection of Aeneas (and an aetiology of the foundation of the Roman empire), then the assimilation of Callirhoe's child to the Trojan Penates lends support to the claim.[34] In this connection it is relevant that Callirhoe later has a dream in which Chaereas appears chained, after he has just been described as working with chains on his feet in an enforced labour-camp on Mithridates' Carian estate (3.7.3-4):

> ἐκεῖ δὲ πέδας σύροντες παχείας εἰργάζοντο τὰ Μιθριδάτου. Καλλιρόη δὲ ὄναρ ἐπέστη Χαιρέας δεδεμένος καὶ θέλων αὐτῇ προσελθεῖν, ἀλλὰ μὴ δυνάμενος· ἀνεκώκυσε δὲ μέγα καὶ διωλύγιον ἐν τοῖς ὕπνοις "Χαιρέα, δεῦρο."

Hector likewise appears to Aeneas in a disposition that reflects his circumstances. His feet have been pierced by thongs (*perque pedes traiectus lora tumentis*, 2.273), and Chaereas (and Polycharmus) drags heavy fetters (πέδας σύροντες παχείας) presumably on their feet; indeed, πέδας 'fetters' constitutes a bilingual transliteration

---

[33] The epic prototype is Patroclus' appearance to Achilles (Hom. *Il*. 23.66-107), but the act of commending the child is Vergilian. When Dionysius proposes that they build a tomb for Chaereas, he asks Callirhoe to imagine him quoting the lines spoken by Patroclus requesting burial (*Il*. 23.71).

[34] Laplace (1980) 121-5. I do not necessarily accept every claim made by Laplace, but acknowledge that it is possible to see in Callirhoe's child, and his future East-West movement from Miletus to Syracuse, hints of Aeneas.

of *pedes* 'feet', whilst the thickness of the fetters (παχείας) echo Hector's 'swollen' feet (*tumentis*).[35]

Callirhoe's preoccupation with her 'dead' spouse Chaereas in the face of a new suit from Dionysius is an obvious reflection of Dido's own anxieties about breaking faith with the dead Sychaeus (*Aen*. 1.720f, 4.20f, esp. 4.552);[36] and both Callirhoe and Dido ultimately revert to their original partners, though Dido and Sychaeus only re-unite in the *Lugentes campi* (6.473f).[37] Hence there is another obvious model for Callirhoe's dream, in which Dido dreams of her dead spouse Sychaeus; he appears to her unburied (thus recalling Patroclus) and tells her of her brother Pygmalion's crime of murder: *ipsa sed in somnis inhumati uenit imago/ coniugis ora modis attollens pallida miris...* (1.353f).[38] Following her meeting with Plangon, Callirhoe presses the image of Chaereas, which she has on her ring (discussed in section 3.3), towards her womb and unborn baby, and claims that nothing is dearer to her than not re-marrying: θέλω γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν <u>Χαιρέου μόνου γυνή</u>. τοῦτό μοι καὶ γονέων ἥδιον καὶ πατρίδος καὶ τέκνου, <u>πεῖραν ἀνδρὸς ἑτέρου μὴ λαβεῖν</u> (2.11.1).[39] The central clause is an Odyssean reminiscence (*Od*. 9.34), but the idea of attachment to one man alone, even after his death, reflects the peculiarly

[35] Dido, in her isolation, also dreams of Aeneas (*in somnis ferus Aeneas*, 4.466). Cataudella (1927) 310 likewise links the King's lovesick disposition while hunting to Dido's: ἔβλεπε δὲ Καλλιρόην μόνην τὴν μὴ παροῦσαν, καὶ ἤκουεν ἐκείνης τῆς μὴ λαλούσης (6.4.5); *illum absens absentem auditque uidetque* (4.83). On the close proximity of the hunt in Chariton (6.4.1-10) and Vergil (4.129-59) see Cataudella (1927) 309-10; in the fragmentary *Calligone* (*PSI* 981), Calligone curses the day she saw Eraseinos at the hunt, her eyes, and Artemis (lines 16-20), to which Ruiz-Montero (2011) 396 n. 2 links the passages in Chariton and the *Aeneid*.
[36] Phinney (1965) argues that Dido's breach of loyalty with respect to Sychaeus is modelled on Hypsipyle and Medea in Apollonius; in Dido's loyalty to the dead Sychaeus G.S. West (1983) detects a reminiscence of Andromache.
[37] Tilg (2010) 276 recognises the situational parallel. Cataudella (1927) 307 adduces the fact that both Dionysius and Dido reassure Callirhoe and Aeneas (respectively) that they have suffered similar bereavements: διήγησαί μοι, Καλλιρόη, τὰ σαυτῆς. οὐ πρὸς ἀλλότριον ἐρεῖς· ἔστι γάρ τις καὶ τρόπου συγγένεια (2.5.8); *me quoque per multos similis fortuna labores* (1.628).
[38] The reference remains unexplored by Tilg (2010) 276.
[39] Chaereas himself, in a private moment, admits that he expects Callirhoe to be a *uniuira* if he dies (3.6.6).

Roman ideology of *uniuiratus*.[40] Again, allusion to the *Aeneid* is smuggled in in proximity to an overtly Homeric intertext.

Callirhoe's decision (at Dionysius' suggestion) to build a cenotaph for the 'dead' Chaereas strengthens the argument for a direct connection to Dido and Sychaeus.[41] She chooses as a site for the cenotaph a spot nearby the shrine of Aphrodite, so that it will serve to remind posterity of their love: ἤρεσε δὲ αὐτῇ πλησίον τοῦ νεὼ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς αὐτόθι ἔχειν <u>ἔρωτος ὑπόμνημα</u> (4.1.4).[42] This neatly inverts Dido's capacity to *forget* Sychaeus, when Cupid (in the guise of Ascanius) sits on her lap and causes her memory of the dead Sychaeus to cede to desire for the live Aeneas:

<div style="text-align:center">at memor ille</div>

matris Acidaliae paulatim <u>abolere Sychaeum</u>
incipit et uiuo temptat praeuertere amore
iam pridem resides animos desuetaque corda.

Sychaeus' claim on Dido's conscience intervenes when, having failed to persuade Aeneas to stay in Carthage, Dido begins seeing deathly portents. We learn that she has built a temple in honour of Sychaeus, from which she can now hear his voice (4.457-61):

praeterea fuit in tectis de marmore templum
coniugis antiqui, miro quod honore colebat,
uelleribus niueis et festa fronde reuinctum:
hinc exaudiri uoces et uerba uocantis
uisa uiri.

---

[40] On the concept of *uniuiratus* in epitaphic practice, see Koetting (1973). The adjective μόνανδρος occurs only in inscriptions, of which one is from Syracuse (*IG* 14.191).

[41] Cf. Eur. *Hel.* 1240f, which refers to funeral rites for Menelaus who may still be alive. See Hardie (2002a) 81-97 for a discussion of cenotaphs as a figure of presence in Latin poetry.

[42] At 4.1.5 Dionysius begrudges the location and instead suggests a site in front of the city walls.

Ovid's version is explicit that there is a statue of Sychaeus in a temple built by Dido for him in Carthage (*Her*. 7.99-102):

> est mihi marmorea sacratus in aede Sychaeus,
>   oppositae frondes uelleraque alba tegunt.
> hinc ego me sensi noto quater ore citari;
>   ipse sono tenui dixit "Elissa, ueni!"

Chaereas' funeral procession to his newly built tomb also features a statue of him (modelled on Callirhoe's ring): ἐπόμπευε δ' εἴδωλον Χαιρέου πρὸς τὴν ἐν τῷ δακτυλίῳ σφραγῖδα διατυπωθέν (4.1.10).[43] She then mounts the bier, embraces and kisses Chaereas' image, and addresses it lamenting their common misfortune (4.1.11):

> οἱ μὲν κομίζοντες τὴν κλίνην ἔθηκαν, ἀναβᾶσα δὲ ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἡ Καλλιρόη
> Χαιρέᾳ περιεχύθη καὶ καταφιλοῦσα τὴν εἰκόνα "σὺ μὲν ἔθαψας ἐμὲ πρῶ
> ἐν Συρακούσαις..."

Cataudella recognises the proximity of this passage to that at the end of the fourth book of the *Aeneid*, where Dido mounts the pyre she has built (onto which she has placed Aeneas' belongings, including their bed), addresses them, and presses her face into the bed resolving to die (4.650-60):[44]

> incubuitque toro dixitque nouissima uerba;
> 'dulces exuuiae...'
> dixit, et os impressa toro.

When Dido constructs the pyre on which she intends to burn both herself and Aeneas' belongings, an 'effigy' of him is also included (*effigiem*, 4.508). Both Chariton and Vergil, then, traffic in simulacral images of dead loved ones in similar circumstances.

---

[43] Zeitlin (2003) 73 notes that the statue is doubly simulacral, in that it is an image based on an image.
[44] Cataudella (1927) 306. Tilg (2010) 274 n. 3 finds the parallel 'improbable' but does not elaborate.

Ovid's treatment of the Protesilaus-Laudamia myth also hovers spectrally over this passage. His heroine Laudamia reports that she has a wax image of Protesilaus, which she embraces and addresses (*Her*. 13.151-7):

> dum tamen arma geres diuerso miles in orbe,
>   quae referat uultus est mihi cera tuos;
> illi blanditias, illi tibi debita uerba
>   dicimus, amplexus accipit illa meos...
> hanc specto teneoque sinu pro coniuge uero.

De Temmerman tentatively suggests that the myth of Protesilaus and Laudamia lurks behind the episode in Chariton, citing a later episode in which Dionysius refers to Chaereas' miraculous resurrection at the trial in Babylon as being like that of Protesilaus (5.10.1);[45] considering the shared Ovidian (and especially epistolary) framework I shall sketch in the following chapter, I suggest that Chariton has the Ovidian heroine in mind here as well as the *Aeneid*.[46] In addition, Callirhoe's earlier dream in which the 'dead' Chaereas appears to her (2.9.6) bears traces of the *pallens imago* of Protesilaus that appears to Laudamia in her sleep (*Her*. 13.107): it is only in Ovid's version that Laudamia has such a dream.[47]

Taken as a package—Callirhoe's dreams of Chaereas, her wish for *uniuiratus*, Chaereas' empty tomb and statue—Chariton seems to conflate aspects attaching to Dido and her relationship with her dead spouse Sychaeus and new love Aeneas.

---

[45] De Temmerman (2014) 58 n. 64. See Lateiner (2003) 225, 229-30 on the myth of Protesilaus and Laudamia as the paradigm of brief marriage and a spouse who returns from the dead.

[46] Reeson (2001) 171-5 and 199-204 offers detailed discussion of the source material for *Heroides* 13: it is uncertain whether Euripides' *Protesilaus* contained a wax image, and the question turns on fr. 655 Nauck. Eur. *Alc*. 348-56 features an erotic dream in which Admetus imagines consoling his grief by means of a sculpted image of his wife, and it is possible Euripides has lifted the idea from his own *Protesilaus*. Cf. also Cat. 68.73-130, and Hyg. *Fab*. 103-4 (referring to a *simulacrum cereum simile Protesilai coniugis*). Hardie (2002a) 132-7 discusses the Ovidian passage and observes that the combination of dream apparition and simulacral image of an absent beloved occurs at Aesch. *Aga*. 414-26 and Eur. *Alc*. 351f. Bettini (1999) 12 discusses on the case of Butades' daughter—called Cora, but also Callirhoe (!)—in Pliny *N.H.* 35.151.

[47] See Reeson (2001) 171-2 *ad* 13.105-8.

Appian also appears to be aware of the Vergilian tradition in which Dido's brother Pygmalion murders her husband Sychaeus: Διδὼ γυνὴ Τυρία, ἧς τὸν ἄνδρα κατακαίνει Πυγμαλίων Τύρου τυραννεύων, καὶ τὸ ἔργον ἐπέκρυπτεν (*Pun*. 1.1). This is not in Justin or Timaeus.[48] Indeed, Greek accounts of Aeneas' travels do not, for the most part, feature Dido; those that do (*A.P.* 16.151, Malalas *Chron*. 6.19) are explicit in attributing to Vergil alone a tradition linking Aeneas and Dido.[49]

The presence of Callirhoe's unborn baby provides further corroboration of Chariton's engagement with Vergil.[50] During her conference with the unborn baby in her womb, and the image of Chaereas on her ring, she debates whether she should abort the child (discussed further in section 3.3); she expresses her wish to be a *uniuira* and hypothesises that the child will grow to be a likeness of his father Chaereas: πέπεισμαι γὰρ ὅτι ὅμοιόν σε τέξομαι τῷ πατρί (2.11.2; cf. ὅμοιον δὲ τῷ πάππῳ, 3.8.8).[51] This type of claim usually occurs in a context where marital fidelity is at stake, and it is therefore a timely topos to evoke (Theoc. *Id*. 17.40-4, 62f; Hes. *Op*. 235; Cat. 61.214-18):[52] Callirhoe will pass off the child as that of Dionysius in order to secure her position in Ionia and a future for the child.[53] After the child is born, Callirhoe thanks Aphrodite for leaving her with an image of Chaereas, and therefore for not separating the lovers totally: εἰκόνα μοι δέδωκας ἀνδρὸς φιλτάτου καὶ ὅλον οὐκ ἀφείλω μου Χαιρέαν (3.8.7); and she had earlier referred to her unborn

---

[48] Appian exhibits knowledge of Vergil elsewhere at *B.C.* 4.41 (the old Oppius carried by his son to safety), on which see Hose (1994b) 333, and p. 85 below.

[49] Garstad (2003) 13.

[50] Adduced by Tilg (2010) 276-7.

[51] At 3.8.8 Callirhoe's prayer to Aphrodite, that her son may be more fortunate than his parents, and resemble his father, recalls Soph. *Aj*. 550f; cf. also Hom. *Il*. 6.479.

[52] See Hunter (2003) *ad* Theoc. *Id*. 17. 44; West (1978) 215-6 *ad* Hes. *Op*. 235, and Montiglio (2013) 45-6.

[53] Callirhoe maintains the charade even in her letter to Dionysius at the end of the novel, reminding him 'I am with you in spirit in the son we share': εἰμὶ γὰρ τῇ ψυχῇ μετὰ σοῦ διὰ τὸν κοινὸν υἱόν (8.4.5). Cf. the suppositious child and the dupe Xouthos in Euripides' *Ion*.

child as a potential 'memorial' of their marriage: ὑπόμνημα τοῦ περιβοήτου γάμου (2.9.4, discussed above in connection with the appearance of Creusa).

In Vergil, however, there is no baby, but only Dido's wish that Aeneas might have left her with a child resembling its father to serve as a reminder of him (4.327-30):

> saltem si qua mihi de te suscepta fuisset
> ante fugam suboles, si quis mihi parvulus aula
> luderet Aeneas, qui te tamen ore referret,
> non equidem omnino capta ac deserta uiderer.

Aeneas and Dido cannot have children: Aeneas has his own son in whom the future of Rome resides (cf. Mercury's words at 4.272-6, and Aeneas' at 4.353f). In contrast, Chaereas and Callirhoe *do* have a dynastic future, which is formalised in Chaereas' announcement to the Syracusans at the end of the novel (8.7.12).[54] Finally, after Chaereas appears alive in the Persian court, Dionysius picks up his 'son' and laments that he is now a 'reminder of an unhappy love': ἔρωτος ἀτυχοῦς ὑπόμνημα (5.10.2). Not only does this echo the language used by Callirhoe to describe Chaereas' tomb (ἔρωτος ὑπόμνημα, 4.1.4), but it directly translates a Vergilian phrase found in the ecphrasis of the Temple of Apollo at the entrance of the Underworld at the beginning of the sixth book. Here, the Minotaur is described as *Veneris monimenta nefandae* (6.24; cf. Ov. *Her*. 11.113).

Chariton distributes elements from the stories of Sychaeus, Dido, Aeneas, Creusa, and Hector amongst Chaereas, Callirhoe, and Dionysius in such a way that it

---

[54] For Bost-Pouderon (2006) this aspect of Chaereas' speech to the Syracusans indicates Chariton's investment in the idea of the classical *polis*.

is impossible to construct a consistent one-to-one typology; but he nevertheless leaves it open to the reader who knows Vergil to generate more overarching structural similarities. And whilst he co-opts elements drawn from the Vergilian tradition of Aeneas' stop in Carthage, he superimposes a Homeric veneer,[55] always thus insuring that the text can be activated with reference to the Homeric hypotexts—this is analogous to Longus (discussed in Chapter 6), whose strategy involves masking Latin pastoral intertexts by putting them into the mouth of Philetas.[56] Tilg is certainly right to detect in Chariton a 'romantic response to Virgil's story of Dido and Aeneas', but his refusal to see in Chariton's use of Vergil any sort of political agenda does not take into account the consequence of the Vergilian intertexts.[57] If Callirhoe and Chaereas are, at any level, Dido and Aeneas, then their happily-ever-after ending functions to create an alternative history in which Aeneas never leaves Carthage to found Rome (though, of course, the east-west journey to be undertaken by their child hints at Aeneas). Or, if Callirhoe and Chaereas are Dido and Sychaeus, then Aeneas is written out of the story altogether. Either way, Callirhoe's survival, that is, Dido's survival, poses a threat to Rome, albeit within the allegorising confines of prose romance.

2.3   Chaereas in Syracuse and Ionia

Throughout the novel, there are a number of instances in which Chaereas resembles characters from the *Aeneid*, especially Aeneas. In addition, his close friendship with Polycharmus recalls the analogous dynamic that obtains between Aeneas and Achates.

---

[55] Cf. also the description of Callirhoe at the funeral: ὑπὲρ τὴν Λευκώλενον καὶ Καλλίσφυρον ἐφαίνετο τὰς Ὁμήρου (4.1.8).
[56] Torres Guerra (2007) 389-90 makes the point in connection with Longus.
[57] Tilg (2010) 265, 296-7.

In the first instance, the simile that marks Chaereas' attractiveness as he leaves the gymnasium the moment before Callirhoe sees him for the first time recalls both the content and context of the first time Dido sees Aeneas.[58] Chaereas is 'as radiant as a star' and the 'flush of exercise blooms on his face like gold on silver' (1.1.5):

> τότε δὲ Χαιρέας ἀπὸ τῶν γυμνασίων ἐβάδιζεν οἴκαδε στίλβων ὥσπερ ἀστήρ· ἐπήνθει γὰρ αὐτοῦ τῷ λαμπρῷ τοῦ προσώπου τὸ ἐρύθημα τῆς παλαίστρας ὥσπερ ἀργύρῳ χρυσός.

In the *Aeneid* the hero's first appearance in Carthage is prefaced by his beautification at the hands of Venus (1.589-91). His appearance is like that of decoration added to ivory, or that of silver or marble overlaid with gold: *quale manus addunt ebori decus, aut ubi flauo/ argentum Pariusue lapis circumdatur auro* (4.592f). This of course recalls Odysseus' own beautification by Athene, where the simile describes him in terms of silver overlaid with gold (*Od*. 6.229-35; cf. 23.159-62),[59] and thereby offers the reader two models according to which they might read Chaereas: Odysseus or Aeneas.[60] The conventional topos at the beginning of the novel does not immediately force the reader into any one particular reading strategy, but the foregoing and subsequent discussions show how the Vergilian model is often the only available option.

The emotional farewell between Chaereas and his family owes its dominant images to the well-known passage in which Aeneas departs from Troy with his father and son, and is the catalyst for a number of other Vergilian correspondences. The old Ariston hugs his son's neck and clings to him: Ἀρίστων δέ, ὁ Χαιρέου πατήρ, ἐσχάτῳ

---

[58] Recognised by Cataudella (1927) 302.
[59] Cf. also Ap. *Arg*. 1.774, Alcman fr. 1.55, Chaeremon fr. 1.2-4 Nauck, Theoc. *Id*. 2.79f.
[60] Callirhoe is likened to Artemis (1.1.16), as is Dido (*Aen*. 1.496-54), Nausicaa (*Od*. 6.102-9), and Medea (*Arg*. 3.876-84).

γήρᾳ καὶ νόσῳ φερόμενος, περιέφυ τῷ τραχήλῳ τοῦ παιδὸς καὶ ἀνακρεμάμενος αὐτοῦ (3.5.4). The similar image of Aeneas taking his old father Anchises onto his neck was exceptionally well known in antiquity. Aeneas will load his father onto his neck and carry him out of Troy: *ergo, age, care pater, ceruici imponere nostrae;/ ipse subibo umeris nec me labor iste grauabit* (2.707f; cf. *sublato... genitore*, 2.804). Ovid tells us that the scene is depicted in statue form in the Forum of Augustus (*Fast*. 5.563); it appears on Roman coins, an Etruscan gem, a terracotta from Veii, a coin from Aeneia, the Vivenzio hydria, the Capitoline Tabula Iliaca, and a wall painting from Herculaneum caricatures the image by rendering Aeneas, Anchises, and Iulus as dog-headed.[61] Appian, describing how the son of Oppius carries his infirm father, is also aware of the image and potentially the Vergilian passage (*B.C.* 4.41):[62]

Ὄππιον δὲ ὁ υἱός, ὑπὸ γήρως ἀσθενεστάτου μένειν ἐθέλοντα, ἔφερεν ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματος… οἷόν που καὶ τὸν Αἰνείαν γράφουσιν αἰδέσιμον τοῖς πολεμίοις γενέσθαι φέροντα τὸν πατέρα.

Favorinus *On Exile* (26.4) also mentions the flight of Aeneas from Troy with his father. It is thus an image known by imperial Greeks.

The major difference is that Anchises initially refuses to leave with Aeneas on account of his old age and weakness: *abnegat... exsilium pati. 'uos o, quibus integer aeui/ sanguis,' ait, 'solidaeque suo stant robore uires,/ uos agitate fugam.'* (2.637-40); he is ultimately persuaded by the portent of Iulus' flaming hair and the subsequent meteorite. In contrast, Ariston asks Chaereas why he is leaving him 'half-dead', and requests that he wait a few days so that he can die and be buried by him: κλαίων ἔλεγε "τί νῦν με καταλείπεις, ὦ τέκνον, ἡμιθνῆτα πρεσβύτην... ἐπίμεινον δὲ

---

[61] For the popularity of this image, see Gruen (1992) 22 with further bibliography.
[62] See p. 81 n. 48.

κἂν ὀλίγας ἡμέρας, ὅπως ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ ταῖς σαῖς ἀποθάνω· θάψον δέ με καὶ ἄπιθι."

(3.5.4-5).[63] Where Ariston bids his son stay momentarily and leave after his burial (ἐπίμεινον... ἄπιθι), Anchises bids his son leave (*discedite*, 2.644); where Ariston says that he will die in a few days, Anchises makes a similar pronouncement (*ipse manu mortem inveniam*, 2.645). In addition, burial is a theme of both Anchises' and Ariston's words: Anchises argues that Aeneas should leave without him and not worry about burying him (*facilis iactura sepulcri*, 2.646), whereas Ariston, in contrast, *does* want his son to bury him (θάψον δέ με).

The subsequent appeal of Chaereas' (unnamed) mother mirrors that of Creusa's subsequent appeal in the *Aeneid*. Unlike Ariston, who begs Chaereas to stay, his mother clasps his knees and implores him to take her with him on the boat, promising not to be a heavy burden (3.5.5):

> ἡ δὲ μήτηρ τῶν γονάτων αὐτοῦ λαβομένη "ἐγὼ δέ σου δέομαι" φησίν, "ὦ τέκνον, μή με ἐνταῦθα καταλίπῃς ἔρημον, ἀλλ᾽ ἐμβαλοῦ τριήρει φορτίον κοῦφον· ἂν δὲ ὦ βαρεῖα καὶ περιττή, ῥίψατέ με εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ἣν σὺ πλεῖς."

Creusa likewise clasps Aeneas' feet as he is about to rush back into the fray: *ecce autem complexa pedes in limine coniunx/ haerebat* (2.673f); and just as Chaereas' mother promises to be a light rather than burdensome cargo (φορτίον κοῦφον· ἂν δὲ ὦ βαρεῖα καὶ περιττή...), Aeneas assures his father that he will not prove a burden (*nec me labor iste grauabit*; cf. also *Tr.* 1.3.84, where Ovid's wife begs to go with him, promising to be a *sarcina parua*). Chaereas' mother follows up her supplication by exposing her breasts, quoting Hecuba's words to Hector in the *Iliad* as she begs him

---

[63] Cataudella (1927) 310-11 sees a resemblance to Dido's words: *cui me moribundam deseris, hospes?* (4.323). Cf. also the words of Habrocomes' pedagogue in Xenophon: "ποῖ με καταλείψεις, τέκνον" λέγων, "τὸν γέροντα, τὸν παιδαγωγόν..." (1.14.4).

not to face Achilles: τάδ' αἴδεο καί μ' ἐλέησον/ αὐτήν, εἴ ποτέ τοι λαθικηδέα μαζὸν ἐπέσχον (3.5.6; cf. *Il.* 22.82f). Indeed, the whole episode in Chariton superficially resembles the Iliadic sequence of Priam and Hecuba's supplication of their son, a resemblance confirmed by the Iliadic quotation.[64] But we have seen above in the case of Callirhoe's dream how Chariton's tactic is to mask his debt to Vergil with a Homeric carapace. The careful reader, however, will see that Chariton and Vergil share many details lacking in Homer.

The sequence of events that follows confirms Vergil as the primary model. Chaereas is despondent about his situation, and chooses suicide as a way of circumventing a decision between two difficult options, namely whether to give up his search for Callirhoe or cause his parents pain (3.5.6).[65] Wishing to die, he jumps overboard: ἔρριψεν ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς νεὼς εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἀποθανεῖν θέλων (3.5.6).[66] Aeneas' response to his father's refusal to leave is similarly suicidal (*rursus in arma feror mortem miserrimus opto*, 2.655). Chaereas is then rescued, and leaves with his friend Polycharmus in search of Callirhoe.

Chaereas' sea-journey and arrival in Ionia co-opt a series of elements from Aeneas' landing in Carthage. During Chaereas' journey, he 'looks out over the sea', prays to Poseidon, and a 'favourable breeze' wafts them onwards: ἀποβλέψας εἰς τὸ πέλαγος... "εὔχομαί σοι, Πόσειδον"... πνεῦμα δὲ φορὸν ὑπέλαβε τὴν τριήρη (3.5.9-

---

[64] Priam is also characterised in terms of his old age (ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῷ, *Il.* 22.60). The episode in addition nods towards the Athenian departure to Sicily from the Piraeus at Thuc. 6.30.

[65] MacAlister (1996) 28, 49 interprets Chaereas' suicide attempts positively. Cf. 1.4.7, 1.5.2, 1.6.1, 3.3.1, 3.3.6, 5.10.6-10, 6.2.8-11, 7.1.6. On the rhetoric of suicide in the novel see Létoublon (2006). See Garrison (1991) on Greek attitudes to suicide.

[66] See Schmeling (2011) 207 *ad* Petr. *Sat.* 48.8 for the theme of the Sibyl wanting to die (ἀποθανεῖν θέλω).

6.1). In Vergil, Neptune calms the storm, looks out over the sea, and rides off on a favourable wind (1.154-6):

> sic cunctus <u>pelagi</u> cecidit fragora, <u>aequora postquam</u>
> <u>prospiciens</u> genitor caeloque inuectus aperto
> flectit equos curruque uolans dat lora <u>secundo</u>.

Vergil and Chariton share all three elements (including the use of the poetic lexeme *pelagus/*πέλαγος). In addition, Chariton specifies that Chaereas' trireme 'follows in the tracks' of Callirhoe's cutter: κατ' ἴχνος τοῦ κέλητος ἔτρεχεν (3.6.1). There are two metaliterary layers here that suggest Chaereas is following in the footsteps of a literary predecessor. In the first instance, κατ' ἴχνος participates in the poetological discourse of the prologue to Callimachus' *Aetia*, in which he disavows travelling in the 'tracks of others': ἑτέρων <u>ἴχνια</u> μὴ καθ' ὁμά/ δίφρον ἐλ[ᾶν], fr. 1.26f).[67] The Latin equivalent *uestigium* occurs in equally metaliterary contexts, for example the disastrous flight of Phaethon, who represents a failed poet in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (2.133, 318). Secondly, the notion of a boat-journey as a surrogate for the literary-journey is widespread in (especially Latin) literary-critical discourse.[68] If Chariton is troping Chaereas' journey in a 'military warship' (τὴν τριήρη τὴν στρατηγικήν, 3.5.3) in pursuit of Callirhoe's 'cutter' (κατ' ἴχνος τοῦ κέλητος) as a metaliterary journey in the tracks of Vergil, then there is surely a joke here: Chariton's prose romance is a warship, whilst Vergil's war-epic is a cutter.

Chaereas' arrival and subsequent activities in Ionia are modelled on those of Aeneas when he lands in Carthage after the storm. Chaereas and his tired comrades

---

[67] See Harder (2012) 2.63-5 for detailed discussion of these lines. The phrase κατ' ἴχνια occurs in Apollonius in the context of fish following the Argo when Orpheus is singing, and are compared to sheep following a piping shepherd (*Arg*. 1.575).
[68] See Harrison (2007a) on (especially) the Argo in Catullus 64; on reading/writing as a journey, see Clare (2002) on Apollonius' *Argonautica*.

put in at the coastal region of Dionysius' estate, and his men set about reviving themselves, erecting tents and preparing food (3.6.1):

> εἰς Ἰωνίαν ἧκον καὶ ὡρμίσαντο ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἀκτῆς ἐν τοῖς Διονυσίου χωρίοις. οἱ μὲν οὖν ἄλλοι <u>κεκμηκότες</u> <u>ἐκβάντες</u> <u>εἰς τὴν γῆν περὶ τὴν ἀνάληψιν</u> ἐγίνοντο τὴν ἑαυτῶν, σκηνάς τε πηγνύμενοι καὶ <u>παρασκευάζοντες εὐωχίαν</u>.

Aeneas' men are likewise tired when they put in at the Libyan shore, rest, make a fire, and begin preparing food (1.157f, 172-4, 177-9):

> <u>defessi</u> Aeneadae, quae proxima litora cursu
> contendunt petere, et Libyae uertuntur ad oras...
>
> <u>egressi</u> optata potiuntur Troes harena
> et sale tabentis artus in litore ponunt.
> ac primum silici scintillam excudit Achates...
>
> tum Cererem corruptam undis Cerealiaque arma
> expediunt <u>fessi</u> rerum, frugesque receptas
> et torrere <u>parant</u> flammis et frangere saxo.

While his men prepare the food, Chaereas and Polycharmus separate from the group and wander around on their own (Χαιρέας δὲ μετὰ Πολυχάρμου περινοστῶν, 3.6.2), just as Aeneas and Achates separate from the main group to climb a hill and shoot stags (1.180-93). In their wandering, Chaereas and Polycharmus stumble upon the shrine of Aphrodite (μεταξὺ δὲ ἀλύοντες περιέπεσον τῷ νεῷ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης, 3.6.3), just as Venus appears to Aeneas and Achates in the guise of a virginal maiden (1.312-5):

> ipse uno graditur comitatus Achate...
> cui mater media sese tulit obuia silua
> <u>uirginis</u> os habitumque gerens et <u>uirginis</u> arma.

At the beginning of the novel, Aphrodite is described as Ἀφροδίτης παρθένου. Indeed, the oxymoronic phrase is so odd that some editors athetise παρθένου;[69] but Tilg notices that Venus' (sexualised) appearance to her son Aeneas is analogously oxymoronic, and suggests that Chariton may have appropriated the memorable Vergilian coinage, as had Ovid (*Met*. 13.733, describing Scylla).[70]

Again, in the midst of a demonstrably Vergilian passage, a Homeric quotation rears its head. Chaereas spots in the shrine a golden statue of Callirhoe dedicated by Dionysius, and his knees collapse: τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ λύτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ (3.6.3; cf. e.g. *Il*. 21.114, *Od*. 4.703). A shrine attendant revives Chaereas with some water, tells him not to be alarmed, and reassures him that epiphanies of Aphrodite often occur in the shrine: ἐπιφανὴς γάρ ἐστι καὶ δείκνυσιν ἑαυτὴν ἐναργῶς (3.6.4).[71] The shrine-attendant of course misunderstands why Chaereas swoons, believing him to have witnessed an epiphany of Aphrodite (rather than a statue of Callirhoe), that is, she reads the situation as Vergilian instead of Charitonian.[72] The conversation turns to the statue of Callirhoe, and the shrine-attendant explains that Callirhoe, who was once a slave, is now 'mistress of all these lands' (αὕτη ἡ δέσποινα τῶν χωρίων τούτων, 3.6.5). The shrine-attendant's brief biography of Callirhoe parallels Venus' narrative of Dido's history; Dido, she explains now holds sway in Carthage having left her previous home (*imperium Dido Tyria regit urbe profecta*, 1.340).

---

[69] Goold (1995), Reardon (2004). Hercher (1859) suggests that παρθένου is an intrusion from 1.1.1 where it describes Callirhoe; Laplace (1980) 124-5 suggests an allusion to Athene Parthenos; Elsom (1992) 221 links it to Callirhoe's capacity to be both desirable and chaste.

[70] Tilg (2010) 274-5, though he leaves the point undeveloped.

[71] Hägg (2002) offers a 'secular-literary' interpretation of epiphany in the novels; Cioffi (2014) argues that epiphany is a generic marker of the novels.

[72] The shrine-attendant twice addresses Chaereas as τέκνον 'son' (3.6.4, 3.6.5), which is perhaps a subtle reminder of the Vergilian context.

The whole sequence of Chaereas' departure from Syracuse to his arrival in Ionia and encounter at Aphrodite's shrine is, then, directly modelled on Aeneas' departure from Troy, arrival in Carthage, and encounter with his mother Venus. Despite the Homeric verses that interlard the episodes, the presence of Vergil is palpable.

2.4   Chaereas and Polycharmus, Aeneas and Achates, Augustus and Agrippa

The radical transformation of Chaereas in the final two books resembles, at the abstract typological level, the shift in Aeneas' actions between the first and second half of the *Aeneid*—both protagonists take six books to morph from inconsequential travellers into dynamic and successful military heroes.[73] In the first six books of the novel Chaereas can be characterised as an odd type of hero: passive, suicidal, and fixated on present disaster rather than future possibility. Whitmarsh detects in Chaereas and Polycharmus two alternative reading strategies: Chaereas is a 'syntagmatic' reader, absorbed in each event as it happens, lacking aesthetic distance and suicidal as a result; Polycharmus is a 'paradigmatic' reader, more detached and able to see the bigger picture.[74] In the final two books, however, Chaereas transforms into a military hero: he subdues Coele Syria and Phoenicia, and captures Tyre as Alexander the Great had done before him. De Temmerman observes mutations at various levels: from youth to hero ready for reintegration into the community; from a lack of self-control to self-mastery; from a failed orator to an accomplished one.[75] Chariton marks Chaereas' sack of Tyre—the first indication of his rise to greatness—

---

[73] Heinze (1915)³ 271-80 discusses the development Aeneas between the two halves; see also Otis (1963) 219-23.
[74] Whitmarsh (2011) 206-7.
[75] De Temmerman (2014) 82. See also Schmeling (1974) 130-52.

as an ἔργον μέγα,[76] just as Vergil's 'proem in the middle' announces his *maius opus* (7.44).[77] And, more fundamentally, Juno's anger (the plot-motor of the *Aeneid*) can partly be blamed on her predilection for Tyrian Carthage, which she had heard would be destroyed by a son of Troy: *progeniem sed enim Troiano a sanguine duci/ audierat Tyrias olim quae uerteret arces* (1.19f). Aeneas (and Rome), then, share with Chaereas the accolade of military victory over (a city linked to) Tyre.

The notion that Chaereas encodes aspects of Aeneas finds rather obvious corroboration in his relationship with the faithful Polycharmus. I have suggested above that, when the Syracusan warship arrives in Ionia, and Chaereas and Polycharmus separate off from the men and encounter Aphrodite's shrine, this neatly corresponds with the similarly private escapades of Aeneas and Achates. Indeed, the dynamic of the relationship between the two pairs is exceptionally close. To my knowledge, Haight is the only scholar who remarks (albeit in passing) on the proximity, namely that Polycharmus 'is to Chaereas what Achates was to Aeneas'.[78] Both Hock and Brioso Sánchez focus on the selfless affection, encouragement, and protection offered to Chaereas by Polycharmus;[79] and Watanabe discusses the homosocial (and distinctly non-erotic and non-contractual) aspects of their relationship.[80] Achates is the steadfast companion of Aeneas, described as *fidus* six times, *comes* (or cognates) three times, *fortis* twice, *magnus* once, and generally

---

[76] Cf. 8.8.8, where Chaereas arrogates to himself ἔργα μεγάλα.
[77] On the metaliterary density of proems in the middle, see Conte (1992). Nimis (2003) detects a proem in the middle at Chariton 4.7.3-5.1.2 on the basis of the presence of forces of narrative energy (Tyche, Eros, Rumour) as well as comparatives, recapitulation, and allusions to the *Odyssey* and Menander.
[78] Haight (1943) 21.
[79] Hock (1997); Brioso Sánchez (1987) sees Polycharmus as representing the world of the family while Chaereas is far from home. Sanz Morales and Laguna Mariscal (2003) argue that Chariton follows a version of the Achilles-Patroclus relationship in which they are lovers.
[80] Watanabe (2003a) 27-8, 30,

accompanies Aeneas and does his bidding.[81] Polycharmus is likewise referred to as φίλος eleven times, πιστός (or cognates) four times, comforter (παρεμυθεῖτο) three times, ἀγαθός once, ἀνδρικός once, ἑταῖρος once, and his principal role is to prevent Chaereas from committing suicide.[82] In addition, both characters are peculiar in their respective narratives in so far as they lack any sort of biography, ancestry, or back-narrative;[83] and we can be relatively certain that Vergil has invented the role of Achates.[84] Both are simply the loyal friends of the protagonists.

I have suggested on a number of occasions that a Homeric quotation serves to mask a literary debt to Vergil. When Polycharmus is first mentioned, in the context of preventing Chaereas' suicide, their relationship is explicitly assimilated to that of Patroclus and Achilles in the *Iliad*: Πολύχαρμος δὲ ἐκώλυε, φίλος ἐξαίρετος, τοιοῦτος οἷον Ὅμηρος ἐποίησε Πάτροκλον Ἀχιλλέως (1.5.2). The citation of Homer in this instance functions to misdirect the reader and mask the Vergilian hypotext. Polycharmus, in his steady background role, has far more in common with the equally ambient Achates than he does with Patroclus, who serves as a major plot-motor and, of course, dies.

---

[81] *fidus*: 1.188, 6.158, 8.521, 8.586, 10.322, 12.384; *comes* (or cognate): 1.312, 6.158, 8.466; *fortis*: 1.120, 1.579; *magnus*: 10.344. Moorby (2008) argues that Achates barely does anything to justify his epithets.

[82] φίλος: 1.5.2, 4.3.5, 4.4.7, 5.1.1, 5.2.4, 5.10.10, 6.2.8-9, 7.1.2, 8.7.8, 8.8.7, 8.8.12; πιστός: 8.6.9, 8.8.7, 8.8.12x2; παρεμυθεῖτο: 3.6.8, 4.4.1, 5.2.6; cf. 8.1.6; ἀγαθός: 8.8.12; ἀνδρικός: 4.2.3; ἑταῖρος: 3.5.7; suicide prevention: 1.5.2, 1.6.1, 5.10.10, 6.2.8-9, 6.2.11; cf. 7.1.7-11. Watanabe (2003a) 30 n. 103 remarks that suicide prevention is the main topos of novelistic friendship, citing (aside from Chariton) Ach. 3.17.3-4; Heliod. 2.2.1, 2.5.3; Luc. *Tox*. 58. There may be a potential link between Polycharmus' role of 'consoler', and the tradition of philosophical consolation popular in the first and second centuries: see esp. παραμυθήσατο, Musonius fr. 9 p. 41 Hense; παραμυθίαν, Favorinus *On Exile* 2.14; on the genre see Kassel (1958).

[83] See Brioso Sánchez (1987) on Polycharmus (though at 3.5.7 we very briefly meet Polycharmus' (unnamed) parents).

[84] See Opelt (1987) on Achates.

Their names contain further evidence that Chariton is working with Achates as a model. Casali argues that Achates' name derives from the etymology offered by Aphrodite for the name of Aeneas in her eponymous *Homeric Hymn* (198f):

τῷ δὲ καὶ <u>Αἰνείας</u> ὄνομ’ ἔσσεται οὕνεκά μ’ <u>αἰνὸν</u>
ἔσχεν <u>ἄχος</u> ἕνεκα βροτοῦ ἀνέρος ἔμπεσον εὐνῇ.

Aeneas' name activates only the 'αἰνὸν' portion of Aphrodite's etymology; Vergil fulfils that part of Aphrodite's etymological prophecy left out in the hymn (ἄχος) in the form Aeneas' alter-ego Achates.[85] According to this proposition Achates' name embodies grief and fear. Polycharmus' name, on the other hand, embodies precisely the opposite, being morphologically related to 'joy' ('ἡ χαρά', 'τὸ χάρμα', 'χαρμοσύνη', and cognates/compounds). Chariton confirms that Polycharmus' name is linked to joy by juxtaposing the name with the lexeme: ...μετὰ <u>χαρᾶς</u>. μεταξὺ δὲ Πολύ<u>χαρμ</u>ος... (8.6.8-9).[86]

It is a dominant reading strategy of the *Aeneid* to see in Aeneas the figure of Augustus.[87] Vergil himself markets his future poem as a temple featuring Augustus as its centrepiece (*Georg*. 3.16); and Servius reads the poem as the praise of Augustus through his ancestors (Serv. *A*.1.*pr*.70).[88] An obvious extension of the Aeneas-Augustus homology is to read Achates as a figure for Agrippa, Augustus' long-time friend and partner in both the civic and military arenas; their relationship is defined by its mutual *amicitia* and *fides*, as is that of Aeneas and Achates (and Chaereas and

---

[85] Casali (2008). It is a popular etymology, also exploited at *Il*. 13.481f; for a detailed discussion of the passage in the *Homeric Hymn* see Faulkner (2008) 257 *ad loc*.
[86] See Reardon (1989) 17 on the author 'Chariton' as 'the man of graces'.
[87] See, e.g., Evans (1992) 42-54.
[88] The bibliography is vast; as a starting point see Thomas (2001).

Polycharmus).[89] Before arguing the case that Polycharmus, by virtue of deriving from Achates, bears traces of Agrippa, it is worth pursuing to what extent an Augustan reading is available for the character of Chaereas.

Tilg remains unconvinced by an ideological reading of Chariton, wondering in what way Augustus might be relevant to Chariton or his readers; indeed, he disavows any sort of political agenda behind Chariton's use of the *Aeneid*. My response is twofold: firstly, *any* engagement with the *Aeneid* is implicated in the imperial ramifications of that poem, whether its author or reader likes it or not; secondly, the decision, made nominally by a native of Roman Aphrodisias, to write the novel in *Greek* automatically politicises the narrative. The novel explores the role of empire and the different paradigms of governmental control (Syracuse, Athens, Ionia, Persia, outlaw groups),[90] and it is therefore no wonder that Chariton is interested in a narrative that mythologises the foundation of Rome and its first emperor. Of course, Rome does not feature explicitly in Chariton (nor in the other novels, except the Ps.-Lucianic *Onos* and Iamblichus' *Babyloniaka*), but political allegory works via displacement: 'just because Chariton's novel doesn't mention Rome does not mean that it is not about—or at least a response to—Rome'.[91] In this regard I agree with Connors who suggests that the novel presents 'an elite Greek response to Roman *imperium* [which] could also include playful mastery of Roman history', and with Alvares who sees in Chariton a wish-fulfilment of the Greek elite who desire a

---

[89] Révész (1972) and Powell (2015) 106 argue for the Achates-Agrippa homology in the *Aeneid*. Syme (1939) 343 adjudicates that Agrippa 'seems to lack colour and personality'; analogously, Perry (1930) 103 describes Polycharmus as a 'colourless satellite' of Chaereas (quoted at Hock (1997) 148).
[90] Alvares (2001-2) 114; Edwards (1991) 192 argues that the text contains models for both rulers and ruled.
[91] Connors (2002) 15.

modicum of political autonomy in relation to Rome.[92] Allusion to the *Aeneid*, then, cannot help but imply Augustus; and for an author writing in Aphrodisias, where 'his potential readers included those who knew Roman presence',[93] as well as the images of Roman power embodied in the Sebasteion reliefs, to suggest an apolitical reading of the narrative misses much of the important cultural work engendered by the text.

In support of the notion that Chariton's reading of the *Aeneid* necessitates his awareness of its Augustan context, I shall point to several elements in his narrative that look suspiciously Augustan. In the first instance, the trial in Babylon is characterised as a matter of adultery (μοιχεία, 8.8.5).[94] According to Suetonius, Augustus was known for infringing his own adultery laws (*Aug.* 69); it is therefore curious that the eunuch Artaxates tries to persuade King Artaxerxes that he can sleep with Callirhoe without breaking his own adultery laws (6.4.7), and that Dionysius thanks the King for his regard for the institution of marriage (5.6.1).[95]

Features of the narrative also reflect Augustus' autobiographical *Res Gestae Diui Augusti*, itself translated into Greek (probably) by Greeks from Asia Minor,[96] and erected in monumental form at Ancyra (in Greek and Latin), Pisidian Antioch (in

---

[92] Connors (2002) 23, Alvares (2001-2), (2007).

[93] Edwards (1991) 191.

[94] μοιχεία and cognates appear twenty-four times in Chariton.

[95] Schmeling (2005) 42-3 detects a hint at the scandalous Elder Julia when Callirhoe says that she has become the talk of Asia and Europe: διήγημα καὶ τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης γέγονα (5.5.3; cf. *Il.* 6.357f and p. 126 n. 92 below). He adduces the anecdote preserved by Macrobius (*Sat.* 2.5.9) in which Julia, told that it was fortunate that her children looked like her husband, replied *numquam enim nisi naui plena tollo uectorem*. This could be fruitfully activated in connection with the emphasis on the likeness of Callirhoe's child to Chaereas (2.11.2, 3.8.8) discussed at p. 81-2.

[96] Adams (2003) 496-7 discusses Latinate elements in the Greek *Res Gestae* (9.1, 25.2, 16.1, 28.2). Jocelyn (1999) 177 n. 49, *pace* Adams, takes these as indicative of the incompetence of the Greek translators, on whom see Wigtil (1982a); see Wigtil (1982b) on the ideological agenda of the Greek versions.

Latin), and Apollonia (in Greek).[97] Greeks would therefore have known the text:

Moles, for example, argues that the *Luke-Acts* pits itself in competition with the *Res Gestae* (as well as exhibiting knowledge of the *Aeneid*).[98] Indeed, it is also likely that the *Wonders Beyond Thule* of Antonius Diogenes, who is also linked to Aphrodisias,[99] encodes (through his use of varied geography) a response to Julio-Claudian monumentalism, namely the *Ethne* from the Sebasteion.[100]

The *Res Gestae* is a text of self-promotion written in first-person format (grammatically and thematically),[101] and can therefore be fruitfully compared with Chaereas' recapitulation of his activities at the end of the novel.[102] Chaereas dilates on the mercy he has shown to the Persians by returning their families to them, as well as the fact that he has rendered the Persian King a future friend to Syracuse (τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν φίλον ὑμῖν ἐποίησα τὸν μέγαν βασιλέα, 8.8.10), just as Augustus advertises his mercy to conquered peoples (3.1-2), and twice mentions the Parthian request for friendship (*amicitia*/φιλία, 29.2, 32.2-3).[103] Chaereas also adds that he *could* have made the Egyptian Pharaoh the master of Asia, had he not joined battle without him and been killed (8.8.10), which perhaps recalls Augustus' similarly disingenuous claim that he

---

[97] I have used the edition of Cooley (2009), with its introduction, commentary, and further bibliography. Thonemann (2012) discusses the inscription *Sardis VII.1 no. 201*, which he identifies as a Greek translation of the Latin original; if correct, it is the only instance of the *Res Gestae* to be recorded outside the province of Galatia.

[98] Moles (2014) 87-8; on the *Luke-Acts* and the *Aeneid*, see Palmer Bonz (2000), Shea (2005).

[99] On Antonius' connection to Aphrodisias see Bowersock (1994) 38-40, Bowie (2002) 58 and (2007) 126-8.

[100] Bowie *per litteras*; on the Sebasteion *Ethne* see Smith (1988).

[101] See Ramage (1987) 21-8, and Cooley (2009) 37.

[102] Whitmarsh (2011) 91, following the theoretical model of Brooks (1984) 99-100, discusses Chaereas' recapitulation of his past trauma as a therapeutic act.

[103] There is a potential Persia-Parthia homology in the novel: Alvares (2001-2) 121 observes that Chariton's Persian frontier is the contemporary Parthian frontier; the 'Chinese' arrow (Σηρῶν ἔργον, 6.4.2) could nod towards Horace *C*. 1.29.9 where the Chinese weapon (*Sericas*) may stand metonymically for a Parthian one; Baslez (1992) attempts to distinguish Achaemenid from Parthian *Realien* in Chariton's depiction of Persia, but concludes that the novel reflects a popular image of the Orient rather than a specific historical reality.

could have turned Greater Armenia into a province (27.2).[104] In addition, Chaereas is responsible for bringing the Sicilian pirate Theron back to Syracuse (3.3.18), whilst Augustus markets his war with Sextus Pompey (the main theatre of which was Sicily) as a war against pirates (25.1).[105]

As in the *Res Gestae*, enfranchisement and land distribution are manifest issues at the end of the novel. Chaereas explicitly states that he is enfranchising the three hundred Greeks who fought with him at Tyre. A decree is passed, and they immediately take their seats in the assembly (8.8.13-4):

> μετὰ ταῦτα πάλιν Χαιρέας εἶπε "καὶ τούσδε τοὺς τριακοσίους, Ἕλληνας ἄνδρας, στρατὸν ἐμὸν ἀνδρεῖον, δέομαι ὑμῶν, πολίτας ποιήσατε." πάλιν ὁ δῆμος ἐπεβόησεν "ἄξιοι μεθ' ἡμῶν πολιτεύεσθαι· χειροτονείσθω ταῦτα." ψήφισμα ἐγράφη καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκεῖνοι καθίσαντες μέρος ἦσαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

Chaereas then gives them a talent each (καὶ Χαιρέας δὲ ἐδωρήσατο τάλαντον ἑκάστῳ, 8.8.14), and Hermocrates distributes land to the Egyptians who fought with Chaereas, on which they might settle and farm: τοῖς δὲ Αἰγυπτίοις ἀπένειμε χώραν Ἑρμοκράτης, ὥστε ἔχειν αὐτοὺς γεωργεῖν (8.8.14). These acts of inclusion and benefaction at the end of the novel correspond to the emphasis placed by Augustus in the *Res Gestae* on enfranchisement and awards of land and money to his soldiers (3.3, 16.1, 28.1). Rome frequently enfranchised those who were felt to have merited it: Aelius Aristides recognises Roman inclusivity in this regard (*Or.* 26.59-60 Keil),[106] and Dionysius of Halicarnassus notes the Roman tradition of enfranchisement of non-citizens as a mark of their superiority over the Greeks (*Ant. Rom.* 2.16.1-2).

---

[104] On the disingenuous nature of Augustus' claim here see Ridley (2003) 205-8.
[105] For Sextus and pirates, see de Souza (1999) 190-2, with Cassius Dio 48.17-8, Vell. Pat. 2.73.3, Appian *B.C.* 5.100.
[106] On this aspect of Aristides' speech see Oliver (1953) 929, Fontanella (2008) 212-6.

Chariton's apparent pro-Dorian bias is also relevant in this connection. Chaereas, himself a Dorian from Syracuse (Ἕλλην εἰμί, Συρακόσιος, γένος Δωριεύς, 7.3.8), picks three hundred Dorians to fight with him: ἐξελέξατο δὲ Λακεδαιμονίους καὶ Κορινθίους καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Πελοποννησίους· εὗρε δὲ καὶ ὡς εἴκοσι Σικελιώτας (7.3.7).[107] Later, when he and his men have gathered on Cyprus and are unsure where to go, a man who has been exiled from Sparta and who claims to be a relative of the famous Spartan Brasidas 'dares to speak', and suggests that they simply make for Sicily by sea: Λακεδαιμόνιος ἀνήρ, <u>Βρασίδου συγγενής</u>, κατὰ μεγάλην ἀνάγκην τῆς Σπάρτης ἐκπεσών, πρῶτος <u>ἐτόλμησεν εἰπεῖν</u>... (8.2.12-3). Strabo and Cassius Dio dilate on the special honour in which Augustan Rome held Sparta (e.g. Strab. 8.5.5, 7.7.6; Cassius Dio 38.15, 54.7.1-4; cf. Suet. *Tib*. 6.2). The Spartan C. Julius Eurycles and his father Lachares supported Octavian at Actium, and Eurycles' naval heroism in the battle earned him citizenship (Plut. *Ant*. 67).[108] This Eurycles, whom Augustus supported and later banished as tyrant of Sparta, repays consideration.[109] Plutarch relates an anecdote in which he is brought to trial before Augustus. One of his accusers is so outspoken that Augustus imprisons him, but on learning that he is a descendant of Brasidas issues his release: ἀφειδῶς καὶ κατακόρως παρρησιαζομένου... πυθόμενος δὲ ὅτι τῶν <u>ἀπὸ Βρασίδου γεγονότων</u> ὑπόλοιπος οὗτός ἐστι μετεπέμψατο (*Reg. et Imp. Apopheg*. 207F).[110] The combination of Chariton's pro-Dorian bias, along with his choice to concentrate on a Spartan descendant of Brasidas, who has been banished from Sparta, and who 'dared to speak' (ἐτόλμησεν εἰπεῖν), ranges him neatly with Augustus' relations with the Spartan Eurycles. Indeed,

---

[107] Pro-Dorian bias noted by Alvares (2007) 13 n. 54; Alvares (2001-2) 120 suggests that Chariton avoids Athens because he wants to promote the Dorians.

[108] Spawforth (2012) 86-102 discusses Sparta's cultural currency under Augustan Rome, where Sparta is identified with traditional *disciplina*, *uirtus*, and *arma*.

[109] He is responsible for the first known Latin inscription in Roman Sparta (*CIL* 3.494 = *IG* V 1.374), honouring Agrippa's visit in 16 BCE, on which see Spawforth (2012) 99.

[110] On this incident see Bowersock (1965) 105 and Spawforth (2012) 40.

the Spartan in Chariton is eventually resettled in Syracuse, perhaps suggesting that Chariton has re-written Augustan-Spartan relations with a happy ending.

There are correspondences between Chaereas' and Augustus' military victories: Chaereas is described as presenting to Hermocrates the spoils of his war with the Persian King (λαφύρων Μηδικῶν, 8.6.12) which are to fill the city of Syracuse; Augustus likewise distributes to the people the plunder taken after Actium (λαφύρων πολέμου, 15.1). There are also aspects of Chaereas' return to Syracuse laden with Persian spoils that recall Augustus' role as victor, especially at Actium,[111] and Schmeling even likens Chaereas' return to Syracuse as 'the triumphant entry of a *Roman* general into Rome', referring to his general's uniform (σχῆμα στρατηγοῦ, 8.6.8).[112] Indeed, Chaereas tells Callirhoe how has he 'filled land and sea with trophies of victory' (πεπλήρωκα γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν τροπαίων, 8.1.17) and is proud of his achievements (ἐναβρυνόμενος τοῖς κατορθώμασιν, 8.1.17); Augustus likewise focuses on the amphibious quality of his military feats (πολέμους καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλασσαν, 3.1) and his numerous victories (4.1).

There are also elements of the dynamic between Chaereas and Polycharmus that harmonise closely with that of Augustus and Agrippa. In the first instance Agrippa's role as Augustus' naval commander responsible for the victories at Mylae, Naulochus, and Actium, is reflected in the fact that Chaereas leaves Polycharmus in charge of the fleet: αὐτὸς [Πολύχαρμος] γὰρ ἦν πεπιστευμένος τὸν ἄλλον στόλον ἀπὸ

---

[111] Chaereas' return to Syracuse under the pretence of being an Egyptian trader laden with Eastern goods recalls several elements of Vergil's ecphrastic description of the victory at Actium (*Aen.* 8.675-88).
[112] Schmeling (1974) 129.

Κύπρου (8.6.9; cf. 8.1.13).[113] Indeed, the interpersonal relations between both pairs of men is close. Agrippa is the only person in the *Res Gestae* presented as anything like Augustus' peer, and is his *conlega* twice (8.2 as co-censor; 22.2 as co-organiser of the *ludi saeculares*);[114] they are the same age and were perhaps schoolmates (Nicolaus of Damascus *FGrH.* 90 F 127.7.16), and in 23 BCE when Augustus became perilously ill, he entrusted Agrippa with his signet ring (Cassius Dio 53.30.2).[115] At the general level the relationship between Chaereas and Polycharmus exhibits the same qualities and functions. Despite the obviously critical role played by Polycharmus and Agrippa in the lives of Chaereas and Augustus, both Chaereas' recapitulation at the end of the novel and Augustus' *Res Gestae* give the impression that they have won victories on their own account. There are in addition several more specific data encouraging the assimilation I have sketched. At the end of the novel Chaereas offers his hitherto unheard of sister (who remains unnamed) in marriage to Polycharmus (δῶμεν αὐτῷ γυναῖκα τὴν ἀδελφὴν τὴν ἐμήν, 8.8.12), just as Augustus offers Agrippa his daughter Julia in marriage in order to cement their political alliance. Both Agrippa and Polycharmus become related to Augustus and Chaereas by marriage. Finally, both Polycharmus and Agrippa are of low birth. Polycharmus explains to Mithridates who he and Chaereas are, and contrasts his own low birth with Chaereas' high station: ἐγὼ δὲ <u>εὐτελὴς</u> μέν, συμφοιτητὴς δὲ ἐκείνου καὶ φίλος (4.3.1). Agrippa is also of humble provenance: Augustus in the *Res Gestae* avoids referring to his *gentilicium* Vipsanius, and the issue is discussed at length by Seneca (*Contr*. 2.4.12-3).[116]

---

[113] At 7.3.5 Chaereas tells the Pharaoh that he and Polycharmus will take Tyre together.
[114] They were also co-consuls in 28 and 27 BCE.
[115] At 8.2.1-2 Polycharmus controls personal access to Chaereas.
[116] In discussing Polycharmus' lower station, Watanabe (2003a) 27-8 compares Achilles' humbler companion Patroclus; D'Orville (1783) 383 suggests that Polycharmus might be disingenuously humbling himself to protect Chaereas.

2.5   Conclusion

Tilg quite rightly wonders why Chariton might be interested in the *Aeneid* on any political level. As a deeply political poem, however, *any* engagement with it makes a political reading available. This is especially the case for the Greek elite in Aphrodisias, some of whom would be heavily involved in the administrative limbs of Roman politics, as well as for any Roman readers. Chariton is an author who thematises issues of empire and types of government, and would therefore be interested in the Julio-Claudian clan (and the first emperor Augustus) as a point of reference; he may even have seen in Augustus' political and personal relationship with Agrippa a suitable model for literary emulation. I have also demonstrated elements of Chariton's intertextual strategy: where his literary Romanising threatens to become overt, he often installs a Homeric veneer in the form of a citation, masking his debt to Vergil and ensuring that Vergil is not the only entry-point into the passage in question.

Despite the resemblance to Augustus sketched above, Chaereas is ethnically and culturally Greek (specifically Dorian, 7.3.8). His transformation from athletic enthusiast (γυμνασίοις ἐντραφεὶς, 1.2.6) to military hero and triumphant general with three hundred Greeks under his command contrasts with contemporary reality. The *Pax Romana* had removed militarism as a viable activity for the Greeks, leaving athletics as the only venue in which one might perform heroism—a suitably vanilla pastime in the eyes of Rome. Bowie analyses the textual and inscriptional evidence and concludes that Greeks in the imperial period were not interested in Roman

military structures or in pursuing a military career,[117] but were instead happy to accept the image of *Romans* as better fighters (see p. 32).[118] Alvares argues that Chariton's novel 'not only asserts the superiority of Greek culture, but... also contains a veiled dream of a Greece that could stand as free and equal against the world's hegemonic powers', as well as offering Greek readers 'an imaginable alternative' to Roman power.[119] He also links the Syracusan independence in Chariton's novel to Nero's proclamation of freedom for the province of Achaia in 67 CE. Chariton's message is therefore that Greeks can be a useful friend as well as a dangerous enemy,[120] and Chaereas' military feat can be read as a Greek elite fantasy of their hypothetical role on the imperial stage (on the model of a 'hidden transcript'). In addition, by making Chaereas a native of Sicily, Chariton appropriates an important site for Aeneas in the *Aeneid* and the Aeneas-legend more generally, and re-codifies it as ethnically Dorian.[121] In an act of postcolonial 'mimicry', Chariton markets Chaereas as a re-written Aeneas with various traits of the first Roman emperor Augustus, and subtly suggests that the Greek-elite, at least within the confines of his prose romance, can outdo the Romans at being masters of empire. [122]

---

[117] Notable exceptions are C. Iulius Quadratus Bassus and Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus.

[118] Bowie (2014). For the famous binary between 'cultural Greeks' and 'military Romans' see Anchises' words at Verg. *Aen*. 6.847-53, and Porcius Licinus' epigram (fr. 1 Courtney).

[119] Alvares (2001-2) 119-20, (2002) 15.

[120] Alvares (2002) 25.

[121] On the role of Sicily in the Aeneas-legend, see Galinsky (1969). Tilg (2010) 295-6 refers to the importance of Sicily in the *Aeneid*. For Whitmarsh (2011) 56 Chariton's decentring away from Athens to Sicily is perhaps 'a symbolic construction of the world that arguably reflects the Italocentric imperial mapping of Rome more than traditional Greek ideas'.

[122] The Persian King even wishes he *were* Chaereas: δοκεῖ δ' ἄν μοι καὶ βασιλεὺς τότε θέλειν Χαιρέας εἶναι (5.8.3). Commenting on the passage, Smith (2007) 110 says that 'in the topsy-turvy world of erotic inversion that the novel depicts, *that* is power'. Cf. Ach. 6.17.1-2 where, in an analogous context, Thersandros wishes he were Clitophon.

Chapter 3

Ovidian Epistolary and Exilic Discourse in Chariton

3.1   Introduction

In this chapter I shall explore some thematic strands implicating Chariton and Ovidian elegy. I shall argue that letters written by Chaereas and Callirhoe in the novel owe their genesis to conventions first found in Ovid's (single and double) *Heroides*;[1] that Chariton is aware of a series of elegies in Ovid's *Amores*; and that Ovid's exilic corpus dictates the terms in which Callirhoe arrives at the Euphrates and later apostrophises the river once in Babylon; I shall also indicate some areas in which Chariton engages with Propertius.

3.2   Epistolary discourse in Chariton and Ovid

Chariton is the only author amongst the Greek novelists to represent the conditions of writing and reading, especially the composition and reception of letters,[2] specifically, Chaereas' composition of a letter *to* Callirhoe (and the chain of hands through which it passes), and Dionysius' reception of a letter *from* Callirhoe. Indeed, for separated

---

[1] Gibson and Morrison (2007) 4 wonder why there are no Greek verse epistles such as those of Horace and Ovid, though see 4 n. 6 for isolated Pindaric and Theocritean exceptions (e.g. *Pyth*, 2, 3, *Isthm*. 2; *Id*. 11, 12, 13, 21, 29). Hunter (1999) 261 acknowledges our ignorance of Aratus' *Letters* (*SH* 106, 119); see Bing (2000) 146-8 on *SH* 977. We should cautiously recall that Ovid claims to have invented the verse epistle format (*Ars* 3.345f), on which see Knox (1995) 14-18 and Gibson (2003) *ad loc*. Discussing papyrological finds, Muir (2009) 8 observes that 'in the letters of everyday life love is a theme almost entirely unrepresented'.

[2] Robiano (2007) 202, for whom the phenomenon mimics the conditions of textual production and the vagaries of transmission, in the manner of a mise-en-abyme, on which see Dällenbach (1977) 100. Hodkinson and Rosenmeyer (2013) 19 argue that the epistolary form is a powerful vehicle for metaliterary comment in this regard. For Altman (1982) 37, 212 letters allow the representation of the act of reading, and the epistolary relationship between sender and recipient stands for that between author and reader.

lovers the epistolary form is the most obvious communicative model, and letters are a major plot device in Chariton.[3] Considering the number of studies on epistolary elements in the novels (and epistolarity in general), it is odd that nobody has commented on the number of elements in common with Ovidian epistolary discourse in the *Heroides*, and exilic *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*.[4] Though New Comedy is interested in letters—we are aware of three plays entitled *The Letter* (Alexis, Euthycles, and Machon) and one *The Letters* (Timocles)—Ovid is the first author to make a project of the epistolary female lament, and his epistolary elegy is replete with passages thematising the conditions of production and consumption of letters, including the presence of bodily fluids on the writing-material, handwriting, and the role of the seal. Chariton's identical preoccupations form the basis of this section.

Chaereas' letter to Callirhoe is a useful entry point. Encouraged by Mithridates to compose a letter to Callirhoe, he withdraws into the privacy of his own company,[5] but finds it difficult to write because of floods of tears and a trembling hand (4.4.6):

> μόνος ἐπ᾽ ἐρημίας γενόμενος ἤθελε γράφειν, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἠδύνατο, <u>δακρύων ἐπιρρεόντων καὶ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ τρεμούσης</u>. ἀποκλαύσας δὲ τὰς ἑαυτοῦ συμφορὰς μόλις ἤρξατο τοιαύτης ἐπιστολῆς·

Chaereas' composition is delayed by certain physical impediments, namely tears and an unsteady hand. Ariadne's trembling hand likewise affects her ability to write her

---

[3] For Létoublon (2003) there are two types of letter in Chariton: (i) official, which transmit orders and arrive successfully at the recipient; (ii) erotic, which are intercepted. For Fusillo (1991) 88-93 letters contribute to the polyphony of the novel.

[4] For Rosenmeyer (1997) 29 Ovid's choice of the epistolary format in the exilic corpus identifies him with the heroines whose letters can themselves be read as exilic.

[5] This reflects the private nature of epistolary discourse, ironised by the fact that the reader eavesdrops, as well as the fact that Chaereas' letter never reaches its intended recipient (Callirhoe), but passes through six pairs of hands. On the public-private dynamic of letters in Chariton see Whitmarsh (2005b) 119-22, König (2013a) 190-1.

letter: *litteraque articulo pressa tremente labat* (*Her.* 10.140);[6] and a storm during Ovid's sea-journey to Tomis causes an unsteady hand: *tamen ipse trementi/ carmina ducebam qualiacumque manu* (*Tr.* 1.11.17f).[7]

Tears are an index of the emotional state of the writer, troping the presence of the writer and embodying him/her physically. In the body of the letter itself, Chaereas follows up his plea that Callirhoe remember him with a speech-act that verbalises the action of pouring tears and kisses onto the actual letters: κατασπένδω τούτων μου τῶν γραμμάτων δάκρυα καὶ φιλήματα (4.4.8). The trope has a rich history in the Latin literary tradition, and many examples are peculiar to Roman epistolary modes, and generally occur in an exilic context.[8] An early example is Catullus, who says he has received a letter 'written in tears': *conscriptum lacrimis epistolium* (68.2); and Cicero, writing to his wife from exile, says that he has received letters and nearly destroyed them with tears: *accepi ab Aristocrito tres epistulas, quas ego lacrimis prope deleui* (*ad Fam.* 14.3.1). In Propertius' epistolary elegy, Arethusa pens a letter to her absent husband Lycotas and apologises for the blotches caused by her tears: *si qua tamen tibi lecturo pars oblita derit,/ haec erit e lacrimis facta litura meis* (4.3.3f).[9] The trope becomes a recurrent feature in the *Heroides*, where Briseis' tears and the smudges they create act as a surrogate for her voice: *quascumque adspicies, lacrimae fecere*

---

[6] Cf. Hypermnestra's and Cydippe's hands become weak and their letters end (*Her.* 14.131f; 21.245f);

[7] At *Tr.* 3.3.1f Ovid confesses to his wife that he cannot write in his own hand because of sickness; and at *Ex Pont.* 3.1.53f his letter trembles.

[8] Heyworth (forthcoming) discusses the materiality of tears in Roman elegy.

[9] On the vexed issue of the priority of Prop. 4.3 to the *Heroides*, see Kennedy (2002) 217 with n. 1, and Knox (2002) 117, 126. Most scholars agree that Prop. 4.3 is the prototype. For Ovidian priority, see Burger (1901) 27-9, Pohlenz (1913) 14-17, Mersmann (1931); for partial Ovidian priority see Reitzenstein (1936) 17-34, Becker (1971) 469-70. Maurer (1990) 38-45 suggests that Propertius might be influenced by Hellenistic verse. No commentator on the Propertian lines, including most recently Fedeli *et al.* (2015), adduce Chariton as a comparandum.

lituras;/ sed tamen et lacrimae pondera uocis habent (*Her.* 3.3f);[10] and Sappho's tears

cause ink-smudges: *scribimus, et lacrimis oculi rorantur obortis;/ adspice, quam sit*

in hoc multa litura loco! (*Her.* 15.97f; cf. Canace's blood, 11.1f).[11] It is also a

discursive marker of the *Tristia*:[12] *neue liturarum pudeat; qui uiderit illas,/ de*

lacrimis factas sentiet esse meis (*Tr.* 1.1.13f; cf. also 3.1.15f, 4.1.95f).[13] In addition,

there is the case of a letter by the later Greek epistolographer Aristaenetus, in which

Chelidonion writes to Philonides: κατασπένδω δάκρυα τῶν γραμμάτων (*Ep.* 2.13.19f

Viellefond). [14] This looks remarkably similar to Chaereas' words: whether

Aristaenetus is reading Ovid directly, or through Chariton, the latter is obviously co-

opting epistolary conventions from Ovid.

The trope is clearly a trademark of elegiac epistles, aligning Ovid

programmatically with the abandoned heroines. Chaereas' language appropriates the

discursive codes of the *Heroides*. He is a husband, separated from his wife; he has

heard that she has taken up with another man and is unhappy about it (4.4.8):[15]

---

[10] Farrell (1998) 336 n. 58 notes how *litura* can also be 'erasure' or 'editorial correction'; see Barchiesi (1992) 203-4 *ad loc*.

[11] On the authenticity of the *Epistula Sapphus*, see conveniently Thorsen (2014) 96-122.

[12] See Hardie (2002a) 108-9: 'these blots, *liturae*, threaten the verbal communicative power of *litterae*, but convey an even more powerful non-verbal message'; cf. Nagle (1980) 33-5. Altman (1982) 13 points to certain instances in the *Heroides* where the epistolary format might impinge on the communicative circuit.

[13] Rosenmeyer (1997) 33-4 argues that at *Tr.* 1.1.13f Ovid takes pride in the blots, but by *Tr.* 4.1.95f pride has turned to despair. Cf. also *Tr.* 1.11.39f where, during Ovid's stormy sea-journey to Tomis, the paper is sprayed with water.

[14] See Fögen (2009b) 203. At n. 51 he observes that the trope also occurs in the fourth century Greek orator Libanius (*Epist.* 1063.6 Foerster).

[15] Repath (2013) 260-1 rightly indicates the close intertextual relationship between this letter of Chaereas, and that of Leucippe at Ach. 5.18.3-6, who likewise wonders whether she is still 'his', complains of his new 'marriage', and catalogues her sufferings on his account. At 260 n. 84 he notes that a man called Chaereas is responsible for Leucippe's abduction from Pharos, pointing metatextually to Chariton's novel. For the purposes of my argument, Leucippe's epistolary complaint draws very much from the code-model of the *Heroides*. This is confirmed by a close textual parallel. She signs off her letter by assuring Clitophon that she is still a virgin, despite his remarriage: ἐγὼ δὲ ἔτι σοι ταῦτα γράφω παρθένος (5.18.6). In the *Heroides* Oenone makes precisely the same claim to Paris, with precisely the same implication that he has been unfaithful: *at manet Oenone fallenti casta marito* (5.133). Clitophon's reply reassures her that he has 'imitated' her virginity (5.20.5).

πάντα δὲ Μιθριδάτης εὐεργετήσας τοῦτό με λελύπηκεν ἀντὶ πάντων, ὅτι μοι τὸν σὸν γάμον διηγήσατο... τὸν δὲ σὸν γάμον οὐκ ἤλπισα.

Many of Ovid's abandoned heroines are in an analogous position, and fear their partners' infidelity: Penelope worries that Ulysses is dallying with a *peregrino amore* (1.75); Phyllis suspects that an *altera coniunx* has Demophoon (2.103); Oenone wonders whether a *coniunx noua* prevents Paris from reading her letter (5.1f); Deianira cannot bear the thought of Hercules marrying Iole (9.131-4); and Hero fears that Leander might be *nescioqua paelice captus* (19.102). It is an obvious choice, then, that Chaereas should appropriate the tropes and female discourse of the *Heroides*.

The content of Chaereas' letter contains evidence to this effect. He refers to himself as 'your Chaereas', and bids her remember their wedding night (4.4.8):

ἐγὼ Χαιρέας εἰμὶ ὁ σὸς ἐκεῖνος ὃν εἶδες παρθένος εἰς Ἀφροδίτης βαδίζουσα, δι' ὃν ἠγρύπνησας. μνήσθητι τοῦ θαλάμου καὶ τῆς νυκτὸς τῆς μυστικῆς, ἐν ᾗ πρῶτον σὺ μὲν ἀνδρός, ἐγὼ δὲ γυναικὸς πεῖραν ἐλάβομεν.

The programmatic opening line of the *Heroides* begins with 'your Penelope' sending a letter to Ulysses: *haec tua Penelope lento tibi mittit, Ulixe* (1.1); Oenone begs to be Paris' once again: *sed tua sum tecumque fui puerilibus annis/ et tua, quod superest temporis, esse precor!* (5.157f); and Sappho stops short of referring to Phaon as 'mine': *me miseram, dixi quam modo paene "meus!"* (15.204). Moreover, Chaereas uses the letter to encourage Callirhoe to remember their wedding night,[16] just as Arethusa reminds Lycotas in Propertius' epistolary elegy: *haecne marita fides et pacta haec foedera nobis,/ cum rudis urgenti bracchia uicta dedi?...* (4.3.11-16). The

---

[16] Alvares (2012) 15 n. 11 categorises this as feminine discourse. For letters as a feminine form of communication see Kaufmann (1992) 105.

heroines are likewise preoccupied with memory and the past (*memor* and cognates occur twenty-eight times);[17] memory is also a keynote of Ovid's exilic corpus, as he wonders whether old friends have forgotten him or remember him.[18] At the end of the novel Callirhoe herself exploits this discourse in her letter to Dionysius, signing off with 'your Callirhoe' and bidding him 'remember' her: Καλλιρόης <u>μνημόνευε</u> <u>τῆς σῆς</u> (8.4.6). In addition, at the end of his letter, Chaereas says that if Callirhoe does not remember him then she has sentenced him to death (4.4.10). This recalls Phyllis' claim to have been forgotten by Demophoon and her subsequent wish for death (*Her.* 2.105, 121-48).[19]

The combination of tears, handwriting, and seals that veins Ovid's epistolary corpus (including the *Heroides* and the exilic material) becomes concentrated at the moment Dionysius receives Callirhoe's letter, and further thematises the processes of composition and reception. Callirhoe's letter, which thanks Dionysius for his fair treatment and instructs him in the future arrangements for 'his' son, signs off with the curious detail that she has written the letter in her own hand: ταῦτά σοι γέγραφα τῇ ἐμῇ χειρί (8.4.6); she then seals it (σφραγίσασα δὲ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, 8.7.1) and, on receiving the letter, Dionysius recognises the handwriting: γνωρίσας τὰ Καλλιρόης γράμματα (8.5.13).[20] Callirhoe is aware of epistolary discursive markers, and therefore that the hand (and the symbols it produces) is a metonymical extension of the person, rendering the sender present in graphic form; she is also conscious of the fact that in the epistolary mode—whose motivating factor is the separation of sender

---

[17] In the *Heroides*, memory functions as a way of troping intertextuality and the *literary* past of the heroines, on which see Conte (1986) 32-99 and Barchiesi (2001) 105-27.

[18] E.g. *Tr.* 1.1.17, 1.8.11, 2.121, 3.6.26, 3.10.1, 5.7.29f; *Ex Pont.* 2.10.52, 3.5.38.

[19] For this type of 'erotic' memory see also Prop. 1.6.35f, 2.1.75-8, 2.13.39f, Longus 1.29.3.

[20] Some inscriptions indicate that they have been drafted and cut by the same hand, e.g. *ILI* 561 (*manu mea scribsi*), discussed by Adams (2003) 84.

and recipient—authenticity might be an anxiety.[21] Recognition of handwriting is likewise a generic marker of Ovidian epistolary discourse. Penelope says that she will give others letters to give to Ulysses written by her own hand: *...traditur huic digitis charta notata meis* (*Her*. 1.61f); Briseis is self-conscious about her barbarian handwriting: *uix bene barbarica Graeca notata manu* (*Her*. 3.2); and Sappho asks Phaon whether he recognises her handwriting (*Her*. 15.1-4):[22]

> ecquid, ut adspecta est studiosae littera dextrae,
> protinus est oculis cognita nostra tuis—
> an, nisi legisses auctoris nomina Sapphus,
> hoc breue nescires unde mouetur opus?

In the *Epistulae Ex Ponto*, Ovid worries that Messalinus might not recognise his handwriting (1.7.1-4), and wonders whether Macer no longer recognises his seal or handwriting (2.10.1-8);[23] and his friends know what his letter contains before even breaking the seal (*Ex Pont*. 3.7.5f). Handwriting is also implicated in the epistolary discourse of Achilles: Clitophon recognises the handwriting on Leucippe's letter (ἐγνώρισα γὰρ Λευκίππης τὰ γράμματα, 5.18.2);[24] and in Xenophon, Manto's plot is uncovered because of her handwriting: ὁ δὲ Ἄψυρτος... ἐπιτυγχάνει τῷ γραμματιδίῳ τῷ Μαντοῦς πρὸς Ἀβροκόμην καὶ γνωρίζει τὰ γράμματα (2.10.1).

---

[21] Rosenmeyer (2001) 145 suggests that the comment serves to reassure Dionysius because of his propensity to suspect forgery (as he had previously done in the case of Chaereas' letter at 4.5.10). Robiano (2007) 213 argues that it is an otherwise redundant phrase and functions metatextually.

[22] Rosenmeyer (2001) 150 n. 25 adduces this passage in her discussion of embedded letters in the Greek novel.

[23] See Galasso (1995) *ad Ex Pont*. 2.10.3, with Hardie (2002a) 322-5, on whether the seal bears a portrait of Ovid himself.

[24] Repath (2013) 242-3 wonders how Clitophon knows what Leucippe's handwriting looks like.

Dionysius' subsequent reactions to receiving the letter are also Ovidian. He kisses the letter, clasps it to his heart as if it is Callirhoe, and weeps to such an extent that he cannot read the letter for tears:[25]

πρῶτον τὴν ἐπιστολὴν κατεφίλησεν, εἶτα ἀνοίξας τῷ στήθει προσεπτύξατο ὡς ἐκείνην παροῦσαν, καὶ ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον κατεῖχεν, ἀναγινώσκειν μὴ δυνάμενος διὰ τὰ δάκρυα.

Ovid responds to several letters with tears. He weeps upon receiving a letter from Maximus containing news of Celsus' death, and the tears fall on the letter: *quae mihi de rapto uenit epistula Celso,/ protinus est lacrimis umida facta meis* (*Ex Pont*. 1.9.1f; cf. Cicero *ad fam*. 14.3.1 quoted above); and he responds to Gallio's letter on the death of his wife by weeping (*Ex Pont*. 4.11.9f). The act of kissing the letter appears to be codified in Cicero's epistolary discourse, where he describes himself embracing and kissing Appius Claudius' letter: *complexus igitur sum cogitatione te absentem; epistulam uero osculatus* (*ad fam*. 3.11.2).[26] Indeed, Dionysius not only kisses and embraces the unopened letter, but upon opening it he kisses the name 'Callirhoe': Καλλιρόης τοὔνομα κατεφίλησεν (8.5.13).[27] All this interaction with the letter as if it were the physical embodiment of the writer shows awareness of an established epistolary convention whereby the letter serves as an 'absent presence' of the writer.[28] Seneca, for example, describes the receipt of a letter as emulating the physical

---

[25] Robiano (2007) 211 rightly observes that tears and kisses feature in Chaereas' composition of a letter and in Dionysius' receipt of one.

[26] At *Tr*. 3.5.12-6 Ovid combines the elements of tears, embraces, and kisses, recalling how a faithful friend reacted to the news of his punishment.

[27] In Achilles, Clitophon's receipt of Leucippe's letter echoes that of Dionysius: he re-reads it, weeps, and imagines that he can see her absent presence (5.19.5-6). See Morales (2004) 202-5 for a discussion of the ways in which the letter gives Leucippe a voice. Clitophon's letter in response is explicit about Leucippe's absent presence ('I find you present in your letter yet still absent from me') and Robiano (2007) 203 observes that whilst Dionysius behaves as if the letter *is* Callirhoe, Clitophon is aware that it is simply a generic convention. Koskenniemi (1956) 182 offers later parallels from Julian *Ep*. 183 and Eustathius Macrembolites 9.9.2.

[28] Hardie (2002a) discusses absent presence across the Ovidian corpus; see Hodkinson and Rosenmeyer (2013) 11 on how the epistolary form relies on separation and absence, and also Kennedy (2002) on the *Heroides*. See more generally Derrida (1980) on epistolarity as a communicative model that problematises presence and absence, togetherness and separation.

presence of the sender (*Ep*. 40.1).[29] Especially for the heroines, and Ovid's own exilic

persona, the theme of the absent addressee and their potential presence in the

epistolary form are major tropes, which enact the premise of elegy:[30] the desire for

full presence.[31]

Both Ovid and, after him, Chariton push the logic of epistolary absent

presence to its erotic conclusion.[32] Leander tells his letter that it might be lucky for

having its seal broken by Hero's lips and teeth (*Her*. 18.16-8):[33]

> iam tibi formosam porriget illa manum.
> forsitan admotis etiam tangere labellis,
>   rumpere dum niueo uincula dente uolet.

He later asks Hero to take the letter to bed with her as a 'provisional substitute':

interea pro me pernoctet epistula tecum,/ quam precor ut minima prosequar ipse

mora! (*Her*. 18.217f).[34] Dionysius' act of opening Callirhoe's letter is demonstrably

sexualised. He kisses the letter before opening it, then hugs it as if it were her and

kisses her name: τὴν ἐπιστολὴν κατεφίλησεν, εἶτα ἀνοίξας τῷ στήθει προσεπτύξατο

ὡς ἐκείνην παροῦσαν... (8.5.13). For Dionysius, possession of the letter is as good as

the erotic possession of the writer, and Robiano observes that his receipt of

Callirhoe's letter is the most intimate we see him with her: only at the point of her

physical emancipation from him does he become able to possess her in epistolary

---

[29] Cf. Demetrius *On Style* 227, who says that the letter contains an image (εἴκων) of the writer's soul;
Turpilius 215 Rychlewska says that letters make the absent present, which is similar to the content of
Philemon fr. 11 Kock; cf. also Palladas *A.P.* 9.401 (on the invention of pen and paper for the purpose of
communication between those who are absent) and Ovid *Ars*. 1.467f.
[30] Cf. *Her*. 7.183; *Tr*. 3.4b.55-9, 73f, 5.13.27-30; *Ex Pont*. 1.2.47-50.
[31] Hardie (2002a) 106-42; cf. Barchiesi (2001) 123-6, who suggests that the paired letters of Acontius
and Cydippe (20-21) perform a genealogy of the elegiac genre.
[32] Hardie (2002a) 107 cites the precedent of Plaut. *Pseud*. 35f, where the wax tablet is assimilated to the
naked girl who wrote the letter.
[33] Cf. Ovid *Am*. 2.15.7-18 to the *anulus* (discussed at p. 118).
[34] Rosati (1996) 40. Cf. *Her*. 17.181, where Paris puns on having *sermo* 'intercourse' with Helen.

form.[35] When Dionysius had earlier intercepted the letter from Chaereas destined for Callirhoe, he orders the invasive action of cutting open the seal (ἐντεμεῖν δὲ τὰς σφραγῖδας κελεύσας, 4.5.8), which can also be read as sexual interference: Gregory of Nyssa refers to the 'seal of virginity' (παρθενίας σφραγίς, *Or. dom*. 1), as does Ambrose (*integritatis signaculum, De Inst. Virg*. 52).[36] This Ovidian sexualisation of epistolary communication is confirmed by a precept in the *Ars Amatoria*. We are told that Callirhoe's composition of the letter is the only thing she kept secret from Chaereas (τοῦτο μόνον ἐποίησε δίχα Χαιρέου, 8.4.4) and on completion she hides it in her bosom (τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἀπέκρυψεν ἐν τοῖς κόλποις, 8.4.7).[37] This is precisely the advice offered to women by the Ovidian *praeceptor* (*Ars*. 3.621f),[38] and enacted by Cydippe: *tegitur trepido littera coepta sinu* (*Her*. 21.26).[39]

The (sexualised) epistolary discourse on display in Chariton, with its preoccupation with the processes of composition and reception, align Chaereas and Dionysius not only with abandoned heroines of the *Heroides*, but also with Ovid's own exilic persona. It is to the latter that I now turn.

3.3   A ring and an abortion

---

[35] Robiano (2007) 204-5.

[36] Whitmarsh (2005b) 120, citing duBois (1988) 130-66 on the 'writing tablet' (δέλτος) and female body. On the opening of a letter as sexual penetration see also Rosenmeyer (2001) 91 n. 64, and Robiano (2007) 204 n. 17. Cf. also Rosenmeyer (2001) 1 on the 'epistolary decorum' in Plut. *Demetrius* 22.2, where the Athenians intercept Philip's letter bearers, but the one from his wife Olympias they forward to Philip with its seal unbroken. Plut. *Ant*. 10.8-10 features an interesting case in which Antony dresses up as a slave, delivers a letter to his wife Fulvia, and kisses her while she reads it.

[37] Callirhoe blushes when she gives the letter to Statira (8.4.9); on Callirhoe as a 'blushing beauty' see De Temmerman (2007). For blushes as signalling erotic interest, see Lyne (1983) on Lavinia; cf. the *conscius rubor* of the girl at Cat. 65.24.

[38] Gibson (2003) 338-9 *ad loc*. cites Turpilius 197f Rychlewska, Tib. 2.6.45f, Ov. *Am*. 3.1.55f, as well as the military advice of Aeneas Tacticus. There is a non-erotic precedent at Plato *Phaedr*. 228d, where Phaedrus keeps the speech of Lysias under his robe.

[39] Likewise in Achilles, Clitophon hides the letter from Leucippe under his belt, only for it to drop onto the floor and be discovered by Melite (5.24.1-3).

Before delving into the more metaphysical aspects of exilic discourse that indicate a direct relationship between Chariton and Ovid, I would like to begin with a clear example of Chariton's debt to Ovid that has gone oddly unnoticed. While Callirhoe is being ferried away to Ionia by Theron and his brigand crew, she addresses a ring on her finger on which is engraved an image of Chaereas.[40] She kisses it, lamenting their separation (1.14.9):

> εἶδεν <u>ἐν τῷ δακτυλίῳ τὴν εἰκόνα</u> τὴν Χαιρέου καὶ καταφιλοῦσα "ἀληθῶς ἀπόλωλά σοι, Χαιρέα" φησί, "<u>τοιούτῳ διαζευχθεῖσα πελάγει</u>[41]..."

For Callirhoe, the 'image summons a presence deeply desired';[42] her apostrophe and physical interaction with the ring recall the trope of absent presence already discussed in connection with epistolary conventions. There is a remarkably similar vignette in the *Tristia*, in which Ovid addresses a hypothetical friend who carries a likeness of him on his ring.[43] Ovid describes how his friend likewise embraces and addresses the image, and laments his separation from Ovid (*Tr.* 1.7.6-10):

> <u>in digito</u> qui me fersque referque tuo,
> <u>effigiem</u>que meam fuluo complexus in auro
>   cara relegati, qua potes, ora uides.
> quae quotiens spectas, subeat tibi dicere forsan
>   "<u>quam procul a nobis Naso sodalis abest</u>!"

---

[40] The ring is first mentioned at 1.13.11 as being the only object that Callirhoe is permitted by the pirates to keep.
[41] Hirschig (1856) reads πάθει instead of πελάγει.
[42] Elsner (1998) 63.
[43] For the propagandistic use of signet rings among the Roman nobility in the late Republic and early Empire see Vollenweider (1955) who adduces the Ovidian passage at 109; the signet rings of Maecenas (a frog) and Augustus (a sphinx, a portrait of Alexander, and a self-portrait) were well known (Pliny *N.H.* 37.10-11; Suet. *Aug.* 50). See further Griffin (1985) 12.

Like Callirhoe's ring, Ovid's friend's ring is a signifier of separation and absence.[44] The correspondences are identical in terms of both context and content. As I shall proceed to discuss in this section, Callirhoe articulates her separation from Chaereas and later journey into Babylon adopting precisely the same idiomatic framework and range of images that Ovid employs to articulate his isolation in Tomis. In this particular instance, Chariton co-opts a memorable Ovidian vignette and transfers it to the soon-to-be-exiled Callirhoe. The coherence between lexical details proves the direct connection: the image on the ring on the finger (ἐν τῷ δακτυλίῳ τὴν εἰκόνα; *in digito... effigiem*), the distance separating them (τοιούτῳ διαζευχθεῖσα πελάγει; *quam procul a nobis Naso sodalis abest*), and the apostrophe of the image on the ring.

This type of simulacral presence is a preoccupation of the exiled Ovid. In another poem (*Ex Pont*. 2.8) he describes a medallion sent to him by Cotta Maximus, on which are depicted the likenesses of Augustus, Tiberius, and Livia; when he looks at it he is transported back to Rome and he addresses the image (15) and says that he will embrace the image as the 'altar of his exile' (68f). Discussing this passage, Hardie recognises the 'power of images to conjure up absent persons' and cites Elsner's analysis of the emperor's presence through his statue, resulting in the 'elision of persons and images'.[45] Elsewhere, Ovid worries that Macer might no longer recognise his seal, and that his *anulus* might no longer be an *index* of its author (*Ex Pont*. 2.10.1-4). It is likely, then, that Ovid's seal featured an image of him (see p. 110 n. 23).

---

[44] On the ring in Ovid see Oliensis (1997) 185.
[45] Hardie (2002a) 318-22, quotation at 318; Elsner (1998) 37.

Callirhoe's ring again features in an episode that has been described as unique in extant Greek literature:[46] finding herself pregnant with Chaereas' baby after they have achieved mutual orgasm (2.8.4),[47] Callirhoe wonders whether or not she should abort the baby, concerned that a descendant of Hermocrates might be born a slave (2.9.2; cf. 2.11.2);[48] she changes her mind, thinking of her unborn son's potential likeness to Chaereas (2.9.4)—indeed, the fact that it is a *son* gives her pause for thought—and a likeness of Chaereas then appears to her in a dream in which he entrusts their son to her (2.9.6; see p. 74-5). She determines to bring up the child but again she vacillates, eventually convening a three-way conference between herself, Chaereas, and the child. She effects this by pressing her ring, with its image of Chaereas, against her womb: ἡ Καλλιρόη... τὴν εἰκόνα Χαιρέου τῇ γαστρὶ προσέθηκε καὶ "ἰδοὺ" φησὶ "τρεῖς γεγόναμεν, ἀνὴρ καὶ γυνὴ καὶ τέκνον..." (2.11.1).[49]

The combination of a ring and a discourse on abortion should have Ovidian alarm-bells ringing. In the second book of the *Amores* there is a sequence of elegies that treat these topics, and which are themselves original and innovative in theme. *Am.* 2.13 and 14 dilate on the circumstances of an abortion undertaken by Corinna to remove the product of her elegiac love affair.[50] The first poem of the diptych constitutes a prayer for Corinna's recovery, but the second articulates an argument against abortion; not on any moral basis, but because abortions prevent patrilineal succession to the extent that there would be no Achilles, Romulus, Aeneas, Caesars,

---

[46] Johne (1996) 180; Schwartz (1999) 26.
[47] Mutual orgasms are an Ovidian preoccupation (*Ars* 2.725-8). In addition, Plangon recognises that Callirhoe is pregnant while she is bathing (2.8.5-6), recalling the circumstances of the exposure of Callisto's pregnancy following her rape by Jupiter (Ov. *Met.* 2.457-63).
[48] On Callirhoe's rhetoric in Book 2 generally see Daude (2006).
[49] Liviabella Furiani (1989) 53 sees Callirhoe's decision as part of a greater female control; Egger (1994) sees her inability to decide as part of a desire to control both Chaereas and Dionysius. See Kapparis (2002) 120-4 on the economic factors impinging on Callirhoe's decision on whether to abort.
[50] Gamel (1989) discusses abortion in these poems.

or even Corinna or Ovid (13-22).[51] The argument here reappears in Callirhoe's concern about her son *qua* grandson of Hermocrates (2.9.2, 2.11.2). Indeed, abortion was condemned according to the patriarchal framework and the risk it posed to the state by destroying future citizens (Cic. *Clu*. 32, Sen. *Dial*. 12.16.3).[52] Schwartz' analysis of the debate in Chariton concludes that Callirhoe's decision to leave her son with Dionysius at the end of the novel is informed by the fact that he is, according to Roman law (whereby paternity is cultural rather than biological), the legal father:[53] Callirhoe front-loads issues of dynasty and succession—just as Ovid does in *Am*. 2.14; and in the *Heroides* Dido suggests that if she kills herself she might also be killing Aeneas' unborn child (*Her*. 7.133-8).[54] Schwartz recognises that 'the concern with the perpetuation of the maternal grandfather's *oikos* through marriage alliance with other members of the Greek elite of Chariton's novel bears a broad similarity to the marriage patterns of the first generations of the Julio-Claudian dynasty'.[55] If Laplace is correct that Callirhoe's child is a figure for Aeneas and an aetiology for the Julia-Claudian clan[56] (and taking into account my earlier discussion of Vergilian associations of this passage and of Augustan themes in Chariton more generally) then perhaps Callirhoe's vacillation over whether or not to abort the child suggests that the creation of the Principate hinged on a coin-flip; it would be analogous to Plutarch's discussion of what might have happened had Alexander the Great turned West (rather than East) and met the Romans, and the role played by τύχη in Rome's rise to

---

[51] McKeown (1998) 277 notes the general resemblance to the passage in Chariton, and cites the declamatory material (which he argues to be the common background) at Theon *Prog*. 2.69 Spengel; at 308 *ad Am*. 2.14.29-34 he notes that both Ovid and Callirhoe (2.9.3) adduce mythological precedents for infanticide, and that they are 'closely paralleled'. Gauly (1990) 81-2 is sceptical about a common background in declamation.

[52] Adduced by Booth (1991) 70-1.

[53] Schwartz (1999), adducing *Dig*. 1.5.5.2

[54] Canace is another example of an Ovidian mother contemplating abortion (*Her*. 11.123).

[55] Schwartz (1999) 50-1; see Corbier (1995) on how Augustus uses his daughter Julia in creating the *domus Augusta*.

[56] Laplace (1980) 121-5.

greatness (*De Fort. Rom.* 13; cf. Liv. 9.18.7 on the *leuissimi ex Graecis* who keep mentioning Alexander).[57]

The third poem in the Ovidian sequence (after *Am*. 2.13, 14) informing the episode in Chariton is *Am.* 2.15, in which he sends his a beloved an *anulus* as an erotic gift; he wishes he might becomes the *anulus* in order to touch Corinna's breasts (11), touch her lips when she uses the ring to seal letters (15-18), and 'play the part of a man' (25f). The topos of wishing to be an object in order to achieve a surrogate presence with the beloved is well attested in Hellenistic epigram and elsewhere,[58] but Ovid is unique (aside from three Pompeian wall inscriptions)[59] in having a ring as his object of choice.[60] In both Chariton and Ovid, the ring serves as a proxy between lover and beloved, and both are unique in their application of the theme. Hodkinson argues that Philostratus *Ep.* 54—in which a rose, which the sender wishes to become, is sent to the beloved to engage in sexual contact with her—is directly indebted to Ovid *Am*. 2.15;[61] it is therefore likely that *Am*. 2.13, 14 and 15—all original and innovative treatments of their respective content—were a well known sequence, and that Chariton has combined them in this episode as part of his own unique treatment of the themes.

3.4   Exilic discourse in Chariton and Ovid

---

[57] On the passage in Plutarch see Forni (1989), Swain (1989); Van der Stockt (2013) argues for the provocative nature of Plutarch's *De Fort. Rom.*; on Livy's 'Alexander digression' (9.17-19) see Momigliano (1934), Suerbaum (1997) 53, Morello (2002); on the postcolonial application of these passages in Greek literature emanating from Rome, see Hose (1999) 303-4.

[58] E.g *PMG* 900, 901, *A.P.* 5.83. See McKeown (1998) 316 for a list of parallels. There is also a tradition of ecphrastic epigrams of signet-rings (*A.P.* 9.746-8, 750-2)

[59] *CIL* 4.1698, 4.10241, Solin (1975) 266 no. 61; see Hiltbrunner (1981) for the connection with Ovid.

[60] Rings are love-tokens in Plaut. *Mil.* 957, Mart. 8.5, *CIL* 13.10024.42, 65, Hor. *C.* 1.9.23f, Prop. 4.7.9.

[61] Hodkinson (2009) 234-6, especially on the basis of the theme of 'playing the role of the man': *et peragam partes anulus ille uiri* (*Am.* 2.15.26); ἐνετειλάμην αὐτοῖς καὶ τὴν δειρήν σου φιλῆσαι καὶ τοῖς μαστοῖς ἐπελθεῖν καὶ ἀνδρίσασθαι (*Ep.* 54.9). At 235 he says that the 'parallel is... too close to be a coincidence'.

Chariton's novel (indeed all of the Greek novels) trades on the emotional consequences following from the enforced separation of the protagonists. In this respect it shares much in common with the condition of the exile, the 'primary association [of which] is with the pain of separation from home and beloved'.[62] Indeed, Chariton tropes Callirhoe's separation from her home and loved ones as exile. She accuses 'malicious fortune' of exiling her own and Chaereas' corpse: φυγάδας ἡμῶν ἐποίησας καὶ τοὺς νεκρούς (4.1.12); at the bank of the Euphrates on the way to Babylon, Callirhoe accuses the sea and Theron of making her an exile: ἐμερίσαντό μου τὴν φυγὴν θάλασσα καὶ Θήρων (5.1.5); she rails at Tyche for exiling her even further away from home than Ionia: οὐκέτι γὰρ εἰς Ἰωνίαν με φυγαδεύεις... (5.1.5); and once in Babylon, the women encourage Callirhoe to choose Chaereas, otherwise she will be an exile living in a foreign land: ζήσεις ἐπὶ ξένης ὡς φυγάς (6.1.4).[63] Exile is an important tool in thinking about issues of (cultural) identity in a large empire.[64] Cicero's frequent epistolary jeremiads from exile reflect the idea that absence from Rome engenders a loss of personal identity,[65] and Ovid's exilic corpus concretises the direct link between exile and imperial power.[66] Both Ovid's exilic persona and Chariton share the fact that they are writing not from the centre of power, but from the

---

[62] Whitmarsh (2011) 222 and more generally 220-3. Comito (1975) discusses exile in the novels in connection with gnostic theology.

[63] Whitmarsh (2011) 222 n. 44 adduces other cases where characters 'metaphorically assimilat[e] themselves to those exiled under law or literally [refer] to themselves as deracinated': Xen. 1.7.1, 1.7.4, 3.3.1; Ach. 2.30.1-2, 5.11.1, 5.11.3, 7.14.2, 8.5.6; Heliod. 2.4.1, 5.1.1, 5.6.3, 5.18.3.

[64] Whitmarsh (2001b) 269.

[65] For Claassen (1999) 27 Cicero is the 'unconscious creator of the autobiographical genre "complaints from exile"'; see further 83-5, 105-10, and Claassen (2009) 173-4.

[66] Whitmarsh (2001b) 304 discusses how Vespasian's and Domitian's banishment of irksome philosophers means that exile becomes a powerful way of troping 'antagonism towards imperial power and movement away from Rome' and a way of framing the combative relationship between Greek *paideia* and Roman power. Philosophers appropriate exile as a celebratory mode of cultural self-positioning and free speech. Musonius, Favorinus, and Dio Chrysostom all claim to have been exiled by the empire, and all write treatises on exile. On the whole issue see Whitmarsh (2001a) 133-180, (2001b) and Nesselrath (2007). Vespasian's banishment of philosophers: Cassius Dio 66.13.2; Domitian's: Suet. *Dom.* 10.5; Tac. *Agr.* 2.1-2; Plin. *Ep.* 3.11.2-3; Philostr. *V.A.* 7.11.

periphery. In this section I shall explore elements of Callirhoe's position that derive from the exilic discourse of Ovid and demonstrate that both are thinking about exile and separation (and their effect) in analogous and often identical ways: the ontologically liminal status between life and death, the distance from and desire for home, the despair for any possible return, and self-blame.

The Euphrates functions as a repository of and catalyst for exilic discourse. Callirhoe's physical arrival at the river, where she apostrophises Τύχη βάσκανε (5.1.3-7), and her later apostrophe of the Euphrates once in Babylon (6.6.3-5) mark key moments at which Ovidian exilic themes come to the surface.[67] The river Euphrates acts as a cultural and political fault-line. It separates Callirhoe from the Greek world of the Mediterranean and the 'starting point of the Great King's empire', and geographically encodes many of the exilic preoccupations to be discussed.[68] Callirhoe specifies the Euphrates as a point of linguistic fracture beyond which she will no longer hear Greek spoken; she begins to feel a desire for her home and family, but fears that this will never happen (5.1.3):

> Καλλιρόη μὲν γὰρ μέχρι Συρίας καὶ Κιλικίας κούφως ἔφερε τὴν ἀποδημίαν· καὶ γὰρ Ἑλλάδος ἤκουε φωνῆς καὶ θάλασσαν ἔβλεπε τὴν ἄγουσαν εἰς Συρακούσας· ὡς δ᾽ ἧκεν ἐπὶ ποταμὸν Εὐφράτην, μεθ᾽ ὃν ἤπειρός ἐστι μεγάλη, ἀφετήριον εἰς τὴν βασιλέως γῆν τὴν πολλήν, τότε ἤδη πόθος αὐτὴν ὑπεδύετο πατρίδος τε καὶ συγγενῶν καὶ ἀπόγνωσις τῆς εἰς τοὔμπαλιν ὑποστροφῆς.

---

[67] Ovid also blames the 'unjust weapons of Fortuna': *Fortunae telis confixus iniquis* (*Ex Pont*. 2.7.15); and apostrophises Lachesis: *o duram Lachesin* (*Tr.* 5.10.45).
[68] At 4.7.8 Callirhoe says that as long as she can see the Aegean (θαλάσσης Ἑλληνικῆς) she considers Syracuse nearby. On this phrase see Bowie (1991) 189, also citing Hdt. 5.54.2, Thuc. 1.4.1, Arrian *Anab.* 2.25.1, 5.1.5.

For Ovid, language is an index of cultural identity. Relegated to Tomis, he says that it is unlikely that any sailor will arrive who speaks Greek or Latin (*Tr*. 3.12.37-40);[69] no native knows Latin or Greek: *nesciaque est uocis quod barbara lingua Latinae,/ Graecaque quod Getico uicta loquella sono est* (*Tr*. 5.2.67f); he complains that he now only hears Thracian and Scythian, and that his Latin is infected with Getic: *Threico Scythicoque fero circumsonor ore,/ et uideor Geticis scribere posse modis* (*Tr*. 3.14.47f).[70] A breakdown in language leads to solipsism, lack of dialogicity, and 'is often symptomatic of the alienation felt by exiles'.[71] Ovid and Callirhoe share the exile's conception of loss of language as a physical and cultural deracination.

Both Callirhoe and Ovid eroticise their desire for a return home. Callirhoe describes her wish as a πόθος for her homeland and family (quoted and underlined above). The lexeme πόθος can refer to a desire for something absent (*LSJ* s.v. I; cf. the pseudetymology in Plato *Crat*. 420a), but it is also sexual longing (*LSJ* s.v. II.1).[72] On his emotional departure from Rome, Ovid describes the desire he feels for his homeland: *blando patriae retinebar amore* (*Tr*. 1.3.49); Daedalus, exiled on Crete, expresses a similar desire for home: *tactusque natalis loci amore* (*Met*. 8.183);[73] trapped in Cilicia, Cicero articulates his desire to be back in Rome: *mirum me*

---

[69] Callirhoe likewise worries that no Sicilian ship will arrive to look for her: ποίαν ἔτ' ἐλπίσω ναῦν ἐκ Σικελίας καταπλέουσαν; (5.1.6).

[70] Cf. also *Tr*. 3.1.17f (if anything seems *non dicta Latine* it is because it is written in a *barbara terra*); *Tr*. 4.1.89-94 (nobody can read his poetry because they do not know Latin); *Tr*. 5.7.51-6 (there is a tiny bit of Greek in a Getic twang, but absolutely no Latin); *Tr*. 5.7.57-64 (Ovid risks forgetting Latin, so speaks to himself); *Tr*. 5.10.35-42 (Ovid can only communicate by gestures, the Getae laugh at his Latin, and *he* is now the barbarian); *Tr*. 5.12.53-8 (nobody understands him in Tomis, he has forgotten Latin and learned Getic and Sarmatian); *Ex Pont*. 3.2.40 (Ovid has learnt to speak Getic and Sarmatian); *Ex Pont*. 4.13.19 (Ovid has written a poem in Getic on the apotheosis of Caesar, on which see the analysis of Galasso (2009) 205). Rochette (1997) 54-5 and Adams (2003) 17-18, 105-6 discuss issues of language contact in Ovid's Tomis

[71] Claassen (2009) 172.

[72] Whitmarsh (2011) 142 describes πόθος in the novels as a 'metanarrative force, a cipher for the romantic plot', which 'marks an absence to be remedied, a gap to be filled, a crisis to be resolved'.

[73] On this passage see Harrison (2007b) 136-7; see Sharrock (1994a) 168-73 for connections between the exiles of Ovid and Daedalus.

121

desiderium tenet urbis (_ad fam_. 2.11.1; cf. 2.12.3).[74] Rome is an elegiac object of desire in Ovid's exile poetry,[75] and Callirhoe's πόθος πατρίδος is of precisely the same orientation as Ovid's _amor patriae_: her last action before boarding the ferry to cross the Euphrates is to kiss the ground: ταῦτα ἅμα λέγουσα <u>τὴν γῆν κατεφίλησεν</u>, εἶτα ἐπιβᾶσα τῆς πορθμίδος διεπέρασεν (5.1.7).[76]

Both Callirhoe and Ovid likewise express a fear that they will never return. Coupled with a desire for her homeland is a 'despair of returning' (quoted and underlined above); she fears that she will cross the river only once: ἅπαξ, Εὐφρᾶτα, μέλλω σε διαβαίνειν (5.1.7); later apostrophising the Euphrates, she recalls her prediction: "ταῦτα" φησὶν "ἐγὼ προεμαντευόμην. ἔχω σε μάρτυν, Εὐφρᾶτα. προεῖπον ὅτι οὐκέτι σε διαβήσομαι (6.6.2-3); and bidding farewell to her father, mother, and Syracuse, she says that she will never see them again: ἔρρωσο, πάτερ, καὶ σύ, μῆτερ, καὶ Συρακοῦσαι πατρίς· οὐκέτι γὰρ ὑμᾶς ὄψομαι (6.5.3). It is a fear that also plagues Ovid who, despite filling his exilic corpus with letters requesting intercessions with Augustus, believes that he will ultimately never return home. He knows that he will never see his _uxor_, _domus_, or _sodales_ ever again (_Tr_. 1.3.63-8); he imagines that he will die on a strange shore, on no _consueto lecto_ but in a _barbara terra_ (_Tr_. 3.3.31-46);[77] elsewhere he fears that he will die in Tomis (_nos his moriemur aruis_, _Ex Pont_. 1.4.43) and be buried in Sarmatian soil (_Ex Pont_. 1.2.57f, 107-12).[78] Callirhoe sketches for herself the same future as Ovid, forecasting Bactra and Susa as her tomb: Βάκτρα μοι καὶ Σοῦσα λοιπὸν οἶκος καὶ τάφος (5.1.7).

---

[74] Adduced by Edwards (1996) 115.
[75] Edwards (1996) 118.
[76] The epic model is Odysseus on his return to Ithaca (Hom. _Od_. 13.354).
[77] Callirhoe likewise accuses Fortune of casting her from 'familiar surroundings': νῦν δὲ ἔξω με τοῦ <u>συνήθους</u> ῥίπτεις ἀέρος (5.1.5).
[78] Gaertner (2005) 171 _ad_ 1.2.58 lists further references to Ovid's fear of dying on foreign soil.

The fear of never returning home is linked to the homology between exile and death, which is a well recognised convention in the exilic discourse of Cicero and Ovid (and is, in fact, seemingly peculiar to Latin literature).[79] Displacement causes confusion in the conventional categories governing time, and ontological states become blurred. Callirhoe sees Bactra and Susa as her τάφος (5.1.7, quoted above); later, once in Babylon, she apostrophises the Euphrates, says that she will never see her family again, and claims that she is 'now truly dead': νῦν ὡς ἀληθῶς Καλλιρόη τέθνηκεν (6.6.3). On many occasions Ovid classifies his exile as a funeral or death.[80] There is an even closer correspondence between Ovid and Callirhoe insofar as both conceptualise their exilic destination as the Underworld. Daude argues that Callirhoe's crossing of the Euphrates, which she explicitly says she will only do once (5.1.7, quoted above), symbolises her passing over the Acheron into the land of the dead.[81] In addition, like Aeneas (Verg. *Aen*. 6.412-6) she crosses the river by ferry (ἐπιβᾶσα τῆς πορθμίδος διεπέρασεν, 5.1.7). Furthermore, Callirhoe says that she is shut up 'in the furthest barbarian recesses' (βαρβάροις ἐγκλείομαι μυχοῖς, 5.1.6), which may suggest interment: in Hesiod μυχός refers to the Underworld (Τάρταρά τ' ἠερόεντα μυχῷ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης, *Theog*. 119).[82] Not only is Ovid's Tomis

---

[79] See Wistrand (1968) 6-26, Nagle (1980) 23-35, Claassen (1996) 576-85, (1999) 239-40; Doblhofer (1987) 174 adduces Publil. e.9; Helzle (1988) 78 gathers Ciceronian examples (*Att*. 4.1.8, *Q. fr*. 1.3.1; cf. *Att*. 3.20.1 and *Red. Sen*. 27, where his return is a 'rebirth'); Gaertner (2007) 159 traces the motif as far back as Ennius *Scen*. 231, containing a pun on *exilium* and *exitium* (unparalleled in any Greek model), on which see LaPenna (1990) 64-72, who suggests (with Gaertner) that the conceit is Latin in origin (cf. Plaut. *Capt*. 519, which features the same pun). Cicero quotes the Ennian line in *D.N.D*. 3.66, so perhaps derives the conceit thence. Gaertner (2005) 353 *ad Ex Pont*. 1.5.86 is a useful summary. For the homology of exile and death in ancient philosophy see Luck (1977) 1-2, Labate (1987) 94, Claassen (1999) 20.
[80] Funeral: *Tr*. 1.3.89, 97, 3.13.21f, 5.1.11-4, 48; Death: *Tr*. 1.2.71, 1.4.28, 3.14.21, 5.9.19; *Ex Pont*. 1.5.86, 1.7.10, 1.9.56, 2.3.3, 42, 3.5.33, 4.1.44, 4.16.4f, 51. The exile is simultaneously dead and desires death (e.g. *Tr*. 1.4.28), on which paradox see Green (1994) 325, Evans (1983) 66.
[81] Daude (1990) 86-8.
[82] Adduced by Whitmarsh (2011) 52, where he suggests a sense of imprisonment.

described in terms that recall depictions of the Underworld,[83] but it is explicitly associated with the Styx on three (or possibly four) occasions, all from the *Ex Ponto*: he wonders how far his death is from the Stygian water: *a Stygia quantum mors mea distat aqua?* (2.3.4); he describes Pontus as adjacent to the Styx, from where he struggles to return: *a Styge nec longe Pontica distat humus...* (3.5.56f); he wishes to leave the Styx: *exeat e Stygiis ut mea nauis aquis* (4.9.74); and he has been thrust onto the Stygian shores: *Stygias*[84] *detrusus in oras* (1.8.27).

Callirhoe's apostrophe of Tyche on her arrival at the Euphrates articulates her separation from home in terms identical to Ovid's exilic persona. She accuses Theron and the sea of sending her into exile (5.1.5, quoted above), which functions metatextually to mark the passage as inhabiting a particular generic space, namely the Ovidian exilic corpus; using a striking turn of phrase, she goes on to say that she has been separated from her home by a 'whole firmament/world': τῆς πατρίδος ὅλῳ διορίζομαι κόσμῳ (5.1.5).[85] This reflects the similarly 'polarising mentality' of 'here' versus 'there' and the hyperbolically extreme distance between Ovid and Rome.[86] As above with respect to the Styx, the *Ex Ponto* again provides Chariton with a lexically (and grammatically) exact model for 'separation by a whole world'. Ovid is separated from Rome by a 'firmament': *diuidimur caelo* (1.5.73); he is separated by a 'whole world' from Celsus' tomb: *aque tuis toto diuidor orbe rogis* (1.9.48); he is separated from his *patria* by a 'whole world': *patria toto sumus orbe remoti* (2.2.121); and despite being separated by a 'whole world', he still remembers Rufus: *toto orbe*

---

[83] See G. D. Williams (1994) 12-13 for details.
[84] Or *Scythias*. See Gaertner (2005) *ad loc*.
[85] Cf. *LSJ* s.v. κόσμος IV.
[86] Quotation from G.D. Williams (2002) 343-4.

remoti... (2.11.3f).[87] Callirhoe immediately goes on to say that she has been torn from Chaereas' tomb (ἀποσπῶμαι καὶ τοῦ σοῦ τάφου, Χαιρέα, 5.1.6), recalling the context of Ovid's separation from Celsus' tomb. In the previous sentence Callirhoe had described herself as 'shut up in the extreme corner' of a barbarian land (5.1.6, quoted above),[88] also reflecting Ovid's incessant claim to be stuck in the remotest and most extreme part of the world: *qui procul extremo pulsus in orbe latet* (*Tr.* 3.1.50); *extremum... missus in orbem* (*Tr.* 4.9.9); *orbis in extremi* (*Ex Pont.* 1.3.49); *in extremo orbi* (*Ex Pont.* 1.7.6); *ultima me tellus, ultimus orbis habet* (*Ex Pont.* 2.7.66).[89] He complains about his barbarian surroundings (e.g. *me sciat in media uiuere barbaria,* *Tr.* 3.10.4), and separation from his *patria*, *domus*, and *uxor* (*Tr.* 3.2.21, 3.4b.51-4, 3.11.15f, 4.6.19, 49), just as Callirhoe complains of separation from her πατρίς, 'familiar surroundings' (τοῦ συνήθους ἀέρος, 5.1.5), and Chaereas' tomb.

Both Callirhoe and Ovid blame certain attributes for their exile: their beauty and poetic genius respectively. On arriving at the Euphrates Callirhoe's major fear is that somebody beyond the river might think her beautiful: φοβοῦμαι γὰρ... μὴ δόξω τινὶ κἀκεῖ καλή (5.1.7); and in her later apostrophe to the Euphrates she curses her 'treacherous beauty' as the 'cause of all her ills' (6.6.4):

ὦ κάλλος ἐπίβουλον, σύ μοι πάντων κακῶν αἴτιον. διὰ σὲ ἀνηρέθην, διὰ σὲ ἐπράθην, διὰ σὲ ἔγημα μετὰ Χαιρέαν, διὰ σὲ εἰς Βαβυλῶνα ἤχθην, διὰ σὲ παρέστην δικαστηρίῳ. πόσοις με παρέδωκας; τάφῳ, λῃσταῖς, θαλάττῃ, δουλείᾳ, κρίσει.

---

[87] Gaertner (2005) 345 cites as lexical parallels Verg. *Ecl.* 1.66, Luc. *B.C.* 8.391, Manil. *Astr.* 2.397; cf. also *Tr.* 4.7.1-4 on the number of mountains, rivers, plains, and seas that lie between Ovid and Rome.
[88] Bowie (1991) 188-92 discusses Chariton's use of 'Greek' versus 'barbarian'.
[89] Gaertner (2005) 390 lists other examples from Latin poetry; cf. also *Tr.* 1.1.127f, 2.186-200; *Ex Pont.* 3.4.58.

125

She later refers to her beauty as the cause of her ruin (τὸ δυστυχὲς κάλλος, ὀλέθρου μοι γέγονεν αἴτιον, 7.5.3; cf. 2.2.8), and the topos is picked by Xenophon, whose protagonist Anthia also curses her beauty: κάλλος ἐπίβουλον (2.11.4); ὦ κάλλος ἐπίβουλον (5.5.5; cf. 2.1.3, 5.7.2).[90] Despite the apparent conventionality of beauty as a bane, Callirhoe's vexed relationship with her beauty as a cause of all her problems (including exile) is analogous to Ovid's relationship with his poetry, which he routinely qualifies as *perniciosus* or *nocens* and blames for his exile. For him, the Muses are responsible: *nostrae <u>maxima causa fugae</u>* (*Tr.* 5.12.45f; cf. πάντων κακῶν αἴτιον, above); *me mea Musa fugasset* (*Tr.* 3.5.21); he explicitly curses them: *carmina deuoueo Pieridasque meas* (*Tr.* 5.7.32); and blames them elsewhere (*Tr.* 1.7.21, 2.1-14, 568, 3.7.9, 4.1.19-30). He also rails against his *ingenium* (*Tr.* 1.1.55f, 3.3.74, *Ex Pont.* 3.5.4), *libri/libelli* and *scripta* (*Tr.* 2.61, 563f, 5.1.67f), *artes* (*Tr.* 1.9.57f, *Ex Pont.* 2.7.47f), and even alludes to the fact that his current poetry is harming his reputation among the Tomitans (*Ex Pont.* 4.14.15-20).

Callirhoe's and Ovid's preoccupation with the negative impact of their otherwise positive attributes is directly linked to their celebrity status.[91] Callirhoe blames her abduction by Theron on her περιβόητον κάλλος (1.14.8); she laments that she has become the gossip of all of Asia and Europe: διήγημα καὶ τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης γέγονα (5.5.3);[92] Dionysius worries that, once seen, she will become a celebrity because of her beauty: ἔμελλε γὰρ περιβόητος ὀφθεῖσα ἔσεσθαι (2.7.1); and

---

[90] The harmful effects of beauty are also a leitmotif of rape victims in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Daphne (1.488f), Coronis (2.575), Herse (2.723-5), Arethusa (5.583, 603), Cephalus' reference to Orithyia (7.697). See Easterling (1977) 122 on the tragic consequences of beauty for Deianira and Iole in Soph. *Trach.* 24f, 464f. Helen curses her beauty in Eur. *Helen* 27f, 304f.

[91] See Schmeling (2005) on Callirhoe's 'celebrity status' as a function of Chariton's metaliterary self-advertising.

[92] Cf. Helen at Hom. *Il.* 6.357f, on her own and Paris' fate, which will be sung by future generations; see p. 96 n. 95 above.

later he is pained at her celebrity: Διονύσιον δὲ καὶ πάλαι μὲν ἐλύπει τὸ περιβόητον τῆς γυναικὸς (5.2.7);[93] Pharnaces refers to her celebrity status: τὸ κάλλος τῆς γυναικὸς περιβόητον (4.6.4); as does Artaxates (6.5.3) and Rumour (4.7.5).[94] Ovid likewise disavows his celebrity status and highlights its deleterious effects. He was always on people's lips: *qui [ego] populi semper in ore fuit* (*Tr*. 4.1.68); he wishes he was known by nobody: *non adeo est bene nunc ut sit mihi gloria curae:/ si liceat, nulli cognitus esse uelim* (*Tr*. 5.12.41f); his *artes* brought him fame but also destroyed him: *artibus ingenuis quaesita est gloria multis:/ infelix perii dotibus ipse meis* (*Ex Pont*. 2.7.47f); and in *Tr*. 3.4a he advises a friend against making a name for himself. Callirhoe's and Ovid's celebrity status—brought about by their beauty and poetic talents—have identical results. In this connection it is possible that Callirhoe's reference to the King's anger at the end of her apostrophe of the Euphrates (τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως ὀργήν, 6.6.5), which she considers to be less frightening than the jealousy of the Queen (φοβερωτέραν ἡγοῦμαι τὴν τῆς βασιλίδος ζηλοτυπίαν, 6.6.5), contains a further allusion. Coming in a passage already so larded with Ovidian exilic markers, it is possible that the 'King's anger' alludes to Ovid's recurring obsession with the *ira principis/Caesaris* who is responsible for his exile;[95] and perhaps Callirhoe's explicit weighting of queenly jealousy over kingly anger serves as a metageneric indicator, namely, that jealousy (rather than anger) is the dominant emotion in Chariton's prose romance.[96]

---

[93] Dionysius' paranoia is very similar to that of Helen in the *Heroides*, where she curses her beauty and says that the more that it is praised, the more Menelaus fears: *forma quoque est oneri; nam quo constantius ore/ laudamur uestro, iustius ille timet* (17.167f).

[94] Cf. the Persian woman Rhodogyne: μέγα τι χρῆμα κάλλους καὶ περιβόητον (5.3.4).

[95] Scott (1930) 57 classes Augustus' anger as 'the central theme which runs throughout the *Tristia* and *Epistulae*', quoted at McGowan (2009) 192, discussing the link between imperial wrath and Homeric μῆνις.

[96] There have been a number of studies on the role of jealousy in Chariton: Paglialunga (2000a) and (2000b) on male and female jealousy in the novels (respectively); Roncali (1991) and Billault (2009) on jealousy as plot-motors in Chariton, and Fantham (1986) for jealousy in Greek literature generally.

Finally, for both Callirhoe and Ovid physical separation from home constitutes a disintegration of personal identity and a loss of a sense of self.[97] When questioned about her origins by Dionysius, she says they no longer matter, because she has undergone a shift in existential status: ὄνειρος ἦν τὰ πρῶτα καὶ μῦθος, εἰμὶ δὲ νῦν ὃ γέγονα, δούλη καὶ ξένη (2.5.7).[98] She displaces her previous life to the experiential levels of dreams and stories in contrast to what she 'now is'. Ovid professes a similar existential shift, saying that he is not what he was, and is now simply a shade: *non sum ego quod fueram. quid inanem proteris umbram?* (*Tr*. 3.11.25); later in the same poem he reminds his addressee that his former self no longer exists: *me quoque, quem noras olim, non esse memento* (29); and elsewhere he contrasts his present and former ontological states: *cernimus... qui sim qui fuerimque* (*Tr*. 3.8.38). Both Callirhoe and Ovid accept their shift in fortune and articulate its effect on their personhood in analogous ways.

3.5   Further remarks on Latin elegy

Alvares observes in passing that there is a similarity in the subject matter and treatment of desire in elegy and the Greek novels, whilst Haynes avers that although it would be 'foolish to suggest any direct intertextual borrowings or influence between Roman satire and elegy and the Greek novel' it might still be 'illuminating'.[99] Whereas I shall argue in Chapter 4 in the case of Achilles that interpersonal relations

---

Jealousy is also a marker of Roman love elegy, on which see Caston (2012). See Scourfield (2003) for the role of anger in Chariton.

[97] See Claassen (1990) and (2003) on this phenomenon in Ovid.

[98] Cf. similar language used by Pliny (*Ep*. 8.24.5) writing of the province of Achaia.

[99] Alvares (2012) 17, arguing from a Lacanian angle; Haynes (2003) 114. Cataudella (1927) 305 likens Plangon's tactic (2.7.2-3) to advice given by the Ovidian *praeceptor* (*Ars*. 2.291f), but suggests that it is a literary commonplace. On Plangon's rhetoric see De Temmerman (2006).

between Clitophon and Leucippe (as well as others) are predicated on various generic codes and discursive markers found in Latin elegy (and especially Ovid's erotic corpus), it does not seem that Chariton has naturalised elegiac codes to the same extent as Achilles, except in the case of *seruitium* and *militia amoris* (discussed in Chapter 1).

That is not to say that the totalising conception of love obtaining between the protagonists in Chariton does not owe something to Latin elegy. Here I shall sketch several further areas where connections between Chariton and Latin erotic elegy demand attention. In the first instance, there is a manifest example of Chariton's knowledge of Propertius. Following a symposium in Miletus, Dionysius cannot sleep and recalls his meeting with Callirhoe at the shrine of Aphrodite. His idiomatic choice is at once arresting and odd; he reports that in his mind he was 'wholly at Aphrodite's shrine': <u>ὅλος δὲ ἦν ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἱερῷ</u> (2.4.3). In Propertius 4.8, Cynthia has left Propertius to go to shrine of Juno at Lanuvium, though he suspects rather the 'rites of Venus': *causa fuit Juno, sed mage causa Venus* (4.8.16). In Cynthia's absence, he invites some girls round to party, but cannot concentrate because his mind is 'wholly at the gates of Lanuvium': <u>*Lanuuii ad portas, ei mihi, totus eram*</u> (4.8.48).[100] Dionysius replicates the conceit of mental displacement to a location associated with the beloved, and in both cases this is a shrine (Aphrodite in Chariton, suspected to be Venereal in Propertius), and the sentiment occurs in (or after) a sympotic environment. Even the lexical structure is identical (ὅλος δὲ ἦν ~ *totus eram*; ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἱερῷ ~ *Lanuuii ad portas*). The erotic use of ὅλος is

---

[100] There is a textual issue here: Hutchinson (2006) prefers *solus* to *totus*, though *totus* is accepted by both Goold (1990), Heyworth (2007a), and Fedeli *et al.* (2015) 2.1069, who cite as parallels Cic. *Att.* 5.10.3, Hor *Sat.* 1.9.2, Ov. *Fast.* 6.251. See Goold (1966) 60-1; Heyworth (2007b) 481 supports his reading with reference to the erotic ὅλος in this passage and at Char. 4.2.8.

repeated later when Mithridates is absorbed in thought of Callirhoe: ὅλος δὲ ὢν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐννοίας ἐκείνης (4.2.8). This can be ranged with the totalising conception of love found elsewhere in Chariton, for example Chaereas' decision to entrust the fleet to Polycharmus because he is so wrapped up in Callirhoe: διὰ τὸ μηκέτι Χαιρέαν ἄλλῳ τινὶ σχολάζειν δύνασθαι πλὴν <u>Καλλιρόῃ μόνῃ</u> (8.6.9). This type of totalising erotic involvement is a constitutive feature of both Propertius and [Tibullus], and codified as such by Ovid: *tu mihi <u>sola</u> places; placeam tibi, Cynthia, <u>solus</u>* (Prop. 2.7.19); *tu mihi <u>sola</u> places* ([Tib.] 3.19.3); *elige cui dicas 'tu mihi <u>sola</u> places'* (Ov. *Ars* 1.42). Chariton has picked up on this elegiac generic marker.[101]

Another hallmark of the elegist's totalising conception of love is his obsession with death and, indeed, his assimilation of love *to* death. This is something he shares with Chariton.[102] Shortly after the erotic use of ὅλος attaching to Dionysius, he tells Leonas that he is 'dying' from love (ἀπόλωλά σοι, Λεωνᾶ, 2.4.7); Chaereas seems likely to die because of his passion (κινδυνεύοντος ἀπολέσθαι διὰ πάθος ψυχῆς εὐφυοῦς, 1.1.10); and Callirhoe's kiss could potentially kill Dionysius (ἀπολώλεκε, 2.8.1).[103] Love as death appears to be a homology generally peculiar to elegiac erotic discourse in which the verbs *pereo*, *depereo*, and *mori* are used erotically, though equivalents are all but non-existent in Greek literature prior to the elegists.[104] Gallus

---

[101] Another close lexical parallel, noted by Heyworth (2007b) 292, is Chariton's description of perfumed garlands and half-burned torches on Callirhoe's doorstep as the 'signifiers of a revel' (<u>σημεῖα</u> κώμου, 1.3.2); Propertius likewise describes such items on the threshold as 'the drunken signifiers of a night's revel' (*nocturnaeque... ebria <u>signa</u> fugae*, 3.3.48f).

[102] Fundamental is Griffin (1985) 142-62 on Roman poets generally, and Papanghelis (1987) on Propertius specifically; cf. also Lyne (1980) 141-3, 272-4. Sex and death are intertwined in modern psychoanalysis, following Freud's 'death drive' theory, according to which Eros and Thanatos are opposing forces representing the drive towards survival and destruction respectively, on which see Freud (1922).

[103] Cf. 3.2.1, where Dionysius wishes to die unless he can have Callirhoe (μὴ τυχὼν δὲ ἀποθανεῖν διεγνώκειν).

[104] Rohde (1960)⁴ 84-5 and Griffin (1985) 143 suspect lost Hellenistic erotic elegy might be a source. Svennung (1945) 113 cites Herodas 1.60 as an inexact parallel (ποθέων ἀποθνήισκει), and Headlam

130

dies of unrequited love (*indigno cum Gallus amore peribat*, Verg. *Ecl.* 10.10);

Propertius is happy to die as a result of Cynthia's charms (*perire iuuat*, 1.4.12); he

reports to Tullus that many have gladly died for love (1.6.7) and tells Gallus that he is

about to die from love (1.13.33); and beauty is frequently a cause of death (*ipse Paris*

nuda fertur periisse Lacaena, 2.15.13; *credo ego non paucos ista periisee figura*,

2.24.41).[105] Catullus, who frequently deploys the verb *depereo* in an erotic sense, is

perhaps the source (35.12, 64.119, 100f; cf. erotic *perire* at 45.5).[106] *Mori* is also

exceptionally frequent in an erotic context. Propertius, for example, sees Gallus dying

in the embraces of his girl: *cum te complexa morientem, Galle, puella* (1.10.5).[107]

The obsession with death shared by Chariton's lovers and the elegists extends

to the funereal context.[108] Planning on suicide, Dionysius draws up a will containing

funeral instructions in which he begs Callirhoe to visit his corpse (3.1.1):[109]

> διαθήκας ἔγραφε τὰς τελευταίας, ἐπιστέλλων πῶς ταφῇ. παρεκάλει δὲ
> Καλλιρόην ἐν τοῖς γράμμασιν ἵνα αὐτῷ προσέλθῃ κἂν νεκρῷ.

He later begs Callirhoe visit his corpse and weep over it (5.10.8):

> ἀλλὰ νῦν ἀληθῶς ἀποθανόντος Χαιρέου αἰτοῦμαί σε, Καλλιρόη, χάριν
> τελευταίαν. ὅταν ἀποθάνω, πρόσελθέ μου τῷ νεκρῷ καὶ εἰ μὲν δύνασαι
> κλαῦσον.[110]

---

and Knox (1922) 45 *ad* Herod. 1.60 cite Archil. fr. 193.1f (δύστηνος ἔγκειμαι πόθωι, ἄψυχος), along with the later Lucian (ἀπολλυμένης ὑπὸ τοῦ ἔρωτος, *Dial. Mar.* 13.1.8) and Paulus Silentiarius (*A.P.* 5.236), both of whom may well be conversant with Latin literature (on the latter see p. 20, 146).

[105] The sentiment is also found in Roman comedy (Plaut. *Poen.* 96, 1095, *Am.* 517, *Cist.* 132, *Merc.* 532; Ter. *Haut.* 525) and [Tib.] 3.2.30 (on the latter see Navarro Antolín (1995) 191).

[106] On Catullus' use of these lexemes see Svennung (1945) 113 and Heusch (1954) 74. It is interesting that Catullus 45, with its unusual representation of the mutual love between Acme and Septimius, anticipates the Greek novels in this regard. Cf. also Hor. *C.* 1.25.7 (*pereunte*), 1.27.12 (*pereat*).

[107] See Pichon (1902) s.v.

[108] Murgatroyd (1980) 66 *ad* Tib. 1.1.59f observes that the theme of the poet's death and funeral is not found until Propertius. Papanghelis (1987) specifies Propertius' second book as particularly obsessed with death.

[109] On poems containing *mandata morituri* see Cairns (1972) 91, Hunter 1983 (81-2), Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 336 *ad* Hor. *C.* 2.20.

Tibullus likewise bids Delia weep on his pyre and kiss him (1.1.61-3):

> flebis et arsuro positum me, Delia, lecto
>   tristibus et lacrimis oscula mixta dabis
> flebis...

Propertius details in full the rites that he expects Cynthia to discharge at his funeral (2.13.17-36; cf. 1.17.19-24) and imagines her visiting his tomb (3.16.21-4); he also worries that Cynthia will fail to attend his funeral (1.19.1-6), a complaint levelled at Propertius himself by the dead Cynthia (4.7.23-34; incl. lack of tears, 27f).

Chariton and the elegists also share the erotic sentiment that lovers wish to die together.[111] Callirhoe hopes to die before or with Chaereas: ἐγὼ μὲν προαποθανεῖν ἢ συναποθανεῖν ηὐξάμην σοι, Χαιρέα (3.10.4); she hopes to have Chaereas in death: εἰ καὶ ζῶντες ἀλλήλων οὐκ ἀπηλαύσαμεν, ἀποθανόντες ἀλλήλους ἕξομεν (3.7.6); Mithridates thinks death sweet with Callirhoe: μετὰ Καλλιρόης θάνατος ἡδύς (4.7.2); and the novel ends with Callirhoe's prayer to Aphrodite that she and Chaereas die a 'shared death': ἀλλὰ καὶ βίον μακάριον καὶ θάνατον κοινὸν κατάνευσον ἡμῖν (8.8.16). Propertius envisions himself and Cynthia dying on the same day (2.20.18, 2.28.39-42), just as Philemon and Baucis do in Ovid's account (*Met*. 8.708f); and in the famous epitaph for Allia Potestas her husband Apelles wishes for death now that his wife is dead (*CEL* 1988). Shared tombs are also a theme. Chaereas wishes that if he cannot share Callirhoe's bed, then at least he should share her grave (τάφον αὐτῇ

---

[110] Xenophon is clearly aware of this passage, in which Anthia asks Habrocomes to bury her with his own hands, kiss her corpse, and remember her (2.4.5). Xenophon has reversed the normatively gendered nature of the generic code, as has Propertius in 4.7.

[111] This can be taken to the erotic extremes of 'mort de Faure', whereby the lover expires at sexual climax: Prop. 2.9.49; Ov. *Am*. 2.10; Val. Max. 9.12.8; Pliny *N.H.* 7.184; Philaeterus fr. 6, 9 Kock. Cf. Tib. 1.1.59f for the wish to die in Delia's embrace, with the precedent of Damagetus *A.P.* 7.735.5f.

κοινὸν εὑρήσω, 3.3.6); and the dead Cynthia wishes her bones engage in skeletal sex with those of Propertius (*mecum eris et mixtis ossibus ossa teram*, 4.7.94).[112] Aigialeus' kissing of Thelxinoe's recently deceased corpse in Xenophon (5.1.9) and Clitophon's kissing of 'Leucippe's' decapitated trunk in Achilles (5.7.9) also participate in this discourse.

The above demonstrates that both Chariton and the elegists share a predilection for collapsing the categories of the erotic and the thanatic, as well as for a totalising conception of love. Chariton's use of jealousy as a thematic lynchpin and driving force of the plot could also warrant further study (on which see p. 129 with n. 96).[113] A final piece of speculation on Chariton's interest in Latin elegy resides in his opening announcement: πάθος ἐρωτικὸν... διηγήσομαι (1.1.1). Parthenius' Ἐρωτικὰ Παθήματα is a prose catalogue composed in the first century BCE containing the narratives of various ill-starred mythological lovers.[114] He dedicates his work to Cornelius Gallus and prescribes that the narratives contained in the work are to be used εἰς ἔπη καὶ ἐλεγείας.[115] In light of the interest that imperial Greek writers

---

[112] Cf. the epitaph for Euphrosyne *Carm. Ep.* 1136, Prop. 2.8.21-4, *Cons. Ad. Liv.* 163, Ov. *Met.* 11.705-7, *A.P.* 7.330.3-4, 7.378.3-4, 7.666.5, 15.8.1f. The epic model for mixed bones is Achilles and Patroclus (Hom. *Il.* 23.83-91, *Od.* 24.76-9).

[113] M. Jones (2012) 80 notes in passing that jealousy in Chariton and elegy is an index of passion. Iamblichus is unique in having a female protagonist, Sinonis, driven by fierce jealousy (cf. fr. 74a9 S-W). I would also add the curiosity of the fact that Chaereas' voice is described as 'thin' after he hears about Callirhoe's alleged infidelity (φωνὴν... ὀλίγην, 1.4.7) having previously been 'thick' with anger (παχεῖ τῷ φθέγματι, 1.3.5). Thinness and thickness are key constitutive features in Latin literary-critical discourse and function as ways of thinking about the generic categories of elegy and epic, whose emotional indices are jealousy and anger respectively; is Chariton suggesting that Chaereas moves from 'thick' epic anger to 'thin' elegiac jealousy?

[114] The phrase ἐρωτικὸν πάθος is not so common as to be labelled a cliché. Of the sixteen instances I am aware of in Greek literature, three occur in Chariton (1.1.1, 1.1.6, 3.2.6) and two in Heliodorus (2.25.2, 7.15.3).

[115] Lightfoot (1999) is fundamental. See my discussion of Achilles' knowledge of Gallus (p. 53-7).

evidently took in Parthenius (for example Lucian and Artemidorus),[116] perhaps their curiosity would have been piqued by the reference to Gallus' putative ἐλεγείας.

3.6   Conclusion

I hope to have demonstrated that Chariton is directly aware of Ovid's epistolary and exilic conventions, and has pressed them into service in a variety of ways. Ovid's *Heroides*, *Tristia*, and *Epistulae ex Ponto* lend themselves to the epistolary and exilic issues thematised in Chariton at specific and highly charged moments. Callirhoe's deracination and increasing distance from familiar cultural markers range her with Ovid's exilic persona. Further, Chaereas' appropriation of epistolary codes found in the *Heroides* encourages his assimilation to the abandoned heroines: both Chaereas and (most of) the heroines fear that their former partners have found love elsewhere. Callirhoe's letter to Dionysius reclaims the letter-form as a feminine mode of communication, and she writes herself as a successful heroine, rendering the male recipient Dionysius the abandoned partner. Chaereas and Dionysius both thematise the composition and reception of writing, as well as the materiality (and sexual potentiality) of the letter-form. In so doing they mobilise the same tropes and range of images as Ovid. The signet ring containing the effigy of Ovid is a particularly blatant appropriation of the conceit as a marker of absence (and simulacral presence), and can itself be read as a metatextual signifier of Ovidian exilic discourse—Clitophon's book in Achilles (1.6.6) functions in an analogous way, as a metatextual marker of Ovidian erotodidaxis (as I shall argue in section 4.4).

---

[116] Lucian *De Hist. Conscrib.* 56-7, Artem. *Oneirocr.* 4.63. Giangrande (1962) argues that the Greek novels in part derive from prose paraphrases of Alexandrian elegy and epyllion.

Chariton shows awareness of a sequence of remarkable elegies in the second book of Ovid's *Amores*. The claim that a Greek novelist has immediate knowledge of Ovid will form the basis of Chapter 4 on Achilles, but here I have alluded to certain instances in which Chariton is clearly engaging with the other Latin elegists, especially Propertius. Chariton shares with them a totalising conception of love, and is in the habit of conflating the erotic and funereal.

There is perhaps also a cognitive link between the frontier region of the river Euphrates and Ovidian exilic discourse, which Callirhoe activates both when she arrives at the river and when she later apostrophises it. The role of the Euphrates as a frontier region, and the Parthian empire lying beyond, is certainly a live issue from the time of Crassus' defeat at Carrhae in 53 BCE until Hadrian's withdrawal and re-establishment of the river as frontier (after Trajan's military activities in 114-6 CE), between which dates the novel was certainly composed; Roman military activity in the region early in Nero's reign may well point to a date in the 60s CE. The focus on the frontier and Artaxerxes' empire beyond, coupled with Chaereas' brusque letter to the King after the Egyptian revolt (8.4.2-3), makes a contemporary political reading available: there are people and places outside of Roman control. Nero's proclamation of Greek freedom in 67 CE may have served as a catalyst for the sentiment we see played out in allegorical form in Chariton's novel, namely, that the Greek elite are not only independent of Rome, but also command respect.

Chapter 4

Achilles Tatius and Latin Elegy

4.1   Introduction

Achilles Tatius' novel stands out from the extant corpus. It has been characterised as some sort of comedy, pastiche, or parody of the so-called 'ideal' novels,[1] veined with a 'carefully calculated sick humour'.[2] Scholars have noted in passing his similarity to Ovid in both form and content. Anderson characterises the relationship between Achilles and the four other extant novels as homologous with that of Ovid and the other elegists: 'each is capable of smiling at love and lovers, while still basically committed to their operations; but Achilles and Ovid stand cynically and skilfully apart'.[3] Indeed, I shall argue that Achilles is engaged in a generic redefinition of the 'conventional' novels, just as Ovid redefines elegiac conventions. For Jones, Achilles presents a 'prose version of Latin elegy' and Clitophon is a 'Phoenician version of the elegiac *amator*, who must often battle the resistance of his beloved'; she more generally supports a reading of an Achilles who 'is familiar with Latin elegy' and whose 'narrative is engaged in a constant playful dialogue with that genre'.[4] Whilst Jones' position represents the most positive argumentation to date in support of direct engagement with Latin elegy, it remains localised and there is much room for development.

---

[1] Comedy: Perry (1967) 115; Heiserman (1977) 117-30. Parody: Durham (1938), Chew (2000), *pace* Rohde (1914) 511 and Merkelbach (1962) 152. Ironic pastiche: Fusillo (1988) 29, (1989) 98-109. Antiroman: Mignona (1995). Generic 'experiment': Zeitlin (2012) 105. Morales (2004) 1-3 surveys the issue. The distinction between 'real' Roman and 'ideal' Greek derives from Heinze (1899), and is perpetuated by e.g. Holzberg (1995) 9-11; for major qualifications see now Brethes (2007).
[2] Anderson (1982) 32.
[3] Anderson (1982) 91; cf. Anderson (1984) 34, (1993) 164.
[4] M. Jones (2012) 261, 169, and 227 n. 158. Alvares (2012) 17 links the treatment of desire in Latin elegy and the Greek novels.

Elegy not only provides a way of 'doing love', but also offers a model of not being properly Roman (or at least problematises the traditional role of the Roman male elite). It is a genre of dissent, in which the elegiac lover trades on images of alienation from the traditional *mores* of society and much of his signifying capacity derives from inverting normative schemes and hierarchies (e.g. *seruitium* and *militia amoris*).[5] In this chapter I shall argue that Achilles—or rather the homodiegetic narrator Clitophon, through whom all the information is mediated—constructs his relationship with Leucippe and others using images and motifs derived from Latin elegy.[6] The egomaniacal outlook of both the novel and elegy renders all concerns subordinate to the protagonist's emotions and love affair, inducing him to confabulate and inscribe himself hyperbolically in the mythical tradition.[7] Achilles mobilises not only the generic discourse and conventions of the elegiac system, but also specific authors. My discussion will focus on the seduction played out in the domestic environment of Hippias' house in the first two books, in scenarios that serve to characterise those involved as elegiac lovers. I shall address the erotodidactic material mediated through Clitophon's cousin Clinias and slave Satyros, and suggest that Ovid is a central intertext and one of the controlling filters of these books; I shall explore the politics of consent and seduction, and how in Achilles they serve to define the

---

[5] Hallet (1973), Stahl (1985), Wallace-Hadrill (1985), Boyd (1997) 7, Thorsen (2013a) 11. On the anti-social positioning of Ovid's *Ars* in relation to Augustus, see Sharrock (1994b), Davis (1995), (1999).

[6] Achilles shares with the elegists (and Petronius) the homodiegetic format. For Fusillo (1989) 193 the homodiegetic narrative destroys the parallelism between hero and heroine; for Reardon (1994) it creates suspense and contributes to psychological realism. On Clitophon's restricted viewpoint see Hägg (1971a) 124-136, Whitmarsh (2003); on mythomaniacal elements see Brethes (2007) 191-2, and Morgan (2007b), who compares Petronius and the interpretation of Conte (1996); Kaspryzyk (2009) 105-7 sees the Narrating-I as creating a novelistic hero out of the Experiencing-I; Anderson (1982) 30-1, (1984) 63, Fusillo (1989) 102, and Brethes (2001), (2007) 202-12 all see the Narrating-I as an epic or novelistic anti-hero; on the narrator generally see Morgan (2004a). On homosocial aspects of Achilles and elegy see Mitchell (2014) and James (2003) respectively. On narratological elements in elegy see the essays in Liveley and Salzman-Mitchell (2008).

[7] De Temmerman (2014) 174 links Clitophon's bent for confabulation with a similar incongruous use of mythic paradigms in Latin elegy, citing Öhrman (2008) 21-64.

generic protocols of Greek prose romance. In sum, Latin elegy will be shown to be key to the signifying practices of the novel, offering a set of tropes and erotological models for Clitophon and the constellation of the characters who surround him.

Achilles is a sophisticated reader of Latin elegy and mobilises elegiac signifying practices in order to modulate interpersonal relationships. He subverts the conventions of the extant novels in not having the protagonists fall mutually in love with one other; rather, the narrator Clitophon embarks on a course of seduction, harnessing a range of precepts and behavioural models from his erotodidactic sources Clinias and Satyros. Latin elegy, especially the erotodidactic material embodied in the *Ars Amatoria*, serves as storehouse for Achilles. Instead of the conventional love at first sight, the reader is treated to a one-sided and dissimulative seduction prosecuted by the protagonist; *simulatio* is likewise a dominant feature of elegy.[8] It is therefore no coincidence that elegiac elements are at their most frequent in the first two books, during which Clitophon attempts to seduce Leucippe. Clitophon rejects the authoritarian voice of his father Hippias and his arranged marriage, and chooses rather to pursue τὸ ἔργον, i.e., sex (e.g. 1.9.5, 1.10.2, 1.10.6), in contrast to the more 'conventional' novels.[9] Likewise, elegy is not particularly concerned with marriage, but rather with a form of love that does not issue in children.[10] Achilles is therefore promoting a model of love very different from the rest of the canon, and is engaged in

---

[8] Stroh (1971).

[9] Only at the end of the narrative does he refer to his marriage in non-erotic terms: τοὺς πολυεύκτους... γάμους (8.19.2). Reardon (1969) 300, Jones (2012) 228, De Temmerman (2014) 165 regard the novel as thematising sexual seduction. Greene (1998) 66 likewise reads Ovid's attitude as one of 'pure priapic functionalism'.

[10] On the importance of marriage in the 'conventional' novels, see Perkins (1995) 41-76, Cooper (1996) 20-44, Doody (1996) 62-81. On marriage and elegy see Griffin (1985) 112-141, Lyne (1980) 1-19. See more generally Lilja (1965) 226-47 and Treggiari (1991).

a radical generic redefinition of the conventions of Greek prose romance as we know it.

The premise of the first two books naturally accommodates the anti-authoritarian framework embodied in Latin elegy: Hippias arranges a marriage between his children Clitophon and Calligone, but Clitophon rails against this, falling in love with and actively seducing his beautiful cousin Leucippe instead. Achilles could equally have had Clitophon marry Calligone, and sent the two of them on a series of escalating adventures around the Mediterranean until their eventual reunion, just like the protagonists in Xenophon and Chariton. The ideological axis of the 'ideal' novel is one of sanctioned marriage, but in Achilles the authoritative voice of Hippias is rejected in favour of private desire; rather than effortless union and early marriage, the dynamic is one of dissimulation, seduction, and pursuit conducted by a sexually aggressive and voyeuristic male who revels in images of female victimisation.[11] In the first two books, Clitophon's seduction of Leucippe plays out predominantly within the perimeter of the *paterfamilias* Hippias' house. Domestic space becomes a site of contest between an authoritarian father and a son whose private desires outweigh all other concerns.[12] In addition to the structural similarity to Greek New Comedy, Latin elegy functions to articulate the subversive position of Clitophon in relation to his father Hippias and the marriage he—and the genre itself—endorse as the *telos* of Greek elite civic life.[13]

---

[11] See Egger (1994) on Clitophon's male gaze, and Elsom (1992) 216-18 on 'pornographic' elements.
[12] Whitmarsh (2010b). Scarcella (1996) 243 notes the focus on the domestic as opposed to the civic in the first two books. The 'father' figure has resonance in imperial discourse, functioning as a metaphor for the Principate, on which see Roller (2001).
[13] Whitmarsh (2010b) 327, 344 adverts to the potential influence of Latin elegy in these books, as well as to Roman ideas of aristocratic display (e.g. the dichroic bowl at 2.3.1-3).

In Books 1 and 2, Achilles stages an opposition between the forces of Clitophon's subversive desire for unsanctioned sex, and the normative socio-civic duties embodied in the instructions of Hippias. Clitophon declares that he is blinded by love for Leucippe alone, and expresses the antagonism between duty and desire (1.11.3):

νῦν δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὸ κάλλος αὐτῆς τυφλώττω καὶ πρὸς Λευκίππην <u>μόνην</u> τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχω. ἐν μεθορίῳ κεῖμαι δύο ἐναντίων· Ἔρως ἀνταγωνίζεται καὶ <u>πατήρ</u>.

In an analogous context, Propertius declares the same totalising love towards Cynthia (see also p. 129-30 on Chariton), and expresses relief at the repeal of a bachelor tax:[14] *tu mihi <u>sola</u> places, placeam tibi, Cynthia, <u>solus</u>:/ haec erit et <u>patrio</u> nomine[15] pluris amor* (2.7.19f). Here, as in Achilles, the lover characterises the totalising nature of his love (μόνην; *sola*) and frames the struggle as that between a private subversive desire and a normative duty endorsed by a father figure (Ἔρως ἀνταγωνίζεται καὶ πατήρ; *hic erit et patrio nomine pluris amor*).

The presence of erotodidactic elements, especially in Books 1 and 2, comprises a substantial part of my argument in support of Achilles as a reader of Latin elegy, especially Ovid. Indeed, the erotodidactic elements of the novel have led some scholars to draw generic links between Achilles and Ovid: Alvares classifies Achilles as an 'Ovidian *ars amatoria*', and Goldhill observes that 'the difficulty of unmediated seriousness and didacticism with regard to erotics' in Achilles could just as well apply to Ovid.[16] It is hard to know how readers responded to Ovid's poetry. We are forced

---

[14] See Badian (1985) on the tax law itself; Gale (1997) 77 surveys the history of scholarship on the ideological position of the poem; see now Heyworth (2007c).
[15] Heyworth (2007b) 142 discusses Postgate's emendation of *sanguine* to *nomine*.
[16] Alvares (2006) 10, Goldhill (1995) 111; cf. Anderson (1982) 8.

to rely on what he tells us in his later poetry and we must therefore proceed with caution. It is clear, however, that Ovid encourages us to read the *Ars* as subversive and anti-Augustan by implying that it was a key element in the Augustan charge against him (e.g. *Tr.* 2.207-10). Ovid himself is responsible for canonising his poetry as subversive.[17] Allusion to Ovidian discourse, then, makes good sense in the context of Clitophon's rejection of the authority of the *paterfamilias*.

Finally, there is some evidence that Ovid has erotodidactic precursors in the philosophical, didactic-technical, and Hellenistic poetic traditions.[18] Dillon, for example, postulates a Platonic precedent for the *Ars*,[19] but it is clear that erotodidaxis in the philosophical tradition is in the business of valorising continence and soulful love. Greek New Comedy (and the Roman comedy attaching to it) is another possible source, for example the *lena* Scapha in Plautus' *Mostellaria* (168-295) or the *parasitus* in the *Asinaria* (757-94). Despite these character-*praeceptores*, Latin elegy is responsible for the development of the author-*praeceptor*.[20] The sex manuals, for example that of Philaenis (*P.Oxy.* 2891), complicate matters further.[21] There are, however, key points of contrast that set elegy and the novels apart from this material. Firstly, in all the sex manuals we know, the author constructs a female authorial persona. The praeceptorial voices of elegy (excepting the *lenae*) and Achilles are all male. Secondly, whilst Philaenis' manual (we assume) continues with an exposition of σχήματα συνουσιαστικά, this is something lacking in elegy and the novels, which are more concerned with *initiamenta* (the exception comes at *Ars* 3.769-808, addressed to

---

[17] Barchiesi (1993), Casali (2006).
[18] Gibson (2003) 13-20 sketches some of the material.
[19] Dillon (1994); cf. Kleve (1983) on erotodidaxis in the Socratic and Platonic traditions.
[20] Wheeler (1910), (1910/11) are detailed examinations.
[21] For discussion and reconstruction see Parker (1989), (1992). In connection with Achilles see Morales (2004) 75.

women, on sexual positions according to somatotype).[22] A third and final distinguishing feature is that the sex manuals choose 'the narrowly heterosexual and phallocentric',[23] as opposed to the homosexual praeceptorial voices in elegy (Tibullus 1.4, 1.8, 1.9) and the novel (Clinias). Whilst the sex manuals undoubtedly tackle erotodidaxis in a fresh way, it is not until Ovid that we get a systematic and rigorous approach to the ensnaring of the opposite sex. Lastly, there are scattered suggestions of erotodidaxis from the surviving Hellenistic fragments (e.g. Call. *Iamb*. 5;[24] Bion frr. 4, 5.7f, 10),[25] as well as epigram.[26] On balance, however, Latin elegy appears to be the first genre to systematise advice on sexual seduction.

4.2   Three symposia (1.5, 2.3, 2.9)

In both Ovid and Achilles the symposium acts as a site in which normative codes of erotic conduct can be manipulated and subverted.[27] Clitophon explains how Hippias attempts to control the organisation of space with the result that Clitophon is seated next to Leucippe: οὕτω γὰρ ἔταξεν ὁ πατήρ (1.5.1). Clitophon is overjoyed at the arrangement, which he characterises as εὐταξία (1.5.2), and can barely stop himself from hugging his father in thanks. Whitmarsh sums up the situation as follows: 'Clitophon not only subverts (by eroticizing) the normative domestic order that his father has tried to create, but even appropriates and ironically refashions the very

---

[22] See Cataudella (1973), (1974).

[23] Parker (1992) 92.

[24] Cairns (1972) 72-3 and Puelma (1949) 254-64 suggest that the persona is a *praeceptor amoris* 'rebuking a γραμματοδιδάσκαλος who has meddled in the business of the ἐρωτοδιδάσκαλος', *pace* Kerkhecker (1999) 145, from whence the quotation.

[25] On the basis of Longus' Philetas (see section 6.7) Cairns (1979) 22-27, Bowie (1985) and Morgan (2004b) 5 float the possibility of erotodidactic pastoral.

[26] See Giangrande (1991) on erotodidaxis in Hellenistic epigram.

[27] On symposia as sites of elite male acculturation in the imperial period see Schmitz (1997) 127-33, Whitmarsh (2000), (2001) 279-93, Amato (2005), König (2008) and (2013b) *passim*. Symposia are implicated in philosophic-erotic modes of discourse, for example Plato's *Symposium* and the fragmentary novels *Metiochus and Parthenope* and *Apollonius*.

language of order itself'.[28] Likewise in Ovid, the symposium is a venue for potential seduction: *dant etiam positis aditum conuiuia mensis;/ est aliquid praeter uina, quod inde petas* (*Ars* 1.229f;[29] other advice in this context occurs at *Am*. 1.4, 2.5; *Ars* 1.229f, 1.505-602, 3.747-86).[30] This is why the first two books of the novel feature no fewer than three symposia at which Clitophon and Leucippe interact.[31]

In the first instance, Achilles shows awareness of the elegiac conceit of *furtiuus amor*, as well as Propertius 1.3. Clitophon describes how he leans his elbows on the table and steals glances of Leucippe: ἐρείσας δὲ κατὰ τῆς στρωμνῆς τὸν ἀγκῶνα καὶ ἐγκλίνας ἐμαυτὸν ὅλοις ἔβλεπον τὴν κόρην τοῖς προσώποις, κλέπτων ἅμα τὴν θέαν (1.5.3). There are two points of interest here. Firstly, this specifically recalls the detail of Cynthia resting her elbow on the bed: *sic ait in molli fixa toro cubitum* (1.3.34). I shall return below (p. 145-6) to this correspondence in connection with other details that appear to derive from the same Propertian poem. Secondly, the phrase κλέπτων ἅμα τὴν θέαν recalls the elegiac conceit of *furtiuus amor*.[32] Elegiac assignations are private and secretive, operating outside of the legislated zone. This language of theft is reiterated when Clitophon later extorts a silent kiss from Leucippe

[28] Whitmarsh (2010b) 332.

[29] On the symposium as a setting for elegy, see Yardley (1991), who argues that three topoi (secret signals, wine-writing, and cup-swapping) derive from Greek New Comedy. See Gibson (2003) *ad Ars*. 3.747-68 for the sympotic literary tradition (e.g. Archestratus). For sympotic behaviour in Latin poetry generally see Griffin (1985) 65-87.

[30] *Am*. 1.4 advice includes: arriving before the *uir* (11-14), playing footsie (15f), nods and other *furtiuae notae*, incl. wine-writing (17-28), cup-swapping (31f), getting the *uir* drunk (51-4); *Am*. 2.5 advice includes: eyebrows and nods (15f), wine-writing (17f); *Am*. 2.5 includes: eyebrows and nods (15f), wine-writing (17f); *Ars* 1.505-602 includes: using ambiguous language (569f), wine-writing (571f), facial expressions (573f), cup-swapping (575f), touching her hand while she reaches for food (577f), pleasing the *uir* (579-84), how much to drink (589-94), feigning drunkenness in order to get away with more (597-602); *Ars* 3.747-68 includes advice on arrival, and the amount to eat and drink.

[31] The presence of women at Roman (as opposed to Greek) symposia (on which see Nepos *praef*. 6.6) contributes to the possibility of the symposium as an erotic space.

[32] See Pichon (1902) s.v. *furta*. Elegiac *furtum* finds its embryonic form in [Bion] 2.6 (λάθρια... φιλάματα, λάθριον εὐνάν). Cf. Paul. Sil. *A.P.* 5.219.4 (φώρια... λέκτρα) and [Theoc] *Id*. 27.68 φώριος εὐνή, the former of which is certainly and the latter potentially of imperial date, on which see Gow (1965) vol. 2.485.

through trickery: κἀγὼ κατεφίλουν σιωπῇ, <u>κλέπτων</u> τῶν φιλημάτων τὸν ψόφον (2.7.5). The language of theft in the context of kisses derives from the elegiac topos of 'stolen kisses' *oscula rapta* (e.g. Ov. *Am.* 2.4.26, Tib. 1.4.54, 1.8.58, 2.5.92);[33] indeed, an early example of Latin erotodidaxis, Tibullus 1.8, contains both *uenus furtiua* and *oscula rapta* (1.8.56f). These scopic and oscular modes promoted by Clitophon are in fact part of a more sustained behavioural strategy. Satyros, for example, reassures Clitophon that he understands how lovers often prefer to keep things secret (...ὀκνεῖν δὲ ἐλέγχειν βουλόμενον <u>λανθάνειν</u>. <u>ὁ γὰρ μετὰ κλοπῆς ἐρῶν</u>..., 2.4.1); Conops keeps his doors open at night to try and catch out 'those acting in secret' (ὥστε ἔργον ἦν αὐτὸν <u>λαθεῖν</u>, 2.20.1); the villain Chaereas secretly loves Leucippe (<u>ἐλάνθανεν ἐρῶν</u>, 5.3.1); and Sopater accuses Melite of taking on many lovers while married and conducting secret affairs (<u>λανθάνειν</u> δὲ ἐπ' ἐκείνοις χρηστὸν ἄνδρα, 8.10.8). The generic oddity of this mode of courtship is confirmed by a fragment of the *Ninus*. Here, the young hero claims he has tried nothing shameful, secretive, or furtive with Semiramis: ἐγὼ δὲ ἀναιδὴς ἂν ἤμην <u>λάθραι</u> πειρῶν καὶ <u>κλεπτομένην</u> ἀπόλαυσιν (A.III.37 - A.IV.2 S-W).[34] Elegiac language and convention, then, directly contribute to the behavioural models on display in Achilles that make him so generically marginal.

At this symposium, the myth of Apollo and Daphne establishes Clitophon's behavioural model and can be ranged with the elegists' bent for mythic confabulation, that is, the incongruous assimilation of his own circumstances to those of Greek myth.[35] The symposium ends with some musical entertainment, and to the

---

[33] See Murgatroyd (1980) 149 for further references.
[34] De Temmerman (2014) 165-6 observes that this is exactly the sort of behaviour undertaken by Clitophon; cf. also S-W (1995) 57 *ad loc*.
[35] On myth and personal experience in Latin elegy see Whitaker (1983).

accompaniment of the cithara a slave sings of Apollo's love for Daphne and her subsequent metamorphosis, which Clitophon classifies as a song about pursuit and flight: τὸ δὲ ᾆσμα ἦν Ἀπόλλων μεμφόμενος τὴν Δάφνην φεύγουσαν καὶ διώκων ἅμα (1.5.5). It may be no coincidence that this is the *primus amor* of Ovid's *Met.* (1.452; see p. 151-2). The Apollo-Daphne myth establishes the erotic paradigm according to which Clitophon will operate—aggressive pursuit and seduction rather than mutual and reciprocated feeling.[36] Clitophon's aesthetic response to the story is one of erotic arousal (τοῦτό μοι μᾶλλον ἀσθὲν τὴν ψυχὴν ἐξέκαυσεν· ὑπέκκαυμα γὰρ ἐπιθυμίας λόγος ἐρωτικός, 1.5.5-6) and he exploits the divine paradigm as justification for his own unauthorised feelings towards Leucippe. The myth offers a paradigm for culturally normative gender roles, but runs counter to the reciprocal model of love embodied in the other novels. For Clitophon, the exemplum functions to offer an ethical paradigm to be imitated, as opposed to its function for the reader as a paradigm to be avoided. In this connection, De Temmerman observes how Clitophon is a subversive reader of many of the mythic exempla in the novel (e.g. Poseidon, Achilles, Heracles, Odysseus),[37] and Brethes correlates Clitophon's subversive use of myth with Latin elegy's irreverent reading of myth and its use in seduction.[38] Petronius' Encolpius is also an apposite comparandum.

The second symposium, in celebration of Dionysos Protrugaios, is loaded with references to Propertius 1.3. Clitophon reports how his inhibitions gradually become eroded at the hands of Eros and Dionysos, and he stares openly at Leucippe: Ἔρως δὲ καὶ Διόνυσος, δύο βίαιοι θεοί (2.3.3). The form and context are in almost isomorphic

---

[36] Morales (2004) 178. On the proleptic quality of this myth see Létoublon (2013). Discussing myths in the novel as 'spaces of pleasure', Rosati (2013) characterises the myth as an 'incentive to sin'.
[37] De Temmerman (2014) 171, 173.
[38] Brethes (2012a) 131.

relation to Propertius: *et quamuis duplici correptum ardore iuberent/ hac Amor hac Liber, durus uterque deus* (1.3.13f).[39] Clitophon claims that Leucippe reciprocates his gaze: ἤδη δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ περιεργότερον εἰς ἐμὲ βλέπειν ἐθρασύνετο (2.3.3). In Propertius' poem the poet reports how he dared not disturb Cynthia by touching her, but could not stop looking at her: *non tamen ausus eram dominae turbare quietam/ ... sed sic intentis haerebam fixus ocellis* (1.3.17-19). The collocation of love and wine is obviously a literary commonplace, for example Callimachus *Ep*. 42 (ἄκρητος καὶ Ἔρως μ' ἠνάγκασαν).[40] However, the similarity of the appositional phrase puts the genetic relationship beyond doubt; and other correspondences between the Propertian poem and Achilles are strikingly close: the language of 'daring' (ἐθρασύνετο; *ausus*) and intense looking (περιεργότερον εἰς ἐμὲ βλέπειν; *intentis haerebam fixus ocellis*) are keynotes in both, occur in the same order and alcoholic-erotic context, and are suggestive of frustrated sexual desire.

Propertius 1.3 has generated some interest in the context Greek imperial prose. Longus also knows the poem (1.24-5; see Appendix 5); and Schulz-Vanheyden and De Stefani treat the question of whether later imperial Greek epigram draws on Propertius.[41] They conclude that Paulus Silentiarius engages in direct imitation of Propertius, for example *A.P*. 5.275 and Prop. 1.3, in both of which a lover returns to his sleeping beloved and contemplates sexual action. Despite dissenting voices,[42] the afterlife of Propertius 1.3 in Greek imperial literature looks secure.

---

[39] Noted by Enk (1946) 37, Fedeli (1980) 121, Whitmarsh (2010b) 333.

[40] Further parallels listed at Fedeli (1980) 120. The digression on the festival of Dionysos Protrugaios focuses on the association between wine and love, and Ovid explains that wine has its use-value in seduction, eg. *Ars*. 1.229-36, and esp. 1.327 *uina parant animos faciuntque caloribus aptos*. For 'heat' in this context, see Clitophon's digression: εἰς τὴν γαστέρα δὲ καταθορὸν ναπνεῖ κάτωθεν ἡδονῆς πῦρ (2.2.5).

[41] Schulz-Vanheyden (1969), De Stefani (2006).

[42] Yardley (1980) explores the domestic violence angle in the Paulus epigram, Ovid *Am*. 1.7, and Prop. 1.3, and determines a New Comic provenance in Menander's *Perikeiroumene*.

The third symposium, which occurs slightly later in the second book, is notable for its Ovidian characteristics. It features Clitophon's *seruus callidus* Satyros,[43] who throughout the seduction process acts to facilitate all of his master's strategems. In this passage he executes the 'cup-swap' trick, allowing Clitophon and Leucippe to kiss each other by proxy (2.9.2-3):

> ᾠνοχόει δὲ ὁ Σάτυρος ἡμῖν καί τι ποιεῖ πρᾶγμα ἐρωτικόν. ἐναλλάσσει τὰ ἐκπώματα καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐμὸν τῇ κόρῃ προτίθησι, τὸ δὲ ἐκείνης ἐμοί, καὶ ἐγχέων ἀμφοτέροις καὶ κερασάμενος ὤρεγεν. ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπιτηρήσας τὸ μέρος τοῦ ἐκπώματος, ἔνθα τὸ χεῖλος ἡ κόρη πίνουσα προσέθηκεν, ἐναρμοσάμενος τὸ ἐμὸν ἔπινον, ἀποστολιμαῖον τοῦτο φίλημα ποιῶν, καὶ ἅμα κατεφίλουν τὸ ἔκπωμα. ἡ δὲ ὡς εἶδεν, συνῆκεν ὅτι τοῦ χείλους αὐτῆς καταφιλῶ καὶ τὴν σκιάν. ἀλλ᾽ ὅ γε Σάτυρος συμφορήσας πάλιν τὰ ἐκπώματα ἐνήλλαξεν ἡμῖν. τότε ἤδη καὶ τὴν κόρην εἶδον τὰ ἐμὰ μιμουμένην καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ πίνουσαν, καὶ ἔχαιρον ἤδη πλέον. καὶ τρίτον ἐγένετο τοῦτο καὶ τέταρτον καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν τῆς ἡμέρας οὕτως ἀλλήλοις προεπίνομεν τὰ φιλήματα.

In Ovid the topos features heavily and occurs in a sympotic context as it does in Achilles.[44] *Am*. 1.4 describes a *conuiuium* in which the poet tutors Corinna in codes enabling surreptitious communication between the poet and herself (to the exclusion of her *uir*). The advice includes cup-swapping: *quae tu reddideris, ego primus pocula sumam,/ et qua biberis, hac ego parte bibam* (31f); and is re-iterated in an analogous passage in *Ars* 1: *fac primus rapias illius tacta labellis/ pocula, quaque bibet parte puella bibas* (575f). The act of swapping the cup, metagenerically described by Clitophon as a πρᾶγμα ἐρωτικόν, which allows a kiss by proxy (ἀποστολιμαῖον φίλημα), is simply another way of subverting the normative behavioural models and τάξις of the symposium. Satyros, who has earlier functioned as an erotodidaskalos

---

[43] Billault (1996a) 117 assigns Chariton's Plangon and Achilles' Satyros to this category.
[44] Cataudella (1927) 304 n. 3 observes the resemblance between Achilles and Ovid, citing also Agathias Scholasticus *A.P.* 5.261 and Aristaenetus *Ep*. 1.25. Yardley (1991) argues that the topos of cup-swapping derives from Greek New Comedy, cf. Plaut. *As*. 772f, Mel. *A.P.* 5.171, Theoc. *Id*. 7.70, Longus 3.8.2.

(see section 4.8 below), here actions Ovid's advice in order to facilitate Clitophon's seduction.[45] Activating the topos at the elegiac level therefore makes perfect sense. Finally, Clitophon claims that Leucippe 'understands' what the topos signifies: <u>συνῆκεν</u> ὅτι τοῦ χείλους αὐτῆς καταφιλῶ καὶ τὴν σκιάν (2.9.3). The idea that Leucippe 'understands' the codes of elegiac discourse will recur elsewhere (2.6.2, 2.7.6; see also p. 42-3), both in contexts where allusion to Latin elegy is at stake. It also signifies recognition of the fact that Achilles is engaged in a programme of generic redefinition in which Latin elegy plays a decisive role.

4.3   The Book trick and Bee trick (1.6.6, 2.7)

Dissimulation is a keynote of Ovid's erotic elegy and the suite of conventions governing Clitophon's seduction of Leucippe. He initiates his deceptive mode of courtship almost immediately after the first symposium. Annoyed at being woken in the middle of an erotic dream about Leucippe (1.6.5),[46] he proceeds to engineer a means by which he can be in her presence. He decides to walk back and forth in front of her while pretending to read a book, every now and then looking up from the book to catch glances of her (1.6.6):

> ἀναστὰς οὖν ἐβάδιζον ἐξεπίτηδες εἴσω τῆς οἰκίας κατὰ πρόσωπον τῆς κόρης, βιβλίον ἅμα κρατῶν, καὶ ἐγκεκυφὼς ἀνεγίνωσκον· τὸν δὲ ὀφθαλμόν, εἰ κατὰ τὰς θύρας γενοίμην, ὑπείλιττον κάτωθεν, καί τινας ἐμπεριπατήσας διαύλους καὶ ἐποχετευσάμενος ἐκ τῆς θέας ἔρωτα σαφῶς ἀπήειν ἔχων τὴν ψυχὴν κακῶς.

---

[45] Clitophon learns the lesson, later realising that kissing a cup full of medicine is a good way to kiss Leucippe on her recovery from a drugging in Egypt: καταφιλήσας τὸ ἔκπωμα δίδωμι τῇ Λευκίππῃ πιεῖν (4.17.2).

[46] Ovidian females are marked for their propensity for erotic dreams: Byblis (*Met*. 9.468-86), Hero (*Her*. 19.59-68), cf. Sappho (*Her*. 15.123-34).

In the first instance, Clitophon is enacting the situation suggested by Ovid (the hexameter of which constitutes a gender reversal): *me legat in sponsi facie non frigida uirgo/ et rudis ignoto tactus amore puer* (*Am.* 2.1.5). Secondly, for Clitophon, the book has a very practical use-value, enabling him to advance his erotic claim. He tells us nothing about it, and the reader is left in the dark as to its title or contents. This constitutes a piece of self-reflexive literary mirroring—a mise-en-abŷme—a moment at which Clitophon's mode of 'reading' is in either an analogous or contrastive relation to the reader's own mode of reading.[47] Whitmarsh suggests that 'the temptation to take this passage as a self-referential commentary upon the reading of erotic literature is almost unbearable';[48] likewise Bowie argues that the book Clitophon pretends to read is 'precisely the sort of book he [Achilles] has written and that we are reading'.[49] Perhaps the suggestion is that Achilles' novel itself is a tool of erotic seduction.

As an empty signifier the book raises a number of questions. Immediately following this passage Clitophon's cousin Clinias offers an inventory of erotodidactic instructions (see section 4.4). These have been characterised as a 'regurgitation of a literary education' which 'seem to come straight from works like Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*, and it might not be pushing things too far to suggest that we are intended to surmise that he has recently read Ovid or something similar'.[50] Could Clitophon's book be, precisely, Ovid's *Ars*? Clitophon's brand of romance makes good sense if his bedtime reading has been Ovid. Foucault argues that the reader *needs* the name of an

---

[47] Dällenbach (1977).
[48] Whitmarsh (2011) 90.
[49] Bowie (1996) 87. Clitophon is the only character in the extant novels to be depicted reading a book, which is ironic considering that he is such a poor reader of generic convention, as Whitmarsh (2003) argues.
[50] M. Jones (2012) 228, 227.

author in order to site the text within a particular discursive framework that offers a particular reading strategy.[51] In this instance Ovid (and Latin elegy more generally) is a prime candidate: Ovid's literature teaches, and Clitophon himself enacts, dissimulative sexual seduction. It is a widespread elegiac topos that poetry wins the *puella* (cf. *Ars* 1.459-62): for both Clitophon and the elegists, the institution of literature is part of their armoury of seduction. The emptiness of the signifier in Achilles remains curious. Has he deliberately elided the name of the *protos heuretes* of this type of literature? Anonymising the book means anonymising Ovid and de-Romanising erotodidactic writing. Longus is also in the business of de-Romanising pastoral poetry and deleting Vergil from its literary history (see esp. section 6.8). This is analogous to the function of the authorless book in Achilles.

My second example of Clitophon's erotic trickery occurs in book 2, in which he 'pretends' to be stung (προσεποιούμην) and is characterised as winning his kiss through deceit, further marked by the language of elegiac *furtum*. I have discussed above the elegiac nature of the description of how Clitophon furtively masks the sound of the kiss (κἀγὼ κατεφίλουν σιωπῇ, κλέπτων τῶν φιλημάτων τὸν ψόφον, 2.7.5), a strategy earlier suggested by Clinias (σιώπα μὲν οὖν τὰ πολλὰ ὡς ἐν μυστηρίοις, φίλησον δὲ προσελθὼν ἠρέμα, 1.10.5). Although there is no direct parallel for this specific trick in Ovid, it is of a piece with the Ovidian *praeceptor*'s dissimulative mode of courtship. Recourse to trickery might profitably take place at the Circus, for example, where the prospective lover should pretend to remove dust from the *puella*'s clothes even if there is none (*Am*. 3.2.41, *Ars*. 1.149-52). Having extorted a kiss from Leucippe, who thinks she is whispering a chant over Clitophon's

---

[51] Foucault (1984).

lips, he proceeds to kiss her more openly (περιβαλὼν φανερῶς κατεφίλουν, 2.7.5).

Leucippe 'jumps back' (διασχοῦσα) and asks him what he is doing, to which

Clitophon responds glibly that he is kissing the charmer who has 'cured' him of his

pain (φιλῶ, ὅτι μου τὴν ὀδύνην ἰάσω, 2.7.5). Indeed, the language of 'healing' is later

used by Clitophon to refer to sex with Melite: ἐπεὶ οὖν τὴν Μελίτην <u>ἰασάμην</u> (6.1.1;

cf. p. 52-3); Ovid likewise advises that sex can be used as a 'cure' against an angry

woman: *ergo age et iratae <u>medicamina</u> fortia praebe* (*Ars* 2.489; cf. *Her*. 20.71-4).[52]

Clitophon then describes Leucippe as 'understanding' the import of his comment and

'smiling' (ὡς δὲ συνῆκεν ὃ λέγω καὶ ἐμειδίασε, 2.7.6), again, signifying that she

understands the generic code.

Clitophon capitalises on the opportunity and kisses her more forcefully,

describing Leucippe as 'pretending to resist': καὶ ἅμα λέγων τὴν χεῖρα βιαιότερον

περιέβαλλον καὶ ἐφίλουν ἐλευθερώτερον· ἡ δὲ ἠνείχετο, κωλύουσα δῆθεν (2.7.7). I

have discussed above how Clitophon ascribes to Leucippe an 'understanding' of

elegy's generic codes (2.9.3). Here he reads her smile as a sign of assent: within the

economy of Clitophon's gestural semiotics, her smile signifies willing participation.

The fact that Clitophon reads the signs as signifying her 'understanding' of his brand

of courtship (as he thinks she does at 2.6.2 and 2.9.3) highlights the way he structures

the world. Leucippe apparently responds negatively to his kiss (διασχοῦσα) and even

'apparently' resists (κωλύουσα δῆθεν).[53] Clitophon nevertheless reads the signs as he

wishes, that is, according to the values privileged by the mode of courtship embodied

in the Apollo-Daphne paradigm. This is remarkably close to Apollo's reaction, in

Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, to the 'nodding' of Daphne, who has metamorphosed into the

---

[52] Medical discourse occurs in the context of less explicitly sexual affairs of the heart at Theoc. *Id*.
11.1-2, on which see Hunter (1999) *ad loc* citing further references.
[53] See Denniston (1954) 265-7 on how the particle δῆθεν imparts a sense of scepticism and untruth.

laurel. In response to Apollo's explication of Daphne's new role within Augustan iconography, Daphne 'seems' to nod in agreement: *factis modo laurea ramis/ adnuit utque caput <u>uisa est</u> agitasse cacumen* (*Met*. 1.566f). Both Apollo and Clitophon impose meaning on their love objects (*uisa est*; δῆθεν).[54] According to Clitophon's Ovidian rulebook trickery wins the girl; Leucippe's smile signifies willingness, and any apparent resistance is simply part of the script—Clitophon's use of the particle δῆθεν betrays the potentially non-consensual paradigm according to which he operates. Leucippe's consent is a repeated concern (see section 4.5), and Clitophon is happy to second-guess her willing intentions; at the end of the episode when their kissing is interrupted he even admits that he does not know what her feelings are (ἡ δὲ οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως εἶχεν, 2.8.1). The Ovidian *praeceptor/amator* likewise reads resistance as assent.

4.4   Clinias erotodidaskalos

Clitophon's cousin Clinias, elder by two years and described as an 'initiate in love' (ἔρωτι τετελεσμένος, 1.7.1),[55] serves as his first source of erotic instruction, and both his advice and biography derive in large part from Latin elegy. We are told that Clinias is in fact in love with a young boy (μειρακίου δὲ ὁ ἔρως ἦν, 1.7.1), and are furnished with the narrative of Clinias' ill-starred love affair with this boy, named Charicles, resulting from Clinias' decision to buy him a horse (1.7.1). What follows mirrors Propertius 1.7 and 1.9 in terms of both content and narrative sequence. In the

---

[54] Farrell (1999) 135-6 discusses Daphne's apparent agreement in the *Metamorphoses*; De Temmerman (2014) 196 observes how Clitophon consistently imposes his own erotic inclinations onto Leucippe.
[55] The language of initiation and mystery cult in this context derives from Plato and becomes a major constituent in the erotic discourse of both Ovid and Achilles; see esp. *Ars*. 2.601-10, 2.640; Ach. 1.9.7, 1.18.3, 2.19.1, 2.37.5, 4.1.2, 4.1.5-7, 4.8.3, 5.15.6, 5.25.6, 5.26.3, 5.26.10. Mystery cult as desire occurs in Plato at *Symp*. 210a; cf. 202e-203a, 215c.

past Clitophon used to mock Clinias for his obsessive behaviour towards Charicles, calling him a 'slave of erotic pleasure': ἔσκωπτον οὖν αὐτὸν ἀεὶ τῆς ἀμεριμνίας, ὅτι σχολάζει φιλεῖν καὶ δοῦλός ἐστιν ἐρωτικῆς ἡδονῆς (1.7.2). Clinias responds by telling Clitophon that one day he too will become subject to erotic slavery: ἔσῃ καὶ σύ μοι ποτὲ δοῦλος (1.7.2). Clitophon now admits that that day has arrived. He too is now a slave, and he recognises that he is atoning for his mockery: "ἔδωκα," ἔφην, "Κλεινία, σοι δίκην τῶν σκωμμάτων. δοῦλος γέγονα κἀγώ." (1.7.3).

In Propertius 1.7, the poet contrasts his elegiac life of love with the epic poet Ponticus: *primo contendis Homero... nos, ut consuemus, nostros agitamus amores* (1.7.3-5). He then establishes himself as a *praeceptor amoris* of lovers who will be able to learn from his own ills: *me legat assidue post haec neglectus amator,/ et prosint illi cognata nostra mala* (1.7.13f). He warns of the day when Ponticus himself will fall in love, at which point his epic poetry will be of no use (1.7.15-20), and the poet signs off with a warning to Ponticus not to spurn elegy: *tu caue nostra tuo contemnas carmina fastu* (1.7.25).[56] This poem is paired with 1.9, in which it transpires that Ponticus has now fallen in love. Propertius opens by reminding him of his past warnings and Ponticus' past mockery of elegy: *dicebam tibi uenturos, irrisor, amores* (1.9.1). He continues by laying claim to erotic experience: *me dolor et lacrimae merito fecere peritum:/ atque utinam posito dicar amore rudis* (1.9.7f).

There are obvious correspondences between the situation in Achilles and the Propertian poems. Past mockers of amorous behaviour (Clitophon, ἔσκωπτον;

---

[56] There is in addition a specific allusion to Prop. 1.7 later in the novel, when Melite requests that Leucippe fetch something to mollify the obstinate Clitophon: δός μοί τι ἐπὶ τοῦτον τὸν ὑπερήφανον (5.22.6). This is precisely how Propertius classes the use-value of elegy against an obstinate mistress: *aliquid duram quaerimus in dominam* (1.7.6).

Ponticus, *irrisor*) are now in love. Both had been warned by their interlocutors, Clinias and Propertius, of the future possibility of love's onset (ἔσῃ καὶ σύ μοι ποτὲ δοῦλος; *dicebam tibi uenturos... amores*); both are now being told 'I told you so' ("ἐρᾷς," εἶπεν, "ἐρᾷς ἀληθῶς· οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου λέγουσιν.", 1.7.3; *ecce iaces supplexque uenis ad iura puellae*, 1.9.3; cf. p. 35 n. 60 and p. 60). While Clitophon is assimilated to the figure of the epic poet Ponticus who lacks erotic foresight and now finds himself under love's orders, Clinias (at this point in the narrative) is assimilated to the figure of the more sensible Propertian *praeceptor amoris* who is familiar with elegiac codes and behaviours. Resemblances in both the situation and language confirm the Propertian intertext. Furthermore, Clitophon's past mockery of Clinias embraces the concepts of ἀμεριμνία and σχολή. This can be ranged with the concept of elegiac *otium*, a lexeme that embraces the Roman idea of the philosophical-contemplative life of the elite gentleman of leisure and is appropriated by Catullus and the elegists to characterise their own lifestyle of love and indolence: *tam Venus otia amat...* (Ov. *Rem.* 135; cf. Plato *Rep.* 571c-d).[57]

Clinias' misogynistic and homosexual characterisation can also be explained in connection with Latin elegy. On learning that Charicles is to wed, Clinias launches into a misogynistic diatribe on the evils of marriage and the female species in general, and the fact that Clinias is characterised as homosexual requires some discussion. Clinias proceeds to offer Clitophon a slew of strategies to aid him in his suit for Leucippe (1.9-10). To this is added the fact that his relationship with Charicles goes disastrously wrong: Charicles ends up dead when, after being unable to control the horse bought for him by Clinias, he is flung from the saddle and dashed against a tree

---

[57] On *otium* and the elegists see André (1966), Alfonsi (1981).

154

(1.12; cf. Appendix 1 for links with Ovid's *Metamorphoses*).[58] How is it that Clinias, who is erotically obsessed with a boy, can hold forth on seduction techniques designed to ensnare females? The suggestion must be that Clinias derives his instruction and didactic authority from literature rather than real life.[59] In this respect, Clinias and Clitophon represent two different metanarrative principles of generic detachment and self-awareness, and emotional absorption (respectively).[60]

Latin elegy provides the first extended example of erotodidaxis in a homosexual context. Tibullus 1.4 (based formally on the fifth *Iambus* of Callimachus) reports an encounter in which a speaker requests from a statue of Priapus some advice concerning the seduction of boys: *quae tua formosos cepit sollertia* (1.4.3). Priapus proceeds to offer precepts on, for example, perseverance (15-20), oaths (21-6), not wasting time (27-38), and *obsequium* (39-56).[61] The speaker passes this advice to Titius, and predicts a time when he will be consulted as a *praeceptor amoris*: *tempus erit, cum me Veneris praecepta ferentem/ deducat iuuenum sedula turba senem* (1.4.79f). Amatory precepts are also provided to the speaker's beloved Marathus in his suit for Pholoe in Tibullus 1.8, though this time in the heterosexual sphere. Outside of Tibullus' Marathus cycle (1.4, 1.8, 1.9) homoeroticism is rare in Latin elegy.[62] Tibullus 1.4, then, is a crucial player within the development of literary erotodidaxis. It is the first extended erotodidactic sequence from a *praeceptor amoris*,

---

[58] The combination of misogynistic tirade and death involving an equestrian misadventure of course recalls Hippolytus in Euripides' *Hippolytus* and (potentially) Seneca's *Phaedra*, especially considering that an annotated portion of Seneca (*Medea* 663-704) has been found on papyri in Egypt (*P. Mich. inv.* 4969), on which see Markus and Schwendner (1997).

[59] The combination of homosexuality and didactic authority also recalls Plato's Socrates.

[60] Whitmarsh (2003). Morales (2004) 152 and M. Jones (2012) 227 see Clinias' homosexual subplot as a cautionary tale, thereby calling Clitophon's judgment into question. For Perkins (1995) 72 homosexual relations in the novel fail because they are not in the interests of the collective; for Whitmarsh (2011) 161 gay subplots serve to denaturalise the dominant ideology.

[61] See Murgatroyd (1980) 128-132 and Maltby (2002) 215-16 for useful introductions.

[62] Exceptions include Prop. 1.20, Ov. *Am.* 1.1.20.

and provides a key model for Ovid in a heterosexual context, for example his advice on perseverance (Tib. 1.4.39-56; *Ars* 1.469-86),[63] which will also feature in Clinias' advice (1.9.5).

As I have argued so far, Clinias is a conflation of Propertian, Tibullan, and Ovidian praeceptorial modes. The advice that follows is in a decidedly Ovidian mode and will be mobilised by Clitophon to subvert the wishes of Hippias. Having received the bad news of Charicles' impending marriage, Clinias urges Charicles to refuse, and embarks on a misogynistic tirade against a catalogue of women, echoing a similar catalogue in Ovid's *Ars*: ἐπιπαρώξυνεν οὖν τὸ μειράκιον ἀποθέσθαι τὸν γάμον, τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν γένος λοιδορῶν (1.8.1). He characterises marriage as a fetter (1.8.2), war (1.8.3), slavery (1.8.9), ageing and enervation (1.8.9), and provides a list of mythological women who, in his eyes, exemplify the evil of the female species in their quest to satisfy their sexual desire (1.8.4-7). The list contains the usual suspects (Eriphyle, Sthenoboea, Aerope, Procne, Candaules' wife, Helen, Phaedra, Clytaemnestra) but also some oddities (Philomela, Chryseis, Briseis, Penelope).[64] There is an obvious connection to Ovid's *Ars*: arguing that female desire is stronger than male desire, the *praeceptor* goes on to offer a catalogue of mythological women with ungoverned passion (*Ars* 1.285-350; cf. Prop. 3.19). Although there is little overlap in content (except Clytaemnestra, Aerope, and Phaedra), both these catalogues occur in an erotodidactic context and serve to set into relief the type of women who form the object of the seduction techniques—that is, the catalogues are populated by the type of women who do *not* require seducing.

---

[63] Murgatroyd (1980) 130.
[64] For M. Jones (2012) 223, Clinias' outburst reads like a product of rhetorical schooling. At 2.35.2 Clitophon tells Menelaus that Clinias frequently inveighs against women; for the tradition, see S. Braund (1992) on Juvenal *Sat*. 6.

Catullus is also present in this passage.[65] Having bombarded Charicles with his catalogue of ungoverned women, Clinias begs him not to 'hand over a lovely rose to be plucked by an ugly farmer': μὴ παραδῷς εὔμορφον τρυγῆσαι ῥόδον ἀμόρφῳ γεωργῷ (1.8.9). In Catullus 11, the poet characterises his injury at the hands of Lesbia as like that of a flower which falls at the edge of a meadow after being touched by a passing plough (Cat. 11.21-24):[66]

> nec meum respectet, ut ante, amorem,
> qui illius culpa cecidit uelut prati
> ultimi flos, praetereunte postquam
>   tactus aratro est.

Ploughing is traditionally a penetrative act associated with the male.[67] Jones rightly observes the gender inversion in both Achilles and Catullus: the male is the passive recipient of the plough's touch (in Catullus) or the ugly farmer's touch (in Achilles). She also notes that Achilles' transference of the image into a pederastic context is anticipated by Vergil, who deploys the simile in order to compare Nisus (perhaps Euryalus' lover) to a purple flower cut by a plough (*purpureus ueluti cum flos succisus aratro*, *Aen.* 9.435).[68] The image in Achilles accrues extra pederastic force by the fact that the flower in question is the rose (ῥόδος), which in Greek epigram symbolises the young boy's anus (e.g. Strato *A.P.* 12.40.4).[69] It has not been noticed, however, that the Catullan link is reinforced by the fact that, in Catullus, the simile comes at the end of a poem which not only renounces Lesbia, but does so in terms that bring out her libidinous nature (Cat. 11.17-20):

---

[65] Wiseman (1986) 118 alludes to some of the thematic correspondences between Catullus and the Greek novels.
[66] Cf. Sappho fr. 105c, where the shepherds tread on a hyacinth, a symbol of lost virginity.
[67] See duBois (1988) and Keith (2000) 36-64.
[68] M. Jones (2012) 224, citing C. Williams (1999) 155.
[69] Richlin (1983) 36.

cum suis uiuat ualeatque moechis,
quos simul complexa tenet trecentos,
nullum amans uere, sed identidem omnium
   ilia rumpens.

This is precisely the context in which Clinias himself deploys the image: both Clinias and Catullus are railing in misogynistic terms against the promiscuity of women. Finally, Clinias' image of marriage as being like a plucked rose directly recalls the context and imagery of Catullus 62, in which the chorus of girls liken an unmarried virgin to a flower touched by no plough, but the married girl to an unwanted flower clipped by a nail (62.39-47):

ut flos in saeptis secretus nascitur hortis,
ignotus pecori, nullo conuolsus aratro,
quam mulcent aurae, firmat sol, educat imber;
multi illum pueri, multae optauere puellae:
idem cum tenui carptus defloruit ungui,
nullum illum pueri, nullae optauere puellae:
sic uirgo, dum intacta manet, dum cara suis est;
cum castum amisit pollute corpore florem,
nec pueris iucunda manet, nec cara puellis.

The constellation of themes and images—misogyny, negativity towards marriage, imagery of flowers plucked in agricultural contexts—derives from Catullus.

     Clinias' erotodidaxis begins in earnest following the departure of Charicles. Clinias predicts that the key to success is to be in the constant presence of the beloved and allow the eye to act as a go-between (1.9.5):

μέγιστον γάρ ἐστιν ἐφόδιον εἰς πειθὼ συνεχὴς πρὸς ἐρωμένην ὁμιλία.
ὀφθαλμὸς γὰρ φιλίας πρόξενος καὶ τὸ σύνηθες τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς χάριν
ἀνυσιμώτερον.

There are two points of interest here. Firstly, the lexeme πειθώ indicates generically odd—indeed elegiac—territory: we are not in the conventional world of Greek prose romance where the protagonists fall mutually and reciprocally in love; πειθώ implies a more culturally normative paradigm of male initiative and seduction. Secondly, the exhortation to 'constant fraternisation' (συνεχὴς ὁμιλία)[70] with the beloved is the same advice offered by the Ovidian praeceptor (*Ars* 2.336-348, esp. 345-8):

> fac tibi consuescat: nihil assuetudine maius,
>   quam tu dum capias, taedia nulla fuge.
> te semper uideat, tibi semper praebeat aures,
>   exhibeat uultus noxque diesque tuos.

In both authors the emphasis is on facial and ocular presence: Clinias' digression on optics and intro-/extromission is designed to prove that 'the eye is the go-between of love' (ὀφθαλμὸς γὰρ φιλίας πρόξενος), whilst Ovid also focuses on sight (*te uideat*; *uultus tuos*). Clinias then adduces the argument from nature to demonstrate the efficacy of the precept that women, like wild beasts, can be tamed by habit: εἰ γὰρ τὰ ἄγρια τῶν θηρίων συνηθείᾳ τιθασεύεται, πολὺ μᾶλλον ταύτῃ μαλαχθείη καὶ γυνή (1.9.6). Ovid adduces a similar argument in the same passage to show how, with constant attention, a calf will grow into a bull: *quem taurum metuis, uitulum mulcere solebas* (*Ars* 2.341). The language of habitude (συνηθείᾳ; *solebas*) and softening/soothing (μαλαχθείη; *mulcere*) is present in both.[71] From this it is clear that both Clinias and Ovid conceptualise the importance of these preliminary strategies in the same way.

---

[70] The idea that daily contact engenders love is exceptionally frequent in Xenophon of Ephesus (1.14.7, 2.3.1, 2.13.6, 4.5.4, 5.9.11) and features in *Metiochus and Parthenope* (II.60f S-W).

[71] *Ars* 1.19-21 (*sed tamen et tauri ceruix oneratur aratro...*) compares the *praeceptor*'s tuition of Amor to the taming of wild animals. On georgic imagery in the *Ars* see Leach (1964).

Clinias then advocates the performative mode of seduction that we find in Ovid. He enjoins Clithophon to ensure that his object of affection at least *think* she is loved and to make her *think* she is beautiful if he wants to have any erotic success (1.9.6-7):

> τὸ συνειδὸς τοῦ φιλεῖσθαι τίκτει πολλάκις ἀντέρωτα. <u>θέλει γὰρ ἑκάστη</u> <u>τῶν παρθένων εἶναι καλή</u>, καὶ φιλουμένη χαίρει καὶ ἐπαινεῖ τῆς μαρτυρίας τὸν φιλοῦντα· <u>κἂν μὴ φιλήσῃ τις αὐτήν, οὔπω πεπίστευκεν εἶναι καλή</u>. ἓν οὖν σοι παραινῶ μόνον· <u>ἐρᾶσθαι πιστευσάτω</u>, καὶ ταχέως σε μιμήσεται.

The performative model of courtship on offer here trades on persuasion (πεπίστευκεν; πιστευσάτω) and has several tangible links to those advertised by the Ovidian *praeceptor*, who counsels his pupil to be a *simulator* (*Ars* 1.615) and to feign love and its associated symptoms in order to win the heart of the girl and establish a basis for *fides*: *est tibi agendus amans imitandaque uulnera uerbis;/ haec tibi quaeratur qualibet arte fides.* (*Ars* 1.611f).[72] The theatrical model encoded in the semantic range of the verb *ago* (*OLD* s.v. 25, 26) is replicated by Clinias' final words to Clitophon, advising him to 'play the part of an actor' if he wants to win the girl: ἐὰν δὲ μαλθακώτερον ἤδη θέλῃ, <u>χορήγησον τὴν ὑπόκρισιν</u>, μὴ ἀπολέσῃς σου τὸ δρᾶμα. (1.10.7). The theatrical mode is also suggested by the behaviour of the antagonists in Chariton. The scheming suitor from Acragas, described as the 'producer of the drama', suborns a smooth-talking crony to 'play the role of the lover' (in order to seduce Callirhoe's maid) as part of a ruse to disturb the marriage of Chaereas and Callirhoe: τοῦτον ἐκέλευσεν ὑποκριτὴν ἔρωτος γενέσθαι (1.4.1); ὁ δημιουργὸς τοῦ δράματος ὑποκριτὴν ἕτερον ἐξηῦρεν (1.4.2); γυνὴ δὲ εὐάλωτόν ἐστιν, ὅταν ἐρᾶσθαι

---

[72] M. Jones (2012) 228 notes the resemblance as part of an argument designed to show that Clitophon is mis-performing masculinity.

δοκῇ (1.4.2).[73] The crucial point here is that, in Chariton, elements deriving from Ovidian erotodidaxis characterise the *antagonists* (an exception is 7.6.10; see n. 73 below), whereas in Achilles it characterises the *protagonist*. In Achilles, Ovid is put to use as part of a package of generic redefinition.

Immediately following his advocacy of the theatrical model, Ovid reassures his audience that it is not a hard task, because all women, even the ugliest, *think* they are pretty: *nec credi labor est: sibi quaeque uidetur amanda;/ pessima sit, nulli non sua forma placet* (*Ars* 1.613f). Elsewhere, he advises the lover to make sure that the girl believes that her beauty has captivated him: *attonitum forma fac putet esse sua* (*Ars* 2.296). To this end he must compliment her hair, her singing and dancing, and her lovemaking (*Ars* 2.303-8), and most importantly he is not to let her realise that the whole thing is a performance: *tantum ne pateas uerbis simulator in illis/ effice, nec uultu destrue dicta tuo* (*Ars* 2.311f). Ovid reiterates this advice to women, instructing them to make men believe that they are loved—an easy task: *efficite (et facile est) ut nos credamus amari:/ prona uenit cupidis in sua uota fides* (*Ars* 3.673f).

There are several obvious correspondences between the advice of Clinias and the Ovidian *praeceptor*: engineering a dynamic of trust and belief through persuasion (πεπίστευκεν; ἐρᾶσθαι πιστευσάτω; *credamus amari*; *credat amari*; *fides*); performance and dissimulation (μιμήσεται (referring to the girl); *imitanda*; *agendus amans*; *simulator*; *simulatus amor*); and the obvious overarching agenda that the lover

---

[73] Goold (1995) 43 notes a resemblance to Menander *Nauclerus* fr. 290 K-T: καὶ φύσει πως εὐάγωγόν ἐστι πᾶς ἀνὴρ ἐρῶν; cf. also the hetaira Thais in Menander (μηθενὸς ἐρῶσαν, προσποιουμένην δ᾽ ἀεί, fr. 185 K-T), Plaut. *Cist.* 96, Lucian *Tox.* 13. Later in Chariton's novel Chaereas himself turns into a *praeceptor amoris*, advising the Egyptian to ensure that the girl in question (who, unbeknownst to Chaereas, turns out to be Callirhoe) *thinks* she is loved, and that he should even apply force if necessary (7.6.10).

should fake his love (i.e. emotional disengagement) and his interest in the girl's looks (i.e. manipulation of the love-object's feelings).[74] In both Ovid and Achilles, the advice is packaged up as part of a repertoire of *praecepta* designed to facilitate the seduction of women.

Erotic experience forms the basis of both Ovid's and Clinias' role as *praeceptores*. In response to this first bit of advice, Clitophon asks Clinias for what looks like an *Ars Amatoria*, by virtue of his apparent age and expertise (1.9.7):

> "πῶς οὖν ἄν," εἶπον, "γένοιτο τοῦτο τὸ μάντευμα; δός μοι τὰς ἀφορμάς· σὺ γὰρ ἀρχαιότερος μύστης ἐμοῦ καὶ συνηθέστερος ἤδη τῇ τελετῇ τοῦ θεοῦ. τί λέγω; τί ποιῶ; πῶς ἂν τύχοιμι τῆς ἐρωμένης; οὐκ οἶδα γὰρ ἐγὼ τὰς ὁδούς."

We have already encountered the discourse of mystery and initiation in the context of erotic experience, and it recurs here. Ovid likewise establishes his praeceptorial voice as endowed with experience (*usus opus mouet hoc: uati parete perito*, *Ars* 1.29; cf. *Ars* 3.791f, Prop. 1.7.13f, 1.9.7f discussed above) and proceeds to use the language of mystery cult to prescribe a readership which excludes married women (*este procul, uittae tenues...*, *Ars* 1.31).[75] Clitophon asks what he should say and do, and how he might 'succeed in winning', for he does not know the 'paths'. This sexually loaded language occurs in an analogous context in Ovid, who promises that 'a long path will not have to be trodden for you to find [your beloved]': *nec tibi ut inuenias longa*

---

[74] Philaenis also advises the reader to compliment the looks of the woman regardless of how old or ugly she is: τὴν μὲν... ὡς ἰσόθεον οὖσαν, τὴν δὲ αἰσχρὰ[ν] ὡς ἐπαφρόδιτον, τ[ὴν] δὲ πρεσβυτέραν ὡς ν[εαν φασ[κ]ων εἶναι (fr. 3 col. ii 3-8).
[75] Similar mystery language at *Am.* 2.1.3 (*procul hinc, procul este, seueri*), Verg. *Aen.* 6.258 (*procul, o procul, este profani*), Call. *H. Apollo* 2.2 (ἑκὰς ἑκὰς ὅστις ἀλιτρός).

terenda uia est (*Ars* 1.52).[76] Ovid and Achilles, then, mobilise the same range of

metaphors in establishing their erotodidactic frameworks.[77]

Clinias tells Clitophon to listen and learn in terms that recall the opening of the

Ars: ὅσα δέ ἐστι κοινὰ καὶ μὴ τῆς εὐκαίρου τύχης δεόμενα, ταῦτα ἀκούσας μάθε

(1.9.2). He establishes a teacher-pupil relationship, setting himself up as a repository

of general maxims (κοινά) from which Clitophon might derive erotic-educational gain

(ταῦτα ἀκούσας μάθε). This dynamic is precisely analogous to that of the Ovidian

praeceptor and his readership: *siquis in hoc artem populo non nouit amandi,/ hoc*

legat et lecto carmine doctus amet (*Ars* 1.1f).[78] Ovid's students are to read (*legat et*

lecto carmine) whilst Clinias' is to listen (ἀκούσας) and both are to learn (μάθε;

doctus). With a slight adjustment in medium by which the discourse is transmitted,

the format is identical.

Clinias' *praecepta* contain further Ovidian elements. He counsels against the

use of dirty talk or any sexually explicit language in general, owing to the fact that

young men and women are modest by nature and prefer not to translate their feelings

into words—αἰδώς and αἰσχύνη are keynotes (1.10.2-6). He contrasts the shyness of

young women, however, with the less inhibited predilections of adult women, who are

happy to indulge in dirty talk: γυναῖκας μὲν γὰρ εὐφραίνει καὶ τὰ ῥήματα (1.10.4).

Ovid similarly encourages women to adopt the practice (in this instance, during sex):

nec blandae uoces iucundaque murmura cessent/ nec taceant mediis improba uerba

---

[76] See Henderson (1975) s.v. τυγχάνω 'take a girl sexually'; Adams (1982) s.v. *uia*. ὀδός is explicitly sexual at Longus 3.18.3 in a passage where Lycaenion is guiding Daphnis' penis to her vagina (ζητουμένην ὀδόν). Similar language (*Amoris iter*) occurs also in Propertius 3.15.2 (cf. 3.10.32), on which see Appendix 4.

[77] See Fowler (2000) on the didactic 'plot' as a 'journey'.

[78] On the teacher-pupil dynamic in didactic poetry see Toohey (1996) and Volk (2002), and on the didactic addressee see Mitsis, Schiesaro, and Clay (1994).

iocis (*Ars* 3.795f). Clinias' distinction between younger and older girls itself echoes Ovid's *Ars* where he refers to the fact that the variety of women requires a variety of strategies.[79] The *praeceptor* sums up the position as follows: *nec tibi conueniet cunctos modus unus ad annos* (*Ars* 1.765). This is the import of Clinias' earlier comment to the effect that girls respond well to advances made by boys their own age: ἔχει δέ τι πρὸς παρθένον ἐπαγωγὸν ἡλικιώτης ἐρῶν (1.9.6). Although in divergent contexts, both Clinias and Ovid are interested in how words themselves function in erotically charged situations, and both agree that different strategies might be required, especially depending on the age of the girl.

4.5   The ethics of consent

Both Clinias and Ovid advocate a model of courtship that problematises the ethics of consent, whereby they are happy to second-guess the love-object's show of resistance as a form of assent. This runs counter to the sexual symmetry that obtains between the protagonists in the other novels. Clinias advocates the use of force, based upon the assumption that when a woman says 'no' what she really means may be 'yes'. In truth, he claims, women often want to *appear* forced in order to preserve their modesty (1.10.6):

> πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ἑκοῦσαι πρὸς τὸ ἔργον ἐρχόμεναι θέλουσι βιάζεσθαι δοκεῖν, ἵνα τῇ δόξῃ τῆς ἀνάγκης ἀποτρέπωνται τῆς αἰσχύνης τὸ ἑκούσιον. μὴ τοίνυν ὀκνήσῃς, ἐὰν ἀνθισταμένην αὐτὴν ἴδῃς, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπιτήρει πῶς ἀνθίσταται· σοφίας γὰρ κἀνταῦθα δεῖ.

He stops short of promoting rape and counsels against the direct application of force if the girl remains obdurate: κἂν μὲν προσκαρτερῇ, ἐπίσχες τὴν βίαν· οὔπω γὰρ πείθεται

---

[79] Observed by M. Jones (2012) 228.

(1.10.7). The assumptions that underlie this particular model of seduction, though culturally dominant,[80] serve to marginalise female subjectivity to the point where it becomes subsumed by the male, patriarchal system of ideas. This is a strategy of seduction in which Ovid is similarly implicated.

The literary tradition frequently thematises the ethics of seduction and consent. For example, Helen in Homer and Euripides, Stesichorus' palinode, and Herodotus' Io and Europa stories. The female's complicity in her own seduction (or abduction) is a perennial source of interest. The Tibullan *praeceptor* Priapus includes it as part of a piece of general advice about *obsequium* (Tib. 1.4.53-6):

> tunc tibi mitis erit, rapias tum cara licebit
>   oscula: pugnabit, sed tibi rapta dabit.
> rapta dabit primo, post adferet ipse roganti,
>   post etiam collo se implicuisse uelit.

But it is not until Ovid that the conceit of women wanting to seem to be forced becomes systematised within erotodidactic discourse.[81] What Sharrock labels as the 'romanticization of force' becomes a keynote in Ovid,[82] who states that 'no means yes': *femina quam iuueni blande temptata repugnet;/ haec quoque, quam poteris credere nolle, uolet* (*Ars* 1.274); he proceeds to dilate on the phenomenon at length in the context of 'stolen kisses' as in the Tibullan passage (*Ars* 1.665-680):

> pugnabit primo fortassis, et 'improbe' dicet;
>   pugnando uinci se tamen illa uolet...

---

[80] See McKie (2009) 149-55 discussing Cat. 66.13-18 on the violent resistance expected of women on their wedding night.

[81] Porphyry's comments *ad* Hor. *C*. 1.9.21 are apposite: *grate dictum: sic enim puellae uerecundiam sexus cum libidine miscentes abscondere se sequentibus amatoribus, et rursus ut inueniantur risu se prodere*. See N-H *ad loc*. The conceit occurs elsewhere in Horace at *C*. 2.12.2f. [Theoc.] *Id*. 27.70 hints at the idea of the female putting on a pretence of modesty whilst actually enjoying the sexual attention: ὄμμασιν αἰδομένοις, κραδίη δέ οἱ ἔνδον ἰάνθη.

[82] Sharrock (2006) 27.

> uim licet appelles: grata est uis ista puellis;
>   quod iuuat, inuitae saepe dedisse uolunt.
> quaecumque est Veneris subita uiolata rapina,
>   gaudet, et improbitas muneris instar habet.
> at quae, cum posset cogi, non tacta recessit,
>   ut simulet uultu gaudia, tristis erit.[83]
> uim passa est Phoebe, uis est allata sorori,
>   et gratus raptae raptor uterque fuit.

This passage is immediately followed by a narrative digression on Achilles and Deidamia (based loosely on [Bion] 2), designed to exemplify the anti-consensualist model Ovid has just promoted. Deidamia, the *praeceptor* tells us, prefers to exhibit a token resistance to Achilles' advance in order to retain her *pudor* (*Ars* 1.699-706):

> uiribus illa quidem uicta est (ita credere oportet),
>   sed uoluit uinci uiribus illa tamen...
> scilicet, ut pudor est quaedam coepisse priorem,
>   sic alio gratum est incipiente pati.

The *praeceptor* himself had, in the past, practised what he preaches here, in his description of a midday sexual encounter with Corinna (*Am.* 1.5.13-16):

> deripui tunicam; nec multum rara nocebat,
>   pugnabat tunica sed tamen illa tegi,
> cumque ita pugnaret tamquam quae uincere nollet,
>   uicta est non aegre proditione sua.

The passages quoted demonstrate that Ovid is keen to apply this model of interpersonal relations to situations that are both general and particular, mythological and autobiographical. In addition, it is also the model upon which, according to Ovid, the Roman institution of marriage is based. In his account of the rape of the Sabine women by the Romuleans Ovid presents the women as resisting their future husbands:

---

[83] Hollis (1977) *ad loc.* cites Seneca *Ep.* 78.14: *quod acerbum fuit ferre, tulisse iucundum.*

si qua repugnarat nimium comitemque negarat... (*Ars* 1.127; cf. *Am*. 2.4.15f). It is therefore a mode of courtship that undergirds the institution of Roman marriage.[84]

In all of these instances the anti-consensualist model justifies itself on the basis that the female acts as she does in order to preserve her *pudor* or *probitas*. All of Clinias' advice at 1.10.2-6 focuses on manipulating the girl's sense of αἰδώς and αἰσχύνη, and likewise here he explains that the semblance of resistance deflects the shamelessness attaching to the charge of willing complicity (ἵνα τῇ δόξῃ τῆς ἀνάγκης ἀποτρέπωνται τῆς αἰσχύνης τὸ ἑκούσιον). Both Clinias and Ovid equate resistance (ἀνθισταμένην... ἀνθίσταται; *repugnet*; *pugnabit*; *pugnando*; *pugnabat*; *pugnaret*) with willingness (ἑκοῦσαι; τὸ ἑκούσιον; *uolet*; *uolunt*; *uoluit*); and in both authors the women *enjoy* the semblance of force and compulsion (θέλουσι βιάζεσθαι δοκεῖν; τῇ δόξῃ τῆς ἀνάγκης; *uim licet appelles: grata est uis ista puellis*; *gaudet*; *gratus raptae raptor*). Achilles, then, although he expresses culturally normative mores, complicates the generically endorsed sexual symmetry that usually obtains between the protagonists. Again, Ovidian behavioural modes are constituent features of Achilles' generic reorientation.

Finally, I have discussed above (p. 150-1) Clitophon's bee-trick, during which he problematises the ethics of consent. He seizes upon the opportunity to kiss Leucippe 'more forcefully', despite her token resistance (2.7.7). Clitophon describes the event in terms of force (βιαιότερον) and feigned resistance (κωλύουσα δῆθεν), which suggests that he is appropriating Clinias' discourse as well as enacting his

---

[84] Labate (2006) regards the Sabine episode as an 'anti-exemplum', a mode of seduction lacking *ars*.

advice.[85] In Clitophon's world of generically redefined modes of erotic conduct, he cannot help but represent Leucippe as behaving according to his rules. Later in the novel, after he has made yet further attempts on her chastity, Leucippe claims to have had a dream in which Artemis commanded her to remain a virgin until marriage (4.1.1-4). Clitophon reports that he henceforth desisted from using 'force' on her: οὐκέτι ἐπεχείρουν βιάζεσθαι (4.1.8). Comparison with a more 'conventional' novel reveals that Achilles is the anomaly by virtue of implicating his protagonist in an Ovidian brand of erotics usually associated with *antagonists*. In Xenophon of Ephesus, the Indian Psammis 'attempts to rape' Anthia, and the language in which it is expressed is identical with that in Achilles: ὠνησάμενος δὲ ἄνθρωπος βάρβαρος καὶ εὐθὺς ἐπιχειρεῖ βιάζεσθαι καὶ χρῆσθαι πρὸς συνουσίαν (3.11.4).

Both Achilles and Ovid thematise the ethics of consent, especially in its erotodidactic contexts; indeed, Achilles is unique amongst the novelists in problematising consent *between protagonists*. This has not passed unobserved. Cataudella, Jones, and Morales mention in passing that 'both Ovid and Clinias argue that maidens typically express consent as dissent',[86] but none develop the idea that the model proposed by Clinias is part of a sustained intertextual strategy and engagement with Ovidian erotic discourse. As I have argued throughout, Ovid functions in Achilles to facilitate a generic redefinition, away from the conventions of novels that promote reciprocal models of interpersonal relations between the protagonists: Ovid is the obvious choice for an author who wishes to move away from such policies.

---

[85] Observed by Morgan (2007b) 118-19, Brethes (2007) 224.
[86] Cataudella (1927) 304 n. 3, M. Jones (2012) 228; quote from Morales (2004) 210.

4.6   The aestheticisation of tears and fears

Achilles and Ovid are obsessed with tears. Clitophon, for instance, twice digresses at length on their physiology. After the attack by the Boukoloi he laments his lot and offers an exposition of the link between levels of grief and the ability to cry, as well as the capacity of tears to phlebotomise the sufferer (4.11.1-2). When he once again believes Leucippe to be dead, he bursts into tears and likens them to blood pouring from a wound (7.4.4-6), recalling the link Ovid himself draws between tears and blood, also in an erotic context: *sanguis erat lacrimae, quas dabat illa, meus* (*Am.* 1.7.60).[87] Clitophon's dacryological interest extends into the aesthetic sphere: he finds them sexy, and in this respect can be ranged closely with the Ovidian *amator*.[88] Eroticised tears appear to be virtually unprecedented in the literary tradition prior to Ovid, except for the example of Apollonius' Jason, who is fired by the sight of Medea's tears: τὸν δὲ καὶ αὐτὸν ὑπήιε δάκρυσι κούρης/ οὖλος ἔρως (*Arg.* 3.1077f). An epigram of the later Paulus Silentiarius provides another fine example (*A.P.* 5.250.1-6).[89]

Fögen observes that whilst male tears are more frequent in Propertius, female tears are a constitutive feature of Ovidian elegiac discourse, especially the idea of false tears.[90] But it is only with Ovid that we witness their systematic fetishisation (though cf. Prop. 3.8.23f for a precedent). In his digression on Dionysus' rescue of Ariadne he remarks upon the fact that her tears are a source of aesthetic and erotic

---

[87] Noted at McKeown (1989) 193. On the hyperrealism and mixture of metaphors in the Achillean passage see Morales (2004) 129. For the mixture of tears and wounds see *Ars* 3.743f and *Met.* 4.140.

[88] Propertius is also explicit about Amor's predilection for tears: *non nihil aspersus gaudet Amor lacrimis* (1.12.16).

[89] Discussed by Konstan (2009) 319.

[90] Fögen (2009b) 196; Prop. 1.15.40 also mentions feigned female tears.

pleasure: *clamabat flebatque simul, sed utrumque decebat;/ non facta est lacrimis turpior illa suis* (*Ars* 1.533f). The sentiment is the subject of one of Clitophon's exhibitions of *paideia*. He describes how Leucippe has been locked away in a cottage by Thersandros, who then makes a sexual advance on her. She bursts into tears, prompting from Clitophon an extended epideixis on how tears and grief enhance beauty (6.7.1-7; I quote 6.7.1, 6.7.3, and 6.7.5):[91]

> ἐπλήσθη δακρύων, καὶ <u>εἶχεν αὐτῆς ἴδιον κάλλος καὶ τὰ δάκρυα</u>. δάκρυον γὰρ ὀφθαλμὸν ἀνίστησι καὶ ποιεῖ προπετέστερον.
>
> τοιαῦτα Λευκίππης ἦν τὰ δάκρυα, <u>αὐτὴν τὴν λύπην εἰς κάλλος νενικηκότα</u>·
>
> ὁ δὲ ἐραστὴς δεξάμενος ἄμφω τὸ μὲν κάλλος εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν ἥρπασε, τὸ δὲ δάκρυον εἰς τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐτήρησεν.

Clitophon's scopic mode (which is also applied to the antagonist Thersandros) eroticises the tears of the female in distress, just as Ovid does in the case of Ariadne. In both authors the signifier of grief is sublimated into the aesthetic and sexual realm, and the male converts signs of female distress into a source of pleasure.[92]

Achilles' and Ovid's eroticisation of tears fits in with their eroticisation of fear more generally. Clitophon's scopic mode repeatedly characterises him as someone who turns sex into violence (for example his description of Panthea's dream in which Leucippe is sliced from the groin upwards, 2.23.5) and violence into sex, and in this respect he provides a potential reading strategy for the novel itself. The Apollo-Daphne paradigm (1.5.5-7) establishes his adherence to an aggressive mode of male sexuality, and he later revels in stories of sexual violence, for example the Philomela

---

[91] See Morales (2004) 135-40 on the whole passage.
[92] In Xenophon, tears are a sign of Anthia's desire: ἡ δὲ ἐδάκρυε τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῆς σύμβολα προπεμπούσης τῆς ἐπιθυμίας τὰ δάκρυα (1.9.2).

ecphrasis and his explanation of it (5.3.4-8; 5.5.1-9), and Pan's attempted rape of Syrinx (8.6). Believing that Leucippe is being disembowelled, he is unable to drag his eyes from the sight, whilst even the soldiers cannot bear to watch (3.15.5):[93]

> ταῦτα δὲ ὁρῶντες οἱ στρατιῶται καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς καθ᾽ ἓν τῶν πραττομένων ἀνεβόων καὶ τὰς ὄψεις ἀπέστρεφον τῆς θέας, ἐγὼ δὲ ἐκ παραλόγου καθήμενος ἐθεώμην.

Likewise, in his description of the Andromeda-Perseus ecphrasis in the Temple of Zeus Casius at Pelusium, Andromeda's fear is explicitly described as beautiful: οὕτως αὐτὴν ἐκόσμησεν ὁ ζωγράφος <u>εὐμόρφῳ φόβῳ</u> (3.7.3). Clitophon's constant (interest in the) sexualisation of violence therefore problematises Konstan's claim that as the novel progresses 'erotic aggression is... securely associated with the behaviour of rivals rather than that of the male protagonist.'[94]

The objectification of sexual violence is a keynote in Ovid.[95] In his account of the rape of the Sabine women, the *praeceptor* describes their fear as a source of beauty: *et potuit multas ipse decere timor*[96] (*Ars* 1.126). Elsewhere in the Ovidian corpus female victims of sexual violence are routinely aestheticised: Leucothoe (*ipse timor decuit*, *Met*. 4.230); Europa (*et timor ipse noui causa decoris erat*, *Fasti* 5.608); Daphne (*auctaque forma fuga est*, *Met*. 1.530). In this context sadness, as well as fear, is a source of erotic pleasure: *spectabat terram: terram spectare decebat;/ maesta erat in uultu: maesta decenter erat* (*Am*. 2.5.43f; cf. *Met*. 7.730f, 7.773).[97] Finally, in

---

[93] The soldiers here resemble those in Livy who avert their eyes from the punishment of the Alban Mettius Fufetius: *auertere omnes ab tanta foeditate spectaculi oculos* (1.28.11).
[94] Konstan (1994) 69.
[95] Curran (1978), Richlin (1992a).
[96] Hollis (1977) *ad loc.* finds *timor* to be a more reliable reading that *pudor*.
[97] Chariton suggests that Callirhoe's unadorned or sad appearance makes her more attractive: φυλάττουσα τὸ σχῆμα γυναικὸς ἀτυχούσης, μελανείμων, ἀκόσμητος καθημένη. ταῦτα καὶ λαμπροτέραν αὐτὴν ἀπεδείκνυε (5.9.7).

Ovid's treatment of the rape of Lucretia, her husband Collatinus arrives home to find her weeping with her face in her lap, a sight which the narrator describes as becoming: *hoc ipsum decuit: lacrimae decuere pudicam* (*Fasti* 2.755-7).

Thersandros is equally implicated in this discourse. Clitophon describes how he (Thersandros) arrives at the cottage to find Leucippe in a state of grief and fear: ἐμφαίνουσαν τοῖς προσώποις λύπην ὁμοῦ καὶ δέος (6.6.1). At this sight he instantly falls in love and proceeds to question her as to why she insists on wasting her beauty by staring down at the floor (6.6.4-5):[98]

> "... ἐπιτηρῶν πότε αὖθις ἀναβλέψει πρὸς αὐτόν. ὡς δὲ ἔνευσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν, λέγει· "τί κάτω βλέπεις, γύναι; τί δέ σου τὸ κάλλος τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν εἰς γῆν καταρρεῖ; ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς μᾶλλον ῥεέτω τοὺς ἐμούς."

The Romans in Ovid's account similarly ask the Sabine women why they are spoiling the beauty of their eyes with tears immediately after his aestheticisation of their fear: *quid teneros lacrimis corrumpis ocellos?* (*Ars* 1.129).[99] The fear of wasted beauty with an emphasis on the eye are constituent features in both.

4.7   Clitophon's amatory digressions

Clitophon has made a name for himself amongst modern scholars as a character who is prone to explosions of rhetorical display.[100] The morphological components of his

---

[98] The female gesture of looking to the floor is a signifier of modesty (*pudor*): Ov. *Am*. 1.8.35-8, 2.4.11f, 2.5.43f; Ach. 8.4.1.

[99] Jupiter makes a similar plea to Alcumena at Plautus *Amphityron* 530 (*ne corrumpe oculos*), noted by Hollis (1977) *ad loc*. Chariton's antagonist Dionysius expresses a similar anxiety, that Callirhoe's beauty might be affected by her grief: ὁ δὲ Διονύσιος ἐλυπεῖτο μὲν ὁρῶν τρυχομένην τὴν γυναῖκα, μὴ ἄρα τι καὶ τοῦ κάλλους αὐτῇ παραπόληται (4.1.2).

[100] Sedelmeier (1959) regards the digressions as ornamental; Bartsch (1989) sees them as part of an interpretative game; Nimis (1998) 101 reads them as 'first drafts' that stimulate the author's creative process.

name, 'Glorious Voice', suggest that we are to see him as some sort of orator whose epideictic outbursts characterise him as an over-educated *pepaideumenos* who perhaps does not understand the import of what he says, and who mistakenly equates knowledge with experience.[101] Marinčič, for example, reads the entire novel as a seduction speech (both of Leucippe and of the reader), and Alvares sees in Clitophon's oratorical display a misuse of *paideia* for his own erotic ends.[102] This is precisely in line with the recommendations of the Ovidian *praeceptor*.

For Clitophon and the antagonists, sophistic display is a mode of seduction. The scene at the end of the first book takes place in the *paradeisos* on Hippias' estate. Clitophon finds himself in the presence of Leucippe, and, taking the flora and fauna in the garden as his cue, launches into a rhetorical set-piece on the peacock in an effort to influence her (1.16.1):

> βουλόμενος οὖν ἐγὼ εὐάγωγον τὴν κόρην εἰς ἔρωτα παρασκευάσαι, λόγων πρὸς τὸν Σάτυρον ἠρχόμην, ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρνιθος λαβὼν τὴν εὐκαιρίαν.

Clitophon then explains (1.16.2) how the male peacock (ταῶς), which is amorous (ἔστι γὰρ ἐρωτικός), attracts (ἐπαγαγέσθαι) its beloved by showing off its beauty (καλλωπίζεται), a description clearly designed to reflect his own intentions.[103] He follows this up with lengthy disquisitions on examples of love in the natural world, such as magnets (1.17.1-2), plants (1.17.3-5), Alpheus and Aresthusa (1.18.1-2), and

---

[101] Brethes (2001) 185; Anderson (1997); Alvares (2006) 7.
[102] Marinčič (2007) 194, Alvares (2006) 7. Whitmarsh (2011) 240 links Clitophon's digressions with sympotic culture in which diners interject random thoughts.
[103] The peacock is linked to rhetorical display at Dio *Or*. 12.2-5, noted by Morales (2004) 190. M. Jones (2012) 71 n. 144 adduces Polemo's *Physiognomy* (*ap*. Anon. Lat. 130) on the fact that men who are like peacocks are likely to be adulterers and *cinaedi*.

reptiles (1.18.3-5).[104] In Ovid's *Metamorphoses* Vertumnus likewise discourses on the marriage of the vine and the elm in his bid to seduce Pomona (14.663-8; see p. 200 below). Clitophon reads Leucippe's reaction to his oratorical display as signifying approval (ἡ δὲ ὑπεσήμαινεν οὐκ ἀηδῶς ἀκούειν, 1.19.1), and congratulates himself and his interlocutor Satyros on their general wit and teamwork (1.19.3). Later in the novel the antagonist Charmides, in order to prolong the amount of time spent in the presence of Leucippe, filibusters by engaging in a display of knowledge on the capture of the hippo (4.3.1-5), the birth of the elephant in India (4.4.1-8), and the Indian rose (4.5.2-3). Once again, we see Clitophon participating in precisely the same strategies as the novel's antagonists.

Ovid likewise advises the prospective lover to dilate on foreign marvels and exotica in order to impress the object of his seduction and extend the time spent in her presence (a connection which has not passed unnoticed).[105] He advises striking up a conversation in the Circus (*hic tibi quaeratur socii sermonis origo*, *Ars* 1.143; cf. τὰς ἀφορμὰς, 1.19.3)[106] as well as capitalising on the exotica displayed at a Triumph, extemporising if needs be (*Ars* 1.219-28; I quote 219-22):

> atque aliqua ex illis cum regum nomina quaeret,
>   quae loca, qui montes quaeue ferantur aquae,
> omnia responde, nec tantum si qua rogabit;
>   ut quae nescieris, ut bene nota refer...

He likewise suggests that the lover should know their letters and be armed with eloquence (*Ars* 1.459-62):

---

[104] See Whitmarsh (2011) 243-4 on this passage. Some of this bookish knowledge recurs in Menander Rhetor 401-2 (e.g. Alpheus and Arethusa), noted by Morales (2004) 185-6, M. Jones (2012) 227 n. 157, De Temmerman (2014) 184.

[105] Anderson (1982) 29, Morales (2004) 185.

[106] The antagonist Chaereas seeks an 'opportunity for familiarity' with Leucippe: ἀφορμὴν οἰκειότητος (5.3.1).

> disce bonas artes, moneo, Romana iuuentus,
>   non tantum trepidos ut tueare reos:
> quam populos iudexque grauis lectusque senatus,
>   tam dabit eloquio uicta puella manus.

He adds a disclaimer to the effect that the lover should wear his learning lightly, for only idiots 'declaim' to their girls (*Ars* 1.463-5):

> sed lateant uires, nec sis in fronte disertus;
>   effugiant uoces uerba molesta tuae.
> quis nisi mentis inops tenerae declamat amicae?

Clitophon, however, is precisely this sort of idiot.[107] Here we see him deploy an Ovidian seduction strategy without having read the instructions properly. He also, once again, imposes on Leucippe an understanding of Ovidian rules of courtship, and assumes that she reacts accordingly (1.19.1, quoted above). Nobody is immune from his world-view, informed as it is by Latin elegiac codes.

4.8   Satyros erotodidaskalos

Clitophon is lucky enough to have a second confidant, as Ovidian as Clinias, to teach him the conduct necessary to seduce Leucippe. Satyros is a slave who plays Clitophon's 'wing-man' and generally serves to facilitate his efforts at seducing Leucippe, as well as later encouraging him to enter into sexual relations with Melite. Not only does he explicitly administer erotodidactic advice in the elegiac and Ovidian mode, but he also enacts it in practice. Immediately following the first symposium Clitophon decides to confide in Satyros and ask his advice (2.4.1-6). He is

---

[107] Noted by Anderson (1982) 29. Another example of Clitophon misreading Ovidian rules is in his digression on the physiology of kissing where he asserts that nothing gives greater pleasure than a kiss (2.8.3). For Ovid, kissing that does not lead to sex is a complete waste of time (*Ars* 1.669f).

characterised as a tricky customer, telling Clitophon that he is already aware of the situation, but that he preferred not to question him, realising that lovers tend to be secretive and do not take kindly to interrogation (2.4.1):

> ὁ δὲ ἔλεγε καὶ αὐτὸς μὲν ἐγνωκέναι πρὶν παρ' ἐμοῦ μαθεῖν, ὀκνεῖν δὲ ἐλέγχειν βουλόμενον λανθάνειν. ὁ γὰρ μετὰ κλοπῆς ἐρῶν ἂν ἐλεγχθῇ πρός τινος, ὡς ὀνειδίζοντα τὸν ἐλέγξαντα μισεῖ.

As discussed above, Satyros' discourse is loaded with the language of elegiac *furtum*. He markets himself as an intertextually aware reader who is able to modify his behaviour based on his knowledge of elegiac conventions.

Satyros' strategy hews closely to Ovid's advice on the manipulation of servants. He explains how he has already seduced Leucippe's maid Clio, and how, having earned her trust, he now plans to exploit the relationship to the advantage of Clitophon (2.4.2):

> ἡ γὰρ τὸν θάλαμον αὐτῆς πεπιστευμένη Κλειὼ κεκοινώνηκέ μοι καὶ ἔχει πρός με ὡς ἐραστήν. ταύτην παρασκευάσω κατὰ μικρὸν πρὸς ἡμᾶς οὕτως ἔχειν, ὡς καὶ συναίρεσθαι πρὸς τὸ ἔργον.

Ovid is similarly manipulative. In *Am* 1.11 he uses the hairdresser Nape as a go-between and in *Am*. 2.7 and 2.8 we hear how he has seduced the hairdresser Cypassis.[108] The Ovidian *praeceptor* enjoins such behaviour on the prospective lover in order to gain access to the *puella*: *sed prius ancillam captandae nosse puellae/ cura sit: accessus molliet illa tuos...* (*Ars* 1.351-8). Later we learn that Satyros has pretended to love a second chambermaid (2.31.2):

---

[108] For parallels see McKeown (1989) 308-9. For New Comedy as an influence on the love-triangle situation see Yardley (1974) 433-4, and for mime see McKeown (1979) 78.

ἡ Λευκίππη θαλαμηπόλον, ἣν τῷ αὐτῷ φαρμάκῳ καταβαπτίσας ὁ Σάτυρος (προσεπεποίητο γὰρ καὶ αὐτῆς, ἐξ οὗ τῷ θαλάμῳ προσεληλύθει, ἐρᾶν)

The knowing reader realises that Satyros is merely exploiting his own love-life in order to curry favour with his master, but he does so by harnessing conventions codified in erotodidactic discourse, especially the performative element advocated at *Ars* 1.611f. He even attempts to win Leucippe's doorkeeper Conops onto his side: βουλόμενος αὐτὸν εἰς φιλίαν ἀγαγεῖν (2.20.2). The doorkeeper is a familiar character in Latin elegy, functioning as a powerful obstacle to the elegist (e.g. *Am.* 1.6)[109] and the *praeceptor* explicitly advises winning over all the servants including the *ianitor* (*Ars* 2.251-60). He especially advises addressing the slave by name in order to affect familiarity and equality: *nomine quemque suo (nulla iactura) saluta* (*Ars* 2.253). Satyros likewise affects a jocular tone with Conops and puns on his name: προσέπαιζε πολλάκις καὶ κώνωπα ἐκάλει καὶ ἔσκωπτε τοὔνομα σὺν γέλωτι (2.20.2). In all these activities Satyros adheres to a specific set of Ovidian instructions involving the servants of the *puella*.

Satyros' advice on verbal and physical interaction with Leucippe participates in Ovidian discourse and elegiac idiom more generally. He counsels direct speech as opposed to mere glances (δεῖ δέ σε καὶ τὴν κόρην μὴ μέχρι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν πειρᾶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ῥῆμα δριμύτερον εἰπεῖν, 2.4.3) in contrast to the silent tactics enjoined by Clinias (1.10.2-4). He then advises him to touch her hand, squeeze her finger, and let out a groan: τότε δὲ πρόσαγε τὴν δευτέραν μηχανήν. θίγε χειρός, θλῖψον δάκτυλον, θλίβων στέναξον (2.4.3-4). Satyros bases his advice on Clitophon's description of the second symposium, which corresponds to the Ovidian *praeceptor*'s advice regarding

---

[109] The slave's power in the household comes from the realm of Roman comedy, e.g. Ter. *Eun*, Plaut. *Mil.* 349-51. The eunuch-slave Artaxates in Chariton wields similar power in the Persian court.

hand-touching at the *conuiuium*: *et quemquemque cibum digitis libauerit illa,/ tu pete, dumque petis, sit tibi tacta manus* (*Ars* 1.578). Satyros then suggests that Clitophon address Leucippe as 'mistress' (σὸν ἔργον ἤδη δέσποινάν τε καλεῖν, 2.4.4; cf. 2.6.1 where he acts on this advice), which is followed by a dialogue larded with military-erotic metaphors. Both the servile and military discourses are crucial elements in Achilles' elegiac jigsaw (as discussed in Chapter 1). Finally, later in the novel Clitophon asks Satyros how he should reply to Leucippe's letter. His response is that Eros himself will dictate the letter: αὐτός σοι ὁ Ἔρως ὑπαγορεύσει (5.20.1). This is a direct echo of an Ovidian line: *carmina...quae mihi dictat Amor* (*Am*. 2.1.38).[110]

There are several other hints that Satyros derives from the Ovidian *praeceptor*. Satyros tells Clitophon that, while he distracts Clio, it is time for Clitophon to 'play the man': νῦν μὲν ἀνδρίζεσθαι καιρός, (2.10.1). Ovid is similarly concerned with playing the part of a man when transformed into a ring: *et peragam partes anulus ille uiri* (*Am*. 2.15.26; see p. 118 n. 61). We see Clitophon later aping the language of masculinity. Charmides has assigned a tent to him and Leucippe, at which point Clitophon declares that he wants to 'play the man': καὶ ὡς εἴσω παρῆλθον, περιπτυξάμενος αὐτὴν οἷός τε ἤμην ἀνδρίζεσθαι (4.1.2). Despite Clitophon's shortcomings, as a student he acts on the advice he is given and appropriates the discourse of his teachers.[111] This is the type of 'mimetic simultaneity' that Volk argues is operative in the *Ars Amatoria*, whereby 'the speaker does not simply provide a theoretical treatment for his passively listening students. Rather, as he is speaking, the young men... are already following the teacher's advice, and the love affair the

---

[110] For dictation by Cupid see also Ov. *Her*. 20.31, Prop. 1.7.19f, *C.E*. 937.1, all listed at McKeown (1998) 24; cf. also Prop. 4.1.133 (*tum tibi pauca suo de carmine dictat Apollo*).
[111] Brethes (2012a) 132.

persona is describing is at the same time actually taking place'.[112] The student starts off a new *miles* (*Ars* 1.36) but by the second book he has successfully put the theory in action. The same process obtains in Achilles. In addition, after an earlier injunction from Satyros, Clitophon asks himself why he is not taking the initiative: τὴν κόρην προσελθεῖν σοὶ περιμένεις; (2.5.1). The Ovidian *praeceptor* likewise advises men to take the initiative and not wait to be asked (*Ars* 1.705-14).

4.9   Conclusion

Achilles' narrative exhibits influence of Latin elegy at the lexical, situational, and generic levels, drawing on Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid, and for Achilles' potential knowledge of Gallus see p. 53-7. In elegy he found an idiom redolent with anti-authoritarian signifiers, which explains why elegiac elements are most frequent in the first two books: they serve to characterise the antagonism between private desire and public duty represented by Clitophon and Hippias respectively. As far as Greek novelistic protagonists go, Clitophon embodies something new and generically experimental. His behavioural mode marks a shift away from the more conventional approaches to *eros* and *gamos*. Clitophon rejects marriage and prefers to focus on how to succeed in having sex with Leucippe. He is supported by the *erotodidaskaloi* Clinias and Satyros, who are representative of the erotodidactic tradition embodied in Ovid (and in part Tibullus and Propertius), who is himself anonymised and removed from the literary tradition by Achilles.

---

[112] Volk (2002) 178.

Clitophon's (and the hidden author Achilles') approach towards the conventions of Greek prose romance marks a radical generic reorientation. He problematises the ethics of consent and blurs the generically conventional lines between the 'sexually symmetrical' lovers and their antagonists. Three times he assumes that Leucippe 'understands' the generic codes of elegy (2.9.3, 2.6.2, 2.7.6; cf. 1.19.1): not only does this suggest that the practice of reading and interpretation is an inherently 'male' activity, but it also endows the male with the power to impose his own meaning on the female, and his own fictions on the world. Likewise, Leucippe's tears and fears become aesthetic effects to be enjoyed by the male (another peculiarly Ovidian motif). Equally problematic is the fact that the protagonist Clitophon participates in behaviours that, in other novels, are delimited to the antagonists. This is again part of Achilles' project of generic reorientation, which, more often than not, relies on the codes and conventions of Latin elegy.

Chapter 5

Achilles and Rome

5.1 Introduction

This chapter moves away from the strictly literary, and instead explores how Achilles mediates his ideas about Rome. It falls broadly into three parts. The first part (section 5.2) aims to explain why Achilles has chosen to engage with Roman themes at all, and why it is that Rome signifies so negatively.[1] I adduce Achilles' knowledge of Latin and potential Alexandrian identity as a useful entry point into the question. Enmity between Rome and Alexandria is a perennial issue in the imperial period, and I discuss other Alexandrian authors such as Timagenes and Dionysius the Periegete as well as the more overtly anti-Roman *Acta Alexandrinorum*.

In the second and third parts (sections 5.3 and 5.4), I demonstrate that Achilles is engaging playfully and subversively with key moments of the Roman cultural narrative involving sexual aggression on the part of Roman males. Callisthenes' abduction of Calligone in Book 2, and his eventual rehabilitation in Book 8, incorporate a number of elements from the story of Romulus' rape of the Sabine women, as well as Romulus' Asylum. I shall then argue that Leucippe's treatment at the hands of Thersandros and his stooge Sosthenes in the final three books of the novel conflates Sextus Tarquinius' rape of Lucretia, and Appius Claudius' attempts to acquire the freeborn Verginia for sexual purposes by falsely alleging that she is his slave. The narratives of Lucretia and Verginia both coincide with moments in Roman

---

[1] Morales (2004) 10 rightly judges the novel to be a 'product of the Roman Empire', despite her reference to Achilles' 'exclusion of Rome and Latin literature'.

history in which tyranny—of the Kings and the Decemvirate respectively—come to an end, but at a cost: the integrity of Lucretia's body is compromised and she commits suicide as a result; Verginia's father cannot bear the thought of his daughter sexually enslaved to the *decemuir* Appius and so kills her himself. In these stories—for which the main sources are Livy and Dionysius[2]—the female body serves as a site of mistreatment and reflects the enslavement of the body politic to tyrannical forms of government. The dialogue between Leucippe and her captors expresses a similar preoccupation with the integrity of her body and free status; she and Thersandros can be read as offering an image of a Greek world subjected to Roman rule. Thersandros is repeatedly associated with the language of 'piracy' and 'brigandage', which I shall suggest encourages his association with Rome. By appropriating episodes from the Roman cultural script that are concerned with excesses of power, Achilles re-contextualises contemporary issues of sovereignty and freedom in his Greek prose romance. The result is a large-scale 'hidden transcript' from a member of the Alexandrian Greek elite.

Thersandros is ethnically a Greek from Ephesus (6.12.2), and it might therefore seem odd to claim that he functions as a venue for negative Roman elements. Yet ethically he is the most barbarian character in the novel.[3] Achilles cannot be explicit in his denunciation of Rome, and must find ways to play with allegories of Roman power and domination via displacement, insinuation, and discursive negotiation (as is the case for every 'hidden transcript'). Indeed, allegory is a viable reading strategy: in Attic tragedy, for example, Thebes provides a site into

---

[2] For the representation of the regal period in Livy and Dionysius, see Fox (1996) 49-141. Forsythe (2005) 59, 66-8 cautions that Livy and Dionysius constitute late first-century BCE redactions of many historians active in the last two centuries of the Republic. Cassius Dio 2.11.13-20 (and Zonaras) also transmits the Lucretia narrative.
[3] The point is made by De Temmerman (2014) 155 with n. 19.

which negative Athenian elements are displaced;[4] and Roman drama—such as Seneca's and Curiatius Maternus' *Thyestes*—could be read as subversive of the imperial household (Tac. *Dial.* 3.3).[5] In Achilles' case, the morally reprehensible Thersandros provides a convenient way of exploring Roman power. Perhaps it is even the case that the choice to make him a native of Ephesus in Asia Minor reflects the fact that in the first and second centuries CE there are more Italians and Romans among the Ephesian elite than in any other city in *prouincia Asia*, because of the city's function as a headquarters for Roman businessmen, magistrates, and imperial administration.[6]

5.2   Alexandrian Achilles

It is difficult to establish reliable data about the socio-cultural systems that produced the novels. Reardon's 'myth of late Hellenism', for example, is too woolly to be useful.[7] Photius, the Suda, and the MSS all associate Achilles with Alexandria, no doubt attempting to draw out biographical data from the author's praise of the city in Book 5.[8] Clitophon even says of the city that it is like being a 'tourist at home' (ἔνδημος ἀποδημία, 5.1.3).[9] Scepticism aside, on balance the evidence points towards an Alexandrian identity.[10] The novel has been variously dated, the earliest possibility

---

[4] Zeitlin (1990a).
[5] See Syme (1958) 362, and MacMullen (1966) 1-45 for conditions of writing under the empire more generally.
[6] Halfmann (2001) 99-100 = (2004) 129-30.
[7] Reardon (1969) 293, reiterated by Lefteratou (2010) 23-4. Whitmarsh (2013b) 61 remarks that we must work with what Martin Bernal (1991) 4 calls 'competitive plausibilities'.
[8] Photius *Bibl.* Cod. 87; Suda s.v. "Ἀχιλλεὺς Στάτιος"; MSS listed at Vilborg (1955) 1. On Achilles' Alexandrian identity see Plepelits (1980) 3-6, (1996) 387-8, Yatromanolakis (1990) 19-23.
[9] Cf. Cic. *Acad. Post.* 1.9, noted by Whitmarsh (2009) 45 n. 38.
[10] A view shared by Plepelits (1996) 387-8, Whitmarsh (2011) 75.

being the first half of the second century, and a date at some point in the second century is almost certain.[11] The dramatic date is likewise vague.[12]

The second century was the height of Roman power in Egypt, and it is therefore 'likely that [Achilles] would have been familiar with Roman ways'.[13] Hilton advances several arguments for Achilles' knowledge of Latin, Roman law, South Italian art, Latin literature (namely Petronius), Roman military practices, and the imperial significance of the phoenix.[14] Latin, though a marginal language in Egypt, was nevertheless a 'language of power' and dominant in the army, courts, and civil administration; and Egyptian papyri attest to Greek speakers learning Latin.[15] Achilles would therefore have been exposed to Latin in a variety of contexts.

The relationship between Rome and Egypt had never been smooth. At Actium, Alexandria supported Antony against Octavian, who famously spared the city only because of Alexander the Great, Serapis, and respect for his friend Areius.[16] Augustus barred Alexandrians from the senate, and the ban was not lifted until the time of Caracalla.[17] The Augustan settlement also exploited the wealth of Egypt, and already in 29 BCE rioting broke out against the Roman governor (Strabo 17.53). Accusations

---

[11] Henrichs (2011) 303-13 reviews the papyrological evidence and argues for an early date, citing the reading by Cavallo (1996) 16, 36 of *P.Oxy.* 3836. Chew (2014) 63-5 reviews the internal dating criteria such as the revolt of the Boukoloi (3.9-24, 4.1-18; cf. Cassius Dio 71.4.1-2), beards (2.18.3), and the Gates of the Sun and the Moon in Alexandria (5.1.1-6; cf. Malalas *Chron.* 11.280).

[12] Achilles, Longus, and Xenophon are more vague than Chariton and Heliodorus. Persian rule in Egypt (410-323 BCE) is possible, on the basis of a reference to a Persian satrap (4.11.1) and to the Persian royal family (7.12.1). Plepelits (1980) 24-7, (1996) 408-11 pinpoints 'with a certain probability' a precise dramatic date of 47 CE on the basis of the Thracian war and also the appearance of the Phoenix at 3.24.3.

[13] Hilton (2009) 101.

[14] Hilton (2009).

[15] See section 0.2.

[16] Plut. *Ant.* 80; *Praec. Rep. Ger.* 18 (814D); [Plut.] *Apophtheg.* 207 B; Cassius Dio 51.16.4; Julian, *Ep.* 51.433D.

[17] See Hose (1999) 286-7, Spawforth (2012) 75; Bowie (1982) 43 notes the prevalence of Alexandrian *ab epistulis*.

of imperial mismanagement, corruption, and oppression were a perennial bone of contention fostering Alexandrian resentment, and Rome is potentially responsible for the decline in Egyptian prosperity.[18] Relations between the Alexandrian Greeks and the Julio-Claudians were particularly bad, exacerbated by the fact that the latter had granted special privileges to the Jews: the *Acta Alexandrinorum* relate how the leader of the Alexandrian Greek embassy insults Claudius as 'the cast-off son of the Jewess Salome' and Claudius promptly executes the ambassadors Isidorus and Lampon (*Acta Isidori*).[19] Vespasian, on the other hand, had been first hailed as emperor by two Egyptian legions before gaining support in Judea and Syria, and the Alexandrians are the first provincials to swear allegiance to him (Cassius Dio 66.8.2). He soon falls foul of the Alexandrians who feel unappreciated and insult him (Cassius Dio 65.8.1-7), and in the *Acta Diogenis* an unnamed emperor, presumably Vespasian, is said to have been attacked in Alexandria.[20] Trajan likewise has a rough time with the Alexandrians, as evidenced by Dio's *Alexandrian Oration* (*Or.* 32), which addresses the issue of mob rioting and is an attempt to reconcile the Alexandrians with the emperor.[21]

Hadrian's relationship with the city is slightly better. Whilst no visits are attested by any emperor since Titus in 71 CE,[22] Hadrian's visit to Egypt in 130 CE is well known, including his stay in Alexandria itself where he was favourably received

---

[18] Milne (1927), with qualifications in Baldwin (1963) 263; Balsdon (1979) 271 n. 61 lists Roman abuses of the Egyptians, incl. Ach. Tat. 4.14.9.

[19] Forte (1972) 205 notes how, of all the Greek provincials, it was the Alexandrians who were consistently hostile in the Julio-Claudian period. See H.S. Jones (1926) on Claudius and the Jewish question at Alexandria, for example how the *Acta* exaggerate the influence of Alexandria on Roman politics; see also Musurillo (1954) 136-7 and Alvares (2001) 15 with n. 19.

[20] *Acta* 6 (*P. Rendel Harris*) contains a certain Hermias who denounces the emperor in his presence. Sen. *ad Helv*. 19.6 says that the Egyptians are good at finding ways of insulting the Romans.

[21] Alvares (2001) 17 links this philosopher-reconciler to the similar role played by the philosopher Demetrius in Chariton (8.3.10) who is tasked with reconciling the Egyptians with the Persian King.

[22] Harker (2008) 60 lists imperial visits to the city.

and took a special interest in the Museum. He is the first emperor to honour Serapis on imperial coinage, depicting himself in the Serapeum in Alexandria.[23] Antoninus Pius even receives honours from the Alexandrians,[24] while Marcus, after pardoning the Egyptians for their support of Avidius Cassius in 175 CE, spends time there as a private citizen in 176/5 CE listening to philosophers as had Augustus, Germanicus, Vespasian, and Hadrian before him (*SHA Marc. Aur.* 26.1-3). Commodus, however, resorts (like Claudius), to the execution of Alexandrian ambassadors: in the *Acta Appiani* (iv.8 Musurillo) the Greek gymnasiarch Appian accuses Commodus of mismanaging the profit from Egyptian grain and calls him a 'pirate leader' (λήσταρχος). In response Commodus passes down a death sentence.

One of the primary factors motivating the resentment of the Alexandrian Greeks was Rome's refusal of permission for a βουλή (which might have allowed the Alexandrians to control civil discord between Greeks and Jews), no doubt made all the more galling by the fact that other cities in Greek Asia Minor, and even smaller Egyptian cities such as Ptolemais, Antinoopolis, and (probably) Naucratis, were free to have one; the restriction was only lifted under Septimius Severus (Cassius Dio 51.17.2-3; *SHA Sept. Sev.* 1). During the first two centuries of the imperial period the Alexandrians put forward repeated requests (for example *CPJ* II 150).[25] In any event, Egypt and Alexandria especially were notorious for resistance to Rome,[26] even if the 'triply-divided' nature of Roman Egypt—Greek, Jewish, and Egyptian—meant that there could be no genuinely effective 'nationalism', despite the dreams of resistance contained in such texts as the *Oracle of the Potter* and *Asclepius*, as well as the

---

[23] MacMullen (1966) 100-1.
[24] References at Forte (1972) 326 n. 97.
[25] See Harker (2008) 28.
[26] In the context of Chariton see Alvares (2001), and in the novels more generally E. M. Smith (1927), Brioso-Sanchez (1992), and Nimis (2004). Plazenet (1995) discusses the Nile in the novels.

novelistic *Sesonchosis* and *Alexander Romance*.[27] The Egyptians and Alexandrians

were also known to have supported several pretenders (including the false Neros).

Curtius Rufus, for example, adjudicates the Egyptians to be a race bent on revolution

(*uana gens et nouandis quam gerendis aptior rebus*, 4.1.30.3) and the Sibylline

Oracles describe the Alexandrians as 'war-loving' (φιλοπτολέμοισιν Ἀλεξανδρεῦσιν,

S.O. 13.74).[28]

The role of Egypt in Chariton requires attention in this connection.[29] In his

novel, the Egyptians under the Pharaoh revolt against the Persian King Artaxerxes,

and are joined by the disgruntled protagonist Chaereas and his friend Polycharmus.

The conclusion of the revolt is an eventual reconciliation between Egypt and Persia,

to be brokered by the philosopher Demetrius.[30] The Egyptians are motivated by

political freedom and the revolt is marketed as targeting tyranny: after killing the

Persian satrap the Egyptians 'elect' a king (κεχειροτονηκέναι, 6.8.2), who—

significantly—rules with the help of a βουλή (ὁ Αἰγύπτιος συνήγαγε βουλήν, 7.3.1).[31]

Taking into account the fact that Chariton's Persians can be read as a reflection of the

Roman empire,[32] it is easy to read the entire affair in Chariton as articulating Egyptian

(and even Alexandrian) discontent against Rome.[33]

---

[27] See MacMullen (1964) on the question of nationalism in Roman Egypt, quotation at 179; and 180-5, with MacMullen (1966) 150 on the *Oracle of the Potter* and *Asclepius*. On Egyptian nationalism in *Sesonchosis* and the *Alexander Romance* see S-W (1995) 246-50, Braun (1938) 1-25, 31-42, MacMullen (1964), Balsdon (1979) 68-9.

[28] See Giovannini and Van Berchem (1986) 110-14 on resistance to the Roman empire from Augustus to Trajan in Jewish and Egyptian writing.

[29] The subject of Alvares (1997), (2001), and (2001-2002) 136-7, Smith (2007) 90-1.

[30] On the role of Demetrius in Chariton see Morgan (2007a). Laplace (2008) detects traces of Demetrius the Cynic.

[31] Alvares (1997) and (2001-2002) 137. Chaereas also complains of tyrannical treatment at the hands of Artaxerxes (τετυράννηκε δὲ ἡμῶν Ἀρταξέρξης, 7.2.4).

[32] Schwartz (2003).

[33] Salmon (1961) reads the revolt in Chariton in connection with the Egyptian revolt of 360 BCE.

As a result of the antagonism between the Greek Alexandrians and Rome on the geopolitical stage, the city generates its fair share of anti-Roman discourse. Timagenes of Alexandria, for example, captured and brought to Rome by Aulus Gabinius in 55 BCE, was an outspoken critic of Rome (*FGrH* ii. A. 88. F. 9), quarrelled with Augustus, burned his work about him, and moved into the house of the erstwhile Antonian Asinius Pollio (Sen. *Contr.* 10.5.22; *de Ira* 3.2); and Plutarch notes that his treatment of Roman involvement in Egypt in the late Republic is unsympathetic (*Pomp.* 49). In the context of a discussion as to how Alexander would have fared had he turned West, Livy refers to those *leuissimi ex Graecis* (9.18.6) who denigrate Rome in favour of Parthia—potentially referring to Timagenes.[34] The Hadrianic Dionysius of Alexandria is also an interesting case. Though not explicitly anti-Roman, critics have detected negative elements to his *Periegesis*. Bowie observes that the mention of the collapsed Persian and Macedonian empires has ramifications for the poem's treatment of Rome;[35] he also points to the bizarre silence on the Punic wars and destruction of Carthage (the future Augustan colony), which he suggests is transferred to the description of the destruction of Nasamon by the Αὐσονὶς αἰχμή (210). He argues that Dionysius is alluding to the Romans as an interruptive force in the development of civilisation and as a destroyer of cities, with the sinister implication that Alexandria—that known troublemaker—might be next.[36] Finally, Lightfoot observes that Rome, in the poem, has wealth, but no temples or mythology (unlike Alexandria). Dionysius is in this respect similar to Aristides, who is silent on Roman literature and history in his *Roman Oration* (see p. 6 above).[37]

---

[34] On Timagenes' outspokenness see Bowersock (1965) 108-110, 125; on the 'Alexander disgression' see p. 118 n. 57.

[35] Bowie (2004) 185, where he also regards the Greek novels as analogous.

[36] Bowie (2004) 180-1.

[37] Lightfoot (2014) 119. She also, 176 n. 174, disavows the supposed 'Hadrianic' theme which has been seen to run through the poem, advanced by Brodersen (1994).

The *Acta Alexandrinorum* report the trials of Alexandrian Greek embassies in the imperial court in Rome in the form of minutes, focusing on their unfair and biased treatment at the hands of various Roman emperors.[38] They survive only as papyrological fragments reflecting second- and third-century reactions to the events represented. Harker's description is apposite: 'the *Acta Alexandrinorum* recycle the same archetypal story where a group of Alexandrian ambassadors travel to Rome and, on arrival, face a hostile emperor who has allied himself with their enemies, usually the Jewish community resident in Alexandria. A bitter exchange of words follows between the emperor and the Alexandrians, who bravely defy the emperor on behalf of their beloved fatherland, and scornfully attribute his hostility towards them to his lack of high birth and culture'.[39] Musurillo likewise sees the *Acta* as the product of an affronted Alexandrian aristocracy, 'originating in the Alexandrian clubs and gymnasium, written by the gymnasiarchal class indignant at Alexandria's humbling under Roman rule, the chief grievance being that Alexandria was not allowed a βουλή'.[40] The stories, whilst apparently aping verbatim the minutes of the interaction, are to some extent fictionalised and designed to entertain.[41] Harker concludes that the second-century accounts, which 'focus on the vitriolic exchanges between Isidorus and the emperor and on glorifying the deaths of the Alexandrian heroes', are the more anti-Roman.[42] They can therefore be comfortably ranged with the position I am staking out for Achilles. The emperors in the *Acta* tend to be caricatured as hostile and tyrannical, in contrast to the noble and high-born ambassadors whose εὐγένεια is

---

[38] Musurillo (1954) is the classic edition. A recent treatment of the *Acta* and related literature is Harker (2008).
[39] Harker (2008) 1.
[40] Harker (2008) 8 on the position of Musurillo (1954).
[41] Harker (2008) 8; Musurillo (1954) 252-8 discusses links with the novels, incl. patriotic motifs (εὐγενεία; εὐσεβεία; τῆς πατρίδος ἔρως), the 'death motif', trial scenes, scenes of violent emotion.
[42] Harker (2008) 44.

frequently alluded to. The dynamic between Thersandros and Leucippe in Achilles is analogous, as I shall demonstrate.

The Alexandrian equestrian Appian offers an exception to the survey I have sketched, and is one of the few Alexandrians ever to praise Rome and the first to write a Roman history. Even Appian, however, has the capacity to criticise Romans (*Ib*. 60, discussed at p. 209-10).

5.3   Callisthenes and the Rape of the Sabine Women

In the second book of the novel a Byzantine named Callisthenes abducts Clitophon's fiancée Calligone, mistaking her for the notoriously beautiful Leucippe. His motivation is marriage. In this section I suggest that Achilles has adapted the narrative of Romulus' rape of the Sabine women, the foundation story for the institution of Roman marriage—as presented (predominantly) in Livy's *History of Rome*, Ovid's *Ars*, Plutarch's *Life of Romulus,* and Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Roman Antiquities* (henceforth 'Dion.')—[43]and has mobilised it to characterise a marginal figure within Achilles' narrative as Romulus, and in order to allegorise Greco-Roman imperial relations.

Kidnap for the purpose of marriage is the keynote in both narratives. In Byzantium, the young man Callisthenes has heard about how beautiful Leucippe is,

---

[43] Plutarch mentions other historians who treated the episode, including Fabius Pictor (*Rom*. 14.1), Valerius Antias and Juba (*Rom*. 14.6), Zenodotus of Troezen (*Rom*. 14.7).

and despite never having seen her before (cf. Thersandros at 6.3.5),[44] petitions her

father Sostratus for her hand in marriage (2.13.1-2):

> οὗτος ἀκούων τὴν Σωστράτου θυγατέρα εἶναι καλήν, ἰδὼν δὲ οὐδέποτε, ἤθελεν αὐτῷ ταύτην γενέσθαι γυναῖκα. καὶ ἦν ἐξ ἀκοῆς ἐραστής... ἀναπλάττων γὰρ ἑαυτῷ τῆς παιδὸς τὸ κάλλος καὶ φανταζόμενος τὰ ἀόρατα ἔλαθε σφόδρα κακῶς διακείμενος.

Callisthenes is then rebuffed by Sostratus on account of his profligate lifestyle, but

seizes upon a stratagem for obtaining Leucippe (2.13.3). He secures for himself a

position on an embassy to Tyre (2.15.1), and whilst there, commissions a crew of

brigands (λῃστάς, 2.16.2) to kidnap Leucippe while she is on the shoreline sacrificing

to Zeus Xenios. Having never seen Leucippe before, they abduct Calligone by

mistake (2.16.1-18.6).

The episode can be profitably read in counterpoint with the narrative of the

rape of the Sabine women. In the Livian tradition, Romulus sends envoys around the

neighbouring nations soliciting intermarriage. The embassies are rebuffed on the basis

of Romulus' Asylum and the low character of the Romans. Romulus conceals his

resentment, and schemes to capture the women after inviting the neighbouring

peoples to celebrations for the Consualia (Liv. 1.9.1-9; cf. Dion. 2.30.2-3, Plut. *Rom.*

14.3). In Achilles, the young Callisthenes likewise petitions Sostratus for his

daughter's hand in marriage, despite never having seen her, and Sostratus rebuffs him

on account of his ἀκολασία 'licentiousness': *spernebant* (Liv. 1.9.5); ὁ δὲ

---

[44] Repath (2007) 113 n. 24 detects similarities between Callisthenes and Thersandros. Morales (2004) 88 reads Callisthenes the 'hearsay' lover as privileging the wrong sensory organ as the instrument of desire, whilst Montiglio (2013) 73 contrasts Callisthenes with Clitophon, who falls in love via the 'generically correct' organ of sight. Parallels for 'hearsay loving' include: Zariadres' kidnap of Odatis by virtue of her reputation (Chares of Mytilene *FGrH* 125 f 5 *ap.* Athen. 13.375); Alcibiades and a prostitute (Athen. 13.574e); Oroondates (Heliod. 8.2.1-3); Paris and Helen (Ov. *Her.* 16, esp. ll. 36-8); Achilles and Helen (Philostr. *Her.* 54.4-5).

βδελυττόμενος τοῦ βίου τὴν ἀκολασίαν <u>ἠρνήσατο</u> (Ach. 2.13.2).[45] Both Romulus and Callisthenes react badly, and plot how they might obtain their women by underhand means.

There are several interesting correspondences: at the macro level, both the Romans and Callisthenes petition for marriage with women they have never seen, are rebuffed, and resort to subterfuge by exploiting the opportunity of a religious event (Ach. 2.13.3; Liv. 1.9.7; Plut. *Rom*. 14.3-4; Dion. 2.30.3). This sequence distinguishes them from, for example, the abductions of Persephone, the Leucippidae, and Helen, where there are no petitions for marriage prior to the abduction.[46] At the micro level both Livy and Achilles use the same idiomatic structure to reflect the annoyance of the aggrieved parties (adverb + participle: κακῶς διακείμενος; *aegre... passa*), and both parties *dissimulate* their annoyance (Ach. 2.13.2; Liv.1.9.6-7):

> θυμὸς ἴσχει τὸν Καλλισθένην καὶ ἠτιμᾶσθαι νομίσαντα ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωστράτου... <u>ἔλαθε σφόδρα κακῶς διακείμενος</u>.
>
> aegre id Romana pubes passa et haud dubie ad uim spectare res coepit... Romulus <u>aegritudinem animi dissimulans</u>.

There is another pertinent detail. Whilst Livy goes on immediately to describe preparations for the ruse at the Consualia, Achilles explains that Callisthenes plans to manipulate 'a certain law of the Byzantines, to the effect that if a man carried off a virgin and instantly made her his wife, the penalty exacted was simply the fact of the marriage itself': νόμου γὰρ ὄντος Βυζαντίοις, εἴ τις ἁρπάσας παρθένον φθάσας ποιήσειε γυναῖκα, γάμον ἔχειν τὴν ζημίαν, προσεῖχε τούτῳ τῷ νόμῳ (2.13.3; also referred to at 8.18.3). In Dionysius' account, after the Sabine women have been seized

---

[45] See also Plut. *Rom*. 9.2 and Dion. 2.30.2.
[46] See Evans-Grubbs (1989) 67-71.

Romulus orders them brought before him and reassures them that they had been seized 'not out of wantonness, but for the purpose of marriage' (οὐκ ἐφ᾽ ὕβρει τῆς ἁρπαγῆς ἀλλ᾽ ἐπὶ γάμῳ γενομένης); for he pointed out that this was an 'ancient Greek custom and that of all methods of contracting marriages for women it was the most illustrious' (2.30.5). Neither the Byzantine law mentioned in Achilles nor the ancient Greek custom mentioned by Dionysius' Romulus is known from anywhere else.[47] It is possible that Achilles' source for this shady Byzantine practice comes from his knowledge of the Sabine episode as transmitted by Dionysius. Roman declamation may be another determinant (as it is in connection with pirates, see p. 218), in which un-dowered marriage as a punishment or mode of restitution is a frequent feature,[48] as well as the New Comic topos of the rape victim marrying her rapist.[49]

Callisthenes' execution of the abduction contains further elements central to the Sabine narrative. He secures a position for himself on the embassy from Byzantium to Tyre, where he 'laid his snares for the women who had gone out to see the sacrifice': ἐφήδρευε ταῖς γυναιξίν. αἱ δὲ ὀψόμεναι τὴν θυσίαν ἐξῆεσαν (2.15.1; cf. πανήγυρις δὲ ἐπέκειτο, καθ᾽ ἣν ἠκηκόει πάσας τὰς παρθένους ἀπαντᾶν ἐπὶ θάλατταν, 2.16.2). The site of the abduction in Ovid's narrative is equally insidious (*theatra insidiosa*, *Ars* 1.133f) and there is an analogous description of the Sabine women

---

[47] Though Plut. *Lyc*. 15.3 reports that it was a Spartan custom for brides to be carried off by force, on which see Lacey (1968) 197-8, Pomeroy (2002) 42; their mythical archetype are the Leucippidae. On 'abduction marriage' and Constantine's law (*CTh* ix.24.1) see Evans-Grubbs (1989), esp. 67-71 on abduction marriages in the literary tradition, and 70, discussing the shadowy Byzantine law in Achilles.

[48] See Evans-Grubbs (1989) 68-70. For the legal premise (*rapta raptoris aut mortem aut indotatas nuptias optet*, 'let the rape victim choose either the death of the rapist or marriage to him without dowry') see Sen. *Contr*. 1.5, 3.5, 4.3, Quint. *Decl. Min*. 262, 270, 280, 286, and Calp. Flacc. *Decl*., exc. 34. It is cited at Servius *ad Aen*. 4.198 in order to explain Vergil's *rapta Garamantide nympha*. See also Sen. *Contr*. 8.6: *uitiata uitiatoris aut mortem aut indotatas nuptias petat*. For the shorthand *lex raptarum* or *raptarum lex*, see Quint. *Decl. Min*. 301; Calp. Flacc. 16, 25, 34, 41, 43, 46, 51.

[49] Pierce (1997) 164 notes that 'religious festivals have provided the ideal opportunity for sexual attacks'. Rapes that end happily are also an Ovidian narrative feature: Orithyia and Boreas (*Met*. 6.675-710), Vertumnus and Pomona (*Met*. 14.622-771), Flora and Zephyr (*Fast*. 5.193-206), Europa and Jupiter (*Fast*. 5.603-20), Crane and Janus (*Fast*. 6.101-28).

congregating at the festival in Livy's, Ovid's, and Dionysius' treatment: *ubi spectaculi tempus uenit deditaeque eo mentes cum oculis erant* (Liv. 1.9.10); *sic ruit ad celebres cultissima femina ludos... spectatum ueniunt* (Ov. *Ars* 1.97-9); τὰς παρούσας ἐπὶ τὴν θέαν παρθένους (Dion. 2.30.4). Callisthenes sees Calligone and believes her to be Leucippe; captured by the sight of her, he points her out to one of those on his payroll: ἑαλωκὼς ἐκ τῆς θέας, δείκνυσιν ἑνὶ τῶν οἰκετῶν τὴν κόρην... (2.16.2). Again, the phrasing closely recalls how the Romans in Ovid's treatment see the women in the theatre and note to themselves their chosen victims: *respiciunt oculisque notant sibi quisque puellam/ quam uelit* (*Ars* 1.109f). Both Achilles and Ovid convey the idea of targeting specific women.

Callisthenes decides that the moment for abduction has arrived. He mobilises his pirate squadron, while he himself rides at anchor just offshore. There are a range of correspondences with the treatments in Livy, Ovid, Plutarch, and Dionysius: the raising of a pre-arranged signal (Livy, Ovid, Plutarch, Dionysius); the suddenness of the approach (Ovid), shouting (Plutarch); drawn swords (Plutarch); fear, confusion, and flight (Ovid, Dionysius).[50] I have indicated these by the underlined words (Ach. 2.18.2-5; Ov. *Ars* 1.114-9; Liv. 1.9.10; Plut. *Rom.* 14.6; Dion. 2.30.4-5):

> ἄρτι δὲ γενομένων ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῷ χείλει τῆς θαλάσσης, ὁ μὲν <u>τὸ συγκείμενον ἀνέτεινε σημεῖον</u>, ὁ δὲ λέμβος ἐξαίφνης προσέπλει, καὶ ἐπεὶ πλησίον ἐγένετο, ἦσαν ἐν αὐτῷ νεανίσκοι δέκα. ὀκτὼ δὲ ἑτέρους ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἶχον προλοχίσαντες, οἳ γυναικείας μὲν εἶχον ἐσθῆτας καὶ τῶν γενείων ἐψίλωντο τὰς τρίχας· ἔφερον δὲ ἕκαστος ὑπὸ κόλπῳ <u>ξίφος</u>, ἐκόμιζον δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ θυσίαν, ὡς ἂν ἥκιστα ὑποπτευθεῖεν· ἡμεῖς δὲ ᾠόμεθα γυναῖκας εἶναι. ἐπεὶ δὲ συνετίθεμεν τὴν πυράν, <u>ἐξαίφνης βοῶντες</u> συντρέχουσι καὶ τὰς μὲν δᾷδας ἡμῶν ἀποσβεννύουσι, <u>φευγόντων δὲ ἀτάκτως ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκπλήξεως</u>, <u>τὰ ξίφη</u> γυμνώσαντες ἁρπάζουσι τὴν ἀδελφὴν τὴν ἐμὴν καὶ ἐνθέμενοι τῷ

---

[50] The reaction of the bystanders also resembles that of the Sabine women in Ovid: ἡμῶν δὲ <u>οἱ μὲν ἔφευγον</u>, οὐδὲν οὔτε εἰδότες οὔτε ἑωρακότες, <u>οἱ δὲ</u> ἅμα τε εἶδον καὶ ἐβόων· "λῃσταὶ Καλλιγόνην ἔχουσι." (2.18.5); *altera maesta silet, frustra uocat altera matrem:/ haec queritur, stupet haec; haec manet, illa <u>fugit</u>,* (*Ars* 1.123f).

σκάφει, ἐμβάντες εὐθὺς ὄρνιθος δίκην ἀφίπτανται. ἡμῶν δὲ οἱ μὲν ἔφευγον, οὐδὲν οὔτε εἰδότες οὔτε ἑωρακότες, οἱ δὲ ἅμα τε εἶδον καὶ ἐβόων· "λησταὶ Καλλιγόνην ἔχουσι." τὸ δὲ πλοῖον ἤδη μέσην ἐπέραινε τὴν θάλασσαν. ὡς δὲ τοῖς Σαράπτοις προσέσχον, πόρρωθεν ὁ Καλλισθένης τὸ σημεῖον ἰδὼν ὑπήντησεν ἐπιπλεύσας καὶ δέχεται μὲν τὴν κόρην, πλεῖ δὲ εὐθὺς πελάγιος. ἐγὼ δὲ ἀνέπνευσα μὲν οὕτω διαλυθέντων μοι παραδόξως τῶν γάμων, ἠχθόμην δὲ ὅμως ὑπὲρ ἀδελφῆς περιπεσούσης τοιαύτῃ συμφορᾷ.

rex populo praedae <u>signa petenda</u> dedit;
<u>protinus</u> exiliunt, animum clamore fatentes
uirginibus cupidas iniciuntque manus...
illae timuere uiros <u>sine more</u> ruentes.[51]

tum <u>ex composito</u> orta uis <u>signoque dato</u> iuuentus Romana ad rapiendas uirgines discurrit.

<u>ἔχοντες οὖν ξίφη</u> πολλοὶ προσεῖχον αὐτῷ, καὶ τοῦ <u>σημείου γενομένου</u>, <u>σπασάμενοι τὰ ξίφη</u> καὶ <u>μετὰ βοῆς</u> ὁρμήσαντες, ἥρπαζον τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν Σαβίνων.

παράγγελμα δίδωσι τοῖς νέοις, ἡνίκ' ἂν αὐτὸς ἄρῃ τὸ <u>σημεῖον</u> ἁρπάζειν τὰς παρούσας ἐπὶ τὴν θέαν παρθένους, αἷς ἂν ἐπιτύχωσιν ἕκαστοι... οἱ μὲν δὴ νέοι διαστάντες κατὰ συστροφάς, ἐπειδὴ <u>τὸ σύνθημα ἀρθὲν</u> εἶδον τρέπονται πρὸς τὴν τῶν παρθένων ἁρπαγήν, <u>ταραχὴ</u> δὲ τῶν ξένων εὐθὺς ἐγένετο καὶ <u>φυγὴ</u> μεῖζόν τι κακὸν ὑφορωμένων.

Although the transvestism of Callisthenes' men derives from Plutarch's account of how Solon prevents the seizure of Athenian women by the Megarians (*Sol.* 8.4-6),[52] cumulatively, the evidence indicates that Achilles incorporates elements from the various versions of the Sabine narrative into his own ludic account of Callisthenes' seizure of Calligone.[53]

There is a further detail in the Sabine narrative that Achilles alludes to in this passage. Both Livy and Plutarch report that the Romans drag off a woman of

---

[51] Cf. the abbreviated account on the shield of Aeneas: *nec procul hinc Romam et <u>raptas sine more Sabinas</u>* (Verg. *Aen*. 8.635).

[52] Apul. *Met*. 7.8 features another example of a bandit in drag

[53] The detail of ten youths (ἦσαν ἐν αὐτῷ νεανίσκοι δέκα) is perhaps another hint that Achilles is familiar with Roman declamation, where groups of ten youths feature as standard: Seneca *Contr*. 3.1, 3.8, 10.1. Cf. also Sen. *Contr*. 5.6 on the man in drag who gets raped by ten youths (*Raptus in veste muliebri*). For further discussion of Senecan declamation see p. 218.

exceptional beauty: *unam longe ante alias specie ac pulchritudine insignem* (Liv. 1.9.12); ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἁρπάζουσι τὰς παρθένους τότε τυχεῖν λέγουσι τῶν οὐκ ἐπιφανῶν τινας ἄγοντας κόρην τῷ τε κάλλει πολὺ καὶ τῷ μεγέθει διαφέρουσαν (Plut. *Rom*. 15.1-2). In both narratives she is being taken to an eminent Roman named Thalassius, and both account for the name Thalassius as an aetiology for the wedding-cry 'Talassio', offering various etymological explanations (Liv. 1.9.13; Plut. *Rom*. 15.1-5; cf. Plut. *Q.R*. 31).[54] Any Greek reader would also hear the word θάλασσα 'sea'. In Achilles, as in Livy and Plutarch, the emphasis is on the seizure of *one* beautiful woman (Calligone/ Leucippe), who is to be taken out to sea (τὸ δὲ πλοῖον ἤδη μέσην ἐπέραινε τὴν θάλασσαν, 2.18.5; cf. ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν, 2.12.3). Whilst the sea is an obvious venue for abduction (e.g. Plut. *Sol*. 8.4-6), the focus on the lexeme bears the traces of an antiquarian detail transmitted in the Sabine narratives of Livy and Plutarch.

In both Achilles and the Sabine narratives, the abductions are distinguished by the fact that the assailants kidnap the wrong girl. Callisthenes thinks he is taking Leucippe, but is in fact taking her relative Calligone. During the course of Plutarch's discussion on the precise number of women kidnapped by the Romans (Plut. *Rom*. 14.6-7) he reports that, according to one tradition, the Romans kidnap the married woman Hersilia by mistake: γυναῖκα γὰρ οὐ λαβεῖν ἀλλ' ἢ μίαν Ἑρσιλίαν, διαλαθοῦσαν αὐτούς (Plut. *Rom*. 14.7). She is later married to Hostilius or Romulus himself (Liv. 1.11.1-4, Plut. *Rom*. 14.7) and is mentioned by all the sources (incl. Dion. 2.45) as the woman who intercedes between the warring Romuleans and the Sabine parents.[55] The resemblances to Achilles' narrative are striking. Callisthenes' seizure of Calligone is likewise erroneous, and whilst she is not already married, she

---

[54] Oligive (1965) 69 *ad* Liv. 1.9.12 contains much useful information.
[55] See Ogilvie (1965) 73-4 for references to Hersilia, including her apotheosis into Hora Quirini.

is already betrothed to Clitophon. Moreover, and as I shall go on to suggest, Callisthenes resembles Romulus, the first King of Rome and instigator of the rape of the Sabine women for the purpose of marriage—Propertius characterises him as the *criminis auctor* (2.6.19-22). In addition, Hersilia and Calligone both end up marrying their captors.

Clitophon's rehabilitation at the end of the novel exhibits several clear indications of a playful awareness of Romulus' Asylum and the low birth of the early Romans. Clitophon and Leucippe have been reunited, and Leucippe's father Sostratus reports to Clitophon and Leucippe the account of what happened to Calligone once she had been mistakenly abducted by Callisthenes. It is worth quoting in full (8.17.3-5):

> μαθὼν κατὰ τὸν πλοῦν ὡς οὐκ εἴη θυγάτηρ ἐμή, διημαρτηθείη δὲ τὸ πᾶν ἔργον αὐτῷ, ἤρα δὲ ὅμως καὶ σφόδρα τῆς Καλλιγόνης. προσπεσὼν αὐτῆς τοῖς γόνασι, 'δέσποινα,' εἶπε, 'μή με νομίσῃς λῃστὴν εἶναί τινα καὶ κακοῦργον· ἀλλὰ γάρ εἰμι τῶν εὖ γεγονότων, γένει Βυζάντιος, δεύτερος οὐδενός. ἔρως δέ με λῃστείας ὑποκριτὴν πεποίηκε καὶ ταύτας ἐπὶ σοὶ πλέξαι τὰς τέχνας. δοῦλον οὖν με σεαυτῆς ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρας νόμιζε. καί σοι προῖκα ἐπιδίδωμι, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐμαυτόν, ἔπειτα ὅσην οὐκ ἂν ὁ πατὴρ ἐπέδωκέ σοι. τηρήσω δέ σε παρθένον μέχριπερ ἂν σοὶ δοκῇ.' καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν καὶ ἔτι τούτων πλείονα εὐαγωγοτέραν τὴν κόρην αὐτῷ γενέσθαι παρεσκεύασεν. ἦν δὲ καὶ ὀφθῆναι καλὸς καὶ στωμύλος καὶ πιθανώτατος· καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἦκεν εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον, συμβόλαιον ποιησάμενος προικὸς μεγίστης καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πολυτελῶς παρασκευάσας... περιεῖπεν εὖ καὶ καλῶς, ἄχραντον τηρῶν, ὡς ἐπηγγείλατο· ὥστε καὶ αὐτὴν ᾑρήκει τὴν κόρην ἤδη.

I have discussed the presence of *seruitium amoris* in this passage at p. 44, but in the context of the Sabine narrative, Callisthenes' reassurance to his captive Calligone is

remarkably similar to the words put in Romulus' mouth to assuage the fears of the Sabine women in Livy's narrative (1.9.14-6):[56]

> illas tamen in matrimonio, in societate fortunarum omnium ciuitatisque et quo nihil carius humano generi sit liberum fore; mollirent modo iras et, quibus fors corpora dedisset, darent animos; saepe ex iniuria postmodum gratiam ortam; eoque melioribus usuras uiris quod adnisurus pro se quisque sit ut, cum suam uicem functus officio sit, parentium etiam patriaeque expleat desiderium. accedebant blanditiae uirorum, factum purgantium cupiditate atque amore, quae maxime ad muliebre ingenium efficaces preces sunt.

> [Romulus said that] the daughters should be wedded and become co-partners in all the possessions of the Romans, in their citizenship and, dearest privilege of all to the human race, in their children; only let them moderate their anger, and give their hearts to those to whom fortune had given their persons. A sense of injury had often given place to affection, and they would find their husbands the kinder for this reason, that every man would earnestly endeavour not only to be a good husband, but also to console his wife for the home and parents she had lost. His arguments were seconded by the wooing of the men, who excused their act on the score of passion and love, the most moving of all pleas to a woman's heart.

Both the Sabine women and Calligone find themselves talked into marriage with the men who abducted them from their family. Callisthenes offers as an excuse the fact that love made him act the pirate's part precisely as the Romans who excuse their actions by pleading passion and love: ἔρως δέ με ληστείας ὑποκριτὴν πεποίηκε (8.17.3); *factum purgantium cupiditate atque amore* (1.9.16; see p. 200 below on Jupiter's justification of Pluto's rape of Proserpina in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*). In addition, both Callisthenes and Romulus highlight the fact that they have acted out of desire for *marriage* (καί σοι προῖκα ἐπιδίδωμι, 8.17.3; *illas tamen in matrimonio*, Liv. 1.9.14; cf. Plut. *Rom*. 14.7-8);[57] and both Callisthenes and Romulus assure the women

---

[56] Ogilvie (1965) 70 cites Soph. *Aj*. 490f, Eur. *Tro*. 665f as 'indirect' parallels for Romulus' attempt to assuage to fear of the women.

[57] Plutarch *Rom*. 9.2 and 14.1-2 reject the suggestion that Romulus acts out of a desire for war rather than marriage.

that they intend to respect their virginity and incorporate them into the socio-civic fabric (Ach. 8.17.4-5; Liv. 1.9.14; Dion. 2.30.5; Plut. *Rom*. 14.7-8).

Further significance attaches to the fact that Callisthenes feels the need to reiterate that he is not of low birth, that he is *no pirate*: μή με νομίσῃς λῃστὴν εἶναί τινα καὶ κακοῦργον· ἀλλὰ γάρ εἰμι τῶν εὖ γεγονότων (8.17.3). Plutarch adduces Romulus' Asylum as a reason given by the neighbouring cities for rejecting Roman petitions for intermarriage (Plut. *Rom*. 9.2):

> ἦν δ' ἴσως ἀναγκαῖον, <u>οἰκετῶν καὶ ἀποστατῶν πολλῶν ἠθροισμένων</u> πρὸς αὐτούς, ἢ καταλυθῆναι παντάπασι τούτων διασπαρέντων, ἢ συνοικεῖν ἰδίᾳ μετ᾽αὐτῶν. ὅτι γὰρ οὐκ ἠξίουν οἱ τὴν Ἄλβην οἰκοῦντες ἀναμειγνύναι τοὺς ἀποστάτας ἑαυτοῖς οὐδὲ προσδέχεσθαι πολίτας.

Here, Plutarch unflatteringly refers to the original Romans as 'slaves and runaways' and goes on to explain the origin of the institution (Plut. *Rom*. 9.3).[58] In Livy's narrative also, the prelude to the rape of the Sabines is the account of Romulus' Asylum, cited by the neighbouring cities as the reason for rejecting Romulus' embassies (1.8.5-6):

> deinde ne uana urbis magnitudo esset, adiciendae multitudinis causa uetere consilio condentium urbes, qui <u>obscuram atque humilem</u> conciendo ad se multitudinem natam e terra sibi prolem ementiebantur, locum qui nunc saeptus descendentibus inter duos lucos est asylum aperit. eo ex finitimis populis <u>turba omnis sine discrimine, liber an seruus esset</u>, auida nouarum rerum perfugit, idque primum ad coeptam magnitudinem roboris fuit.

This aspect of Rome's origins mean that low birth and piracy are frequent tropes in anti-Roman discourse (which I shall discuss at p. 216-7).[59] Here it is only necessary to

---

[58] On Romulus' Asylum see Dench (2005).
[59] Forte (1972) 186 notes that Greeks have a tendency to see Romans as 'descendants of uncivilised nomads, murderers and fugitives who had sought asylum in primitive Rome', quoted at Haynes (2000-2001) 87.

recall that the Romulean Callisthenes and his band are designated as 'pirates' by the bystanders at the moment of abduction ("λῃσταὶ Καλλιγόνην ἔχουσι", 2.18.5) and that Callisthenes is keen to stress that he is not of low birth, a claim overtly in counterpoise to his servile pose. In this way Achilles reminds the knowledgable reader of Rome's lowly origins.

There are further literary models upon which Callisthenes' behaviour here is based. The ethical paradigm for Clitophon's mode of courtship is the Apollo-Daphne myth, sung at the first symposium (1.5.5-7; see p. 144-5). In Ovid's treatment of the same myth, Apollo pursues Daphne, and reassures her that 'love' is the reason for his pursuit: *amor est mihi causa sequendi* (*Met*. 1.507). He proceeds to assert that he is no rustic, but is in fact the son of Jupiter: *non incola montis,/ non ego sum pastor... Iuppiter est genitor* (*Met*. 1.513-17). The sequence and content of Callisthenes' reassurances are analogous.[60] As Callisthenes does in Achilles, Jupiter in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* justifies Pluto's abduction of Proserpina as an act of love: *non hoc iniuria factum,/ uerum est amor* (*Met*. 5.525f). An additional parallel with Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in this connection is the episode of Vertumnus and Pomona (*Met*. 14.622-771)—the first properly Roman tale in the poem—in which Vertumnus transforms from Pomona's potential rapist into her lover and engenders mutual desire (see p. 174 above).[61]

---

[60] For further parallels with Ovid's *Metamorphoses* see Appendix 1.
[61] On this aspect of the Pomona-Vertumnus episode see Littlefield (1965), Fantazzi (1976) 288

There are two final points of speculation about Callisthenes and his Romanising aspects. Firstly, names in the Greek novels are semantically pregnant.[62] Morphologically, the second part of Callisthenes' name derives from the Greek adjective σθενής ('strong' or 'mighty') and the cognate noun σθένος. Could this be a deliberate play on the virtually synonymous Greek word ῥώμη and Rome? Roman authors are aware of the Greek etymology: *Roma, nisi immensum <u>uires</u> promosset in orbem...* (Ov. *Am*. 2.9.17);[63] *suis et ipsa Roma <u>uiribus</u> ruit* (Hor. *Epod*. 16.2); *Roma, tuum <u>nomen</u> terris fatale regendis* (Tib. 2.5.57).[64] Greek authors are similarly aware: ἔξοχον <u>ῥώμη</u> γένος (Lycophron *Alex*. 1233); οἱ μὲν Πελασγούς... αὐτόθι κατοικῆσαι, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις <u>ῥώμην</u> οὕτως ὀνομάσαι τὴν πόλιν (Plut. *Rom*. 1.1). Polyaenus, the Macedonian rhetorician who dedicates his *Strategikon* to Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus,[65] exploits the etymology to explain why he wrote his work, being too old to help the emperors fight with true 'Macedonian strength' (1 *pr*. 2):

> εἰ μὲν ἤκμαζέ μοι τὸ σῶμα καὶ στρατιώτης πρόθυμος ἂν ἐγενόμην <u>Μακεδονικῇ ῥώμῃ</u> χρώμενος.

It would therefore be of a piece with Achilles' humour and sophistication to encode in the Romulean Callisthenes ('Mr. Fairstrong') a sly nod towards the etymology of Rome itself. Secondly, the name of the author himself is Achilles *Tatius*.[66] Could he have felt an affinity to the Sabine narrative because of the name of their king, Titus Tatius?

---

[62] See, for example, Hägg (1971b) and Bierl (2006) on names in Xenophon of Ephesus. For De Temmerman (2014) 146-7 with n. 119 names contribute to characterisation; for Morales (2004) 67 they function as 'vacant signs' onto which a range of readings can be mapped.

[63] On the derivation of Rome from ῥώμη see Mckeown (1987) 47. See McKeown (1998) 179 *ad loc.*, adducing Plato *Phaedr*. 238B-C, a passage that links ἔρως and ῥώμη.

[64] See Murgatroyd (1994) 202 and Maltby (2002) 449 *ad loc*. The latter cites the grammarians Festus (328 Lindsay) and Solinus (1.1).

[65] On Polyaenus see Forte (1972) 368-71.

[66] See p. 183. n. 8.

5.4   Leucippe and Thersandros, and the narratives of Lucretia and Verginia

The events of the last three books of the novel unfold in Ephesus. During this period, both Leucippe and Clitophon spend time imprisoned and the integrity of their bodies comes under threat. The narrative culminates with legal and religious trials exploring issues of personal freedom and chastity. In both the Lucretia and Verginia narratives, transmitted principally by Livy and Dionysius, the female body is exposed to the tyranny of arbitrary male desire in stories set at 'critical points in the state's formation', which mark the downfall of the Roman institutions of the Kings and Decemvirate respectively, and which result in the exile of the tyrant.[67] I shall demonstrate how a nexus of narrative elements combines in Achilles to suggest that he uses the rape of Lucretia and the attempted rape of Verginia as templates for the interpersonal relations obtaining between Leucippe and Thersandros. Extreme beauty, tyrannical/piratical behaviour, uncontrolled lust, liberty, chastity, and exile are keynotes in all the narratives. The major difference is that, within Achilles' fiction, Leucippe succeeds where her Roman antecedents failed, and is neither raped nor killed. In her defiance and ultimate vindication she reflects the wishes of the Greek elite and their place within the Roman imperial machine.

Haynes argues that the virginal heroines of the novel who resist bodily violation reflect a Greek elite keen to project an image of cultural integrity and superiority. Connors likewise reads the bodily integrity of the novelistic heroines as a

---

[67] Joshel (1992) 114. Ogilvie (1965) 195-7, 218-19, 453, 477 also points to Greek tyrannical models; Forsythe (2005) 77 recognises that the Lucretia story is a Roman adaptation of the homosexual version which ultimately led to the overthrow of the Peisistratid tyranny in Athens in 510 BCE. Livy's story of Chiomara and the lustful centurion (38.24.3-10) is thematically similar to that of Lucretia and Verginia.

'metaphor for the experience of continuing to be (or enact being) Greek in the Roman empire'.[68] The narratives of Lucretia and Verginia are elaborated using the same constellation of images and metaphors, and suffer from the same preoccupations relating to the integrity of the female body. Discussing both cases, Joplin recognises that the erotic and the political overlap. Male politics becomes sublimated into the erotic sphere, and the erotic desire felt by Sextus (for Lucretia) and Appius (for Verginia) is mimetic of political rivalry—a 'cover story for violent political rivalry' among men—of which Lucretia and Verginia are innocent victims. Narratives of rape or attempted rape express a crisis in socio-political boundaries, in which the 'arbitrary passion of a ruler who, roused beyond the limits of just rule, becomes a tyrant'.[69] Joshel similarly argues that the Roman male's inability to control his own sexual impulses provides a model for Rome's imperial control.[70]

Several preliminary details link the narratives of Leucippe and Lucretia: exceptional beauty, a cottage, and lamplight. Towards the beginning of Book 6, the reader learns that Sosthenes, in order to curry favour with his master Thersandros, boasts to him of the incredible beauty of a girl (Leucippe) he has acquired: κόρην ἐωνησάμην, ὦ δέσποτα, καλήν, ἀλλὰ χρῆμά τι κάλλους ἄπιστον (6.3.4). He offers to snatch the girl (currently under the care of Melite) and lock her away in a cottage (δωμάτιον, 6.4.2; cf. 6.15.4) for Thersandros to do with as he pleases.[71] This done, he tries to persuade the girl to become Thersandros' lover (6.4.3) and proceeds once again to impress upon Thersandros the nature of her beauty: τοῦ δὲ Σωσθένους αὐτῷ μηνύσαντος τὰ περὶ τῆς Λευκίππης καὶ κατατραγῳδοῦντος αὐτῆς τὸ κάλλος (6.4.4).

---

[68] Haynes (2003) 113, 163-4, Connors (2005) 246; see further Douglas (1966) 115, Frye (1976) 86, Perkins (2009) 9, and my discussion at p. 22-5.
[69] Joplin (1990) 53.
[70] Joshel (1992).
[71] Ovid suggests that one should not keep guard over a freeborn girl (*Am*. 3.4.33f).

Exceptional beauty is likewise a characteristic of Lucretia (ταύτην τὴν γυναῖκα καλλίστην οὖσαν τῶν ἐν Ῥώμῃ γυναικῶν, Dion. 4.64.4) and Verginia (καλλίστη τῶν ἐν Ῥώμῃ παρθένων, Dion. 11.28.2; *forma excellentem*, Liv. 3.44.4). Lucretia is also the subject of a boast (by her husband Collatinus, Liv. 1.57.7), and is raped by Sextus in a cottage (δωμάτιον): ἧκεν ἐπὶ τὸ δωμάτιον, ἐν ᾧ τὴν Λουκρητίαν ᾔδει καθεύδουσαν (Dion. 4.64.5; cf. 4.65.1). There is a further detail in the lamplight, which attends both Leucippe and Lucretia: ἦν δὲ ἔνδον λύχνος (6.6.3); *lucubrantes* (Liv. 1.57.9).

Extreme reactions to the beauty of the female (involving metaphors of combustion) initiate all these episodes. The first time Thersandros sees Leucippe it is as if he has been struck by lightning, and he is transfixed by the beauty of her eyes (6.6.3):

> ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Θέρσανδρος τὸ κάλλος ἐκ παραδρομῆς, ὡς ἁρπαζομένης ἀστραπῆς (μάλιστα γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς κάθηται τὸ κάλλος) ἀφῆκε τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὴν καὶ εἱστήκει τῇ θέᾳ δεδεμένος.

He also bursts into flames at the sight of her the next time he comes to the cottage (6.18.1-2):

> ἐπεὶ δὲ εἶδε τὴν Λευκίππην, ἀνεφλέγη τὴν ψυχήν, καὶ ἔδοξεν αὐτῷ τότε καλλίων γεγονέναι. θρέψας γὰρ ὅλης τῆς νυκτὸς τὸ πῦρ, ὅσον χρόνον ἀπελείφθη τῆς κόρης, ἀνεζωπύρησεν ἐξαίφνης ὕλην λαβὼν εἰς τὴν φλόγα τὴν θέαν.

In Ovid's version of the Lucretia narrative, Sextus bursts into flames: *interea iuuenis furiales regius ignes/ concipit et caeco raptus amore furit* (*Fast.* 2.761f); and Appius, in both Livy and Dionysius, is sent witless by Verginia's beauty: *hanc uirginem adultam forma excellentem Appius amore amens...* (Liv. 3.44.4); ταύτην τὴν κόρην

ἐπίγαμον οὖσαν ἤδη θεασάμενος Ἄππιος Κλαύδιος... εὐθύς τε ὑπὸ τοῦ κάλλους τῆς παιδὸς ἑάλω καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον ἔξω τῶν φρενῶν ἐγένετο (Dion. 11.28.3; cf. ζέων τὰ σπλάγχνα διὰ τὸν ἔρωτα τῆς παιδός, Dion. 11.35.4).

All of the females weep and look to the floor, a disposition that affects the beauty of Leucippe and Verginia. Both Achilles and Dionysius describe the aesthetic effect of their females' mournful appearance upon the viewer, and both zero in on *ocular* beauty. Thersandros' response to Leucippe's downcast demeanour is to ask her why she lets the beauty of her eyes drop to the floor (6.6.4):

> ὡς δὲ ἔνευσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν, λέγει· "τί κάτω βλέπεις, γύναι; τί δέ σου τὸ κάλλος τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν εἰς γῆν καταρρεῖ; ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς μᾶλλον ῥεέτω τοὺς ἐμούς."

Clitophon as narrator then dilates on the nature of tears as an erotic stimulus (6.7.1-8) before describing how Thersandros promises to 'cure' Leucippe of her tears (6.7.9). I have already discussed this passage in connection with Ovid's aestheticising of fear (p. 172), namely where the Romuleans ask the Sabine women why they are spoiling the beauty of their eyes with tears: *quid teneros lacrimis corrumpis ocellos?* (*Ars* 1.129). Dionysius' Verginia provides a more precise parallel in his description of Verginia in court. She captivates everybody and is described as 'wasting the beauty of her eyes' by looking to the floor (Dion. 11.35.2):

> καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἐσθῆτι οὖσα πιναρᾷ καὶ κατηφὲς ὁρῶσα καὶ τὸ καλὸν τῶν ὀμμάτων ἐκτήκουσα τὰς ἁπάντων ἥρπαζεν ὄψεις, οὕτως ὑπεράνθρωπός τις ὥρα περὶ αὐτὴν καὶ χάρις ἦν.

Lucretia likewise looks to the floor with teary eyes: ἀλλὰ σύννους καὶ κατηφὴς καὶ μεστοὺς ἔχουσα τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς δακρύων (Dion. 4.66.1).

Both Leucippe and Lucretia are promised marriage and respond by accusing the men of adultery. Sosthenes approaches Leucippe on his own and imparts to her the 'good news' that his master Thersandros is in love with her and willing to make her his wife: Θέρσανδρος ἐρᾷ σου καὶ μαίνεται, ὥστε τάχα καὶ <u>γυναῖκα ποιήσεταί σε</u> (6.11.3). In Dionysius, Sextus makes Lucretia a similar promise of marriage (using identical language to that of Sosthenes) as he hovers over her bed holding her at sword-point, on the condition that she yield herself to him: εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὑπομενεῖς, ἔφη, χαρίσασθαί μοι, <u>γυναῖκά σε ποιήσομαι</u> (Dion. 4.65.2). Sosthenes proceeds to praise the high birth, riches, χρηστότης, and good looks of his master Thersandros (6.12.1-2), to which Leucippe responds that she does not care to hear the praises of a man who interferes with the wives of others (6.12.4):

> τί μοι καταλέγεις σωρὸν ἀλλοτρίων ἐγκωμίων; τότε ἐπαινέσω Θέρσανδρον
> ὡς ἄνδρα ἀγαθόν, <u>ὅταν εἰς τὰς ἀλλοτρίας μὴ ἐνυβρίζῃ γυναῖκας</u>.

Leucippe's allusion to Thersandros' hubristic adultery is reiterated shortly afterwards: εἶτα Κλειτοφῶντα <u>μοιχὸν</u> καλεῖς, αὐτὸς <u>μοιχὸς</u> ὤν; (6.21.2).[72] Livy's Lucretia is explicit about Sextus' status as an adulterer: *sed date dexteras fidemque haud impune* <u>*adultero*</u> *fore* (Liv. 1.58.7). Likewise Ovid's Sextus, when he threatens to murder Lucretia and then spread the report that he has caught her in bed with a slave if she is non-compliant, characterises *himself* as an adulterer: *falsus adulterii testis* <u>*adulter*</u> *ero* (*Fast*. 2.808). μοιχεία and *adulterium* are therefore significantly charged categories in both Achilles and the Lucretia narrative.

---

[72] μοιχεία is a key issue in this part of the novel, and much of the trial relates to whether Clitophon has in fact committed adultery with Melite. See Schwartz (2000-2001) on the subject.

Both Dionysius and Achilles conjoin issues of unbearable oppression and sexual favours into their narratives, articulated using almost identical lexical choices. After Sosthenes has been rebuffed by Leucippe, he changes tack and warns her of what happens when a 'good man' (χρηστὸν ἄνδρα, 6.13.3) gets angry and does not get his way: ὀργισθεὶς γὰρ ἀφόρητός ἐστι. χρηστότης γὰρ τυγχάνουσα μὲν χάριτος ἔτι μᾶλλον αὔξεται, προπηλακισθεῖσα δὲ εἰς ὀργὴν ἐρεθίζεται (6.13.3-4; cf. Plangon's characterisation of Dionysius at Char. 2.7.2-3).[73] He becomes 'unbearable'. Brutus, who leads the uprising of the people after Sextus' rape of Lucretia, gives a speech in which he likewise refers to the tyranny of the Tarquins as 'unbearable': ἀφορήτου τυραννίδος (Dion. 4.70.2; 'tyranny' will also become a keynote of Leucippe's imprecations against Thersandros). Moreover, when Sextus creeps into Lucretia's room and threatens her, he requests her complaisance (χαρίσασθαί μοι, quoted above); the sexual connotation of the word χαρίσασθαί (see *LSJ* I.3 s.v.) is precisely the implication of Sosthenes' use of its cognate (χρηστότης γὰρ τυγχάνουσα μὲν χάριτος, quoted above; see *LSJ* III.2 s.v. χάρις).

Once he is alone with Leucippe in the cottage, Thersandros moves in for a kiss, which Leucippe rejects by dropping her face. There follows a struggle in which Thersandros pulls her hair and tries to force her to lift her face. The sequence of actions participates in the discourse of (representations of) interactions—both sexual and military—between the Roman emperor and his subjects. I quote the passage in full (6.18.4-5):

> ἅμα οὖν συνδιαλεγόμενος καὶ ἐπιθεὶς τὴν χεῖρα τῷ τραχήλῳ περιέβαλεν
> ὡς μέλλων φιλήσειν. ἡ δὲ προϊδοῦσα τῆς χειρὸς τὴν ὁδὸν νεύει κάτω καὶ

---

[73] Dio Chrysostom *Or.* 3.2-5 reflects a similar sentiment about Trajan, who is kinder than a father to his subjects, but more feared than the gods by his enemies.

εἰς τὸν κόλπον κατεδύετο. ὁ δὲ οὐδὲν ἧττον περιβαλὼν ἀνέλκειν τὸ πρόσωπον ἐβιάζετο· ἡ δὲ ἀντικατεδύετο καὶ ἔκρυπτε τὰ φιλήματα. ὡς δὲ χρόνος ἐγένετο τῇ τῆς χειρὸς πάλῃ, φιλονεικία λαμβάνει τὸν Θέρσανδρον ἐρωτική, καὶ τὴν μὲν λαιὰν ὑποβάλλει τῷ προσώπῳ κάτω, τῇ δὲ δεξιᾷ τῆς κόμης λαβόμενος, τῇ μὲν εἷλκεν εἰς τοὐπίσω, τῇ δὲ εἰς τὸν ἀνθερεῶνα ὑπερείδων ἀνώθει.

The passage thematises issues of consent, resistance, and the interplay of force and power (ἀνέλκειν τὸ πρόσωπον ἐβιάζετο· ἡ δὲ ἀντικατεδύετο).[74] The power differential that obtains between Leucippe and Thersandros, and his attempt to impose his will upon her body without her consent, potentially reflects a negative model of imperial relations between Rome and the (Alexandrian) Greek elite—this is an aspect of Thersandros that will become much clearer in what follows.[75] In the first instance, the refusal to kiss is freighted with Roman imperial associations: Pernot discusses the example of Aelius Aristides in his *Sacred Tales*, who recounts a dream in which he subverts court etiquette by refusing to come forward and kiss the emperor Antoninus Pius (*Or.* 47.23); and we know from correspondence between Fronto and Marcus Aurelius that emperors liked to be kissed (*Ad M. Caes*. 3.14.3; cf. Cassius Dio 59.29.5 on Pomponius Secundus and Caligula).[76] In addition, Suetonius describes Caligula using his hand to lift the chin of women who kept their eyes modestly to the floor, just as Thersandros does here: *etiam faciem manu adlevans, si quae pudore submitterent* (Suet. *Calig*. 36.2); and the Sebasteion relief in Aphrodisias depicts Claudius pulling Britannia's head back by her hair, again, as Thersandros does here.[77] These are all

---

[74] The explicit mention of Thersandros' left hand (καὶ τὴν μὲν λαιὰν ὑποβάλλει τῷ προσώπῳ κάτω) recalls the fact that Livy's Sextus uses his left hand to restrain Lucretia: *stricto gladio ad dormientem Lucretiam uenit sinistraque manu mulieris pectore oppresso* (1.58.2). It is also a characteristic of Ovid's Lucretia that she keeps her eyes to the floor: *non oculos ideo sustulit illa suos* (*Fast*. 2.824).

[75] Whitmarsh (2013b) 72-3 also adduces this passage in a discussion about modes of discursively negotiated resistance to Roman *imperium*.

[76] On Fronto and Marcus see Pernot (2008) 179-80, and Van den Hout (1999) 124, 185 for further examples of this type of court etiquette. Cassius Dio 59.27.1 reports that Caligula was sparing with his kisses.

[77] Wolftal (1999) 68-71 discusses the links between rape and interference with hair.

constituent elements of the interaction between Thersandros and Leucippe in this passage.

The possibility that Thersandros represents a mask for the more negative aspects of Roman behaviour towards their subjects is reinforced by an anecdote from the Alexandrian Appian.[78] Thersandros desists from force, and Leucippe accuses him of not acting like a freeborn man, but like his slave Sosthenes. Leucippe's claim carries with it a key message, namely that one's political status cannot guarantee one's ethical disposition (6.18.6):

> ὡς δέ ποτε ἐπαύσατο τῆς βίας, ἢ τυχών, ἢ μὴ τυχών, ἢ καμών, λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ Λευκίππη· "οὔτε ὡς ἐλεύθερος ποιεῖς οὔτε ὡς εὐγενής. καὶ σὺ ἐμιμήσω Σωσθένην· ἄξιος ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ δεσπότου. ἀλλὰ ἀπέχου τοῦ λοιποῦ, μηδὲ ἐλπίσῃς τυχεῖν, πλὴν εἰ μὴ γένῃ Κλειτοφῶν."

The charge of acting like a slave operates under the assumption that slaves lack the self-control expected of a freeborn male. For Whitmarsh, this has to do with the relationship between correct ethical behaviour and socio-political categories.[79] In this instance, Thersandros is undermining his claim to freeborn elite status by exhibiting a breathtaking lack of self-control. Appian reports how, during the Spanish wars in the mid-second century BCE, one of the Roman commanders, Servius Galba, deceptively slaughters a group of repentant Spanish rebels. Appian accuses the Roman of acting faithlessly, in a manner unbecoming of the Romans and more like barbarians: οὐκ ἀξίως δὲ Ῥωμαίων μιμούμενος βαρβάρους (App. *Ib*. 60).[80] Perhaps Achilles knows

---

[78] Appian is well versed in Latin, on which see Rochette (1997) 242-3: he cites Latin authors (*B.C.* 2.70), translates Latin into Greek (*B.C.* 4.8-11), and even quotes a line of Pacuvius (*B.C.* 2.146, 611). On Appian's knowledge of the *Aeneid* see p. 85.

[79] Whitmarsh (2013b) 73.

[80] Cf. Pausanias' account of Sulla's actions in Athens, where the author suggests that Romans are expected to behave better (1.20.7; 9.33.6; cf. 1.17.4, 7.18.3-4, 9.27.3-4). On Pausanias as pro-Roman see Palm (1959) 63-74, Habicht (1985) 122-5, Swain (1996) 347-8, as anti-Roman see Arafat (1996)

the work of his countryman Appian: both contain the idea of behaviour that is out of

kilter with one's proper station (<u>ἄξιος</u> ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ δεσπότου and οὐκ <u>ἀξίως</u> δὲ

Ῥωμαίων) and of imitating the behaviour of those who lack ethical integrity (σὺ

<u>ἐμιμήσω</u> Σωσθένην and <u>μιμούμενος</u> βαρβάρους); and both make identical lexical

choices to articulate the sentiment.[81]

Thersandros' subsequent characterisation as a 'slave' (whose erotic

ramifications I have discussed in Chapter 1) encourages association with Romulus'

Asylum. Unsuccessful in his suit, Thersandros loses his temper and strikes Leucippe

(6.20.1):

> ὁ Θέρσανδρος οὖν, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐλπίζων εἰς τὸν ἔρωτα εὐτυχήσειν,
> ὅλος Λευκίππης δοῦλος ἦν· ἀτυχήσας δὲ ὧν ἤλπισεν, ἀφῆκε τῷ θυμῷ τὰς
> ἡνίας. ῥαπίζει δὴ κατὰ κόρρης αὐτήν.

In connection with Verginia, it is relevant that Appius too is enslaved by Verginia's

beauty: ὑπὸ τῆς δεδουλωμένης αὐτὸν εὐμορφίας πεπονθώς (Dion. 11.35.5).

Combined with Leucippe's previous characterisation of Thersandros' servile status

(6.18.6), and as in my discussion of Callisthenes in the previous section, it is tempting

to think in terms of Romulus' Asylum, and the lowly origins of the early Romans.

Anti-Roman discourse often exploits this aspect of Roman history. Mithridates, for

example, expresses his contempt for the Romans on this score, whose injustices he

sees as characteristic of servants, slaves, and a race nursed by wolves (Mithridates'

speech in Trogus *ap.* Justin 38.6;[82] Mithridates' letter to Arsaces in Sall. *Hist.* fr.

214-5); useful summaries in Pretzler (2007) 28-9, and Hutton (2008), discussing the notoriously vexed passage at 8.27.1 and the 'disaster' of Roman rule.

[81] For Forte (1972) 358 the anecdote 'indicates that Appian was so far Romanised that he accepted the Romans' idealistic belief in their innate *fides*'.

[82] See Lavan (2013b) 141-2 on Justin's (or Trogus') use of the metaphor of slavery to refer to Roman rule of the provinces.

4.67.17); and Dionysius of Halicarnassus refers to those who falsely talk of the barbarian and servile origins of the Romans (βαρβάρους καὶ οὐδὲ τούτους ἐλευθέρους οἰκιστάς, 1.4.2; cf. 1.89.1, 7.70.1-2).

The passage also articulates the sequence from an unsuccessful non-violent means of seduction to the use of open force, characteristic of both the Lucretia and Verginia narratives. Livy's Sextus moves from confessing his love to a direct threat of death: *tum Tarquinius fateri amorem, orare, miscere precibus minas* (1.58.3; cf. Ov. *Fast*. 2.805). Livy's Appius enacts a similar sequence of bribery followed by force (3.44.4):

> Appius amore amens pretio ac spe perlicere adortus, postquam omnia pudore saepta animaduerterat, ad crudelem superbamque uim animum conuertit.

Likewise Dionysius' Appius (11.28.4-5). Indeed, in both Livy and Dionysius, Sextus threatens to kill Lucretia: *moriere, si emiseris uocem* (Liv. 1.58.2); εἰ δ' ἀντιπράττειν ἐπιχειρήσεις σώζειν βουλομένη τὸ σῶφρον, ἀποκτενῶ σε (Dion. 4.65.3). This is precisely the accusation that Leucippe levels at Thersandros slightly later, that if he cannot get his hubristic way, he resorts to murder: ἂν ὑβρίσαι μὴ δυνηθῇ, καὶ φονεύει (6.22.3).

Thersandros' failure gives rise not only to a physical attack on Leucippe's identity and bodily integrity, but also a verbal one, in several ways identical to that on Verginia. Thersandros accuses Leucippe of being both a slave and a prostitute who is in love with an adulterer: ὦ κακόδαιμον ἀνδράποδον... ἐγὼ μέν σε καὶ πεπορνεῦσθαι δοκῶ· καὶ γὰρ μοιχὸν φιλεῖς (6.20.1-2). Despite the fact that Thersandros knows the

true details of Leucippe's social station, he determines to perjure himself in court and claims on several occasions that she is his slave. In the first trial, he demands his 'slave' back (7.11.4):

τί μου τὴν δούλην λαβόντες πεποιήκατε; δούλη γὰρ ἦν ἐμή, Σωσθένους αὐτὴν ἐωνημένου· καὶ εἰ περιῆν καὶ μὴ πρὸς αὐτῶν ἐπεφόνευτο, πάντως ἂν ἐδούλευεν ἐμοί.

Again, after Clitophon's release, he demands his nymphomaniac slave back: ἔχεις δὲ καὶ δούλην ἐμήν, γυναῖκα μάχλον καὶ πρὸς ἄνδρας ἐπιμανῆ (8.1.2). The charges of slavery and prostitution are reiterated in the second trial: τὰ δὲ σεμνότατα τῶν ἱερῶν μιαίνωσιν αἱ πόρναι, τὰς ἡμέρας λογιζόμεναι ταῖς δούλαις καὶ τοῖς δεσπόταις (8.8.3); συνῆν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ γυνή τις ἀκόλαστος, ἀποδρᾶσα τοῦ δεσπότου (8.8.10); τοῦτο γὰρ ἤκουσα τὴν πόρνην καλεῖσθαι... δουλεύειν τῷ δεσπότῃ (8.11.2).[83]

Verginia is likewise accused of being a slave in Livy and Dionysius. In both instances the tyrannical male contrives to prove in court that the young girl is a slave despite being aware of her free status. Thersandros repeatedly claims in court that Leucippe is his slave, and the *decemuir* Appius suborns his *cliens* Claudius to bring a false allegation that Verginia is his slave (Liv. 3.44.5; cf. Appius refers to Verginia as an *ancilla*, 3.44.10, 3.47.6):

M. Claudio clienti negotium dedit, ut uirginem in seruitutem adsereret neque cederet secundum libertatem postulantibus uindicias.

In addition, both Thersandros and Appius (via Claudius) accuse the fathers of the girls, Sostratus and Verginius respectively, of being impostors: τὴν δοκοῦσαν εἶναι

---

[83] Thersandros' lawyer Sopatros likewise accuses Leucippe of being a prostitute (πόρνην, 8.10.3).

τοῦ <u>θεοπρόπου θυγατέρα</u> ...τῷ δὲ ὄντι δούλην ἐμήν (8.11.1); ὁ δέ μοι τρίτος τῶν λόγων πρὸς τὴν <u>δούλην</u> ἐστὶ τὴν ἐμὴν καὶ τὸν σεμνὸν <u>τοῦτον πατρὸς ὑποκριτήν</u>; *puellam domi suae natam furtoque inde <u>in domum Vergini translatam</u> suppositam ei esse* (Liv. 3.44.9).

The sham nature of the case is explicit in both Thersandros' and Appius' trials. The Priest of Artemis twice legitimately accuses Thersandros of fabricating sham-accusations against Leucippe and Clitophon: τοὺς <u>συκοφαντηθέντας</u> (8.9.7); οὐκ αἰσχύνῃ δέ, ὅτι κατηγορῶν τοὺς ξένους ἄμφω <u>συκοφαντῶν</u> ἐλήλεγξαι; (8.9.14).[84] Artemis is also described as proving Thersandros as a sham-accuser: Ἀρτέμιδος, ἣ τοῦτον ἀπέφηνε <u>συκοφάντην</u> (8.3.1). Likewise, Verginia's uncle Numitorius accuses Claudius, the mover of the case, of fabricating the charge because of Verginia's marriageable age and good looks: ἐρῶντα ἥκειν ἀναίσχυντον <u>συκοφάντημα πλάσαντα</u> (Dion. 11.30.2). Dionysius himself comments on the sham nature of the case and characterises it as an example of Appius' tyranny: τὸ <u>συκοφάντημα</u> κατὰ τῆς κόρης αὐτὸς ἔγραψε καὶ ἔργον ἐτόλμησε τυραννικὸν πρᾶξαι καὶ ὠμόν (Dion. 11.35.5); and Livy describes the whole case as a 'farce' (*fabula*, 3.44.9). There are also typological parallels. In the first instance, an appetitive older tyrannical male takes a fancy to a young virgin and tries to exploit his position of power over her to get what he wants. Both Leucippe and Verginia are involved with other men (Clitophon and Icilius respectively) and are of a free station. The fathers of the girls are both absent, engaging in some sort of military duty (Liv. 3.44.2; Dion. 11.28.1), but arrive on the scene just in time (Ach. 7.11.3-4; Liv. 3.46.9-47.1; Dion. 11.33.2-3); and both Appius

---

[84] On the priest's rhetoric see Brethes (2006), and on the irreverant treatment of priests in the novels see Brethes (2012b).

and Thersandros are already married (Dion. 11.28.3) and co-opt a crony to facilitate their scheme.[85]

Leucippe's response to Thersandros' overbearing behaviour in the cottage is to accuse him of tyranny, a highly loaded concept generally, but also specifically in the context of Lucretia and Verginia. Leucippe defiantly adds that she will not be subjected to force: κἂν <u>τυραννεῖν</u> ἐθέλῃς, κἀγὼ <u>τυραννεῖσθαι</u>, πλὴν οὐ <u>βιάσῃ</u> (6.20.3).[86] Her response provides one of the key thematic filters through which we can read the entire episode and establishes a crucial link with the Lucretia and Verginia narratives, in which the tyrannical behaviour of the Kings and Decemvirate against the individual women leads to the establishment of the more democratic institutions of the Republic and Tribunate.[87] In the aftermath of Lucretia's rape Brutus swears to put an end to the kingship (Liv. 1.59.1; Dion. 4.70.1; Ov. *Fast*. 2.852). The people are similarly shocked by the event, preferring to die for their freedom than suffer such outrage from tyrants: περὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἢ τοιαύτας ὕβρεις ὑπὸ τῶν τυράννων γενομένας περιορᾶν (Dion. 4.67.4; cf. 4.70.2, 4.71.3). Brutus characterises Lucretia's treatment at the hands of Sextus as fitting for a slave (Dion. 4.82.1-1):

> <u>τὴν ἀκόλαστον ὕβριν τῆς τυραννίδος</u> οὐκ ἐδυνήθη διαφυγεῖν, ἀλλ᾽ <u>ὥσπερ</u>
> <u>αἰχμάλωτος ὑπ᾽ ἀνάγκης κρατηθεῖσα</u> ὑπέμεινεν <u>ὅσα μὴ θέμις ἐλευθέρα</u>
> <u>γυναικὶ παθεῖν</u>. ἐφ᾽ οἷς ἀγανακτοῦσα καὶ ἀφόρητον ἡγουμένη τὴν ὕβριν.

Likewise, in the Verginia narrative Icilius accuses Appius of tyranny and of trying to rob the people of their freedom: τὰ δὲ δίκαια συγχεῖν καὶ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν

---

[85] A further minor correspondence is that both Thersandros and Appius interrupt speeches given by their supporters in the trial: Sopatros (ἔτι τοῦ Σωπάτρου λέγοντος ὑποτεμὼν αὐτοῦ τὸν λόγον ὁ Θέρσανδρος, 8.11.1); and Claudius (*Appius interfatur*, Liv. 3.47.4).

[86] The charge of tyranny is later reiterated by Clitophon (σὺ δὲ αὐτῶν ἐν ὄψει <u>τυραννεῖς</u> τῶν θεῶν, 8.2.1) and in the speech by the Priest of Artemis in the second trial (8.9.7).

[87] In Dionysius, Brutus' speech makes it clear that he views Sextus' treatment of Lucretia as analogous to Tarquin's treatment of the people (4.82.1-5).

ἀφαιρεῖσθαι, μηκέτι τὴν ὀνειδιζομένην ὑμῖν ἀρνοῦ <u>τυραννίδα</u> (Dion. 11.31.4; cf.

ἔργον ἐτόλμησε τυραννικὸν πρᾶξαι, 11.35.5).

Leucippe then offers up her body for torture in a passage whose contemporary socio-political ramifications have not passed unnoticed (6.21.1):

τὰς βασάνους παράστησον. φερέτω τροχόν· ἰδοὺ χεῖρες, τεινέτω. φερέτω
καὶ μάστιγας· ἰδοὺ νῶτος, τυπτέτω. κομιζέτω πῦρ· ἰδοὺ σῶμα, καιέτω.
φερέτω καὶ σίδηρον· ἰδοὺ δέρη, σφαζέτω.[88]

The similarity to the Christian martyr acts is clear,[89] especially the idea that the body signifies the community.[90] In the martyrologies, as in Achilles, the female[91] body functions not only as a venue for physical resistance to external authorities but also as a site of alternative narrative, where those who are usually disempowered and 'aphonous' can speak.[92] Bodily pain is a dominant feature of Christian discourse and, as Potter has demonstrated, the martyrologies deny audience expectations by having the destruction of the female body signify not the confirmation of Roman power but its failure.[93] For King, Leucippe subverts the nominal hierarchy between herself and Thersandros by mobilising 'her body at strategic points' and by the repeated imperatives (παράστησον, φερέτω, ἰδοὺ (4x), τεινέτω, φερέτω (2x), τυπτέτω, κομιζέτω, καιέτω, φερέτω, σφαζέτω).[94] Perkins links the Christian narratives and the Greek novels by arguing that both are reacting to a changing society, and that this

---

[88] Icilius similarly offers himself to be murdered publicly at Appius' tribunal (Dion. 11.31.5).

[89] Shaw (1996) 269-70, Pervo (1994) 239-54, Goldhill (1995) 117, Morales (2004) 103-6, Haynes (2000-2001) 84.

[90] Perkins (1995) explores the body as a venue for Christian pain and resistance, a symbolism that ultimately leads to the triumph of Christianity. The tortured and assaulted body is a martyrological leitmotif, e.g. Melito (Eusebius *Historia Ecclesiastica* 4.26.2), Hermas (*Pastor* 3.2.1), and Justin (II *Apologia* 12), Polycarp 2.2, 16.1; Carpus, Papylus and Agathonice 23, 36; Lyons 1.59; Perpetua and Felicitas 21.2. See further Perkins (1995) 15.

[91] King (2012) 154 observes that in martyrologies resistance against political hierarchy is gendered.

[92] Shaw (1996) 276-7, and King (2012), esp. 148.

[93] Potter (1993) 53-4, 65, cited by King (2012) 152 who links Leucippe in this connection.

[94] King (2012) 153.

manifests itself in the texts as episodes of bodily violence.[95] From this it is clear that some contemporary bodily discourse, especially martyrological, conceives of the female body as a site of resistance to Roman oppression.

The emphasis on piracy that follows corroborates the anti-Roman tone of the episode.[96] In response to Thersandros' allegation of Leucippe's sexual impropriety among pirates (6.21.3), she returns fire, re-asserting her claim to chastity,[97] and in turn accuses Sosthenes and Thersandros of being the true pirates (6.22.1-2):

> "ἦ παρθένος, καὶ μετὰ Σωσθένην· ἐπεὶ πυθοῦ Σωσθένους· οὗτος γὰρ ὄντως γέγονέ μοι <u>λῃστής</u>. ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ ἦσαν ὑμῶν μετριώτεροι, καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν ἦν οὕτως <u>ὑβριστής</u>. εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς τοιαῦτα ποιεῖτε, <u>ἀληθινὸν τοῦτο πειρατήριον</u>. εἶτα οὐκ αἰσχύνεσθε ποιοῦντες ἃ μὴ τετολμήκασιν <u>οἱ λῃσταί</u>;"

Leucippe repeats the charge shortly afterwards: καὶ μετὰ Θέρσανδρον παρθένος, τὸν καὶ <u>λῃστῶν ἀσελγέστερον</u>· ἂν ὑβρίσαι μὴ δυνηθῇ, καὶ φονεύει (6.22.3). Later, Clitophon refers to Thersandros as the biggest pirate of them all (8.5.6):[98]

> καὶ ἐν μέσοις λῃσταῖς ἔμεινε παρθένος καὶ τὸν μέγαν ἐνίκησε <u>λῃστήν</u>, Θέρσανδρον λέγω, τὸν ἀναίσχυντον, τὸν βίαιον.

---

[95] Perkins (2009), esp. 90-106, discusses the role of the body in the Roman judicial system, and the effect that Christian body-politics has on it—Roman judicial practice discriminates between bodies of different social status, but for the Christians every body is equal.

[96] See Shaw (1984) and Perkins (1995) 81 on bandits as 'a foil for the normative structures of elite society', especially in Roman imperial ideology. For bandits (both fictional and papyrologically attested) in Greco-Roman Egypt see Baldwin (1963), McGing (1998), Riess (2001-2002) 267. Riess (2001), Watanabe (2003b), and Grünewald (2004) are book-length studies on bandits in Apuleius, Xenophon of Ephesus, and the Roman empire respectively. For brigands in the novels see also Scarcella (1996) 233, 242-3, 250-252, Hopwood (1998), Dowden (2013). On the βουκόλοι see Winkler (1980), Rutherford (2000). On bandits as an anthropological category see Hobsbawm (1969). On pirates under the Principate see D.C. Braund (1993), and for the ancient world more generally de Souza (1999), esp. 2⃣7⃣-8 on the novels. On piracy as an erotic metaphor in the novels, see Létoublon (1993) 219-20 and Boulic and Létoublon (2014), adducing Hedylus *A.P.* 5.161 (τὰ λῃστρικὰ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης); Meleager 12.144 (φρενολῃστά); Maecius 16.198 (ὑβριστά, φρενοκλόπε, λῃστὰ λογισμοῦ); Menander *Sic.* 272, *Mis.* 801f; cf. also Longus 1.32.4.

[97] Chastity tests occur at 8.6.1-15 (Leucippe) and 8.12.1-14.4 (Melite); cf. also Prop. 4.8.3-14.

[98] Melite had earlier accused Clitophon of being worse than a pirate for *not* sleeping with her: ὦ καὶ λῃστῶν ἀγριώτερε· δάκρυα γὰρ καὶ λῃστὴς αἰσχύνεται (5.25.7).

Whilst late Republican and triumviral rhetoric mobilises piracy as a weapon within political invective,[99] non-Romans also employ the term to refer pejoratively to the Romans. A good example occurs in the *Acta Alexandrinorum* in which the Egyptian gymnasiarch Appian calls the emperor Commodus a 'pirate-leader' (σὺ ὁ λήσταρχος, col. iv.8 Musurillo, quoted above).[100] The charge of piracy can therefore be read as part of the anti-Roman discourse in the novel.[101] Callisthenes, for example, is emphatic in his assertion that he is neither a pirate nor of low birth (8.17.3, quoted p. 197), and I have suggested that this articulates a subtle nod towards Romulus' Asylum: Plutarch refers to the 'many slaves and runaways' (*Rom*. 9.3, quoted above)[102] who make up the citizen body of early Rome; and Strabo refers to a 'promiscuous rabble' gathered by Romulus (σύγκλυδας ὁ Ῥωμύλος ἤθροιζεν, 5.3.2).

In addition to Leucippe's charge of piracy against Thersandros, that of ἀσέλγεια and ὕβρις (6.22.1-3) repays attention. In Lucian's *On Salaried Posts*, the speaker rails against the servility of the Greek client (whom he characterises as a slave), and against the boorish Roman patron, whom he colours with a list of vices: ἐστι τῦφος καὶ μαλακία καὶ ἡδυπάθεια καὶ <u>ἀσέλγεια καὶ ὕβρις</u> καὶ ἀπαιδευσία (25). This buttresses the claim that Thersandros, cumulatively, functions as a crystallisation

---

[99] E.g. L. Calpurnius Piso and Aulus Gabinus: Cic. *Post. Red. Sen.* 11; Verres: II. *Verr.* 1.151, 1.90, 4.29, 5.5; Antony: Cic. *Phil.* 13.18 (*archipirata*; cf. *ad Fam.* 10.5, 10.6, 12.12, 12.14 where he is *latro*); Caesar *B.C.* 3.110 (*praedonibus latronibusque*); Lucan *B.C.* 6.422 (*pirata*); Aug. *R.G.* 25, 31 characterises his war with Sextus as a 'pirate war'; cf. Appian *B.C.* 5.77 and Cassius Dio 48.17 on Sextus' incorporation of pirates; Vell. Pat. 2.73.3 characterises Sextus as using piracy as a strategy. On Sextus see de Souza (1999) 190-5; Connors (2002) 19 discusses Sextus and Sicily in connection with Chariton's Syracusan setting.

[100] Musurillo (1954) 218 appositely notes *ad loc*. that 'λήσταρχοι are a frequent menace to hero and heroine in the novels of Heliodorus and Chariton'.

[101] Haynes (2003) 155 tentatively accepts the anti-Roman discourse in Thersandros' pirate connection, though Haynes (2000-2001) 87 had disavowed the possibility as 'untenable position'.

[102] Plut. *Rom*. 16.5 mentions the institution in positive terms as being the source of Rome's strength; this is reiterated by Aelius Aristides' *Or*. 26.59-60 where the institution is re-marketed an ἄστυ κοινόν.

of negative Roman elements seen from the perspective of a Greek (and potentially Alexandrian) elite.[103]

Piracy is also freighted with potentially Latin literary associations. Although the tradition of Greek declamation contains a number of pirate stories, they are predominantly a Senecan phenomenon.[104] They are very frequent in the Elder Seneca's *Controversiae* (1.2, 1.6, 1.7, 3.3, 7.1, 7.4; cf. Petr. 1.3), no doubt because they create interesting situations on which to base a debate. *Contr.* 1.2, which debates whether a virgin captured by pirates and sold on to a pimp is still actually chaste and whether she can become a priestess, contains some strikingly close parallels to the situation in Achilles. The Senecan speakers claim that her presence has turned the temple into a brothel (*Contr.* 1.2.2) precisely as Thersandros says of the Temple of Artemis: ἡ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος οἰκία μοιχῶν γέγονε καὶ πόρνης θάλαμος (8.8.11; cf. 8.6.15). The speakers in Seneca likewise reject the claim that a girl can still be a virgin if she has dwelt among pirates (*Contr.* 1.2.2, 1.2.8, 1.2.9, 1.2.11), as Thersandros says of Leucippe (6.21.3, quoted above). Indeed, the whole narrative of the Senecan girl and the insinuations of sexual impropriety is paralleled closely by Leucippe's situation (*Contr.* 1.2.7).[105] Achilles may therefore be familiar with the Roman declamatory tradition.

---

[103] See Fuchs (1938) 49-54 for Lucian's anti-Roman sentiments, especially those embodied in *De Merc. Cond.*, *Nigrinus*, and *Demonax*.

[104] Greek: Liban. *Decl.* 46; *RG* 4.154-5, 4.160, 4.267, 4.816-7, 4.470, 4.645-6, 5.107-8, 5.149, 7.140, 7.163 7.355, 8.365, 8.408-9; Apsines 241.8-12 Sp.-H. Latin: Quint. *Decl. Min.* 257, 342, 343, 373, 388; Quint. *Decl. Mai.* 5, 6, 9, 16; Calp. Flacc. 52. Russell (1983) 26 avers that 'the classic pirate stories are in Seneca', and at 38 n. 100 notes the declamatory features of the novel, including trial scenes, accusations of adultery, and false confessions. Gunderson (2003) 12 n. 36 mentions pirates as part of the 'stock in trade' of Chariton and Achilles, as well as being 'part of the dominant idiom of declamation itself'. Bornecque (1902) 89, 130 and Rohde (1914) 339 see Greek declamation as an influence on the novel.

[105] de Souza (1999) 216 notes the similarity. Other potential allusions in the novels to Roman declamation include: *Contr* 1.2 (the virgin kills a soldier in order to defend her virginity) and Xen. Eph. 4.5.5 (Anthia kills Anchialus); *Contr.* 1.7 and 7.1 (humane pirates) and Xen. Eph. 2.10.1 (Apsyrtus the

The repeated theme of personal freedom links Achilles and the Roman narratives. Leucippe concludes the episode by announcing the inviolability and eternal integrity of her ἐλευθερία (6.22.4; cf. Char. 2.5.12):

> ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ γυμνὴ καὶ μόνη καὶ γυνή, καὶ ἓν ὅπλον ἔχω τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, ἣ μήτε πληγαῖς κατακόπτεται μήτε σιδήρῳ κατατέμνεται μήτε πυρὶ κατακαίεται. οὐκ ἀφήσω ποτὲ ταύτην ἐγώ. κἂν καταφλέγῃς, οὐχ οὕτως θερμὸν εὑρήσεις τὸ πῦρ.

In essence, the question of Leucippe's (and Clitophon's) freedom from tyranny and the restoration of their elite status is the entelechy of the final three books of the novel. The Lucretia and Verginia narratives likewise revolve around *libertas* and the exposure of the female body to political tyrants who attempt to enslave and rob the citizen body of its freedom.[106] It is especially telling, then, that Achilles chooses *Roman* cultural narratives to construct his own story, which itself reflects contemporary (Alexandrian) Greek elite concerns about oppressive imperial behaviour. Leucippe's imperviousness to physical assault and her corporeal inviolability function as dominant images within a new cultural script of Greek elite wish-fulfilment.[107] In addition, Leucippe's claim to ἐλευθερία, which cannot be cut by iron (σιδήρῳ) or burned by fire (πυρί) evokes an identical combination of elements

---

Tyrian pirate who tries to make amends with Habrocomes), noted by Watanabe (2003a) 18 n. 57, who also observes the resemblance between Manto's love for Habrocomes and the *filia archipiratae* motif of *Contr.* 1.6. Morales (2004) 69 sees Achilles as a narrativisation of a set of *Controversiae*. Webb (2013) 10 notes the resemblance of the shipwreck episode at 3.1-2, with its absurd description of passengers running from side to side with their baggage, to the shipwrecks of mime mentioned at Sen. *de Ira* 2.2.5.

[106] Ogilvie (1965) 478 characterises Verginia's story as the 'paradigm of the *causa liberalis*'. The tyrannical behaviour of the Tarquins and Decemvirate in their respective stories, and their attempts to enslave and rob citizens of their freedom, are keynotes in both Livy and Dionysius: Liv. 3.45.8, 3.45.9, 3.48.5; Dion. 4.71.3, 4.82.1-2, 4.82.5, 11.30.5, 11.31.4, 11.37.6.

[107] Clitophon emphasises the fact that Leucippe did not lose her virginity, and in this respect has not undergone any change: καὶ ἔμεινε, πάτερ, τοιαύτη μέχρι τῆς παρούσης ἡμέρας, οἵαν αὐτὴν ἐξέπεμψας ἀπὸ Βυζαντίου (8.5.5); Chaereas is similarly insistent that Callirhoe has not suffered slavery (8.7.10), discussed at p. 38.

articulated by the lover of Propertius' first poem: *fortiter et ferrum saeuos patiemur et ignes,/ sit modo libertas quas uelit ira loqui* (1.1.27f).

Further, in both Achilles and the Lucretia narrative, the tyrannical male is exiled. Thersandros flees (τοῦ Θερσάνδρου φυγόντος, 8.14.6) and is officially sentenced to exile *in absentia* (τοῦ δὲ Θερσάνδρου φυγὴν ἀπόντος κατέγνωσαν, 8.15.2). Livy's Brutus likewise encourages the people to pronounce exile on the Tarquins: *incensam multitudinem perpulit ut imperium regi abrogaret exsulesque esse iuberet L. Tarquinium cum coniuge ac liberis* (1.59.11; cf. 1.60.2 *Tarquinio clausae portae exsiliumque indictum*). Dionysius' Tarquin also flees and Brutus pronounces exile: ἀπωσθεὶς δὴ καὶ ταύτης ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς ἐλπίδος φεύγει σὺν ὀλίγοις εἰς Γαβίων πόλιν (4.85.4); φεύγειν Ταρκύνιον ἅμα τοῖς παισὶ καὶ τῇ γυναικὶ πόλεώς τε καὶ χώρας τῆς Ῥωμαίων εἰργομένους τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον καὶ γένος τὸ ἐξ αὐτῶν (4.75.1); δέδοκται γὰρ ἡμῖν φεύγειν Ταρκυνίους πόλιν τε τὴν Ῥωμαίων καὶ χώραν (4.84.2); καὶ ἐπειδὴ πᾶσαι τὴν φυγὴν τῶν τυράννων αἱ φρᾶτραι κατεψηφίσαντο (4.84.3). Plutarch also describes Lucretia herself—or rather her suffering and nobility—as being responsible for the exile of the Tarquins: Ταρκύνιον Σούπερβον... ἐξήλασεν ὕβρις καὶ ἀρετὴ Λουκρητίας (*Mul. Virt.* 250a). Read in the context of these Roman cultural narratives, Thersandros' exile embodies a symbolic end to the threat of oppressive Roman imperial behaviour.

Clitophon's own incarceration (6.5.3-7.6.6) is available to be read as a reflection of the anxiety of the Greek elite.[108] His passivity in the face of physical violence at the hands of Thersandros (5.23.5, 7.14.3) has been described as 'a parody

---

[108] Perkins (2009) 76-7.

of the self-restraint expected of the upper class male'.[109] Haynes and Perkins read the

apparent passivity and powerlessness of male protagonists in the novels as offering an

ethical model 'attractive to those [Greek elite] men who felt politically marginalised

by the imposition of a new [Roman] power structure', that is, a model of interpersonal

relations that avoids unnecessary conflict.[110] Especially interesting is Thersandros'

third attempt to beat up Clitophon in the Temple of Artemis after the latter has re-

asserted Leucippe's claim to be free and a virgin (αὕτη δὲ καὶ ἐλευθέρα καὶ παρθένος,

8.1.2). Thersandros accidentally injures his hand when his fist comes into contact with

Clitophon's teeth, which are characterised as the 'avengers of hubris' (8.1.3-4):

> ὡς δὲ ταῦτα ἤκουσε, "καὶ λοιδορεῖς," φήσας, "δεσμῶτα καὶ κατάδικε;"
> παίει με κατὰ τῶν προσώπων μάλα βιαίως καὶ ἐπάγει δευτέραν· οἱ δὲ τῶν
> ῥινῶν αἵματος ἔρρεον κρουνοί· ὅλον γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν θυμὸν εἶχεν ἡ πληγή.
> ὡς δὲ καὶ τρίτην ἀπροφυλάκτως ἔπαισε, λανθάνει μου τῷ στόματι περὶ
> τοὺς ὀδόντας προσπταίσας τὴν χεῖρα, καὶ τρωθεὶς τοὺς δακτύλους μόλις
> τὴν χεῖρα συνέστειλεν ἀνακραγών. καὶ οἱ ὀδόντες ἀμύνουσι τὴν τῶν ῥινῶν
> ὕβριν. τιτρώσκουσι γὰρ αὐτοῦ τοὺς παίοντας δακτύλους, καὶ ἃ πεποίηκεν
> ἔπαθεν ἡ χείρ.

Here Thersandros' hubristic behaviour results in injury to himself.[111] For Perkins, this

indicates that the passive strategy of 'showing the other cheek' has worked.[112] Critics

have, however, overlooked a parallel that confirms the allegorical aspect of this

passage. In Ps. Lucian's *Onos,* Lucius is sold to a gardener who becomes embroiled in

a physical altercation with a Roman soldier annoyed by the fact that the gardener

---

[109] Haynes (2000) 86. Perkins (1995) 91 detects a Stoic element in Clitophon's restraint. M. Jones (2012) 251 discusses how Clitophon's passivity impinges on his masculinity. Rohde (1914) 511 faults Clitophon's passivity. Perkins (2009) 77 sees Clitophon as spoofing the non-aggressive paradigm of novelistic male protagonists.

[110] Haynes (2003) 99, Perkins (2009) 76-7.

[111] Clitophon proceeds to accuse Thersandros of beating Artemis herself: ἐν αὐτοῖς τυπτόμεθα τοῖς ἱεροῖς... τύπτομαι παρ' αὐτῷ τῷ βωμῷ, βλεπούσης, οἴμοι, τῆς θεοῦ. ἐπὶ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν αἱ πληγαί (8.2.1-2; cf. 6.21.2). Dionysius' Tarquin has similarly violated the sanctity of temples and altars: ὧν ἱερὰ καὶ τεμένη καὶ βωμοὺς μιαίνει Ταρκύνιος ταῖς αἱμοφύρτοις χερσὶ καὶ παντὸς ἐμφυλίου γεμούσαις ἄγους θυσιῶν καὶ σπονδῶν καταρχόμενος (4.83.1).

[112] Perkins (2009) 77. She also observes that Clitophon only shows passivity to the *elite*, being elsewhere happy to fight the prison guards (7.15.4) and beat up an Egyptian slave (4.15.6).

cannot speak Latin (τῇ Ἰταλῶν φωνῇ);[113] the soldier beats the gardener, who retaliates and deprives the soldier of his sword, leaving him rather the worse for wear (44). The *Onos* has been described as 'direct and brutal in its exposure of the power structures which Rome imposes on her provinces and the arrogance and inhuman treatment of provincials by the Roman army', and its lost prototype as 'the most subversive ancient novel ever written'.[114] In Apuleius' version (*Met*. 9.39-41) the gardener beats the soldier with his fists, elbow, a rock, and—as in Achilles—his teeth (*morsibus*, 9.40); and just as Thersandros is throughout characterised by his arrogance, so is the Roman soldier (*superbo atque adroganti sermone*, 9.39). In both the *Onos* and the *Metamorphoses*, as I suggest in Achilles, the Greek provincial suffers high-handed treatment from an arrogant Roman, and the reader is offered images of a resurgent Greek elite.

5.5   Conclusion

I have argued that Achilles' Callisthenes-Calligone narrative engages with that of the rape of the Sabine women, a central story in the myth of early Rome. Achilles' version deflates and demythologises a mytheme entrenched in the Roman cultural psyche. He transforms the Romuleans into a group of brigands dressed up as women who then abduct the wrong woman. The rape of the Sabine women provides an aetiology for Roman marriage, an institution problematised by the fact that its

---

[113] Adams (2003) 383, 560-1 discusses the use of Latin in a Greek-speaking area in this passage (and in the analogous passage in Apul. *Met*. 9.39) as an example of how language-choice can function as a display of power. See Millar (1981) 67-8 on the realism of the passage in Apuleius.
[114] Finkelpearl (2007) 264; E. Hall (1995) 57, and 52 on the physical and intellectual outmanoeuvring of the Roman soldier by the market gardener.

foundational act is one of rape.[115] Like the Romans, Callisthenes acts out of a desire for marriage after being rebuffed. Whilst Callisthenes' abduction of Calligone sets in motion the train of events that make the novel what it is—just as Romulus' abduction of the Sabine women makes Roman history what *it* is—Callisthenes' narrative is quickly marginalised. *His* narrative is not the important one: Achilles has chosen one of the main breeze-blocks of the Roman narrative and used it as fodder for his Greek prose romance.

I also hope to have demonstrated that Achilles is intimately familiar with the Lucretia and Verginia narratives—symbolic of the inappropriate extension and use of power—and has conflated them in order to form the basis of Leucippe's escapades in the final three books of the novel. Both Lucretia and Verginia are Roman *exempla* of chastity in stories of tyrannical Roman institutions, and are known as such by writers of Greek imperial prose, including Plutarch and Dionysius.[116] In Achilles their stories serve to map issues of civic freedom (and slavery) and appetitive tyrannical males onto the character of Thersandros (and his stooge Sosthenes). Could Thersandros' name hold a clue (as Callisthenes' might)? In the third book of the *Sibylline Oracles* Italy is described as 'not the mother of good men, but a nurse of beasts': ἔσσῃ δ' οὐκ ἀγαθῶν μήτηρ, θηρῶν δὲ τιθήνη (3.469). Perhaps Thersandros 'Mr. Beastman' represents just such a child of Italy,[117] as well as being evocative of the she-wolf, nurse of Romulus and Remus, so central to Roman identity: *Romulea fera* (Juv. *Sat.* 11.104); προσῄεσαν ἀθρόοι δεδιττόμενοι βοῇ τὸ θηρίον. ἡ δὲ λύκαινα οὐ μάλα

---

[115] Hemker (1985), on rape and the foundation of Rome, reads Ovid's Sabine narrative as an *anti*-rape narrative; Labate (2006) reads it as a seduction without *ars*, and therefore as an anti-*exemplum*. Richlin (1992a) 169 argues that in Ovid the signifier of masculinity is the ability to commit rape.

[116] The author of the pseudo-Lucianic *Makrobioi* (8-9) mentions Tarquin among other early Roman kings.

[117] Morales (2004) 83-4 recognises the beastly etymology encoded in Thersandros' name. Theron is also the name of a pirate in Chariton (1.7) and a *latro* in Apuleius (*Met.* 7.5).

ἀγριαίνουσα… (Dion. 1.79.7).[118] Achilles therefore reminds the reader of moments in Roman history when tyranny is replaced by more democratic mechanisms (the Republic and the Tribunate); he activates the narratives in the context of the Greek elite of the Roman period, encoding an implied criticism of the non-democratic nature of the Principate in contrast to the former glory of Greek democracy.

---

[118] On the lupine discourse in Longus see esp. section 6.9.

Chapter 6

Longus, Vergil, and Rome

6.1   Introduction

Longus' date remains uncertain, but rough estimates place him in the late second or early third century CE; his identity and (potentially Roman) name are equally shadowy, though theories abound.[1] In this chapter I shall argue that he is a member of the Greek elite who is well versed in Latin literature (especially Vergil) and Roman culture, and who mobilises his knowledge in a sophisticated and adversarial manner. Indeed, I am not the first to suggest connections between Longus and Vergil (predominantly the *Eclogues*), as well as other Roman authors, but most postulate a lost common source in Philitas of Cos.[2] Yet Vergil nowhere announces Philitas as a source, as he does in the case of, for example, Theocritus or Euphorion (*Ecl.* 6.1, 10.50); nor is he mentioned along with Theocritus and Vergil as a pastoral poet by Quintilian (*I.O.* 10.1.55).

---

[1] Discussions of Longus' date and identity include Hunter (1983) 1-15, (1996) 367-9, MacQueen (1990) 187-203, Morgan (2004b) 1-2, Alvares (2014) 27. A primary MS (F) gives 'Logos' as his name. For Longus' familiarity with Lesbos see Mason (1979), (1995); for Longus' potential connection with the Pompeii Longi in Mytilene see Cichorius (1922) 321-3; Merkelbach (1962) 193 sugests that Longus is potentially writing in Rome; Herrmann (1981) identifies him with the Roman grammarian Velius Longus (see p. 278-9 below). Reeve (1982) 90 suggests that Longus has assimilated Latin linguistic affectations, on the basis of νῦν… νῦν (1.13.6), which corresponds to the Latin *modo… modo*.

[2] E.g. Hubaux (1953), Cairns (1979) 25-7, DuQuesnay (1979), (1981) 60, Hunter (1983) 76-83, Bowie (1985), Thomas (1992), Morgan (2011); exceptions (who do not press the parallels into the service of interpretation) include Edmonds (1916) 7, Valley (1926) 90, Turner (1968) 117, Viellefond (1987) cxxix-cxxxi. Hodkinson (2012) suggests that Longus (1.16.1) shows awareness of Vergil's hierarchy of herdsmen. Positive arguments for Longus' knowledge of the *Eclogues* include Di Virgilio (1991), Di Marco (2000), (2006), Hubbard (2006a), (2006b) Torres Guerra (2007); on Longus' knowledge of Roman narrative painting see Mittelstadt (1967). Discussing erotodidactic elements in Longus, Di Virgilio (1991) 305 sees in the novel a 'moralisation of Ovidian erotic didactic'. On the spelling of Philitas' name (whom I distinguish from the character Philetas in Longus) see Müller (1990).

In the first instance, I shall explore a number of elements that, cumulatively, present a strong case in favour of Longus' direct knowledge of Vergil's *Eclogues*. Vergil is responsible for the tradition of pastoral poetry as we know it: it is Vergil who codifies Theocritus as a pastoral poet and who can therefore be said to have invented the genre.[3] Without Vergil, then, there is no pastoral tradition, and Longus could only have recognised pastoral as a genre through Vergil's instantiation of it.[4] I shall discuss the fact that both authors problematise the autonomy of the pastoral world through the interfering presence of the city, politics, history, and time;[5] this is in contrast to Theocritus, in whose poetry there is rarely a threat to the integrity of the pastoral world.[6] I shall then discuss the various thematic and lexical correspondences between Longus and the *Eclogues* (especially *Ecl*. 1), and the presence in Longus of specifically Vergilian discursive markers such as 'woods', 'greenness', 'willow', and of poetic memory, as well as his choice of dendronyms (especially the φηγός). All of these are central to the semiotic economy of both Longus' and Vergil's pastoral landscapes, but are absent from Theocritus (or at least different in degree and kind). I shall go on to discuss Philetas' garden, and the roles of Amaryllis and Tityros, as metapoetic epicentres of the novel in which Longus negotiates his relationship with the literary history of pastoral. I shall then analyse Longus' engagement with Roman pre-history and the narrative of Romulus and Remus, the mytheme of the wolf, and Dorcon's attempted rape of Chloe as a re-working of the Lupercalia (as well as Ovid's Actaeon episode). I end by discussing the Methymnaean invasion as a caricature of the Trojans who invade Italy in Book 7 of the *Aeneid*. By inverting a range of Roman

---

[3] Halperin (1983) 2.
[4] Hubbard (2006a) 499-500.
[5] For Vergil's problematisation of pastoral autonomy see Martindale (1997a) 111, 120.
[6] DuQuesnay (1981) 38; cf. also Leach (1974) 70, Clausen (1994) 32. Stephens (2006) offers a mild corrective.

master narratives, Longus successfully enacts both a 'hidden transcript' and postcolonial 'mimicry'.

6.2   Pastoral autonomy

Both Longus and Vergil compromise the autonomy of their pastoral worlds. Paschalis observes that 'a reading of the novel that lays the emphasis on a pastoral world exposed to intrusions from outside would inevitably invite a comparison with Vergilian bucolic', though he ultimately disavows a direct connection between the two authors.[7] Longus' pastoral world is frequently punctured by unwanted external presences, most obviously by pirates (1.28-30), the Methymnaeans (2.12-3.2) and Dionysophanes' urban train (4.10-40). Vergil is the first to introduce the idea that external forces can drastically impinge on the pastoral world, namely in the form of the land confiscations, which shatter the pastoral tranquillity of *Eclogues* 1 and 9. In *Eclogue* 1 Meliboeus has been forced to abandon his home to a resettled soldier: *nos patriae finis et dulcia linquimus arua./ nos patriam fugimus* (1.3f); *impius haec tam culta noualia miles habebit,/ barbarus has segetes* (1.70f). Land confiscations likewise precipitate fisticuffs between Moeris and the *aduena nostri... possessor agelli* (9.2f). Whereas in Longus' narrative the Methymnaean menace is ultimately driven off and pastoral harmony is restored, in the *Eclogues* the land confiscations have an ineradicable effect on the lives of the herdsmen.[8] This is a defining difference, which I shall explore in more detail below (section 6.11).

---

[7] Paschalis (2005) 54; cf. Pandiri (1985) 116 n. 3, MacQueen (1990), 163.
[8] For Longus' rejection of war see Hilton (2005) 68-9. Hubbard (2006a) 500 notes the 'counterfactual impossibility' of happiness in the *Eclogues*, in contrast to Longus, in whose narrative Vergil's 'subjunctive becomes the indicative'. Cf. also Leach (1974) 47-8.

The city-country dialectic is a constituent feature of both authors, and is implicated in the failure to maintain an autonomous pastoral world. In the *Eclogues* this lack of pastoral autonomy is underwritten by the initial and dominant presence of the city. It is the 'god' and 'young man' (Octavian) in Rome who authorises Tityrus' pastoral leisure:[9] *deus nobis haec otia fecit* (1.6); *ille meas errare boues, ut cernis, et ipsum/ ludere quae uellem calamo permisit agresti* (1.9f); *hic illum uidi iuuenem* (1.42); and he describes Rome's greatness (1.19-25):

> <u>urbem</u> quam dicunt Romam…
>   …sic paruis componere <u>magna</u> solebam.
> uerum haec tantum alias inter caput extulit urbes
> quantum lenta solent inter uiburna cupressi.

The first word of Longus' novel after the prologue is 'city',[10] serving to establish the city-country dialectic that runs through the novel:[11] πόλις ἐστὶ τῆς Λέσβου Μιτυλήνη, <u>μεγάλη</u> καὶ καλή (1.1.1). Just as Tityrus' pastoral and musical activities have to be endorsed by the city politicians, Lamon's negotiations with Dryas rest on the need for a similar endorsement: δοῦλος δὲ ὢν οὐδενός εἰμι τῶν ἐμῶν κύριος, ἀλλὰ δεῖ τὸν δεσπότην μανθάνοντα ταῦτα συγχωρεῖν (3.31.3).[12] Indeed, the 'prominence of the City as a counterpoint and threat to the pastoral world is quite without precedent in Greek bucolic poetry'.[13]

In both Vergil and Longus pastoral freedom is sanctioned externally by the city (unlike in Theocritus). The farms and garden that Lamon tends belong to the

---

[9] Tityrus' praise of the *iuuenis* is partly based on Ptolemy Philadelphus in Theoc. *Id*. 17 (esp. 97-103), on which see Hunter (2006a) 268-9.
[10] Noted by Berranger-Auserve (2005) 54.
[11] Morgan (2012) 540.
[12] Segal (1981) 85 notes the absence in Theocritus of the Vergilian tension between 'threatening *urbs* and defenceless *rus*'.
[13] Hubbard (2006a) 501.

(initially unnamed) urban overlord Dionysophanes (ἀνδρὸς εὐδαίμονος, 1.1.2)—a master who, for the shepherds, is merely a name (Χλόην πρῶτον ἔμελλεν ὄψεσθαι δεσπότην, οὗ πρότερον μόνον ἤκουε τὸ ὄνομα, 4.6.2), just as Meliboeus is ignorant of the name of the *deus* in Rome who is responsible for Tityrus' freedom (1.18). Lamon's freedom and activities are predicated on ensuring Dionysophanes' continued goodwill. He hopes that the right marriage arrangement will result in his family's emancipation: ἐλευθέρους θήσει καὶ δεσπότας ἀγρῶν μειζόνων (3.26.3); Gnathon promises Daphnis his freedom in a bid to secure sexual favours: ἔφη ταχέως ἐλεύθερον θήσειν τὸ πᾶν δυνάμενος (4.11.3); after seeing the *paradeisos* Dionysophanes promises Lamon his freedom: ἐλεύθερον ἀφήσειν ἐπηγγέλλετο (4.13.3); and as part of the closural process Lamon and Myrtale earn their freedom: ἐλεύθερον αὐτὸν ἔθηκαν καὶ ἐλευθέραν τὴν γυναῖκα (4.32.3; cf. 4.33.2, where Lamon is given farmland and cattle). Dionysophanes also bequeaths land and property to Daphnis, who then rushes away to play the syrinx and water his goats (4.24.4-25.1),[14] directly recalling Tityrus' pastoral and musical activities endorsed by the *deus* in Rome (1.9f, quoted above; cf. *pascite ut ante boues, pueri*, 1.45). Lexemes with a semantic range connoting slavery and freedom only appear after the third book when the arrival of Dionysophanes and his train of urbanites are imminent.[15] *Libertas*, a key lexeme in Republican and Imperial socio-political discourse,[16] functions as one of the foremost anxieties of the cast of *Eclogue* 1: *libertas... respexit tamen et longo post tempore uenit... nec spes libertatis erat...* (1.27-32).[17] These concepts are therefore

---

[14] Vieillefond (1987) cxxii links this scene to Lucian *Dial. Deor.* 10.2, where Ganymede worries about his flock, untended since his move to Olympus.

[15] Bowie (2013). There is one exception at 2.23.3; other instances include 4.17.4, 2.23.3, 3.12.1, 4.1.1, 4.17.1, 4.19.3, 4.28.3.

[16] See Wirszubski (1950), and Morford (1991) and (1992) on Tacitus and Pliny respectively.

[17] On the social status of Tityrus in this poem see DuQuesnay (1981). In the context of Tityrus' relationship with Galatea, it is unclear whether *spes libertatis* refers to social or amatory *seruitium*. The issue of freedom also features briefly in the badinage between Comatas and Lacon (Theoc. *Id*. 5.5-8).

closely allied to the city-country dialectic underpinning the narrative, where social categories are endorsed by the presence of the city.[18]

In both Longus and the *Eclogues*, music is constitutive of pastoral harmony; when the autonomy of the pastoral world is compromised, music suffers.[19] In *Eclogue* 1 the dispossessed Meliboeus will sing no more (*carmina nulla canam*, 1.77; cf. ἡ δὲ ἐμὴ σῦριγξ σιωπᾷ, 1.18.2). *Eclogue* 9 amplifies the range of responses to political disruption, and the fragmentation and powerlessness of pastoral poetry become abiding features: Menalcas' poetry has not saved Moeris' land (9.2-4); the beech trees, symbols of Vergilian pastoral, are now broken (*ueteres, iam cacumina fracta, fagos*, 9.9); pastoral poetry is useless among weapons (9.11-3). By the same token, in Longus the irruption of external forces impinges on musical production: on hearing Daphnis' screams as he is driven off by pirates, Chloe drops the pipes (τὴν σύριγγα ῥίπτει, 1.28.3); after Chloe has been abducted by the Methymnaean invaders, Daphnis finds her pipes lying discarded on the ground (τὴν σύριγγα ἐρριμμένην, 2.21.2); and as he is chased by the urban parasite Gnathon, Daphnis drops his pipes (ῥίψας… τὴν σύριγγα, 4.22.2). The negative impact of external forces on the musical capacity of the pastoral world is a peculiarly Vergilian phenomenon.[20]

Loss of poetic memory is also a Vergilian keynote: Moeris wonders whether he can remember a song (*si ualeam meminisse*, 9.38); Lycidas can remember the tune,

---

[18] See Skoie (2006a) on the complexities of the city-country dialectic obtaining in the *Eclogues*; cf. Leach (1974) 96. Briand (2006) offers an analogous discussion of spatial modes in Longus. Bowie (2009) demonstrates how Longus deconstructs the traditional axiological propositions embodied in the 'good country' vs. 'bad city' dichotomy; on economic realism in Longus see Anderson (1982) 44, Winkler (1990) 107, Scarcella (1996), Morgan (2012) 551.

[19] Liviabella Furiani (1984), Maritz (1991), and Montiglio (2012) explore the role of music in Longus.

[20] Montiglio (2012) observes that love (and absence) engenders similar results in Longus' world, e.g. 1.17.4, 1.18.2, 2.7.6-7, 3.4.3; cf. also Theoc. *Id*. 3.52, 4.28.

but not the words (*numeros memini, si uerba tenerem*, 9.45); and Moeris recalls earlier days full of song, in contrast to his present loss of poetic memory and exiled voice (9.51-4):

> saepe ego longos
> cantando puerum memini me condere soles.
> nunc oblita mihi tot carmina, uox quoque Moerim
> iam fugit ipsa.

Poetic memory becomes a preoccupation of Daphnis when he hears sailors on a passing boat singing a rowing-song, which he tries to memorise: ἐπειρᾶτό τινα διασώσασθαι τῶν ᾀσμάτων, ὡς γένοιτο τῆς σύριγγος μέλη (3.22.1).[21] Daphnis attempts to 'preserve one of the songs in memory' (see *LSJ* s.v. II διασῴζω), and whilst not in the context of pastoral disruption, the sentiment replicates the anxiety felt by the Vergilian shepherds. It also exposes Longus' pastoral world (and the orality-fiction governing it)[22] to the same threat of disintegration that accompanies the entry of textuality and reliance on memory so central to the *Eclogues* (esp. *Ecl.* 9).[23]

6.3   Aspects of *Eclogue* 1 in Longus

Abandonment of the young is a major theme at the opening of both Longus and the first *Eclogue*. Longus' narrator explains how the goatherd Lamon discovered a baby (Daphnis) being suckled by a she-goat (1.2.1):[24]

---

[21] The episode precipitates the aetiology for the pastoral phenomenon of echo, which I argue at p. 258-9 to be a specifically Vergilian feature of the pastoral world.

[22] Breed (2006) is fundamental.

[23] Longus' knowledge of *Ecl.* 9 is confirmed by a further parallel: *quis caneret Nymphas? quis humum florentibus herbis/ spargeret aut uiridi fontis induceret umbra?* (9.19f); οἴχομαι, Νύμφαι φίλαι· οὐδὲ ὑμεῖς σῴζετε τὴν παρθένον τὴν ἐν ὑμῖν τραφεῖσαν. τίς ὑμᾶς στεφανώσει μετ᾽ ἐμέ; τίς τοὺς ἀθλίους ἄρνας ἀναθρέψει; τίς τὴν λάλον ἀκρίδα θεραπεύσει; (1.14.3-4); Clausen (1994) 273 notes the parallel. I discuss 2.5.3 and *Ecl.* 9.21f at p. 254-5.

[24] I discuss this passage at p. 269-70 in connection with Romulus and Remus.

δρυμὸς ἦν καὶ λόχμη βάτων καὶ <u>κιττὸς ἐπιπλανώμενος</u> καὶ <u>πόα μαλθακή</u>, καθ᾽ ἧς ἔκειτο τὸ παιδίον. ἐνταῦθα ἡ <u>αἲξ</u> θέουσα συνεχὲς ἀφανὴς ἐγίνετο πολλάκις καὶ <u>τὸν ἔριφον ἀπολιποῦσα</u> τῷ βρέφει παρέμενε.

This is mirrored by the later discovery of Chloe in similar circumstances (1.5.1-3). In the passage quoted, the she-goat abandons her own kid in order to suckle the human child. In *Eclogue* 1, the unfortunate Meliboeus explains how he has been leading his she-goats, one of whom has given birth to twins only to abandon them on a bare rock (1.12-15):

> en ipse <u>capellas</u>
> protinus aeger ago; hanc etiam uix, Tityre, duco.
> hic inter densas corylos modo namque gemellos,
> spem gregis, a! <u>silice in nuda</u> conixa <u>reliquit</u>.

In both authors, she-goats abandon their young (τὸν ἔριφον ἀπολιποῦσα; *gemellos, spem gregis… reliquit*). In contrast to the *locus amoenus* in Longus (κιττὸς ἐπιπλανώμενος καὶ πόα μαλθακή) Meliboeus' she-goat abandons her young on bare rock (*silice in nuda*), connotative of death;[25] where the actions of Longus' she-goat function to preserve life, Vergil's she-goat is symbolic of the bleaker side of triumviral Italy.[26]

The passage from Longus also exhibits a close lexical borrowing from the *Eclogues*. The thicket in which the she-goat suckles Daphnis is adorned with 'wandering ivy' (κιττὸς ἐπιπλανώμενος). In Theocritus, the verb used to describe this quality of ivy is μαρύεσθαι 'wind' (μαρύεται κισσός, *Id.* 1.29). Vergil, however, uses the verb *erro* 'wander' to describe ivy (*errantis hederas*, 4.19) in the Golden Age, when she-goats will return home of their own accord with full udders. Lipka suggests

---

[25] Leach (1974) 116.

[26] Meliboeus' initial complaint revolves around his displacement from his ancestral land: *nos patriae fìnis… fugimus patriam* (1.3f). Unlike the dispossessed Meliboeus, Cleariste describes Daphnis as herding his 'father's goats: σὸς υἱός ἐστι Δάφνις, καὶ <u>πατρῴας</u> ἔνεμεν αἶγας (4.21.3).

that Vergil is imitating Catullus, who uses precisely the same phrase (*hedera errans*, 61.34f). When describing plants, it is also Vergil's practice to use a present participle of a verb (instead of, for example, a main verb).[27] Longus, then, co-opts from Vergil both the lexeme and grammatical construction for his 'wandering ivy' (noun + participle). Two further phraseological parallels buttress this. The sequence by which Meliboeus says that he 'drives' and 'leads' his she-goats (*ago… duco*, 1.13) is reflected in an analogous sequence in Longus, in which Chloe 'drives' and 'leads' her flock home: ἀπ<u>ήλαυνε</u> δὲ καὶ ἡ Χλόη τὴν ποίμνην τῷ μέλει τῆς σύριγγος συν<u>άγουσα</u> (2.38.1).[28] The second example also involves the end of the herding day. Daphnis and Chloe drive their flocks home at the setting of the sun: καὶ τότε μὲν (<u>ἐπὶ δυσμαῖς γὰρ</u> <u>ἦν ὁ ἥλιος</u>) ἀπήλασαν <u>τὰς ἀγέλας</u> <u>οἴκαδε</u> (1.13.3). The combination of the setting of the sun and a homeward movement of flocks mirrors the final verse of the *Eclogue* book: *ite <u>domum</u> saturae, <u>uenit Hesperus</u>, ite <u>capellae</u>* (10.77).

Lastly, the scene of destruction faced by Daphnis and Lamon (after Lampis has vandalised the latter's garden, 4.7.1-8.4) reflects several elements of Meliboeus' jeremiad to Tityrus (1.46-58). The narrator describes the whole place as 'muddy': ἀποκεκόσμητο γὰρ ὁ τόπος καὶ ἦν λοιπὸν γῆ <u>πηλώδης</u> (4.8.1). Meliboeus is jealous of Tityrus' pastureland regardless of its marshy quality: *quamuis lapis omnia nudus/ <u>limosoque palus</u> obducat pascua iunco* (1.47f). Despite the vandalism to which it has been exposed, the flowers in Lamon's garden still attract bees, which buzz ceaselessly as if in lament: ἐπέκειντο δὲ καὶ μέλitται αὐτοῖς <u>συνεχὲς καὶ ἄπαυστον</u> βομβοῦσαι καὶ <u>θρηνούσαις ὅμοιον</u> (4.8.2). Meliboeus likewise describes how bees feed on the

---

[27] Lipka (2001) 83, 147-8.
[28] Observed by Heyworth (2007b) 352.

flowers in Tityrus' land, and how ring-doves and turtle-doves ceaselessly lament (1.53-8):

> Hyblaeis apibus florem depasta salicti
> saepe leui somnum suadebit inire susurro…
> nec tamen interea raucae, tua cura, palumbes
> nec gemere aeriae cessabit turtur ab ulmo.

With its bees and ceaseless wailing, Meliboeus' sentimentalisation of Tityrus' land provides the model for Lamon's vandalised garden. In addition, Lampis' vandalism of the garden has no precedent in Greek literature. Once again, the *Eclogues* provide the model (see also p. 256). Menalcas describes how he vandalised Micon's vineyard: *tum, credo, cum me arbustum uidere Miconis/ atque mala uitis incidere falce novellas* (3.10f); and Corydon sees his neglect of work as such an act: *heu heu, quid uolui misero mihi? floribus Austrum/ perditus et liquidis immisi fontibus apros* (2.58f). Lampis' activities reflect the content of these passages (4.7.3-4):

> δένδρα μὲν οὖν τέμνων ἔμελλεν ἁλώσεσθαι διὰ τὸν κτύπον· ἐπεῖχε δὲ τοῖς ἄνθεσιν, ὥστε διαφθεῖραι αὐτά. Νύκτα δὴ φυλάξας καὶ ὑπερβὰς τὴν αἱμασιὰν τὰ μὲν ἀνώρυξε, τὰ δὲ κατέκλασε, τὰ δὲ κατεπάτησεν ὥσπερ σῦς... Λάμων... ἔμελλεν ὕδωρ αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῆς πηγῆς ἐπάξειν...

He decides against taking an axe to the trees, and chooses instead to concentrate on spoiling the flowers (irrigated by a spring in the garden), which he tramples 'like a boar'. The nexus of images in the specific context of garden-vandalism is extremely similar.

6.4   Woods

Siluae 'woods' are the paradigmatic metonymical marker of Vergilian pastoral and the primary metageneric term 'through which Vergil marks his own achievement'.[29] The programmatic opening five lines of *Eclogue* 1 refer to the *Musa siluestris* (1.2) and *siluae* (1.5).[30] 'Woods' are prominent in *Eclogues* 4 and 6 'where the boundaries of pastoral are themselves at issue':[31] *si canimus <u>siluas</u>, <u>siluae</u> sint consule dignae* (4.4); *prima Syracosio dignata est ludere uersu/ nostra neque erubuit <u>siluas</u> habitare Thalea* (6.1f; cf. 10.62f). In *Id.* 1 Daphnis epitaphically announces himself: Δάφνις ἐγὼν ὅδε τῆνος ὁ τὰς βόας ὧδε νομεύων (1.120). But in the analogous line of Mopsus' song in *Eclogue* 5 there is an important addition marking the transference of Daphnis into Vergilian bucolic: *Daphnis ego <u>in siluis</u> hinc usque ad sidera notus* (5.43). In Theocritus, on the other hand, ὕλη 'wood' is never programmatic or a generic marker. It appears in only two bucolic *Idylls* and 'thus plays only a subordinate role'.[32] The promotion of woods comes with Vergil.[33]

In the first instance a connection between woods in Vergil and Longus is plausible because of the prominence of explicitly sylvan features in both.[34] Daphnis is responsible for narrating the first metadiegetic inset of the novel, namely, the myth of Phatta.[35] He and Chloe hear the sound a ring-dove singing a 'bucolic song from the wood' (βουκολικὸν ἐκ τῆς ὕλης φθεγξαμένη, 1.27.1), prompting Chloe to ask what it

---

[29] Quotation from Lipka (2001) 30; cf. Heyworth (2005) 149, Harrison (2007c) 31-2.
[30] There are twenty-two occurrences in the Eclogues, all in the plural (1.2, 1.5, 2.5, 2.31, 2.60, 2.62; 3.46, 3.57, 3.70, 4.3 (bis), 5.7, 5.28, 5.43, 5.58, 6.2, 6.39, 7.65, 7.68, 8.56, 8.58, 8.97, 10.8, 10.24, 10.52, 10.63).
[31] Harrison (2007c) 32.
[32] Lipka (2001) 31 n. 14; instances include *Id.* 1.116, 14.43, 22.36, [8.49], [25.158]. In [Moschus] *Lament for Bion* the Cranides mourn for Bion καθ' ὕλαν (28f) and the Βοιωτίδες ὗλαι mourn for Pindar (88).
[33] Cf. Hunter (1999) *ad Id.* 1.116.
[34] ὕλη occurs twelve times in Longus, all in the singular (1.27.1, 1.27.2, 2.20.2, 2.37.2, 3.16.2, 3.16.3, 3.20.1, 3.20.2, 4.14.1, 4.15.3 (*bis*), 4.40.3).
[35] See Kossaifi (2012) for detailed discussion of this myth in Longus. The φάσσα features as a love-gift in Theoc. *Id.* 5.96f, imitated at *Ecl.* 3.68f.

is saying. The adjective βουκολικός is well known from the programmatic pastoral refrain of *Id*. 1 (ἄρχετε βουκολικᾶς, Μοῖσαι φίλαι, ἄρχετ᾽ ἀοιδᾶς),[36] and in the neuter plural functions as shorthand for Theocritean pastoral (e.g. Ps.-Longinus *De Subl.* 33.4);[37] but it is also known in antiquity as the title of Vergil's *Eclogues*.[38] Phatta's song becomes further generically marked by the qualification that the sound derives ἐκ τῆς ὕλης. Daphnis then explains that the dove used to be a beautiful maiden who herded her cattle in the woods, as well as being a songstress: ἔνεμε βοῦς πολλὰς οὕτως ἐν ὕλῃ· ἦν δὲ ἄρα καὶ ᾠδικὴ (1.27.2). She encounters a boy who is endowed with identical qualities: παῖς οὐ μακρὰν νέμων βοῦς, καὶ αὐτὸς καλὸς καὶ ᾠδικὸς ὡς ἡ παρθένος (1.27.3). The combination of herding cattle and playing music embodies the bucolic *libertas* awarded to Tityrus by the *iuuenis* in Rome: *ille meas errare boues, ut cernis, et ipsum/ ludere quae uellem calamo permisit agresti* (1.9f). In addition, the combination of beauty, woods, and herding recalls Daphnis' epitaph (partly quoted above): *Daphnis ego in <u>siluis</u>.../ <u>formosi</u> <u>pecoris custos, formosior</u> ipse* (5.43f; cf. *Id.* 1.120f, where the elements of woods and beauty are absent). The boy and the maiden engage in a musical competition, which results in the loss of the maiden's eight best cows to the boy. Daphnis explains that the song currently being produced by the dove is that of the maiden, metamorphosed into a dove, still searching for her 'wandering' cows—just as Tityrus' cows are allowed to 'wander': βοῦς ζητεῖ πεπλανημένας (1.27.4); *meas errare boues* (1.9).[39] Finally, Phatta (Mrs. Ring-dove) 'even now sings of her misfortune' just as ring-doves and turtle-doves 'ceaselessly lament' in *Eclogue* 1: καὶ ἔτι νῦν ᾄδουσα μηνύει τὴν συμφοράν (1.27.4); *nec tamen interea raucae, tua*

---

[36] Cf. Theocritus' use of the verb βουκολιάζεσθαι (*Id.* 5.44, 60, 7.36, 9.1, 5) and Artemidorus of Tarsus = [Theoc.] *Ep.* 26.1 (Βουκολικαὶ Μοῖσαι σποράδες ποκά, νῦν δ᾽ ἅμα πᾶσαι).
[37] Hunter (1999) 5, 27.
[38] See Horsfall (2001) 27-8, citing Macr. *Sat.* 5.17.20.
[39] The only use of the verb πλανάομαι in Theocritus occurs at [Theoc.] *Id.* 9.4 (in the context of herding).

cura, palumbes/ nec gemere aeria cessabit turtur ab ulmo (1.57f). The intertextual engagement is functional: both passages thematise (the potential for) pastoral and musical loss.

In a further passage loaded with metaliterary implications, the wood is characterised as 'low-lying'. Lycaenion claims to Daphnis that an eagle has stolen one of her geese, but dropped it into the low-lying wood because of its weight: μέγα φορτίον ἀράμενος… εἰς τήνδε τὴν ὕλην τὴν ταπεινὴν ἔχων κατέπεσε (3.16.2). Vergil likewise self-deprecatingly refers to his poetry book as 'low-lying': *non omnis arbusta iuuant humilisque myricae;/ si canimus siluas siluae sint consule dignae* (*Ecl.* 4.2f; cf. 6.10f *te nostrae, Vare, myricae,/ te nemus omne canet*).[40] For both Pattoni and Lefteratou, Longus' 'low-lying wood' stands for his own pastoral romance in contrast to the 'high rock' (ὑψηλὴν πέτραν, 3.16.2) of the *Odyssey*, from whence Lycaenion's goose-narrative derives (*Od.* 15.160-3, 19.536-43).[41] Both Longus and Vergil therefore describe their literary woods as 'low-lying' in contexts where the humility of their pastoral is being contrasted to higher literary modes.

Elsewhere in Longus, woods are not only a site of pastoral activity, but also a place of refuge from sexual violence (Syrinx, 2.37.2;[42] Chloe, 4.14.1) and a venue for a consensual sexual encounter (Lycaenion and Daphnis, 3.15-20).[43] This might suggest the mediating influence of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, in which woods are frequently eroticised as sites of sexual violence (e.g. Daphne and Apollo, 1.474-80;

---

[40] Lipka (2002) 135 n. 15 notes that the two Theocritean occurrences of tamarisks (ὡς τὸ κάταντες τοῦτο γεώλοφον αἵ τε μυρῖκαι, *Id*. 1.13 = 5.101) lack the self-referentiality of Vergil.
[41] Pattoni (2004a) 93, Lefteratou (2010) 314.
[42] Cf. *Ach*. 8.6.7, where Syrinx flees into the wood.
[43] Cf. Lucretius' history of man's development, in which man first copulated in the woods: *et Venus in siluis iungebat corpora amantum* (5.962).

Callisto and Jupiter, 2.438; Philomela and Tereus, 6.546f).[44] The final sentence of the novel, describing the wedding night of Daphnis and Chloe, combines the pastoral and sexual resonance of woods, and reframes the entire narrative as having taken place 'in/at the edge of the woods': καὶ ἔδρασέ τι Δάφνις ὧν αὐτὸν ἐπαίδευσε Λυκαίνιον, καὶ τότε Χλόη πρῶτον ἔμαθεν ὅτι τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς ὕλης γινόμενα ἦν ποιμένων παίγνια (4.40.3).[45] Here the woods are a signifier of both pastoral and sexual activity, providing a venue for the ποιμένων παίγνια 'shepherds' games'.[46] This phrase looks very much like a translation of the elements contained in the final two lines of the *Georgics*, which themselves function as a periphrasis of the *Eclogues*: *carmina qui lusi pastorum audaxque iuuenta,/ Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi* (4.565f). 'Playing' is traditionally the province of love and youth, to be contrasted with marital and progenerative sex;[47] it is also a familiar way of troping (especially love) poetry.[48] Though Aelian characterises Theocritus as ὁ τῶν νομευτικῶν παιγνίων συνθέτης (*N.A.* 15.19),[49] Theocritus himself nowhere tropes the composition of pastoral poetry as 'play'.[50] Vergil, however, does frame the musical activities of his herdsman, and indeed his own composition of pastoral poetry, as 'play': *ille…/ ludere quae uellem calamo permisit agresti* (1.9f); *prima Syracosio dignata est ludere uersu* (6.1); *posthabui tamen illorum mea seria ludo* (7.17).[51] This latter example, and the contrast between work and play it embodies, is picked up elsewhere by Longus, who describes

---

[44] See Parry (1964) and Segal (1969) on places of natural beauty in the *Metamorphoses* as sites of (sexual) violence.

[45] On the phrase ἐπὶ τῆς ὕλης see Morgan (2004b) *ad* 4.40.3, (2012) 545, Hardie (2006) 283 n. 18.

[46] For discussion of this phrase see Bowie (2005a) 82-3, M. Jones (2012) 78-9, Gillespie (2012) 442. Edmonds (1916) emends ποιμένων to παιδέων, accepted by Winkler (1990) 124.

[47] Carson (1986) 149.

[48] See e.g. Philod. *A.P.* 5.112.5; Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.214-6; Ov. *Ars* 3.809, *Tr.* 3.3.73; see Pichon (1902) s.v. *ludere*. L. Morgan (2003) discusses 'childlike poetics' and 'love-as-play' in Ovid.

[49] Gorgias *Helen* 21 (fr. 11 D-K) markets itself as a παίγνιον (meaning something like a 'literary exercise'); and Philitas is known to have composed παίγνια (*CA* 10-11).

[50] Bernsdorff (2006) 186 talks of an 'infantilisation' of the pastoral world visible in [Theoc.] *Id.* 8.3 on the basis of the youth of the herdsmen.

[51] Cf. also [Verg.] *Culex* 1: *lusimus Octaui gracili modulante Thalia*.

how Eros plans something 'serious' while Daphnis and Chloe 'play games': τοιαῦτα δὲ αὐτῶν <u>παιζόντων</u> τοιάνδε <u>σπουδὴν</u> Ἔρως ἀνέπλασε (1.11.1).[52]

Commenting on the phrase *carmina qui lusi pastorum*, Servius notes that it evokes the title of Vergil's *Bucolica*: *qui etiam Bucolica scripsi* (Serv. *Georg.* 4.564.1; cf. Serv. *Ecl.* 1.10.1).[53] As the object of the verb *lusi*, which throughout the *Eclogues* has been the designator of pastoral composition, *carmina pastorum* can be translated as the 'playful pastoral compositions of herdsmen' and serves as a periphrasis for the *Eclogues* as a whole. This is precisely the semantic import of Longus' ποιμένων παίγνια, which can also be translated as 'playful pastoral compositions of herdsmen', especially when they are so pointedly described as having taken place ἐπὶ τῆς ὕλης, the metonymical signifier of the *Eclogues*.

The question remains as to why there is such a heavily Romanising literary presence at the end of the narrative. Part of the explanation, I suggest, has to do with the existential choice of Daphnis and Chloe not to return to the city and live out their lives as urbanites; they instead choose to spend the rest of their lives in pastoral style: ἔστε ἔζων τὸν πλεῖστον χρόνον <βίον> ποιμενικὸν εἶχον (4.39.1).[54] Both the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics* thematise the idea of poetic progress and career: *surgamus* (*Ecl.* 10.75) announces the movement from the *Eclogues* to the *Georgics*, and whilst the end of the *Georgics* recurs to the beginning of the *Eclogues*, the proem to the third book announces the project of the *Aeneid*.[55] The four lines prefacing the *Aeneid*,

---

[52] The games played by Daphnis and Chloe include prototypical pastoral activities such as making cricket-cages and panpipes (1.10.1-2; cf. *Id.* 1.52f, *Ecl.* 10.71).

[53] See p. 236 n. 38 above.

[54] <βίον> *add*. Reeve (1982).

[55] See Putnam (2010) on Vergil's literary career, and Hardie (1993) 102 on post-Vergilian imitation; on poetic careers more generally see the essays in Hardie and Moore (2010).

preserved in the *Vita Donati* (41),[56] are the clearest articulation of Vergil's generic ascent:

> ille ego qui quondam gracili modulatus auena
> carmen et egressus siluis uicina coegi
> ut quamuis auido parerent arua colono,
> gratum opus agricolis, at nunc horrentia Martis…

As I shall discuss further in connection with the Methymnaean invasion (section 6.11), Longus mobilises the Vergilian poetic career in order to reject its ultimate destination, the *Aeneid*, and everything it represents—that is, Rome and empire as the entelechy of human civilisation; it thereby constitutes a *recusatio* of Rome's 'master narrative' as embodied in Vergil's career. The Greek author of *P.Oxy.* 3537, which contains a third- or fourth-century ethopoea of Hesiod, also exhibits knowledge of the Vergilian poetic career such as we find in other Latin poets of the first century CE (e.g. Calp. Sic. 4.160-3, *Laus Pisonis* 230-5).[57] Longus is therefore not alone in his knowledge and manipulation of Vergil's literary career. The presence of the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* at the end of the novel obstructs any progression towards imperial epic and prevents Rome from developing beyond its origins of a community of shepherds (on which see section 6.9).

6.5   Greenness and willow

---

[56] Hansen (1972) argues that Vergil is responsible for these lines; cf. also *Vita Donati* 36 (*cecini pascua rura duces*). Further discussions include Conte (1986) 84-7, Farrell (2004) 46-52, Kraggerud (2010/11), and Kayachev (2011) with extensive bibliography at 75 n. 2.

[57] Bernsdorff (1999) and Miguelez Cavero (2008) 51 discuss the connections of *P.Oxy.* 3537 with Vergil(ian biography).

The lexeme *uiridis* is another marker of Vergilian bucolic.[58] It occurs eleven times in the *Eclogues* and in each instance it qualifies some aspect of the bucolic landscape.[59] In Greek the adjectives χλωρός and χλοερός are the closest analogues. Occurrences in Theocritus are far fewer and less systematic, with only three in the so-called bucolic *Idylls,* and seven elsewhere.[60] Vergil's codification of the pastoral world as 'green' contributes to the semiotics of *Daphnis and Chloe* in three capacities.

Firstly, the adjective χλωρός occurs twelve times and each time it is used in connection with the greenness of leaves or willow (i.e., it qualifies pastoral elements).[61] Daphnis cuts φυλλάδα χλωράν as fodder for the kids after pasture (1.21.1); he does this again just before the Methymnaean raid, but in this instance he is significantly qualified as foraging 'in the woods' (2.20.2).

Secondly, the marker is used three times to describe the 'willow' (ἡ λύγος): the Methymnaeans make a rope out of λύγον δὲ χλωρὰν μακράν (2.13.3); Daphnis' goats eat τὴν λύγον τὴν χλωράν (2.13.4); and the Methymnaeans explain that they moored their ship with λύγῳ χλωρᾷ, on which Daphnis' goats proceeded to feast (2.15.2, cf. 2.16.3, 3.27.3). The connection to willow is significant because the Latin willow (*salix/salictum*) is a permanent fixture in the *Eclogues* but never features in Theocritus.[62] Likewise, Vergil consistently characterises it as fodder for goats: *non me pascente, capellae,/ florentem cytisum et salices carpetis amaras* (*Ecl.* 1.77f); *lenta*

---

[58] Martindale (1997) 109.
[59] 1.75, 1.80, 2.9, 2.30, 5.13, 6.59, 7.12, 7.46, 8.87, 9.20, 10.74; the *Georgics* and *Aeneid* contain nine and eighteen instances respectively, often modifying bucolic nouns.
[60] 7.9, 11.3, 13.41, 14.70, 15.119, 25.21, 25.158, 25.220, 25.231, 28.4.
[61] 1.5.1 (cf. Ov. *Met.* 1.675f); 1.17.4, 1.21.1, 1.21.4, 2.2.5, 2.3.4, 2.13.3, 2.13.4, 2.15.2, 2.20.2, 4.38.1, 4.38.4.
[62] Grant (2004) 130 observes that willow has various established uses in Roman Italy. On botanic realism in Theocritus see Lindsell (1937). At 2.16.3 Daphnis explains how his goats had no arbutus or thyme to eat: thyme is not a feature of Theocritus' pastoral world, but does occur in Ecl. 5.77, 7.37. Cf. also 2.3.4 (ἴα ἀμφότερα) with Ecl. 2.47 (*pallentis uiolas*) and 10.39 (*nigrae uiolae*).

salix feto pecori (*Ecl.* 3.83; cf. *Georg.* 4.234-6);[63] and it is qualified by the adjective *lentus* 'supple' and *glaucus* 'sea-green', the latter participating in the semantic range of χλωρός: *lenta salix quantum pallenti cedit oliuae* (*Ecl.* 5.16); *glauca canentia fronde salicta* (*Georg.* 2.13); *glaucas salices* (*Georg.* 4.182). Both Longus and Vergil, then, characterise willow as goat-food, but in Longus willow becomes a highly charged generic marker: the goats nibble at the willow used by the Methymnaeans as a mooring-rope,[64] in turn precipitating their coastal raid and abduction of Chloe. This constitutes what we might call a 'misuse' of the willow: Daphnis rhetorically asks who would be so daft as to use willow to moor a ship (2.16.3). The willow becomes even more negatively charged by a further misuse on the part of the Methymnaeans, who use willow twigs to beat Chloe like a goat or sheep: ὥσπερ αἶγα ἢ πρόβατον παίοντες λύγοις (2.20.3).[65] The urban Methymnaeans fail to understand the rules of pastoral and misuse a Vergilian generic marker.

Thirdly, the name Chloe is linked etymologically to the adjectives χλωρός and χλοερός, in her case connoting the greenness of youth, innocence, and virginity; the noun ἡ χλόη also means 'green shoot',[66] and Nisbet and Hubbard observe that 'the name suggests greenness and immaturity'.[67] Her name occurs a total of one hundred and eighty-one times in Longus,[68] and Pan describes her as the material from which Eros intends to make a story: παρθένον, ἐξ ἧς Ἔρως μῦθον ποιῆσαι θέλει (2.27.2). Her name is therefore a marker of Longus' pastoral world and is described as a

---

[63] It is also food for bees: *florem salicti* (*Ecl.* 1.54); other occurrences of willow at *Ecl.* 3.65, 10.40.
[64] Varro etymologically links *caprae* 'goats' and *carpo* 'nibble': *a carpendo caprae nominatae* (*R.R.* 2.3.7; cf. Verg. *Georg.* 2.378f and Appendix 3).
[65] For a more 'proper' use of willow see, for example, 2.1.2 where it is chopped for fuel by the country folk.
[66] See *LSJ* s.v. I.1, I.2; cf. Cat. 17.14 (*uiridissimo nupta flore puella*).
[67] Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) *ad* Hor. *C.* 1.23.1. Hunter (1983) 17 notes that it is a frequent Horatian name (*C.* 3.7.10, 3.9.6, 3.26.12) and also a cult-title of Demeter (Athen. 14.618d, Paus. 1.22.3, Soph. *O.C.* 1600). Morgan (2011) 158 links Chloe-Demeter to Philitas' *Demeter*.
[68] One questionable instance at 4.29.5.

ποιμενικὸν ὄνομα (1.6.1), though it features in no extant pastoral poetry. On the basis that Chloe stands for the putative pastoral poetry of Philitas, Morgan suggests that the marriage of Daphnis and Chloe stands poetologically for the marriage of Theocritus and Philitas;[69] but if χλωρός is a Greek version of a Vergilian generic marker, then it makes sense to construe the marriage of Daphnis and Chloe as a marriage between Theocritus and a Greek version of Vergil.

6.6   The δρῦς, the φηγός, and the parched ὀξύα

At the beginning of the novel, the narrator describes how he was hunting in a grove (θηρῶν ἐν ἄλσει, *pr.* 1). In both the Greek and Roman literary tradition the grove often has metaliterary associations, as does the activity of 'hunting', with its connotations of searching for literary material.[70] He describes the grove as follows: καλὸν μὲν καὶ τὸ ἄλσος, πολύδενδρον, ἀνθηρόν, κατάρρυτον (*pr.* 1).[71] The adjective πολύδενδρος 'with many (types of) trees' brings with it the suggestion that, in this narrative, the reader is to be alive to the literary associations of specific dendronyms, which become heavily codified in Roman literary discourse.[72]

---

[69] Morgan (2011) 158.

[70] On the poet-as-hunter topos in Longus see Paschalis (2005), and Macleod (1983) on Catullus C. 116. Hunter (2008) 784-5 notes that the grove in the prologue is a 'literary site' and that 'such beautiful markers of literary inspiration are a commonplace of (particularly Roman) poetry'; cf. M.C. Edwards (1997) 239 citing *Ecl.* 6.72f and Prop. 3.1.1-6. Spanoudakis (2002) 228-30 suggests that the *nemus* and *antrum* in Prop. 3.1.2, 43 derive from Philitas' Demeter. See my Appendix 4.

[71] Pausanias' description of the Grynaean grove is comparable (1.21.7).

[72] For vegetal metaphors in Roman literary discourse see Bretin-Chabrol (2012); Maggiulli (1995) focuses on Vergil. On dendronyms in Horace see Fenton (2008); on the catalogue at Ov. *Met.* 10.86-105 see Pöschl (1968); on the catalogue in the *Culex* see Barrett (1970), for that at Verg. *Georg.* 2.83-108 see Basson (1981), (1982); on Cat. 64 see Sebesta (2000). On Vergil cf. also Nethercut (1967). See Sargeaunt (1920) for a discussion of trees, shrubs, and plants in Vergil, and André (1985) for Roman literature more generally.

The dendronym φηγός 'holm-oak' constitutes a marker of Vergilian pastoral owing to the homophony with the Vergilian *fagus* 'beech tree', the programmatic tree of the *Eclogues*. Di Marco argues that Eros, during his epiphany in Philetas' garden, articulates Philetas' biography in three stages, each of which represents a key author in the literary history of pastoral from Theocritus, to Vergil, to Longus.[73] The second stage is Vergilian: παρήμην σοι συρίττοντι πρὸς ταῖς φηγοῖς ἐκείναις, ἡνίκα ἤρας Ἀμαρυλλίδος (2.5.3). I shall briefly explore the poetic pedigrees of the δρῦς and φηγός/*fagus*, and their place within the semiotic economy of Longus' narrative as markers of Theocritean and Vergilian pastoral respectively, especially when in conjunction with the modifier συνήθης. I shall also suggest that the use of the hapax ὀξύα 'beech tree' during the Methymnaean episode underwrites the identification of the φηγός with the Vergilian *fagus* and the role it plays in Longus' narrative.

The δρῦς has a rich literary pedigree in the Greek tradition. In Hesiod it is an attribute of the 'just city' (*Op*. 232-4; cf. Verg. *Georg*. 1.159), and in Callimachus it has erotic associations, especially in connection with Artemis and Aphrodite.[74] In Theocritus it retains its erotic flavour (1.106, 5.61, 5.117), becomes an agent of bucolic lament (7.74; cf. Bion *Lament for Adonis* 32, [Moschus] *Lament for Bion* 21), and part of the furniture of the *locus amoenus* (1.23, 5.45, 5.102, 7.88, 8.46; *Ep*. 4.1, 5.5).[75] There are a total of fifteen occurrences of the δρῦς in Theocritus, making it the most recurrent tree in the corpus.[76]

---

[73] Di Marco (2006) 485-92.
[74] Giangrande (1983) on Call. *H*. 3.119-123; Giangrande (1977) links Aphrodite to the δρῦς on the basis of Theoc. *Id*. 1.106f.
[75] See Schönbeck (1962) on the characteristics of the Theocritean *locus amoenus*. See Billault (1996b) and Cusset (2005) for other recurrent trees in Theocritus. The pine (πίτυς) has obvious programmatic force in Theocritus (Hubbard (1998) 49 n. 11), appearing in the first line of *Id*. 1, as well as at 1.134, 3.38, 5.49. Hunter (1999) 71, 121 observes that Vergil's placement of the *fagus* at the beginning of his collection is comparable to Theocritus' placement of πίτυς; and Hubbard (1998) 156 recognises that Calpurnius Siculus places *pinus* and *fagus* near the beginning of his first *Eclogue* (1.9; 1.11). In Longus

In Longus' novel, the δρῦς has a narrative function. Cusset analyses each occurrence and detects an increasing specificity (and decreasing randomness) as the narrative progresses.[77] Initially, the protagonists sit and inspect Daphnis' injuries: καθίσαντες ἐπὶ στελέχει δρυός (1.12.5). A little later Daphnis sits under his 'usual' oak and plays the pipes: ὁ μὲν Δάφνις ὑπὸ <u>τῇ δρυῒ τῇ συνήθει</u> καθεζόμενος ἐσύριττε (1.13.5). Not only does the definite article denote increasing specificity, but the modifier συνήθει serves as a metaliterary marker, footnoting the δρῦς as a Theocritean site of pastoral piping.[78] Elsewhere, the δρῦς functions as a venue for the pair's erotic progress (2.11.1), and a combination of erotic and pastoral activities (2.38.3, 3.12.2; cf. 3.16.1).

The adjective συνήθης is significant. It translates *solitus* (and cognates), a self-referential marker peculiar to Roman literary discourse. The adjective is not part of the lexical apparatus of Theocritus, Apollonius, Callimachus, Posidippus, or Aratus. It is not until the Romans that 'usual' becomes a way of troping literary tradition and allusion. For example, Corydon in *Eclogue* 2 sings about what he usually does (*canto quae solitus*, 2.23) thereby alluding to the lovelorn singers of Theoc. *Id*. 3, 6, and 11; Menalcas accuses Damoetas of being an awful songster in *Eclogue* 3 (*non tu in triuiis, indocte, solebas/ stridenti miserum stipula disperdere carmen?*, 3.26f), self-reflexively annotating the bickering singers of Theoc. *Id*. 5; and in *Eclogue* 6 Linus

the πίτυς is systematically associated with Pan (1.27.2, 2.24.2, 2.32.2, 2.39.1, 3.12.2, 4.39.2). Pine trees are a central feature of literary rustic landscapes (Plato *Phdr*. 259a, Myrinus *A.P*. 7.703, adesp. *A.Plan*. 12.1).

[76] *Id*. 1.23, 1.106, 5.45, 5.61, 5.102, 5.117, 7.74, 7.88, 8.46, 8.79, 9.19, 11.51, 26.3; *Ep*. 4.1, 5.5.

[77] Cusset (2005).

[78] Cusset (2005) 171 and Morgan (2012) 543 with n. 11 suggest that συνήθης is proleptic.

presides over Gallus' poetic investiture with the pipes Hesiod used to sing with (6.69-71):

> dixerit: 'hos tibi dant calamos (en accipe) Musae,
> Ascraeo quos ante seni, quibus ille <u>solebat</u>
> cantando rigidas deducere montibus ornos...'

All of these instances occur in the context of poetic production, confirming the lexeme's use as a self-referential marker. This will prove relevant in the context of Longus' φηγός.

The φηγός has a tradition as rich as the δρῦς.[79] It is associated with Zeus (Hom. *Il.* 5.693)[80] and Dodona (Hes. fr. 240.8, 319 West; Soph. *Trach.* 171; Euphorion *CA* fr. 2.1; *SH* 418.28); in Aristaenetus' prose paraphrase of Callimachus' Acontius and Cydippe episode (*Aet.* 3 fr. 67-75) it is paired with the elm as the tree under which Acontius sits in isolation to sing his erotic lament (*Ep.* 1.10.53-9); likewise in Theocritus the lover relates how he 'hastens to [his beloved] as a wayfarer to a shady holm-oak in the scorching sun': σκιερὴν δ' ὑπὸ <u>φηγόν</u>/ ἠελίου φρύγοντος ὁδοιπόρος ἔδραμον ὥς τις (*Id.* 12.8f). Elsewhere it is associated with acorns (αὖαι φαγοὶ, *Id.* 9.19f),[81] obedience to Orpheus' music (φηγοὶ δ' ἀγριάδες, Ap. Rh. *Arg.* 1.28), and Pan (φηγοὶ Πανὸς ἄγαλμα, Nicander *Georgica* 2 fr. 69 G-S; cf. Prop. 1.18.20).

---

[79] Pedianus Dioscorides suggests that the φηγός and δρῦς can be interchangeable: ἡ φηγὸς δὲ καὶ ἡ πρῖνος εἴδη ὄντα δρυὸς ἐοικότα ἐνεργεῖ (*De Mat. Med.* 1.106.2); and Sophocles uses both dendronyms to described the Dodonian oak (*Trach.* 171, 1168).

[80] For a connection with Jupiter, see Varro *D.L.L.* 5.152 (*fagutal a fago*).

[81] Servius *Aen.* 6.772.4 links the *fagus* to eating acorns: *causae uitae in hac arbore hominibus fuit, qui glandibus uescebantur, unde etiam fagus dicta est* ἀπὸ τοῦ φαγεῖν.

The *fagus* 'beech' lacks the literary pedigree of the φηγός, and is not technically the same species of tree. O'Hara cites the *fagus* as an instance of 'translation with paranomasia' or 'translation by homonym'.[82] Varro thinks that the φηγός and the *fagus* are in fact the same tree: *fagus quas Graeci* φηγούς *uocant* (*ap.* Charis. Gramm. 1.130.5 *GL*).[83] Its first appearance in Latin is in Catullus 64, in which it is one of the arboreal wedding gifts given by Peneos to Peleus and Thetis (*altas fagos*, 64.288f).[84] Vergil instantiates the *fagus* as the programmatic tree of the *Eclogues* (*Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi*, 1.1), in which it subsequently occurs in a variety of contexts. The disconsolate lover Corydon seeks the shade of beech in the heat (*densas, umbrosa cacumina, fagos*, 2.3);[85] this constitutes a bucolicisation of both the simile in Theoc. *Id*. 12 quoted above,[86] and of the site of Acontius' lament in Callimachus.[87] In the second *Eclogue*, they are described as *ueteres* (3.12; cf. Soph. *Trach*. 171), and in the third and fifth *Eclogues*, the *fagus* becomes a vehicle of pastoral inscription and writing and, by extension, a metonym of the *Eclogues* book itself (3.36f, 5.13-5).[88] Whether Vergil's *fagus* denotes the beech or holm-oak, it can be said with certainty that he bucolicised the φηγός, rendering it a specifically pastoral tree and a signifier of the *Eclogues* (similarly Calpurnius: 1.11, 1.20, 2.59, 4.35, 7.5).

---

[82] O'Hara (1996) 243-4. For historical-linguistic analysis of the connection between φηγός and *fagus* see Blazek (2002).

[83] Lipka (2002) argues, on the basis of Varro's statement, that Vergil also identifies his *fagus* with the φηγός.

[84] The dearth of any reference to the *fagus* prior to Catullus perhaps suggests a lost instantiation in Gallus. The neoteric appositional construction (known as the schema cornelianum, on which see Solodow (1986)) of *densas, umbrosa cacumina, fagos* (*Ecl*. 2.3) and *ueteres, cacumina fracta, fagos* (*Ecl*. 9.9) strengthen the case; but G.W. Williams (1968) 317-19 argues that the popularity of the *fagus* must have originated with Vergil.

[85] Theophrastus *Hist. Plant*. 3.8.4 describes the φηγός as stunted and leafy, therefore making it a good tree at which to seek shade.

[86] So DuQuesnay (1981) 50, O'Hara (1996) 243-4, Lipka (2002).

[87] For Kennedy (1987) 50 'Vergil's *fagi* were borrowed from Callimachus' φηγοί, whether by Vergil himself or Gallus'; cf. also Cairns (1969) 133.

[88] See Breed (2006) 52-74.

In Longus' narrative there are four instances of the dendronym φηγός. I have already discussed the first instance in which it metaleptically marks the 'Vergilian' stage in Philetas' career (2.5.3). The three further instances, which Cusset rightly suggests are associated with the *absence* of Chloe,[89] are as follows: realising that Chloe has been abducted by the Methymnaeans, Daphnis 'runs to the oak where they used to sit' (πρὸς τὴν φηγὸν ἔτρεχεν ἔνθα ἐκαθέζοντο, 2.21.3); following Chloe's rescue by Pan, they rush to their 'usual oak' (ἐπὶ τὴν συνήθη φηγόν, 2.30.2)—again, the self-referential marker συνήθη both imparts specificity to the dramatic fiction, as well as annotating Vergil's *fagus*; finally, after Chloe has fled from the arrival of the urban crowd into the woods (Χλόη μὲν οὖν εἰς τὴν ὕλην ἔφυγεν, 4.14.1), Cleariste requests that Daphnis give an exhibition of his skill in controlling the animals with his music (4.15.1), and he chooses the φηγός as his location: στὰς ὑπὸ τῇ φηγῷ (4.15.2).

The δρῦς and the φηγός occupy different spaces within the semiotic economy of the novel. In the tightly patrolled and highly codified tradition of pastoral literature, the φηγός functions as a generic marker of Vergilian pastoral (in contrast to the Theocritean δρῦς). Not only does Philetas pipe in the same position as Tityrus in the programmatic incipit of the *Eclogues* (2.5.3; *Ecl.* 1.1-2; cf. *Georg.* 4.566), but the two instances at 2.21.3 and 2.30.2 occur just after Chloe's kidnap and just after her return (respectively) and thus occupy a crucial position, framing Chloe's abduction by the Methymnaeans and their irruption into the pastoral world. Longus ensures that δρῦς-situations connote Theocritean heterosexuality and the positive development of the pair's erotic relationship; he identifies the Vergilian φηγός, on the other hand, with Chloe's absence and her abduction by the incoming Methymnaeans.

---

[89] Cusset (2005) 173 n. 43.

There is further evidence of the Vergilian freighting of the dendronym φηγός. During the Methymnaean raid on the coastal farms, Daphnis goes up to the wood to collect fodder for his goats: ἐς τὴν ὕλην ἀνελθὼν φυλλάδα χλωρὰν ἔκοπτεν (2.20.2). I have discussed above how *siluae* and *uiridis* are discursive markers of Vergilian pastoral. Here, Daphnis' location in the *wood* cutting *green* leaves signifies to the reader that the narrative has entered a Vergilian mode. Seeing the raid on his own farm, Daphnis hides in the trunk of a dead 'beech tree' (ἐνέκρυψεν αὐτὸν στελέχει κοίλῳ ξηρᾶς ὀξύης, 2.20.2), and Chloe's abduction immediately follows. The significance of this dendronym has never been discussed. It is comparatively rare, and elsewhere occurs in the context of Italy and Rome.[90] It is possible to read in the 'parched beech' a polemical reference to Vergil's *Eclogues*. The dendronym ὀξύα is a learned acknowledgment that Vergil's *fagus* is *not* semantically coterminous with the Greek φηγός. Further, the modifier ξηρός could suggest that Vergilian pastoral is, like the ὀξύα, dead. This is confirmed by the location of the ὀξύα in a place larded with Vergilian pastoral markers, as well as being in the context of disruption of pastoral autonomy brought about by the Methymnaean invasion. In addition, in literary-critical discourse ξηρός connotes stylistic aridity (e.g. Demetr. *Eloc*. 238; cf. *LSJ* s.v. II.2), and may therefore articulate a broadside at Vergilian pastoral.

Daphnis' cutting of leaves also activates a specific Vergilian intertext in this context. In *Eclogue* 9 Lycidas suggests to Moeris that they stop and sing at the spot where the farmers cut the leaves: *hic, ubi densas/ agricolae stringunt frondes* (9.60f).

---

[90] Theophr. *Hist. Plant*. 5.8.3, Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 20.15.1.

His suggestion is prompted by the appearance of the tomb of Bianor,[91] a marker of death and war on the boundaries of the pastoral landscape. Earlier in the same poem a raven had warned Moeris and Menalcas 'from a hollow oak' (*caua ab ilice*, 9.15) not to continue protesting about the new *possessores*.[92] In *Eclogue* 9 both the hollow oak and the tomb of Bianor signify death and pastoral loss, just as the hollow beech in which Daphnis hides marks the moment in the narrative at which Chloe is abducted and pastoral harmony is destroyed. Longus neatly activates the analogous context in *Eclogue* 9, a poem in which Vergilian pastoral reaches a nadir of failure, and in which the final appearance of the *fagus* qualifies them as 'broken' (*ueteres, iam cacumina fracta, fagos*, 9.9).

6.7   Philetas' Garden and the Epiphany of Eros (2.3-7)

Philetas' garden is a metapoetic space in which Longus negotiates various aspects of pastoral and Vergilian literary history.[93] Particular curiosity attaches to the person of Philetas himself. At the level of the dramatic fiction, he is an old gardener and ex-herdsman, who encounters Eros in his garden, and reports the epiphany to Daphnis and Chloe. I shall suggest that certain elements of Philetas' biography—including his old age, past and present vocations (herdsman and gardener), wife (Amaryllis), and children (who are herdsmen and farmers)—can be activated in connection with Vergil. I also suggest that Longus deliberately chooses to name Philetas in such a way

---

[91] On which see Brenk (1981) and Tracy (1982).
[92] For other hollow trees see Verg. *Aen*. 5.448, *Georg*. 4.44; Lucan *B.C.* 1.143-63; and the dead tree overhanging the shrine depicted in the House of Venus in Pompeii.
[93] General treatments of the episode include McCulloh (1970) 93-9, Miralles (1973), Forehand (1976), Anderson (1982) 222-3, Zeitlin (1990b) 444-9, Teske (1991) 29-35, Alpers (2001), Whitmarsh (2005c), Hindermann (2013); treatments discussing potential links with Latin poetry include Cairns (1979) 25-7, DuQuesnay (1979) 60, Hunter (1983) 77-80, Bowie (1985), Thomas (1992), Morgan (2004b) 14-15, Di Marco (2006) 485-92, Torres Guerra (2007) 385-8.

as to remind the reader of Philitas of Cos; and that he puts Latin material into the mouth of the nominally Greek Philetas in order to re-codify the literary history of pastoral as a purely Greek affair.[94]

In the Latin literary tradition, to characterise someone or something as 'old' (e.g. *senex*, *uetus*, *antiquus*) can be a way of self-reflexively siting oneself in relation to a poetic predecessor; it is in this respect analogous to *solitus* (see p. 245-6) and a particularly Roman mode of intertextual annotation—there is no earlier Greek equivalent. For example, in *Eclogue* 6 the Muses give the pipes to the 'old Hesiod' (*Ascraeo... seni*, 6.70; cf. Ov. *Ars* 2.4, 109), even though nowhere in his poetry, even his consecration (Hes. *Th*. 22-4), is there a suggestion of old age;[95] and the Corycian gardener in the *Georgics* (discussed below) is an old man (*Corycium… senem*, 4.127).[96] Other examples include the representation of Epimenides, Hesiod, and Corinna in Propertius: *nil iuuat in magno uester amore* <u>*senex*</u> (2.34.30); *tu canis* <u>*Ascraei ueteris*</u> *praecepta poetae* (2.34.77); <u>*antiquae*</u> *scripta* <u>*Corinnae*</u> (2.3.21); and the earlier Laevius Melissus' reference to Livius Andronicus (*Liuius ille* <u>*uetus*</u>, *Ino* fr. 12a Courtney). For the Romans, old age is part of 'the alluding poet's emplotment of his work in literary tradition'.[97]

Philetas' old age is a recurrent preoccupation of this episode. He introduces himself to Daphnis and Chloe as an old man (Φιλητᾶς, ὦ παῖδες, ὁ πρεσβύτης ἐγώ, 2.3.2); he stopped herding owing to old age (διὰ γῆρας, 2.3.3); he became tired chasing Eros because of his age (καμὼν οὖν ὡς γέρων, 2.4.3); he says that Eros

---

[94] Torres Guerra (2007) 389-90 argues that Latin material in the mouth of the Greek Philetas is part of an authorial strategy of irony.
[95] Harrison (2004) 120 n. 30.
[96] On which see Thomas (1992).
[97] Hinds (1998) 100.

speaks more sweetly than a bird grown as old as him (ὅμοιος ἐμοὶ γέρων γενόμενος, 2.5.1); Eros wants to be kissed more than Philetas wants to be young (βούλομαι γὰρ φιλεῖσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ σὺ γενέσθαι νέος, 2.5.1); his old age will not stop him chasing Eros (οὐδὲν γάρ σε ὠφελήσει τὸ γῆρας πρὸς τὸ μὴ διώκειν ἐμὲ μετὰ τὸ ἓν φίλημα, 2.5.2); his age is set into relief against Eros' youth (οὔ τοι παῖς ἐγὼ καὶ εἰ δοκῶ παῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ Κρόνου πρεσβύτερος κα αὐτοῦ τοῦ παντὸς χρόνου, 2.5.2); he is the only old man ever to have seen Eros (μόνος ἀνθρώπων ἐν γήρᾳ θεασάμενος τοῦτο τὸ παιδίον, 2.5.5); and his grey hair and age are a sign of wisdom (εἰ δὲ μὴ μάτην ταύτας τὰς πολιὰς ἔφυσα μηδὲ γηράσας ματαιοτέρας τὰς φρένας ἐκτησάμην, 2.6.2).[98] As he has done in the case of συνήθης, Longus hijacks a Latin marker of self-reflexive annotation. Philetas' metaliterary status is confirmed by his own description of his poetic career: ὃς πολλὰ μὲν ταῖσδε ταῖς Νύμφαις ᾖσα, πολλὰ δὲ τῷ Πανὶ ἐκείνῳ ἐσύρισα, βοῶν δὲ πολλῆς ἀγέλης ἡγησάμην μόνῃ μουσικῇ (2.3.2). His past activities include singing and piping, and the Orphic quality of being able to control animals is a recurrent characteristic of singers in the *Eclogues*.[99] A past full of singing, piping, and herding, is clearly a footnote to the literary history of pastoral.

Philetas's career as a herdsman and gardener embodies the early and middle career of Vergil. As discussed (p. 239-40) Vergil's career is troped as an ascendant movement from pastoral to didactic to epic. He also employs the convention of the *poeta creator* whereby, for example, Tityrus comes to be closely associated with Vergil as a result of the metaleptic effect of *Ecl*. 6.3-8 and *Georg*. 4.565f; and the end of the herding day is coterminous with the end of the *Eclogues* collection: *ite domum*

---

[98] Cf. the reference to παλαιῶν ποιμένων ποιήματα (2.31.1), which Morgan (2004b) *ad loc*. and (2011) 155 argues to be a footnote to the pastoral of Philitas. In this instance, the adjective παλαιός has the same self-reflexive weight as its Latin equivalents.

[99] 6.26-30 (Silenus), 6.70 (Hesiod); 3.44-6 (Orpheus); 8.1-5 (Damon and Alphesiboeus; cf. Theoc. *Id*. 6.45).

saturae, uenit Hesperus, ite capellae (10.77).[100] Philetas began his career as a herdsman, as Vergil had done. He is now an old gardener, like the Old Corycian in the fourth book of the *Georgics* (4.116-48), who can himself be understood as a figure for the poet. Thomas argues that Longus' Philetas and Vergil's Old Corycian with his self-sufficient garden derive from the lost work of Philitas,[101] and other metapoetic (or allegorical) readings have been offered, all of which construct a metonymical relationship between garden and text, and gardener and poet.[102] This is the case for Philetas' garden, which stands for Longus' book:[103] both the narrator and Philetas have expended much effort in producing their work (τέτταρας βίβλους ἐξεπονησάμην, *pr.* 3; κῆπός ἐστί μοι τῶν ἐμῶν χειρῶν... ἐξεπονησάμην, 2.3.3). Troping a gardener as a poet—whoever he might be—finds its most developed form in Vergil, and contributes to the case for Philetas as embodying the early career of Vergil. Further details corroborate the argument. Philetas tells Daphnis and Chloe that he has come to transmit to them what he has seen and heard: ἥκω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅσα εἶδον μηνύσων, ὅσα ἤκουσα ἀπαγγελῶν (2.3.2). The profession to autopsy is one of the self-referential strategies of the Vergilian narrator, who recalls how he 'saw' the Old Corycian working his plot (*memini me... Corycium uidisse senem*, 4.125-7).[104]

---

[100] See Lieberg (1982) on the *poeta creator*; on its metaleptic effect in pastoral see Gutzwiller (1991) 176-9, Bernsdorff (2006), Reed (2006).

[101] Thomas (1992), citing numerous correspondences between the gardens of the Corycian and Philetas: πρεσβύτης ~ *senem* (2.3.1; 4.127); κῆπός ~ *hortos* (2.3.3; 4.118); ἦρος... θέρους... νῦν ~ *uere... autumno... hiems... aestatem* (2.3.4; 4.134-8); ῥόδα ~ *rosam* (2.3.4; 4.134); κρίνα ~ *lilia* (2.3.4; 4.131); ὑάκινθος ~ *hyacinthi* (2.3.4; 4.137); μήκωνες ~ *papauer* (2.3.4; 4.131); ἀχράδες ~ *pirum* (2.3.4; 4.145); μῆλα ~ *pomis* (2.3.4; 4.142); συνηρεφὴς γὰρ καὶ κατάσκιος ~ *iamque ministrantem platanum potantibus umbras* (2.3.5; 4.146). Some details have spilled into Lamon's garden: κατὰ τοὺς βασιλικούς ~ *regumque aequabat opes animis* (4.2.1; 4.132). On the self-sufficiency of the Corycian's garden see Gale (2000) 182, Gowers (2000) 130. Kossaifi (2011) 72 argues that Longus recreates Phrasidamus' farm (Theoc. *Id*. 7.132-145); Spanoudakis (2002) 65, 240 suggests a stemma of gardens going back to Chalcon's garden in Philitas' *Demeter*.

[102] Perkell (1981), Thomas (1982) 59, Leigh (1994), Gowers (2000), Thibodeau (2001), Harrison (2004).

[103] Zeitlin (1990b) 421, Di Marco (2000) 34-5, Briand (2006) 47, Morgan (2012) 553. The 'garden of the Muses' features in Pindar (*Ol*. 9.27) and Plato (*Ion* 534b).

[104] On memory and autopsy as ways of troping allusion see Conte (1986) 32-99, Thomas (1992), Hinds (1998) 3-4, 14-15.

For Longus, then, the garden of Vergil's Old Corycian stands in a synecdochic relationship to the *Georgics*, just as Philetas' garden does to the novel. In encompassing Vergilian literary history in Philetas' past and present, Longus cues the reader to re-codify Vergil's career as Greek, in much the same way as Dionysius of Halicarnassus seeks to present Rome as Greek in origin. It also has the effect of removing the possibility of an *Aeneid* and empire. By troping Vergil's career, in the character of Philetas, as a move from herding (*Eclogues*) to old-age gardening (*Georgics*), he prevents any future progress towards epic and the *Aeneid*. This is a calculated move (which I discuss in section 6.11).[105]

Themes of theft, eavesdropping, and vandalism in this episode also point to a Vergilian heritage. In Latin poetic discourse, theft and eavesdropping can serve as markers of intertextuality (e.g. Hor. *C.* 1.10.1-12; Prop. 4.9.7-13). In *Eclogue* 9, Lycidas recalls how he eavesdropped on Menalcas singing a quotation of Theoc. *Id.* 3.3-5 to his sweetheart Amaryllis (9.21-5):

> uel quae <u>sublegi tacitus</u> tibi carmina nuper,
> cum te ad delicias ferres <u>Amaryllida</u> nostras?
> 'Tityre, dum redeo (breuis est uia), pasce capellas,
> et potum pastas age, Tityre, et inter agendum
> occursare capro (cornu ferit ille) caueto.'

Likewise Eros tells Philetas how he eavesdropped on him piping by the holm-oaks when he was in love with Amaryllis: παρήμην σοι συρίττοντι <u>πρὸς ταῖς φηγοῖς ἐκείναις</u>, ἡνίκα <u>ἤρας Ἀμαρυλλίδος</u> (2.5.3); and Eros adds the significant detail that Philetas could not see him: ἀλλά <u>με οὐχ ἑώρας</u> καίτοι πλησίον μάλα τῇ κόρῃ

---

[105] Vergil frames the Old Corycian's garden as a *praeteritio* (4.147f); Longus therefore valorises that which Vergil had affected to circumvent.

παρεστῶτα (2.5.3). Eros' eavesdropping on Philetas' relationship with Amaryllis (at the programmatic Vergilian dendronym) is modelled directly on Lycidas in *Eclogue* 9, and playfully co-opts the Vergilian intertextual marker of eavesdropping from the Vergilian passage he alludes to.

Eros is implicated in even more explicit types of theft. Philetas complains that Eros steals fruit from his garden: ἔπαιζεν ὡς ἴδιον κῆπον τρυγῶν (2.4.1); ἀλλότριον κῆπον τρυγᾷ (2.4.3). Theft is not a feature of Theocritus' pastoral world, but it does feature in *Eclogue* 3, in which Menalcas accuses Damoetas of thieving from the flocks of Damon (3.16-19):

> M: Quid domini faciant, audent cum talia <u>fures</u>?
> non ego te uidi Damonis, pessime, caprum
> <u>excipere</u> insidiis multum latrante Lycisca?
> et cum clamarem 'quo nunc se proripit ille...'

Considering Eros' obvious role elsewhere as a surrogate for the author (1.11.1; 2.27.3), Philetas words suggest that Eros is engaging intertextually in an area that does not concern him (cf. also the self-reflexive valence of ἔπαιζεν; see p. 238-9); indeed, he is using a Roman (and in this case specifically Vergilian) marker of allusion to make the suggestion. The implication of the passage, and Eros' superintendence of Philetas' garden and life more generally, is as follows: by forcing the history of pastoral, embodied in Philetas, to submit to the controlling force of Eros, Longus definitively brings literary history under the aegis of the Greek erotic novel. In addition, Eros claims to be responsible for the productivity of Philetas' garden (and therefore the novel) because he has washed himself in its springs: κἀν <u>ταῖς πηγαῖς ταύταις λούομαι. διὰ τοῦτο καλὰ καὶ τὰ ἄνθη καὶ τὰ φυτά, <u>τοῖς ἐμοῖς λουτροῖς ἀρδόμενα</u> (2.5.4); and Philetas reiterates the sentiment to Daphnis and

Chloe: τὰ ἄνθη πάντα Ἔρωτος ἔργα· τὰ φυτὰ ταῦτα τούτου <u>ποιήματα</u> (2.7.3). The image is drawn from Propertius, where Amor bathes either himself or the poet's *carmina* (which are not yet familiar with Hesiodic 'springs') in the Permessus: *nondum etiam Ascraeos norunt mea <u>carmina fontes;</u>/ sed modo <u>Permessi flumine lauit</u> <u>Amor</u>* (2.10.25f).[106] The activities of the inspiring deities—and the terms in which they are framed—are remarkably close.[107]

The discourse of vandalism also ranges Eros with the shepherds of *Eclogue* 3. As discussed above (p. 234), there is no Greek precedent for pastoral vandalism, which is only found in Vergil (*Ecl.* 3.10f; cf. 2.58f). Philetas fears that Eros will break his fruit-shrubs (δείσας μὴ ὑπ' ἀγερωχίας τὰς μυρρίνας καὶ τὰς ῥοιὰς κατακλάσῃ, 2.4.2), a fear which Eros is keen to dispel: ὅρα δὲ μή τί σοι τῶν φυτῶν κατακέκλασται, μή τις ὀπώρα τετρύγηται, μή τις ἄνθους ῥίζα πεπάτηται, μή τις πηγὴ τετάρακται (2.5.5; cf. esp. *Ecl.* 2.59, *liquidis immisi fontibus apros*). The nexus of theft, eavesdropping, and vandalism, in a passage larded with metapoetic cues, strongly suggests an engagement with the *Eclogues*: not only is the content peculiar to both authors, but theft and eavesdropping are specifically Latin intertextual modes.

The role of Philetas' wife Amaryllis is a key part of my argument, and proves not only that Longus is a reader of Vergil but also that he is able to play linguistic games with Latin. I shall quote the relevant passages in full (2.5.3; 2.7.4; 2.7.6):

> [Eros speaking]: παρήμην σοι συρίττοντι πρὸς ταῖς <u>φηγοῖς</u> ἐκείναις, ἡνίκα <u>ἤρας Ἀμαρυλλίδος</u>. σοὶ μὲν οὖν ἐκείνην ἔδωκα·

---

[106] Heyworth (2007b) 155 notes the parallel, and discusses the textual uncertainty of the Propertian couplet.
[107] Cf. also Prop. 3.3.51f (*talia Calliope, lymphisque a fonte petitis/ ora Philitea nostra rigauit aqua*) with Hunter (1983) 78-9 and Bowie (1985) 83-4, suggesting a provenance in Philitas.

[Philetas speaking]: αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ἤμην νέος καὶ <u>ἠράσθην Ἀμαρυλλίδος</u>...

[Philetas speaking]: ἐπήνουν τὴν <u>Ἠχὼ τὸ Ἀμαρυλλίδος ὄνομα μετ' ἐμὲ καλοῦσαν</u>· κατέκλων τὰς σύριγγας, ὅτι μοι τὰς μὲν βοῦς ἔθελγον, Ἀμαρυλλίδα δὲ οὐκ ἦγον.

In the first instance, both Tityrus and Philetas are endowed with pasts. This is not a feature of Theocritean characterisation, but becomes part of the make-up of Vergil's pastoral cast.[108] Di Marco argues for the incrementally increasing presence of mutual love in the history of pastoral, culminating in Longus, whose novel marks the apogee of the tradition.[109] For Di Marco, the 'second stage' of Philetas' life is Vergilian, and includes a time when he piped by the holm-oaks and loved Amaryllis (2.5.3). Its designation as Vergilian is owed to the fact that it repeats the contents of the first five lines of *Eclogue* 1 (1.1-5):[110]

> Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi
> siluestrem tenui Musam meditaris auena…
>   …tu Tityre, lentus in umbra
> formosam resonare doces Amaryllida siluas.

Both Philetas and Tityrus are by the homonymous holm-oaks/beeches, in love with Amaryllis; both also refer to echo's mediation of Amaryllis (which I shall discuss below); in addition, Ovid characterises Vergil's *Eclogues* as the venue at which he wrote of his love for Amaryllis: *Phyllidis hic idem teneraeque <u>Amaryllidis ignes</u>/ bucolicis iuuenis luserat ante modis* (*Tr*. 2.537f).[111] This suggests that, for post-Vergilian readers, Amaryllis was a viable shorthand for the *Eclogues*.

---

[108] Papanghelis (2006) 369 n. 2.
[109] Di Marco (2006) 485-92.
[110] Leo (1903) 13 n. 1 first notes the parallel; cf. Edmonds (1916) vii, (1926) 90, and Bowie (1985) 81, who argues for a lost model in Philitas.
[111] Cf. Prop. 2.34.67-76, which characterises the *Eclogues* in terms of their erotic content.

Amaryllis repays particular attention. She is mentioned five times in the novel: once by Eros (2.5.3); three times by Philetas (2.7.4, 2.7.6 *bis*); and once by Daphnis and Chloe (2.8.5). She plays an important role in Philetas' (literary) past as his former sweetheart, present wife, and mother to his children.[112] In Theoc. *Id*. 3 she had been the recalcitrant subject of the besotted goatherd's serenade (3.1, 3.6; 3.22); then in *Id*. 4 she featured as the late lover of the boxer Aegon (4.36; 4.38). Though there is no evidence to suggest a continuity in character between *Id*. 3 and 4, the echo of ὦ χαρίεσσ' Ἀμαρυλλί (3.6; 4.38) points to her name as a floating pastoral signifier.[113] She next appears in the programmatic opening of *Eclogue* 1. In Vergil's poem, Amaryllis is not the haughty tease of *Id*. 3, but Tityrus' doting wife who awaits his return from Rome (1.36).[114] The fact that she features a further six times in the *Eclogues*,[115] as well as the fact that she is the wife of Tityrus at the opening of the collection, contributes to her reception as a signifier of Vergilian bucolic.

Vergil's treatment of Amaryllis has clearly influenced Longus. Philetas describes the stage in his (literary) past when he used to praise Echo for repeating the name of Amaryllis (2.7.6), and Meliboeus observes how Tityrus teaches the woods— that is, the *Eclogues*—to echo her name (1.5).[116] Whilst echo is not a feature of

---

[112] Bowie (1985) 80-1 derives her from Philitas.

[113] On the 'citationality' of Amaryllis see Papanghelis (2006) 382-4.

[114] See DuQuesnay (1981) 38-40 for the status of Amaryllis as Tityrus' *contubernalis*.

[115] 2.14, 2.52, 3.81, 8.77f, 8.101, 9.22. The name Amaryllis is attested once in imperial Athens (*LGPN* ii s.v.), but seems to be very popular in South Italy (Brundisium, Campania, and Pompeii) with five attestations (*LGPN* iiia s.v.). Could this reflect an enhanced popularity on account of her role in Vergilian pastoral?

[116] The pastoral echo of a beloved's name also features in Propertius: *sed qualiscumque es, resonant mihi 'Cynthia' siluae* (1.18.31). Echo is implied, but not explicitly stated, in Callimachus' Acontius and Cydippe episode *ap*. Aristaen. *Ep*. 1.10.58-9: εἴθε, ὦ δένδρα, καὶ νοῦς ὑμῖν γένοιτο καὶ φωνή, ὅπως ἂν εἴπητε μόνον 'Κυδίππη καλή'.

Theocritus' pastoral world,[117] it is a constitutive element of the *Eclogues* (occurring seventeen times in various guises) and goes on to play a major role in Longus. As Vergil is the first to canonise pastoral as a literary genre, he is therefore the first to develop internal metaphors for negotiating its literary history. Echo provides a convenient model for literary response and quotation: its defining features of repetition and iteration make it a highly plastic metaphor for intertextuality.[118] In Vergil, echo becomes a way of mediating literary history, and so too in Longus. Philetas' past praise of Echo, who repeated the name of Amaryllis, homes in on the programmatic force of *Ecl*. 1.5, and perpetuates the Vergilian metaphor of pastoral literary history as an intertextual echo chamber.

Philetas' initial failure to attract Amaryllis with his piping (in contrast to his success in attracting his flocks) provokes him to smash his pipes (2.7.6), an act of vandalism that has a Vergilian precedent. There is, however, no Theocritean precedent for the smashing of musical instruments, but in *Eclogue* 3 (heavily indebted to Theoc. *Id*. 4 and 5), Damoetas accuses Menalcas of smashing Daphnis' pipes out of jealousy, an event programmatically sited at the beech trees: *aut hic <u>ad ueteres fagos</u> cum Daphnidis <u>arcum/ fregisti et calamos</u>* (3.12f).[119] In addition, an almost identical collocation of elements features in Propertius. Amor instructs the poet to inhabit Hesiod's grove, not in order that his poetry should attract trees and animals,[120] but Cynthia herself (2.13.2-7):

---

[117] T.G. Rosenmeyer (1969) 148-50, Breed (2006) 75. Echo is implied in the Hylas narrative (Theoc. *Id*. 13), on which see Hunter (1999*) ad Id*. 13.58-60; the post-Theocritean *Epitaph for Bion* features echo twice (30f, 54).

[118] Hollander (1981) and Gély-Ghédira (2000) are the classic studies; on the *Eclogues* see Boyle (1978), Breed (2006) 74-101, Papanghelis (2013) 205 n. 1. See further Galand-Hallyn (1994), Heerink (2010).

[119] Hunter (1983) 79-80 notes the parallel.

[120] For this type of Orphic power see esp. *Ecl*. 8.1-5 with Clausen (1994) *ad loc*., who notes that 'no singer in Theocritus possesses such Orphean power over the natural world'. Cf. *Ecl*. 6.27-30 and Calp.

> Amor… iussit et Ascraeum sic habitare nemus,
> non ut Pieriae quercus mea uerba sequantur,
>   aut possim Ismaria ducere ualle feras,
> sed magis ut nostro stupefiat Cynthia uersu.

As above (p. 255-6), the Propertian parallel is analogous in content and context, and, in combination with the Vergilian topos of pipe-smashing—in verses which are themselves adjacent to the description of pastoral *theft* (3.16-8)—strengthens the case that Philetas is a Frankenstein's monster of Roman elements.

There are aspects attaching to Amaryllis' name that have ramifications for Longus' relationship with Latin. Vergil variously etymologises her name in relation to *amarus* 'bitter' by way of her anger (*tristis Amaryllidis iras*, 2.14; *Amaryllidis irae*, 3.81) and *amare/amor* 'love' (*Amaryllis amabat*, 2.52). Longus also etymologises Amaryllis,[121] but the etymology is Latin and specifically Vergilian, available to be activated as a bilingual pun. Her name is situated in a syntagmatic relationship with the verb ἐράω 'love' on three occasions: ἤρας Ἀμαρυλλίδος (2.5.3); ἠράσθην Ἀμαρυλλίδος (2.7.4); Ἀμαρυλλίδος ἐρῶντα (2.8.5). Longus clearly etymologises her name via the Latin verb *amare*, which shares the same semantic range as ἐράω; it converts into Greek precisely the same etymology offered by Vergil (*Amaryllis amabat*)—indeed, Vergil plays the same game with the verb *amare* and the name Phyllis (punning on the Greek φιλέω): *Phyllida amo* (3.78); *Phyllis amat corylos; illas dum Phyllis amabit* (7.63).[122] In addition, and considering the iotacisation of Greek vowels, perhaps Longus' ἤρας Ἀμαρυλλίδος is a phonetic bilingual pun

---

Sic. 2.9-11. Bonner (1909), 279 n. 1 sees these as developments from Theoc. *Id*. 6.44f. Musical control of animals occurs in Longus at 1.13.4, 1.22.2, 1.27.2, 1.29.2, 2.3.2, 2.38.1, 4.15.2-4, on which see Bowie (2006b) 69-76.
[121] Her name is derived from the Greek verb ἀμαρύσσω 'sparkle' (*LSJ* s.v. I).
[122] Egan (1996).

designed to recall Vergil's *Amaryllidis* <u>iras</u>.[123] If Longus has in fact etymologised

Amaryllis in relation to the verb *amare*, then her marriage to Philetas represents the

union of *amor* and φιλία.[124] This is of a piece with (the potentially contemporary)

Apuleius, in whose *Metamorphoses* Lucius and Photis—that is, *lux* and φάος/φῶς,

both meaning 'light'—engage in sexual union.[125]

Amaryllis' name may also have more subversive (or at least ludic) political

implications. The so-called 'secret/mystic name' (ὄνομα τελεστικόν) of Rome (or her

tutelary deity)—Amor—was apparently an open secret in antiquity, especially from

the first century BCE onwards. Its utterance was prohibited in order to prevent an

enemy removing Rome's tutelary deity by means of *euocatio*.[126] Most of the sources

who discuss the issue—including Greek authors from the imperial period—mention a

certain Valerius Soranus, executed for divulging the name (Plin. *N.H.* 3.65; Plut. *Q.R.*

61; Solinus 1.4-6, Serv. *Aen.* 1.277 (citing Varro), Serv. *Georg.* 1.498; John Lydus

4.73).[127] The *Roma-Amor* palindrome made *Amor* a potential candidate for the secret

name, whether correctly or not; Vergil's Aeneas potentially alludes to it when he says

hic amor haec patria est (*Aen.* 4.347),[128] and both love elegy and Pompeian graffiti—

namely the *ROMAAMOR* quadrate (*CIL* IV Suppl. 3.1.8297)—attest to the popularity

of the connection,[129] as does Hadrian's double temple of Roma and Amor on the

---

[123] More speculatively, could the second syllable of Ἀμ<u>αρυ</u>λλίδος allude to Publius Vergilius <u>Maro</u>? Vergil's cognomen is known by the Greek author of *A.P.* 16.151.9: Πιερίδες, τί μοι αἰνὸν ἐφωπλίσσασθε <u>Μάρωνα</u>;

[124] Di Marco (2006) 491-2 uses the punning relation of Philetas' name to the verb φιλέω to downplay the character's putative link to Philitas of Cos.

[125] On the bilingual pun in Apuleius see Carver (2007) 255, (2013) 254-5.

[126] For the practice see Beard, North, and Price (1998) 1.34-5, 62, 82, 111, 132-4.

[127] Cairns (2010) offers a sceptical review of the evidence.

[128] Skulsky (1985).

[129] De Angelis (1947) 7-33, Stanley (1963). On elegy see McKeown (1998) *ad* Ov. *Am.* 2.9.17f. See further Horstmann (1979), Murphy (2004).

Velia.[130] In addition, Oliver argues that Aelius Aristides' *Roman Oration* (*Or.* 26, delivered in 143 CE) shows an awareness that some thought that Rome's secret name was *Amor*, and indeed praises Rome as if it were Eros.[131]

John Lydus directly implicates Amaryllis' name in his discussion of Rome's ὄνομα τελεστικόν (*De Mens*. 4.73):

> ὀνόματα δὲ τῇ πόλει τρία, τελεστικὸν ἱερατικὸν πολιτικόν· τελεστικὸν μὲν οἱονεὶ[132] Ἔρως, ὥστε πάντας ἔρωτι θείῳ περὶ τὴν πόλιν κατέχεσθαι, διὸ καὶ Ἀμαρυλλίδα τὴν πόλιν ὁ ποιητὴς αἰνιγματωδῶς βουκολιάζων καλεῖ·
>
> And the city [Rome] had three names: an initiatory name, a sacred name, and a political name. The initiatory name was Love, so that all were held fast around the city by divine love, and for this reason, the poet enigmatically calls the city Amaryllis in his bucolic poetry.

He is referring to the notion rejected by Servius. Commenting on *Eclogue* 1.5 (*formosam resonare doces Amaryllida siluas*), Servius disavows the possibility that the name Amaryllis alludes allegorically to Rome: *male enim quidam allegoriam uolunt, tu carmen de urbe Roma componis celebrandum omnibus gentibus*.[133] Taken together, the evidence of Servius and John Lydus strongly suggests that the name Amaryllis could be seen to gesture towards Rome's mystic name. Longus, therefore, may also be playfully alluding to the name that, if uttered, exposes Rome to danger,[134] as well as to the Vergilian character who precipitated Servius' disavowal. If so, could Longus be investing Eros with political significance? As I discuss in detail below (section 6.9), Eros is responsible for engineering the arrival of the λύκαινα 'she-

---

[130] Plato *Phaedr.* 238b-c shows an awareness of the part-anagrammatic connection between ἔρως and ῥώμη.

[131] Oliver (1953) 883-4.

[132] The presence of οἱονεί here suggests that something may have fallen out of the text, perhaps a Greek transliteration of *Amor*.

[133] For John Lydus' knowledge of Latin see Rochette (1997) 253-4, and 273-4 on his knowledge of the Aeneas-Dido tradition.

[134] Alfonsi (1948) 88 suggests that this was the purpose of Soranus' indiscretion, who, as a Latin and a Marian, sought to interfere with Sulla's campaign in 82 BCE.

wolf'—that is, the introduction of Roman history—into the pastoral world (1.11.1).
Elsewhere, we are told that Daphnis and Chloe, eager to see each other after winter,
are the first to lead their flocks to pasture, because they are 'slaves to a greater
shepherd', namely, Eros: οἷα μείζονι δουλεύοντες ποιμένι (3.12.1; cf. 2.5.4, where
Eros tells Philetas νῦν δὲ Δάφνιν ποιμαίνω καὶ Χλόην). Considering the prevalence of
the Roman~master and Greek~slave double homology (e.g. Dio *Or*. 34.51; Lucian *De
Merc. Cond*. 1, 7; cf. my discussion at p. 20, 27), might Longus be articulating the
position of the dispossessed Greek elite vis-à-vis Rome, that is, that they are slaves?
Furthermore, Daphnis and Chloe are often assimilated to the pastoral animals under
their care (1.2.2, 1.5.2, 1.16.2); Daphnis' goats are present at the wedding, where he
calls them by name and kisses them (4.38.4).[135] This proximity between the
protagonists and their animals potentially encodes further socio-political relevance.
Lavan has demonstrated how animals function as a metaphor for the provinces in
Latin historiography.[136] For Tiberius (and, we might assume, in imperial discourse
more generally) provincial taxpayers are thought of as sheep, and the emperor a
shepherd, who should make sure not to 'fleece' his subjects: *boni pastoris esse
tondere pecus, non deglubere* (Suet. *Tib*. 32.3; κείρεσθαί μου τὰ πρόβατα, ἀλλ' οὐκ
ἀποξύρεσθαι βούλομαι (Cassius Dio 57.10.5).[137] Indeed, Aelius Aristides criticises
the Persians for not knowing how to rule as shepherds, an art that, he implies, the
Romans have mastered (*Or*. 26.18). Daphnis and Chloe's symbiotic relationship with
their animals therefore offers a protreptic image of good governance.[138]

6.8   Philetas' children, Tityros, and the succession of pipes

---

[135] There is an epic model in Polyphemus who addresses his favourite ram (Hom. *Od*. 9.447-60).
[136] Lavan (2013a) 73-91.
[137] Bowie (2013) makes this suggestion, citing the passages of Suetonius and Cassius Dio.
[138] Goats and vines also affect Domitianic policy (Suet. *Dom*. 14.2).

Philetas' children, especially Tityros, play a key role in establishing Longus'

connection with Vergil. Eros says that Philetas' children are 'herdsmen and farmers':

καὶ ἤδη σοι παῖδες, ἀγαθοὶ βουκόλοι καὶ γεωργοί (2.5.3). Specifically in that order,

his children look suspiciously like a poetological shorthand for Vergil's early and

middle career,[139] embodied by the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* (though the *Aeneid* is, once

again, left out of account); and the lexemes βουκόλοι and γεωργοί reflect both the

content of these poems as well as their ancient titles.[140] As Philetas' children, the texts

are represented as practitioners of their contents, and thus participate in the *poeta*

creator trope discussed above in connection with the Old Corycian. In addition, the

metaphor of fatherhood is a frequent way of imagining authorship (e.g. Plato *Phaedr.*

275f; Ov. *Trist.* 1.1.111-6). Furthermore, the adjective ἀγαθοί—which nowhere

describes the pastoral characters of Theocritus—may bear traces of the Vergilian

Daphnis: *amat bonus otia Daphnis* (*Ecl.* 5.61).

The only child of Philetas who is explicitly named is his son Tityros, a name

with obvious ramifications for Longus' relationship with Vergil: as the first word of

the *Eclogues* (*Tityre*) he is a programmatic signifier of Vegilian pastoral (despite his

appearance in Theoc. *Id.* 3.2-4 (as a goatherd) 7.72-7 and (as a poet)).[141] We first meet

Tityros at the celebrations after Chloe's rescue from the Methymnaeans. He is

Philetas' youngest son, and is described in terms that assimilate him to the pastoral

world: αὐτῷ τῶν παίδων ὁ νεώτατος εἵπετο Τίτυρος… καὶ ἤλλετο κοῦφα βαδίζων

[139] Di Marco (2000) 30 n. 60, (2006) 493 n. 43 relegates the point to footnotes.
[140] See p. 236 n. 38; Quint. *I.O.* 10.1.56 suggests that Nicander provided Vergil with his title for the *Georgics*.
[141] Lipka (2001) 178, 182; cf. Cairns (1999). On the reception of Tityrus, see Küppers (1989), and Hubbard (1998) 168-9 who argues that Martial 8.55.7-12 and Calp. Sic. 4.59-63 use Tityrus as code for Vergil. Cf. also Prop. 2.34.72f, Ov. *Am.* 1.15.25, *Ex Pont.* 4.16.33.

ὥσπερ ἔριφος (2.32.1). Tityros' role is as significant as his name. Daphnis and Chloe beg Philetas to play a song on Daphnis' pipes—itself reminiscent of Chromis and Mnasyllos pestering Silenus for a song in *Eclogue* 6.13-26—but Daphnis' pipes are too small,[142] and Philetas instructs Tityros to fetch his own pipes: πέμπει οὖν Τίτυρον ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σύριγγα, τῆς ἐπαύλεως ἀπεχούσης σταδίους δέκα (2.33.2). Tityros returns with Philetas' grand pipes: ὁ Τίτυρος ἐφίσταται τὴν σύριγγα τῷ πατρὶ κομίζων, μέγα ὄργανον καὶ αὐλῶν μεγάλων, καὶ ἵνα κεκήρωτο, χαλκῷ πεποίκιλτο (2.35.1). And finally, after Philetas and Daphnis have both played on the pipes, Philetas is so impressed that he bequeaths his pipes to Daphnis, in order that Daphnis might then bequeath them to a successor: ὁ Φιλητᾶς θαυμάσας φιλεῖ τε ἀναπηδήσας καὶ τὴν σύριγγα χαρίζεται φιλήσας καὶ εὔχεται καὶ Δάφνιν καταλιπεῖν αὐτὴν ὁμοίῳ διαδόχῳ (2.37.4).

There is much in these passages to suggest that Longus seeks to establish himself in the pastoral tradition in relation to Vergil. In the first instance, the name Tityros is an explicit recognition of Vergil's role in the literary history of pastoral, and his status as 'youngest' son evokes the *Eclogues* as the work of Vergil's youth. Hubbard argues that, in having Tityros serve merely as mediator between Philetas and Daphnis (and not play the pipes himself), Longus 'minimises Vergil's importance' and thereby revalorises the pastoral tradition as 'properly Greek'.[143] This is extremely persuasive. Vergil had been responsible for Romanising pastoral poetry, and Longus (as I have argued) is attempting to re-codify the literary history of pastoral as Greek. For Longus, Tityros-Vergil is simply a supporting-act between two main events, that is, Theocritus' *Idylls* and the novel *Daphnis and Chloe*. In an act of postcolonial

---

[142] Winkler (1990) 120 and P. Alpers (1996) 330-1 offer Freudian analyses of the passage.

[143] Hubbard (2006b) 104, (2006a) 504. On the basis of Tityros' role in Longus, Cairns (1999) 289 with n. 1 wonders whether Tityros also featured in the poetry of Philitas.

'mimicry', Longus playfully co-opts Tityrus, a signifier of the *Eclogues*, to effect

Vergil's own exclusion from the literary tradition. I would add two points to buttress

the claim: firstly, Tityros never speaks, and thus reflects Longus' silencing of Vergil's

role in literary history; and secondly, Longus chooses to make Tityros run *ten* stades

away to collect the pipes (σταδίους δέκα), subtly pointing to his role as Vergil, whose

book of *Eclogues* contains precisely ten poems.[144]

The episode has also been linked to Vergil for its representation of poetic

succession.[145] Hubbard argues that Philetas' bequest of pipes to Daphnis, who will in

turn pass his pipes to a successor, is significant for two reasons. Firstly, it replaces as

the object of poetic investiture the Theocritean *staff* (τὸ λαγωβόλον) given by Lycidas

to Simichidas (*Id*. 7.128f) with the Vergilian *pipes* (*fistula*) given by Damoetas to

Corydon (*Ecl*. 2.36-8).[146] Secondly, both Longus and Vergil are exceptional in

featuring a *tripartite* bequest: Philetas to Daphnis to a successor (2.37.4), and

Dameotas to Corydon to Alexis (*Ecl*. 2.37-42):

> fistula, Damoetas dono mihi quam dedit olim,
> et dixit moriens:[147] 'te [Corydon] nunc habet ista secundum'…
> quos tibi [Alexis] seruo.

Hubbard also suggests that Philetas' claim that his one syrinx imitates all syrinxes

(ὅλως πάσας σύριγγας μία σῦριγξ ἐμιμήσατο, 2.35.4) is indicative of Longus'

---

[144] Vaughn (1981) discusses the evidence of the so-called *Theocritus-Vergilianus*, according to which Vergil worked with a Theocritean poetry book of ten poems put together by Artemidorus of Tarsus; Gutzwiller (1996) assesses the evidence for Theocritean bucolic collections; cf. also Serv. *Buc. Prooem*. 3.21.

[145] DuQuesnay (1979) 60; Hunter (1983) 81-2.

[146] Hubbard (2006a) 502-6, cf. (1998) 54-8. Skoie (2006b) discusses pipe-succession in Vergil as a dramatisation of the act of reception. Pipes feature as part of gift-exchanges in Theoc. *Id*. 4.30, 5.8, 6.42f and Verg. *Ecl*. 5.85-90.

[147] Death-bed succession of pipes also occurs in Theoc. *Id*. 1.128-30 (Daphnis to Pan) and Longus 1.29.2-3 (Dorcon to Chloe). Valley (1926) 90 and Torres Guerra (2007) 383-4 note the resemblance of the passages in Longus to that in *Eclogue* 2.

engagement with *all* pastoral precursors, including Vergil.[148] He does not, however, discuss the tripartite transmission of pipes in *Eclogue* 6. In a passage which, for Hunter, 'inscribe[s] competitive succession' into the pastoral tradition,[149] Linus bestows Hesiod's pipes on Gallus: *[Linus] dixerit: 'hos tibi dant calamos (en accipe) Musae,/ Ascraeo quos ante seni...* (6.69f).[150] Here, Linus plays a mediating role analogous to that of Tityros in Longus. Using the Vergilian object of investitutre (the pipes) to freeze Vergil out of the pastoral tradition is another excellent example of postcolonial 'mimicry'.

The shape of Philetas' pipes provides further evidence. In Lamon's aetiological song about Pan and Syrinx, Syrinx metamorphoses into a syrinx constituted of reeds of differing length (symbolising unreciprocated love), unlike the traditionally rectangular shape of the Greek syrinx: τοὺς καλάμους κηρῷ συνδήσας ἀνίσους (2.34.3; cf. Ach. Tat. 8.6.4).[151] Other examples of this shape (other than Achilles Tatius) are Roman: *est mihi disparibus septem compacta cicutis/ fistula* (*Ecl.* 2.36f); *fistula cui semper decrescit harundibus ordo:/ nam calamus cera iungitur usque minor* (Tib. 2.5.31f); *atque ita disparibus calamis compagine cerae/ inter se iunctis* (Ov. *Met.* 1.711f).[152] Longus' phrase καλάμους κηρῷ συνδήσας is lexically and phonically analogous to Vergil's *Pan primus*[153] *calamos cera coniungitur pluris/ instituit* (*Ecl.* 2.32f) and Tibullus' *calamus cera iungitur*.[154] In addition, Philetas' pipes are described as being like the ones Pan first constructed: εἴκασεν ἄν τις εἶναι ταύτην ἐκείνην ἣν ὁ Πὰν πρώτην ἐπήξατο (2.35.2); this recalls Pan's archetypal pipes

---

[148] Hubbard (2006a) 503-4, (2006b).
[149] Hunter (2006b) 26.
[150] Ross (1975) 18-38 suggests that Vergil is reworking a Gallan scene.
[151] On the traditionally Greek shape, see Gow (1965) 2.554 and n. 3 on [Theoc.] *Syrinx*.
[152] Cf. also Ov. *Met.* 2.682, 8.192.
[153] *Apud* Ottaviano and Conte (2013).
[154] Cairns (1979) 23 n. 118 notes the parallels.

in *Eclogue* 2 quoted above (2.32f, esp. *Pan primus*, and 2.36 *compacta*).[155] This nexus of elements points strongly to the possibility that Longus is not only engaging with Vergil, but also Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (see p. 275-8).[156]

Finally, the etymological implications of Tityros' name point to knowledge of Vergil. The *Eclogues* opens with Tityrus playing on the reed-pipe: <u>*Tityre… siluestrem tenui Musam meditaris auena*</u>. Artemidorus of Ephesus (*ap*. Athen. *Deipn*. 4.182d) says that Doric Italians call the καλάμινος αὐλός the τιτύρινος: ὁ δὲ καλάμινος αὐλὸς τιτύρινος καλεῖται τοῖς ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ Δωριεῦσιν (cf. Amerias *ap*. Athen. *Deipn*. 4.176c; Eust. *ad* Hom. *Il*. 18.495). Vergil is therefore establishing an etymological connection between Tityrus and the pipe,[157] which Longus, in having Tityros collect the pipes, playfully narrativises. In addition, both Servius (*ad Ecl*. pr. 1) and the scholia to Theoc. *Id*. 3.2 identify Tityrus/Τίτυρος with the he-goat.[158] Longus' description of Tityros as 'like a kid' (ὥσπερ ἔριφος, i.e. a young he-goat) likewise narrativises the etymological link between Theocritus' Tityros and he-goats. Longus therefore combines, in narrative form, the etymological associations of Tityrus/Tityros in both Vergil and Theocritus.

6.9   Romulus and Remus, and the she-wolf

---

[155] Cf. also *P. Rainer* 29801, the verso of which represents Pan assembling himself a new set of pipes after they have been stolen (which provides a model for Nemesianus *Ecl*. 3); Hubbard (1998) 208 n. 98 surveys the history of scholarly debate about the authorship of this poem.

[156] Morgan (2011) 152-3 postulates Philitas' treatment of the Syrinx myth. Longus' treatment of metamorphosis myths, incl. Syrinx (2.34.1-3) and Echo (3.23.1-5) may well derive elements from Ovid (*Met*. 1.689-712; 3.339-510). In both Longus and Ovid the Syrinx myth is a metadiegetic inset narrated by Lamon and Mercury respectively. V.T. Gärtner (2009) offers a detailed examination of versions of the Syrinx myth.

[157] Lipka (2001) 178-92 offers extended discussion. Cf. O'Hara (1996) 244.

[158] Cf. *Ecl*. 5.19 (*seruabit Tityrus haedos*), 9.23-5 (*Tityre... pasce capellas*), translating *Id*. 3.2-4 (ὁ Τίτυρος… βόσκε τὰς αἶγας).

Images of Rome's early cultural narrative and pastoral pre-history are seeded with precision into Longus' text from the outset. Firstly, Daphnis and Chloe's exposure,[159] subsequent suckling by a she-goat and a sheep (respectively), and rearing by country folk mirrors the narrative of Romulus and Remus (of which Greeks in the East were well aware)[160] as transmitted by Livy (1.4) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 1.79,[161] drawing on Fabius Pictor).[162] Secondly, the threatening presence of wolves in Longus, and the lupine discourse in general, signifies the spectral presence of Rome in the novel, as well as hinting at the festival of the Lupercalia.

In Longus, a she-goat and a ewe suckle Daphnis and Chloe respectively (1.2.2; 1.5.2):

[Λάμων] ὁρᾷ τὴν μὲν αἶγα πεφυλαγμένως περιβεβηκυῖαν, μὴ ταῖς χηλαῖς βλάπτοι πατοῦσα, τὸ δὲ ὥσπερ ἐκ μητρῴας θηλῆς τὴν ἐπιρροὴν ἕλκον τοῦ γάλακτος.

[Δρύας] ἐπιστὰς δὲ οὐδὲν εἶδεν ὧν ἤλπισεν, ἀλλὰ τὴν μὲν διδοῦσαν πάνυ ἀνθρωπίνως τὴν θηλὴν εἰς ἄφθονον τοῦ γάλακτος ὁλκήν, τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἀκλαυτὶ λάβρως εἰς ἀμφοτέρας τὰς θηλὰς μεταφέρον τὸ στόμα καθαρὸν καὶ φαιδρόν, οἷα τῆς ὄϊος τῇ γλώττῃ τὸ πρόσωπον ἀπολιχμωμένης μετὰ τὸν κόρον τῆς τροφῆς.

---

[159] Daphnis is abandoned among the laurels in the myth transmitted by Diodorus (4.84) and Aelian (*V.H.* 10.18).

[160] The cult of Roma at Chios may have included the dedication to Roma of a sculpture of the wolf suckling Romulus and Remus, on which see Price (1984) 44; *SEG* 30.1073.24-7 (second century BCE) also shows knowledge of the legend; and a relief on the Sebasteion in Aphrodisias features Romulus, Remus, and the she-wolf, on which see Smith (1987) 133.

[161] Henceforth 'Dion.'.

[162] Bremmer and Horsfall (1987) 25-48 and Cornell (1995) 60-3 are fundamental on the historicity of and archetypal elements in the Romulus and Remus legend, which influenced Greek writers from at least the third century BCE, e.g. Nicander's account of Miletus reared by a she-wolf (*ap.* Ant. Lib. 30.1). See also Ogilvie (1965) 46-7. Diocles of Peparethus (*FGrH* 820) was, according to Plutarch (*Rom.* 3.1, 8.9), the first Greek to treat the story, and probably modeled it on that of Sophocles' *Tyro*, on which issue see Frier (1979) 261-2; on the connection between Diocles and Fabius Pictor see Cornell (1975), Poucet (1976). Children abandoned and brought up by animals and/or shepherds are widely attested, e.g. Cyrus (Hdt. 1.109-13), Attis (Paus. 7.17.11), Zeus and Amalthea (Hygin. *Poet. Astr.* 2. 13; Arat. *Phaen.* 163; Callim. *Hymn. in Jov.* 49), Melampus and Aegisthus (Hyg. *Fab.* 87; Ael. *V.H.* 12.42). On child-abandonment in the novels see Kudlien (1989); on the she-goat nurse in Longus see Calder (1982), Guida (1985).

There are a number details co-opted from the Romulus-Remus legend, in which the she-wolf offers her dugs to the twins and licks their faces clean (Dion. 1.79.6; Liv. 1.4):[163]

> λύκαινα δέ τις ἐπιφανεῖσα νεοτόκος σπαργῶσα τοὺς μαστοὺς ὑπὸ γάλακτος ἀνεδίδου τὰς θηλὰς τοῖς στόμασιν αὐτῶν καὶ <u>τῇ γλώττῃ τὸν πηλόν</u>, ᾧ κατάπλεοι ἦσαν, <u>ἀπελίχμα</u>.

> tenet fama… lupam… submissas infantibus adeo mitem praebuisse mammas ut <u>lingua lambentem</u> pueros magister regii pecoris inuenerit.

Dugs and milk are constituent features in all passages, but the shared detail of 'licking with the tongue' (τῇ γλώττῃ… ἀπολιχμωμένης; τῇ γλώττῃ… ἀπελίχμα) is particularly striking. The herdsmen in both narratives are dumbstruck by what they see. Lamon is 'astonished' (θαυμάσας, 1.2.3), and Dryas beholds the sight as something 'unexpected' and 'divine' (οὐδὲν εἶδεν ὧν ἤλπισεν, 1.5.2; θεῖον δή τι νομίσας τὸ εὕρημα, 1.6.1), whilst the herdsman in Dionysius is 'agape with disbelief' and his fellow herdsmen think they are beholding 'something divine' (ἀχανὴς ἦν ὑπό τε θάμβους καὶ ἀπιστίας, 1.79.6; δαιμόνιόν τι χρῆμα ὁρᾶν ὑπολαβόντες, 1.79.7). In Dionysius too, the twins cling to the she-wolf 'as if their mother' (τὰ δ' ὡς μητρὸς ἐξεχόμενα, 1.79.7) as does Daphnis (ὥσπερ ἐκ μητρῴας θηλῆς, 1.2.2).

The locations of the events in both narratives are described in very similar terms. In Dionysius, at the appearance of the herdsmen the she-wolf withdraws into the Lupercal (sacred to Faunus, i.e. Pan via *interpretatio Graeca*),[164] a grove within which there is a cave formed by a hollow rock containing a spring and an altar to Pan,

---

[163] For the λύκαινα see also Plut. *Rom.* 2.6, 4.2, 7.6, 21.4-6; Strabo 5.229c.
[164] For the complex links between Faustulus, Faunus, and Pan see Horsfall and Bremmer (1987) 30-1 with n. 29. On the Faunus vs. Pan issue, see Wiseman (1995) 77-88.

and a nearby bronze statue representing the suckling of Romulus and Remus by the she-wolf (Dion. 1.79.8):

> καὶ ἦν γάρ τις οὐ πολὺ ἀπέχων ἐκεῖθεν ἱερὸς χῶρος ὕλῃ βαθείᾳ συνηρεφὴς καὶ <u>πέτρα κοίλη</u> πηγὰς ἀνιεῖσα, ἐλέγετο δὲ Πανὸς εἶναι τὸ νάπος, καὶ βωμὸς ἦν αὐτόθι τοῦ θεοῦ… τὸ δὲ <u>ἄντρον</u>… καὶ τέμενός ἐστιν αὐτοῦ πλησίον, ἔνθα εἰκὼν κεῖται τοῦ πάθους λύκαινα παιδίοις δυσὶ τοὺς μαστοὺς ἐπίσχουσα, χαλκᾶ <u>ποιήματα</u> παλαιᾶς ἐργασίας.

This is almost identical to the cave of the Nymphs in which Dryas finds Chloe suckled by the ewe, likewise containing stone statues of the Nymphs and a spring (1.4.1-3):

> Νυμφῶν <u>ἄντρον</u> ἦν, <u>πέτρα</u> μεγάλη, τὰ ἔνδοθεν <u>κοίλη</u>, τὰ ἔξωθεν περιφερής. τὰ ἀγάλματα τῶν Νυμφῶν αὐτῶν λίθοις <u>ἐπεποίητο</u>… ἐκ <u>πηγῆς</u> ἀναβλύζον ὕδωρ ῥεῖθρον ἐποίει χεόμενον.

This is the same cave of the Nymphs described by the narrator in the prologue (*pr*. 1-4) containing the images that commemorate the story of Daphnis and Chloe (though the narrator fails to make the connection), just as the Lupercal contains media commemorating the story of Romulus and Remus (the statue erected by the Ogulnii; cf. Liv. 10.23.11-2). The story of Daphnis and Chloe, reared by a she-goat and ewe, represents a gentler version than that involving the more predatory wolf, a signifier that, in Longus, becomes constitutive of a threat to the pastoral world. The choice of a goat also recalls Zeus' suckling (see p. 269 n. 162), and thereby 'goes behind the back' of the Lupercalia to a Greek tradition.

The herdsmen in both narratives take the children back home to their wives: Lamon takes Daphnis back home to Myrtale (1.3.3), Dryas takes Chloe back to Nape (1.6.2), and Faustulus takes the twins back to Acca Larentia (Liv. 1.4; Plut. *Rom*. 4.3;

cf. Dion. 1.79.9).[165] Faustulus' wife repays consideration. She is first mentioned by Ennius (*Ann*. 1. xliv Sk.), and both Livy (1.4.6) and Plutarch (*Rom*. 4.3) transmit an alternative of the she-wolf story, in which Acca Larentia is simply called *lupa* 'she-wolf' because she is a prostitute (related to 'brothel' *lupanar*).[166] Pollux attests to the equivalent semantic range of λύκαινα in Greek (4.150). In this connection I suggest that the meretricial attributes of Acca Larentia have, in Longus, been displaced into the character of Lycaenion (Λυκαίνιον). Her name encodes the lupine element and means 'little she-wolf',[167] and, despite her contubernal relationship with Chromis, she seduces Daphnis and takes his virginity (3.15-20).[168]

The mytheme of the wolf is complex and freighted with a broad signifying range,[169] but in the context of my argument so far I suggest that Longus incorporates a lupine discourse within his narrative as a way of thinking about Rome.[170] The she-wolf is fundamentally implicated in the story of Romulus and Remus, is symbolically coterminous with Rome and her tutelary god Mars, and is central to conceptions of Roman identity.[171] It is therefore striking that Longus chooses to initiate his narrative with an incident involving a λύκαινα,[172] the very animal responsible, albeit indirectly,

---

[165] In both narratives the herdsmen recognise the abandoned children as being of noble descent (*D.C.* 1.8.1; Liv. 1.5.5). Cf. also the proximity of *D.C.* 1.8.1 and Dion. 1.79.10 (the children in both narratives, despite living as herdsman, bear the marks of a higher station).

[166] See Ogilvie (1965) *ad* Liv. 1.4.7 and Bremmer and Horsfall (1987) 32 with n. 34.

[167] Morgan (2004a) 208 cites Lyca and Lycaina as prostitute names, cf. the prostitute Lycainis of *A.P.* 11.327. See also Hunter (1983) 68 with n. 38. *Lupa* means 'prostitute' in Plaut. *Epid*. 403, *Truc*. 657.

[168] On the role played by Lycaenion see Levin (1977), Epstein (1995) 60-4, Robiano (2002). Scarcella (1993) 313-28 questions the technical status of her cohabitation with Chromis.

[169] See, e.g., Piccaluga (1968) and Forbes-Irving (1990) 90-5 on Lycaon.

[170] Epstein (1995), a detailed discussion of wolves in Longus, concludes that lupine intrusions in the novel are ambivalent, benevolent, and educative. Bowie (2005b) discusses the role of animals in Longus, including wolves. See also Epstein (2002).

[171] See, e.g., Verg. *Aen*. 8.630-4 (which Servius says follows Ennius closely), *Georg*. 2.167 (*genus acre uirum*) and 3.264 (*genus acre luporum*); Liv. 10.27.8-9. On the she-wolf and Roman identity see conveniently Mazzoni (2010).

[172] Epstein (1995) 65 rightly notes that this is the only real wolf in the narrative; it is also the only she-wolf. Wolves (not including the name Lycaenion) are mentioned fourteen times (1.12.5,1.16.2, 1.20.2, 1.20.4, 1.21.2, 1.22.1, 1.25.3, 2.16.2, 2.22.2, 2.26.1, 2.31.1, 2.32.3, 2.39.4, 3.6.3, 3.23.3, 4.4.3, 4.15.3).

for the foundation of Rome.[173] The narrator tells us that Eros plots a 'serious event' while Daphnis and Chloe 'play' (1.11.1, quoted at p. 239 cf. *Ecl.* 7.17); the contrast reflects the activities of Romulus and Remus among the shepherds, who engage in both 'serious undertakings' and 'play' (*seria ac iocos*, Liv. 1.4.10). The narrator goes on to describe how a she-wolf, needing to feed her cubs, engages in cattle-raids on nearby farms (1.11.1):

> λύκαινα τρέφουσα σκύμνους νέους ἐκ τῶν πλησίον ἀγρῶν ἐξ ἄλλων ποιμνίων πολλὰ ἥρπαζε, πολλῆς τροφῆς ἐς ἀνατροφὴν τῶν σκύμνων δεομένη.

Like the goat and the ewe who suckle Daphnis and Chloe, and the she-wolf who suckles Romulus and Remus, the λύκαινα in this instance is motivated by a maternal instinct (τρέφουσα σκύμνους νέους); her solution, on the other hand, is to resort to pastoral depredation (ἐκ τῶν πλησίον ἀγρῶν ἐξ ἄλλων ποιμνίων πολλὰ ἥρπαζε). Romulus and Remus are likewise implicated, in various ways, in pastoral brigandage.[174] Indeed, Schwegler suggests 'that the traditions in which Romulus helped shepherds against rustlers were later transformations of tales in which the founder of Rome himself participated in cattle-lifting'.[175] In Dionysius, a quarrel erupts between Romulus and Remus and Numitor's herdsman, after they accuse each other of using each other's meadow-land (1.79.12-3); in Livy, Numitor's men accuse Romulus and Remus of cattle-rustling (1.5.4); Ovid, through artful hyperbaton, plays with the idea that Romulus and Remus are themselves the brigands: *"Romule,*

She-wolves are absent from both Theocritus and the *Eclogues*, though male wolves represent a frequent threat to the pastoral world: *Id.* 1.71, 1.115, 3.53, 4.11, 5.38, 5.106, 8.63, 10.30, 11.24, 14.24, 25.185, *Ep*.6.4; *Ecl.* 2.63 (*bis*), 3.80, 5.60, 7.52, 8.52, 8.97, 9.54.

[173] For Ogilvie (1965) 46 the introduction of the she-wolf into the Romulus-Remus legend is a 'specifically Roman turn'. Bowie (2005b) 79 notes that the combination of Daphnis and Chloe's suckling, and the predatory she-wolf, should make the reader think of Rome.

[174] Bremmer and Horsfall (1987) 33-4 discuss the role of cattle-raids in the Romulus-Remus legend.

[175] Schwegler (1867) 431 n. 26, cited by Bremmer and Horsfall (1987) 33.

praedones, et Reme," dixit [pastor] *"agunt."* (*Fast*. 2.370);[176] and Eutropius is explicit that Romulus 'leads a predatory life among the shepherds': *is cum inter pastores latrocinaretur* (*Brev*. 1.1).

The she-wolf in Longus, herself a rustler, is therefore a potent symbol of the intrusive birth of Roman history, and the predatory and aggressive characteristics it embodies. In Longus, the herdsmen do not manage to catch the she-wolf with their wolf-traps since she is said to be too smart to fall for such tricks (1.11.2).[177] Rome and her empire are obvious referents. Daphnis and Chloe, suckled by a she-goat and ewe and reared by shepherds, present a pacific and romanticised alternative to the narrative of Romulus and Remus who are implicated in pastoral depredations and assimilated to a she-wolf.

6.10   Dorcon, Ovid's Actaeon, and the Lupercalia

Longus' pastoral world faces another lupine threat in the form of the cowherd Dorcon, who dresses up in a wolf-skin in an attempt to rape Chloe (1.20-2). The sequence exhibits a range of elements linking it to the Roman festival of the Lupercalia, which Greek sources perceive as being in honour of Lycaean Pan and which they claim to be Arcadian in origin.[178] Pan is a dominant deity in Longus,[179] and it is therefore no surprise that an author playing with early Roman cultural narratives might be interested in a festival that is central to conceptions of Roman identity and re-enacted every year (on the 15th February). In both Livy and Dionysius discussion of the

---

[176] See Barchiesi (1997) 158 n. 29.
[177] For wolf-traps see Hor. *Epist*. 1.16.50; Sil. *Pun*. 6.329-31.
[178] Dion. 1.31.1-3, 1.32.3, 1.80.1-3; Plut. *Rom*. 21.3; cf. Liv. 1.5.2; Verg. *Aen*. 8.343f. The Greek version of Aug. *R.G.* 19.1 translates *lupercal* as Πανὸς ἱερόν.
[179] Cheyns (2001); on Pan in general see Borgeaud (1979).

festival is immediately preceded by the upbringing of Romulus and Remus, making it likely that Longus encountered it in this context. The Dorcon episode yields further interest by virtue of its intertextual engagement with Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, namely, the fate of Actaeon (3.131-252), which I shall discuss first.[180]

Whilst the act of dressing in a wolf-skin has a precedent in Ps.-Euripides' *Rhesus* (208-12; cf. Hom. *Il.* 10.334),[181] the episode as a whole clearly derives from Ovid's treatment of the Actaeon myth.[182] Dorcon plans to ambush Chloe at the site of a secluded spring (ἐν κοίλη δὲ πάνυ γῇ ἦν ἡ πηγή, 1.20.3)[183] where Chloe regularly waters her flocks after pasture, just as Diana and her nymphs regularly bathe in a secluded grove (3.155-62) containing a *fons perlucidus* (3.161). Both Dorcon's self-bestification and Actaeon's metamorphosis enumerate specific body-parts and the covering of the body with a skin or fleece (1.20.2; 3.195-7):[184]

> 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 στόματος τὸ χάσμα σκέπειν τὴν κεφαλήν, ὥσπερ ἀνδρὸς ὁπλίτου κράνος·

> dat spatium collo summasque cacuminat aures
> cum pedibusque manus, cum longis bracchia mutat
> cruribus et uelat maculoso uellere corpus.

---

[180] In suggesting a connection with Ovid's *Met.*, I am in certain respects anticipated by the unpublished Masters dissertation of Howard (2009). Cf. also O'Connor (1991) 398 who compares Lycaenion spying on Daphnis and Chloe from a bush (εἴς τινα λόχμην ἐγκρύψασα ἑαυτήν, 3.15.4) with Salmacis spying on Hermaphroditus from the wood (*fruticumque recondita silua/ delituit*, Ov. *Met.* 4.339f).

[181] Pattoni (2004) 101 discusses Dorcon as an epic-tragic Dolon.

[182] Forbes-Irving (1990) 80-90 discusses the sources. The story is popular in art, see *LIMC* s.v. Aktaion; later images (e.g. the metope at Selinus) depict Actaeon wearing a deer-skin rather than metamorphosing into a deer, cf. Paus. 9.2.3. Tacitus includes an account of Nero's punishment of the Christians in which they are put in animal skins and torn apart by dogs (*Ann.* 15.44), and Dionysius' *Bassarica* includes a man disguised as a deer being torn apart (*GLP* 536-40); cf. also Joseph. *B.J.* 3.191-2. Merkelbach (1988) 158 links the Dorcon episode to Eur. *Bacch.* 714-33, 1107f.

[183] See p. 238 n. 34 on such landscapes as the site of sexual violence in Ovid.

[184] Cf. also the metamorphosis of Lycaon into a wolf (*Met.* 1.234-9); he is presented (by Jupiter) as a threat to the (Roman) order, just as Dorcon presents a threat to the pastoral order.

Dorcon is foiled in his plan when Chloe's keen-scented dogs spot him, begin barking, and attack him (1.21.2):

> καὶ οἱ κύνες οἱ τῶν προβάτων ἐπὶ φυλακὴν καὶ τῶν αἰγῶν ἑπόμενοι, οἵα δὴ κυνῶν ἐν ῥινηλασίαις περιεργία, κινούμενον τὸν Δόρκωνα πρὸς τὴν ἐπίθεσιν τῆς κόρης φωράσαντες, πικρὸν μάλα ὑλακτήσαντες ὥρμησαν ὡς ἐπὶ λύκον· καὶ περισχόντες, πρὶν ὅλως ἀναστῆναι δι' ἔκπληξιν, ἔδακνον κατὰ τοῦ δέρματος.

Actaeon's dogs likewise spot him and begin barking, including 'keen-scented' Ichnobates: *uidere canes primique Melampus/ Ichnobatesque* sagax latratu *signa dedere* (3.206f; cf. *resonat latratibus aether*, 3.231). Chloe's dogs are 'following the sheep and goats' for their protection,[185] recalling the dog Poemenis ('shepherd') who also 'follows flocks' (*pecudesque secuta/ Poemenis*, 3.215f).[186] Chloe's dogs then 'sink their teeth through the skin', as do Actaeon's dogs (*confertque in corpore dentes*, 3.236).

The correspondences continue with increasing specificity. Dorcon initially remains silent out of embarrassment and stays hidden in the bush (1.21.3):

> τέως μὲν οὖν τὸν ἔλεγχον αἰδούμενος καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ δέρματος ἐπισκέποντος φρουρούμενος ἔκειτο σιωπῶν ἐν τῇ λόχμῃ.

Dorcon's silence recalls Actaeon's inability to speak (*uerba desunt animo*, 3.231; cf. 3.201), and his initial embarrassment recalls Actaeon's post-metamorphosis predicament of whether he should return home or hide out in the woods: *quid faciat? repetatne domum et regalia tecta,/* an lateat siluis*? pudor hoc, timor impedit illud* (3.204f). The dogs become too ferocious for Dorcon, who groans for help in

---

[185] Dogs provide protection from wolves at Verg. *Georg*. 3.407.
[186] Other happy coincidences are the presence of the dog Nape 'born from a wolf' (*deque lupo concepta Nape*, 3.214) and Lyciscus (3.220).

supplication: μέγα <u>οἰμώξας</u> <u>ἱκέτευε</u> βοηθεῖν (1.21.3). This precisely recalls Actaeon: *gemit* ille*… supplex* *similisque roganti* (3.237-40). Daphnis and Chloe call the dogs to order with their familiar signal for recall in terms that are almost lexically parallel to Ovid: τοὺς μὲν δὴ κύνας <u>ἀνακλήσει συνήθει ταχέως</u> ἡμέρωσαν (1.21.4); *at comites* <u>*rapidum solitis hortatibus*</u> *agmen/ ignari instigant* (3.242f).[187] Indeed, the adjective συνήθει is a self-reflexive annotation of the passage in Ovid, which contains the comparable adjective *solitis*; the relationship established between Longus and Ovid by the self-referential marker functions in precisely the same way as does Vergil's citation of Callimachus through the metaphor of textual memory: *saepe ego longos/ cantando puerum <u>memini</u> me condere soles* (*Ecl.* 9.51f); <u>ἐμνήσθην</u> δ', ὁσσάκις ἀμφότεροι/ ἥλιον ἐν λέσχῃ κατεδύσαμεν (*A.P.* 7.80.2f). It is therefore a specifically Roman mode of intertextual self-reflexivity. In addition, Daphnis and Chloe fail to realise the sinister intent behind Dorcon's actions 'out of inexperience of erotic daring' (ὑπό τε ἀπειρίας ἐρωτικῶν τολμημάτων, 1.21.4), just as Actaeon's comrades are *ignari* (3.243), and in contrast to Diana who believes Actaeon's voyeurism to be erotically motivated (3.192f).[188]

The etymology of Dorcon's name also implicates Callimachus' account of Actaeon (*Hymn* 5.107-18).[189] St. Basil (*Hom. in Prov.* 6.4) preserves an etymology for the roe deer (δορκάς) in connection with its keenness of sight (ὀξυδορκία; ὀξυδερκές) and the verb δέρκομαι.[190] Dorcon's name, then, encodes his link with both deer and

---

[187] The key difference is that Daphnis and Chloe seek to *restrain* the dogs (ἡμέρωσαν), whereas Actaeon's comrades urge them on (*instigant*).

[188] For the link between lupine and erotic behaviour see Plato *Phaedr.* 241d1. Actaeon's crime is erotic in nature in Hesiod fr. 271a, Stesichorus *PMG* 236; Acusilaus *PMG* 47-58, 375-386.

[189] Longus' Dorcon is the only fictional example of the name; *LGPN* yields twenty-seven non-fictional examples.

[190] Morgan (2003) 182 n. 18, (2004b) 163; cf. also Bömer (1969) 505, Bulloch (1985) 201-2 with 202 n. 1.

vision, just as Actaeon is metamorphosed into a deer (*ceruus*) and is punished for his ungoverned vision (*uisae… Dianae*, 3.185; *me… uisam*, 3.192). Callimachus also hints at the etymological link between deer and sight. Chariclo grieves at her son Tiresias' loss of sight, blinded after he sees Athena bathing, and then Chariclo upbraids Athena: δόρκας ὀλέσσας/ καὶ πρόκας οὐ πολλὰς φάεα παιδὸς ἔχεις (*Hymn* 5.91f). Athena then goes on to contrast the fate of Tiresias with that of Actaeon (107-18).[191] This nexus of issues in Callimachus, Ovid, and Longus—deer, sight, and being torn apart by dogs— combines in the case of Dorcon so as to support the case for Longus' awareness of Ovid's account. Happily, one of Actaeon's dogs in Ovid's catalogue is also named Dorceus (3.210).

In addition to the Lupercalia (discussed below) there are three further items that potentially contribute to the Romanising tenor of the Dorcon episode. In Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* a group of bandits hollow out the carcass of a dead bear in order that one of their number, Thrasyleon, might wear it to gain access to Demochares' house (4.14-5); he ends up being mauled to death by hunting dogs (4.20-1).[192] It is likely that one author was reading the other, or indeed that both were reading Ovid.[193] Secondly, Charisius reports that the Roman grammarian Velius Longus, active under Trajan or Hadrian, wrote about wolf-skins (*GL* I.93.31):

> cum sint Titus et lupus similia, thermas Titinas, ut pelles lupinas non dicimus, sed Titianas, de qua quaestione a Velio Longo libellus scriptus est.

---

[191] Van Tress (2004) 82 argues that Ovid relies on Callimachus for his account of Actaeon. Callimachus' account is also the first version in which Actaeon is punished for intruding on Artemis bathing.

[192] On this episode see Shumate (1996) 65-71.

[193] At Apul. *Met*. 2.4 Lucius stares at a statue of Actaeon, in Byrrhena's courtyard, on the verge of metamorphosing into a stag.

Herrmann adduces this passage as part of his argument that Velius himself is the 'Longus' responsible for the novel, and links this fragment to the Dorcon episode. Given the novelist's knowledge of Latin literature and culture, Herrmann's theory should not be discounted out of hand.[194] Velius composed a treatise on ornithology and was a commentator on Vergil (Macr. *Sat*. 3.6.6; Serv. *ad Aen*. 10.245), so his interests fit neatly with those of the novelist. And thirdly, Romulus' first appearance in the *Aeneid* features him wearing the skin of a she-wolf: *lupae fuluo nutricis tegmine laetus* (1.275).[195]

Following from my argument in the previous section that Longus manipulates narratives of early Roman history, the lupine element in the Dorcon episode seems to show awareness of the Lupercalia, perceived as originally a shepherd festival (Plut. *Caes*. 61), associated with wolves and the origin of Rome itself (Greek sources include Plut. *Q.R*. 61, *Rom*. 21.3-4; Dion. 1.32.3, 1.80.1);[196] it was restored by Augustus (Suet. *Aug*. 31) and celebrated until the time of the Emperor Anastasius.[197] The sacrifice of a dog is among the peculiarities of the festival,[198] which Plutarch explains as either a thank-offering to the she-wolf for saving Romulus and Remus, or because of its status as an enemy to wolves, or perhaps because they annoy the Luperci as they run round (Plut. *Rom*. 21.8):[199]

---

[194] Herrmann (1981). Morgan (1997) 2231 thinks that an 'austere specialist in archaic Latin does not really make a plausible author for a witty erotic romance in Greek'. But why not?
[195] Cf. also *Aen*. 11.680f, where the warrior Ornytus wears a wolfcap.
[196] Rodríguez-Mayorgas (2010) 98-9. Vukovic (2015) 42-59 reviews the evidence.
[197] McLynn (2008) argues that the festival survived into the 6th century.
[198] Goats and goat-skins are also central to the practice of the Lupercalia (see, e.g., Plut. *Rom*. 21.4-5, *Caes*. 61; Ov. *Fast*. 2.361; Val. Max. 2.2.9; Quint. *I.O*. 1.5.66-7; Serv. *ad Aen*. 8.343). Interestingly, goat-sacrifices also feature in Longus at 2.30.5 and 2.31.2-3, which is specifically in honour of Pan; both of these passages recall the sacrifice and skinning of a goat in Verg. *Georg*. 3.380-96, on which see Appendix 3.
[199] Cf. also Plut. *Q.R*. 68, 111.

εἰ δὲ τῇ λυκαίνῃ χαριστήρια ταῦτα καὶ τροφεῖα καὶ σωτήρια Ῥωμύλου τελοῦσιν, οὐκ τόπως ὁ κύων σφάττεται· λύκοις γάρ ἐστι πολέμιος· εἰ μὴ νὴ Δία κολάζεται τὸ ζῷον ὡς παρενοχλοῦν τοὺς Λουπέρκους ὅταν περιθέωσι.

The Dorcon episode therefore reverses the hierarchy governing the treatment of wolves and dogs in the Lupercalia. For Plutarch, the sacrifice of a dog is a 'thank offering to the she-wolf' (τῇ λυκαίνῃ χαριστήρια) for her tutelage over the twins; whereas in Longus, Chloe's dogs not only 'annoy' the lupine Dorcon but almost maul him to death. Longus' replay of the Lupercalia therefore valorises the dog and marginalises the wolf.

Longus also retains the element of 'play' so central to the Roman festival. Daphnis and Chloe, unaware of convention, think that Dorcon's attempted rape of Chloe is a 'pastoral prank': ὑπό τε ἀπειρίας ἐρωτικῶν τολμημάτων <u>ποιμενικὴν παιδιὰν</u> νομίζοντες τὴν ἐπιβολὴν τοῦ δέρματος (1.21.5). Likewise, the sources ubiquitously attest that the Lupercalia was conducted in playful spirit: *per lusum atque lasciuiam* (Liv. 1.5.2); *per lusus* (Ov. *Fast*. 2.369); *laetitia exulantes* (Val. Max. 2.2.9); παιδιᾷ καὶ γέλωτι (Plut. *Caes*. 61); μετὰ παιδιᾶς (Plut. *Ant*. 12.2).

Finally, the ambush by Dorcon on Chloe while Daphnis is away cutting fodder (1.21.1) resembles the ambush by Numitor's men on Remus while Romulus is away at a sacrifice (Dion. 1.79.13-4). Indeed, Aelius Tubero (*ap*. Dion. 1.80.1) reports that the ambush took place *at* the Lupercalia, which coheres with Longus' re-imagining of the festival. Longus has re-pastoralised the Lupercalia and deployed its elements to characterise the antagonist Dorcon.

6.11   The Methymnaean invasion (2.12-3.1), Vergil *Aeneid* 7, and Philopoimen

The episode in question features an incident in which an adolescent group of pleasure-seeking urbanites, on a hunting trip from the city of Methymna, put in at Daphnis and Chloe's coastal farm and proceed to disrupt the pastoral harmony.[200] In this section I suggest that the irruption of war brought about by the Methymnaeans in the pastoral hinterland of Mytilene looks to a comparable set of events in the seventh book of the *Aeneid*, in which the incoming Trojans bring war to the countryside of Latium in central Italy.[201] The key difference is that, in Vergil, the presence of external forces in pre-Roman Italy has devastating and permanent consequences; in Longus, however, the disruption of pastoral autonomy is temporary and the effects are impermanent. By rendering the incursion of the Methymnaeans as a momentary blip, Longus transforms the *Aeneid* into a romance in which the Trojans never become Romans and never, therefore, establish Italy as the site of their imperial headquarters. Vergil's epic is chiselled into the shape of a Greek romance and stripped of its imperialising teleology. In brief, an alternative history is created in which the Roman Empire never actually happens.[202] The whole episode contributes to Longus' adversarial relationship with Latin literature and culture, enacting a 'hidden transcript' through postcolonial 'mimicry'.

---

[200] Anderson (1984) 97 observes that the Mytilene-Methymna conflict would have been 'technically impossible' between Greek cities under *Pax Romana*.

[201] Horsfall (2000) *ad* 7.475-539 offers a survey of treatments of the episode; it is well known in antiquity and is treated by Macrobius who criticises its 'childishness', and accounts for this by pointing to the fact that it is a Vergilian invention (*Sat.* 5.17.1-2). In Dionysius of Halicarnassus the Trojans initiate unprovoked seizure of Latin agricultural implements: σίδηρον καὶ ξύλα καὶ τὰς γεωργικὰς παρασκευάς (1.57.1).

[202] Frye (1976) and Jameson (1981) 103-50 see romance as a space of alternative history.

I shall briefly summarise the episode. Firstly, Longus: on a hunting trip, the young Methymnaeans arrive by boat at Daphnis and Chloe's coastal farm, but their badly trained dogs scare Daphnis' goats who scatter to the shore. Here, the goats chew through the willow rope being used to moor the Methymnaean boat, which floats away, and the Methymnaeans angrily beat up Daphnis. An *ad hoc* court is convened and presided over by Philetas who adjudicates the case in favour of Daphnis. More hostilities ensue during which Chloe is abducted, but ultimately Pan saves the day and pastoral harmony is restored.[203] In Book 7 of the *Aeneid*, after the Trojans land in Italy, Juno's agent Allecto excites Ascanius' dogs while he and the Trojan youths are on a hunting trip. Ascanius shoots the local Silvia's pet stag, and hostilities ensue leading to war in Italy. In both narratives, a minor rustic incident, both involving huntsmen with out-of-control dogs on the coast, precipitates a skirmish and outbreak of full-scale war. The only difference is that, in Longus, the Methymnaeans disappear, never to be heard from again, but in Vergil the event marks a milestone in the move towards Rome and empire. Likewise, the events in the *Aeneid* are concerned with the complex question of who is responsible for the outbreak of the war. Vergil makes no explicit judgment and leaves the matter so ambiguous as to make it difficult for the reader to pronounce one way or the other.[204] Longus, however, disambiguates the issue and leaves the reader in no doubt that the marauding Methymnaeans are in the wrong.

In Longus the whole episode is prefaced by a statement by the narrator to the effect that Daphnis and Chloe would have had sexual intercourse were it not for the incursion of the Methymnaeans: ἴσως δὲ ἄν τι καὶ τῶν ἀληθῶν ἔπραξαν, εἰ μὴ

---

[203] Bowie (2001) links the episode of Panic in Longus (2.25.4-26.1) to Paus. 10.23.1-7.

[204] On the issue of Trojan responsibility see Horsfall (2001) 155-61 with further bibliography. Horsfall (2000) xx characterises the seventh book as an 'epic meditation on causation and responsibility'.

θόρυβος τοιόσδε πᾶσαν τὴν ἀγροικίαν ἐκείνην κατέλαβε (2.11.3). Bowie detects a resemblance to Meliboeus' complaint that the countryside has been disrupted by the land dispossessions: *undique totis/ usque adeo turbatur agris* (*Ecl.* 1.11f).[205] The intertext is therefore functional within its new context: the episode that it prefaces concerns the incursion of the Methymnaeans into the pastoral world and the trouble this causes. The Vergilian intertext, then, imports a central concern of Vergilian pastoral (discussed in section 6.2).

In the first instance, the sequence of events in both Vergil and Longus involves a hunting misadventure that takes place on the coast. The Methymnaeans come ashore to hunt; they then unwisely moor their ship using a rope made of willow, set their nets to the ground and release their hounds to find a scent, after which the hounds scare the goats who wander to the shore (2.13.2-4):

> προσορμίζονται τοῖς ἀγροῖς... ἐδόκει γὰρ αὐτοῖς καλὸν εἶναι τὸ πεδίον ἐς θήραν λαγῶν... ἔπειτα τοὺς κύνας ἀφέντες ῥινηλατεῖν ἐν ταῖς εὐκαίροις φαινομέναις τῶν ὁδῶν ἐλινοστάτουν. οἱ μὲν δὴ κύνες ἅμα ὑλακῇ διαθέοντες ἐφόβησαν τὰς αἶγας· αἱ δὲ τὰ ὀρεινὰ καταλιποῦσαι μᾶλλόν τι πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν ὥρμησαν.

Likewise in the *Aeneid*, Allecto spies Ascanius hunting on the shore; she then maddens the hounds with a familiar scent, causing them to chase the stag (7.476-81):

> Allecto... speculata locum, quo litore pulcher
> insidiis cursuque feras agitabat Iulus...
> hic subitam canibus rabiem Cocytia uirgo
> obicit et noto naris contingit odore,
> ut ceruum ardentes agerent.

---

[205] Bowie (1985) 81 n. 59, arguing that 'if these two passages do have a common model we shall have to be cautious about treating confiscations and the plight of Meliboeus as an alien element brought into the pastoral by Virgil'.

The correspondences are numerous and close. The Methymnaeans and Ascanius are both hunting on the shore (προσορμίζονται... ἐς θήραν; *quo litore... feras agitabat*) with nets (ἐλινοστάτουν; *insidiis*) and keen-scented dogs (τοὺς κύνας ἀφέντες ῥινηλατεῖν; *canibus rabiem Cocytia uirgo/ obicit et noto naris contingit odore*). The crucial difference is that Longus makes the Methymnaeans *guilty* by releasing the dogs of their own accord, whereas in Vergil the issue is complicated by the mediating influence of Allecto.

Not only does Longus clarify the guilt of the Methymnaeans, he also pares away the pathos of the Vergilian episode. Following a ten-line vignette describing the beauty of Silvia's stag and the care she administers to it (7.483-92), its peaceful demeanour is shattered by Ascanius' baying hounds: *hunc procul errantem rabidae uenantis Iuli/ commouere canes* (7.493f; cf. κύνες… ἐφόβησαν τὰς αἶγας, quoted above).[206] In Longus' narrative, a rather slapstick sequence of events ensues in which the goats, lacking their normal food, nibble on the willow rope being used to moor the Methymnaean boat,[207] which is then carried away by the wind (2.14.1-2).[208] The angered youths locate Daphnis, hit him, strip him, and tie him up with a dog lead (2.14.3). Whatever the rights and wrongs of Ascanius' actions—he shoots Silvia's stag for the sake of *laus* 'glory' (7.496)—he and the Trojans are not guilty of the dehumanising treatment meted out by the Methymnaeans to Daphnis. The Methymnaeans are beginning to look like caricatures of the Trojans from *Aeneid* 7.

---

[206] The hunting episode in Book 4 of the *Aeneid* is similar, during which the she-goats run down from the mountains: *ecce ferae saxi deiectae uertice caprae/ decurrere iugis* (4.152f).
[207] Engelmann (1904) connects this episode to a frieze from the Casa Farnesina in Rome depicting what appears to be a goat standing behind a boat, an argument between a hunter and a shepherd, and the same two men before a seated judge; this is discussed by Morgan (2011) 152, who derives the scene from Philitas.
[208] The rustics are not completely absolved of blame, insofar as one of their number steals the Methymnaeans' original mooring-rope (2.13.1).

The sequel corroborates the network of correspondences I have sketched so far. Daphnis cries out and appeals to the elder countrymen for help; there is an analogous cry for help from Silvia in the Vergilian episode (2.14.4; 7.500-4):

> ὁ δὲ ἐβόα τε παιόμενος καὶ ἱκέτευε τοὺς ἀγροίκους καὶ πρώτους γε τὸν Λάμωνα καὶ τὸν Δρύαντα βοηθοὺς ἐπεκαλεῖτο.

> saucius.../ successitque gemens stabulis, questuque cruentus
> atque imploranti similis tectum omne replebat.
> Siluia prima soror palmis percussa lacertos
> auxilium uocat et duros conclamat agrestis.

Again, the correspondences are numerous and close. Both Daphnis and the stag cry out (ἐβόα; *gemens*); Daphnis begs for help, whilst the stag is as if such a person (ἱκέτευε; *imploranti similis*); Daphnis then calls for the countrymen as does Silvia (ἱκέτευε τοὺς ἀγροίκους... βοηθοὺς ἐπεκαλεῖτο; *auxilium uocat... conclamat agrestis*); and the beating received by Daphnis recalls Silvia's beating of her own arms (παιόμενος; *percussa*). The old rustics are described as turning up immediately in both narratives. Longus' narrator dilates on their rustic strength (picking up Vergil's *duros… agrestis*): οἱ δὲ ἀντείχοντο σκληροὶ γέροντες καὶ χεῖρας ἐκ γεωργικῶν ἔργων ἰσχυρὰς ἔχοντες (2.14.4).[209] The image of hardy rustics draws on the idealisation of the old-school rustic Italians, as typified, for example, by the doomed Numanus Remulus (9.598-620, esp. 602-613) who contrasts Italian virility with the effeminacy of the incoming Trojans.[210]

---

[209] Lyne (1989) 144 discusses the simile at *Aen.* 12.450-5 and likens Aeneas' destruction of the Italian enemy to a storm cloud that frightens the onlooking farmers, as well as suggesting that the simile evokes sympathy for the *agricolae*.

[210] See Horsfall (1971) on this passage; the Roman ideal of the farmer-soldier is codified by Cato the Elder: *at ex agricolis et uiri fortissimi et milites strenuissimi gignuntur* (*R.R. praef.* 4); see also Nisbet and Rudd (2004) *ad* Hor. *C.* 3.1.21f, 3.6.37f.

The subsequent mediating efforts of Philetas (in Longus) and Galaesus (in Vergil) are precisely parallel.[211] After the elders arrive on the scene, both the Methymnaeans and the countrymen demand a judicial enquiry.[212] Philetas is appointed as arbitrator on account of his seniority and superlative sense of fairness (2.15.1):

> δικαστὴν καθίζουσι Φιλητᾶν τὸν βουκόλον· πρεσβύτατός τε γὰρ ἦν τῶν παρόντων καὶ κλέος εἶχεν ἐν τοῖς κωμήταις δικαιοσύνης περιττῆς.

He adjudicates the case to Daphnis, and an escalation of hostilities ensues. In Vergil's narrative there is no kind of arbitration between the Trojans and Italians, and military action immediately follows the arrival of the *duri agrestes* (7.504). Among the first casualties is a character named Galaesus, killed whilst attempting to keep the peace and arbitrate between the Trojans and Italians (7.535-9):

> corpora multa uirum circa seniorque Galaesus
> dum paci medium se offert, iustissimus unus
> qui fuit Ausoniisque olim ditissimus aruis:
> quinque greges illi balantum, quina redibant
> armenta, et terram centum uertebat aratris.

The proximities between Philetas and Galaesus are obvious and significant. Both are described in terms of age and seniority (πρεσβύτατός; *senior*); both are renowned for their superlative sense of justice (δικαιοσύνης περιττῆς; *iustissimus unus*); both are connected to herding (τὸν βουκόλον; *greges... balantum... armenta*); and both attempt to arbitrate in the interests of keeping the peace between the war-mongering incomers and the countrymen (δικαστήν; *paci medium se offert*).

---

[211] For the link between Galaesus and the Old Corycian gardener in the *Georgics* (who is discussed in connection with Philetas at p. 252-4) see Verg. *Georg.* 4.125-7 and Prop. 2.34.67f.

[212] Cueva (1998) 437-8 notes the resemblance of this quasi-judicial episode to the debate between Cleon and Diodotus in Thuc. 3.37-48, and Trzaskoma (2005) discusses the Thucydidean elements in this episode more generally.

Longus' trial between the Methymnaeans and the countrymen is a clear case of disambiguation. Vergil hedges his bets by having Allecto intervene as an agent of causation, whereas in Longus there is no question over who is to blame. The Methymnaeans present their case, claiming that they tied up their ship using willow (see p. 241-2), intending to hunt (θηρᾶσαι θέλοντες… διὰ τῶν κυνῶν ζήτησιν ἐποιούμεθα θηρίων, 2.15.2). Again, this recalls the therophiliac disposition of Ascanius and his troop. The Methymnaeans lay the blame on the goats, lament the loss of their valuables, and call Daphnis to account for being a useless goatherd who grazes his goats by the sea: πονηρὸν ὄντα αἰπόλον, ὃς ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης νέμει τὰς αἶγας (2.15.3; cf *quo litore*, 7.477). Buoyed by the presence of Chloe, Daphnis puts on a rhetorical *tour de force* in response. He argues that he is a good goatherd with well-behaved goats (just as Silvia's stag is *adsuetus imperiis*, 7.487), and that it is the Methymnaeans who, as unskilled huntsmen with badly trained dogs, are to blame (2.16.2):

> οὗτοι δέ εἰσι κυνηγέται πονηροὶ καὶ κύνας ἔχουσι κακῶς πεπαιδευμένους,
> οἵτινες τρέχοντες πολλὰ καὶ ὑλακτοῦντες σκληρὰ κατεδίωξαν αὐτὰς ἐκ
> τῶν ὀρῶν καὶ τῶν πεδίων ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν, ὥσπερ λύκοι.

Vergil describes Ascanius' hounds as 'mad' (*rabidae canes*, 7.493f),[213] where Daphnis describes the Methymnaean hounds as 'like wolves'. The lupine comparandum is significant and functions within Longus' pastoral landscape as a threatening signifier of Rome; slightly later Daphnis disconsolately refers to the fact that no wolf has ever snatched any of his flock, in contrast to the Methymnaeans who have taken the whole flock and Chloe too: αἶγα μὲν οὐδὲ μίαν μοι λύκος ἥρπασε,

---

[213] See Horsfall (2000) *ad Aen*. 7.493, discussing Ascanius' control of the hounds.

πολέμιοι δὲ τὴν ἀγέλην ὅλην καὶ τὴν συννέμουσαν (2.22.2; cf. 4.4.3). The crucial difference between Vergil's version and Longus' version is that Longus disambiguates the question of Roman guilt. His version of the Romans—that is, the Methymnaeans—are conspicuously guilty.[214]

As above in the case of the shooting of Silvia's stag, here too Longus pares away the Vergilian pathos and presents a mini-trial between the Methymnaeans and Daphnis, in which Philetas as judge adjudicates the case in favour of Daphnis. Nobody dies, and the Methymnaeans end up looking foolish. Vergil's Galaesus, on the other hand, is killed trying to keep the peace. Within the framework of the *Aeneid*, Galaesus functions as a symbol of the pastoral world and a final vestige of the landscape of the *Eclogues*. His death represents the pastoral world as a victim of Rome. Longus, however, redirects his version of the narrative away from the imperial teleology of the *Aeneid*, and makes sure that Philetas remains alive and well.

The ensuing outbreak of violence and involvement of the countrymen is directly paralleled in both narratives. After Daphnis concludes his speech with the obligatory show of tears and the case is concluded,[215] the Methymnaeans assault Daphnis. The rustics step in and retrieve him, administering a severe beating to the Methymnaeans in the process (2.17.3):

> ἐνταῦθα οἱ κωμῆται ταραχθέντες ἐπιπηδῶσιν αὐτοῖς ὡσεὶ ψᾶρες ἢ κολοιοί·
> καὶ ταχὺ μὲν ἀφαιροῦνται τὸν Δάφνιν ἤδη καὶ αὐτὸν μαχόμενον, ταχὺ δὲ
> ξύλοις παίοντες ἐκείνους εἰς φυγὴν ἔτρεψαν· ἀπέστησαν δὲ οὐ πρότερον
> ἔστε τῶν ὅρων αὐτοὺς ἐξήλασαν ἐς ἄλλους ἀγρούς.

---

[214] One of Philetas' arguments for absolving Daphnis and his goats from any guilt is to assign blame to the sea and the wind, who are answerable to 'other judges' (2.17.1). It is curious that the *Aeneid* opens with an episode that thematises who, precisely, governs the wind and the sea (1.34-156).

[215] Tears at the end of a forensic speech are a Roman rather than Greek phenomenon (e.g. Cicero *Pro Milone* 105). Haynes (2000) 86 compares Telemachus' tears (*Od*. 2.80f).

This precisely recalls the arrival of the *duri agrestes* after Silvia has called for their help (7.506-8):

> improuisi adsunt, hic torre armatus obusto
> stipitis hic grauidi nodis; quod cuique repertum
> rimanti telum ira facit.

Their speed of arrival and action is emphasised (ταχὺ... ταχὺ; *improuisi adsunt*); an emotional disturbance affects them (ταραχθέντες;[216] *quod cuique repertum/ rimanti telum ira facit*); and they both use rustic wooden hardware as rudimentary weapons (ξύλοις παίοντες; *torre armatus obusto/ stipitis hic grauidi nodis*; cf. 7.508-10, the arrival of Tyrrhus, the herdsman in charge of the royal flocks, armed with an axe). The differences are nonetheless as telling as the similarities: Longus' countrymen put the Methymnaeans to flight, whilst the combat between the Trojans and Italians is bloody and deadly. Both episodes lead to further war: the Methymnaeans trump up false charges against the countrymen and persuade those back in the city to authorise an unheralded war against the Mytileneans (2.19); and following the skirmish in the *Aeneid*, Allecto returns to Hades, Latinus withdraws, and Juno smashes open the Gates of Mars. Once again, Longus' narrative not only disambiguates the question of Trojan responsibility but also characterises the Methymnaeans as sore losers and liars.

The remainder of the episode contains further evidence that the Methymnaeans are available to be read as caricatures of the Romans. The Methymnaeans return and begin making coastal raids, seizing animals, property, and

---

[216] *LSJ* s.v. ταράσσω I.2.

farmhands (2.20.1).[217] Dionysius depicts the Trojans engaging in similar agricultural depredations in Italy (see p. 281 n. 201). During one of the raids, the Methymnaeans again put in at Daphnis and Chloe's farm. Daphnis is not present, but is up in the woods gathering fodder; he spots the raid and hides in the trunk of a dead beech tree (2.20.2; see p. 249).[218] The Methymnaeans then abduct the suppliant Chloe from the Nymphs, hurling abuse at their statues as they leave, and beat her with willow twigs like a goat or sheep (2.20.3):

ἡ δὲ Χλόη παρῆν ταῖς ἀγέλαις καὶ διωκομένη καταφεύγει πρὸς τὰς Νύμφας ἱκέτις καὶ ἐδεῖτο φείσασθαι καὶ ὧν ἔνεμε καὶ αὐτῆς διὰ τὰς θεάς. ἀλλ᾽ ἦν οὐδὲν ὄφελος· οἱ γὰρ Μηθυμναῖοι πολλὰ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων κατακερτομήσαντες καὶ τὰς ἀγέλας ἤλασαν κἀκείνην ἤγαγον ὥσπερ αἶγα ἢ πρόβατον παίοντες λύγοις.

Daphnis subsequently searches for Chloe 'at the holm-oak tree where they used to sit' (2.21.3). The above passages are a repository of generic markers of Vergilian pastoral: ὕλη 'wood', χλωρός 'green', ὀξύη 'beech', λύγος 'willow', and φηγός 'holm-oak'. The high density of Vergilian markers in this passage not only underpins the network of allusions elaborated in this section, but also thematises the intrusive presence of the Methymnaeans in the pastoral landscape: elsewhere Daphnis' goats *feed on* willow (2.13.3, 2.15.2, 2.16.3 etc.), as do Vergil's (*Ecl.* 1.77f, 3.83; *Georg.* 4.234-6); but the Methymnaeans misunderstand the generic marker and use it to do violence to Chloe, whose very name reflects the pastoral world (see p. 242-3).

---

[217] In the simile at *Aen*. 12.4-8 likening Turnus to a wounded lion, it is possible to activate the *latro* of line 7 as Aeneas, as observed by Lyne (1989) 165.

[218] In this instance Longus seems to be narrativising the first simile in Book 2 of the *Aeneid* (2.304-8; cf. Hom. *Il*. 4.452-5) in which Aeneas awakes from his dream encounter with Hector, and rushes to the high-point of the roofs. He is then likened to a bemused shepherd watching the destruction of his crop and flocks: *stupet inscius alto/ accipiens sonitum saxi de uertice pastor*. That Daphnis is here typologically related to the Trojan Aeneas, and the Methymnaeans to the Greeks, complicates any hopes of a simple typology, but also confirms that Longus has Vergil in mind.

The intrusive quality of the Methymnaean actions is magnified by Pan's rebuke to their leader Bryaxis. Pan upbraids him and his men for their impiety in bringing war to the countryside and tearing Chloe from the altars of the Nymphs (2.27.1-2):

> ὦ πάντων ἀνοσιώτατοι καὶ ἀσεβέστατοι, τί ταῦτα μαινομέναις φρεσὶν ἐτολμήσατε; πολέμου μὲν τὴν ἀγροικίαν ἐνεπλήσατε τὴν ἐμοὶ φίλην, ἀγέλας δὲ βοῶν καὶ αἰγῶν καὶ ποιμνίων ἀπηλάσατε τὰς ἐμοὶ μελομένας· ἀπεσπάσατε δὲ βωμῶν παρθένον, ἐξ ἧς Ἔρως μῦθον ποιῆσαι θέλει· καὶ οὔτε τὰς Νύμφας ἠδέσθητε βλεπούσας οὔτε τὸν Πᾶνα ἐμέ.

In their removal of animals the Methymnaeans have transformed the countryside from a place of pastoral activity into a site of war, that is, they have momentarily replaced the *Eclogues* with the *Aeneid*. The emphasis on their impiety (ἀνοσιώτατοι καὶ ἀσεβέστατοι) can be activated in connection with the intrusion of the *impius miles* into the pastoral world of the *Eclogues* (1.70) and the dispossession of land that takes place there,[219] as well as with Aeneas' repeated epithet *pius*.[220] In addition, the seizure of Chloe thematically recalls that of the Palladium by *impius Tydides* (*Aen.* 2.163-9) and of Cassandra *a templo adytisque* (*Aen.* 2.403f); and there are potential traces of Romulus' rape of the Sabine women.[221] Furthermore, Pan even sounds like the indignant Juno in the *Aeneid* railing against the Trojans: *heu stirpem inuisam et fatis contraria nostris/ fata Phrygum...!* (7.293-322); and Pan's accusation that the Methymnaeans have filled the countryside with war (πολέμου μὲν τὴν ἀγροικίαν

---

[219] Bowie (2009) 15 notes that ἀσέβεια is also applied to the pirates by Dorcon at 1.29.1; he also suggests that Pan, in upbraiding Bryaxis, exaggerates the behaviour of the Methymnaeans by his inclusion of the detail that Chloe had been dragged from the altars of the Nymphs, a detail not in the initial narrative event at 2.20.3.

[220] E.g. 1.220, 305, 378, 4.393, 5.26, 286, 685. At 4.496 Dido calls Aeneas *impius*.

[221] *Ecl.* 3.8f features an apparent rape in a shrine of (or associated with) the Nymphs: *nouimus et qui te transuersa tuentibus hircis/ et quo (sed faciles Nymphae risere) sacello*; the Theocritean verses on which this is based (*Id.* 5.41f) contain no mention of the Nymphs.

ἐνεπλήσατε τὴν ἐμοὶ φίλην) recalls the effects of Ascanius' hunting expedition: *quae prima laborum/ causa fuit belloque animos accendit agrestis*, 7.481f).[222]

Pan also functions as a positive version of Vergil's Allecto, restoring order where Allecto had been an agent of disorder. At the first onset of Panic, the sound of pipes heard from a high peak causes consternation for the Methymnaeans, who rush to arms: ἠκούετό τις καὶ <u>ἀπὸ τῆς ὀρθίου πέτρας</u> τῆς ὑπὲρ τὴν ἄκραν σύριγγος ἦχος… ἐταράττοντο οὖν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα ἔθεον (2.26.3). Awaking fearfully from his dream, Bryaxis orders Chloe's release, and the sound of the pan-pipes is again heard, though this time they are not 'martial and scary' but 'pastoral and such as is used for herding': οὐκέτι πολεμικὸς καὶ φοβερός, ἀλλὰ <u>ποιμενικὸς</u> καὶ οἷος εἰς νομὴν ἡγεῖται ποιμνίων (2.28.3).[223] Allecto's 'pastoral' call to arms (*pastorale signum*, also from a high peak), however, serves only to instil fear, and lacks the genuinely pastoral effect of Pan's piping after Chloe's liberation (7.513-21):

> at saeua e speculis tempus dea nacta nocendi
> <u>ardua tecta</u> petit stabuli et de <u>culmine summo</u>
> <u>pastorale</u> canit <u>signum</u> cornuque recuruo…
> contremuit nemus et siluae insonuere profundae...
> et trepidae matres pressere ad pectora natos.
> tum uero ad uocem celeres, qua bucina signum
> dira dedit, raptis concurrunt undique telis
> indomiti agricolae...

Longus' Pan, then, assumes the role of Vergil's Allecto. Both issue the call to war from a high vantage point (ἀπὸ τῆς ὀρθίου πέτρας τῆς ὑπὲρ τὴν ἄκραν; *e speculis... ardua tecta petit stabili et de culmine summo*); both have a signal for war that is mediated musically (σύριγγος ἦχος; *pastorale canit signum cornuque recuruo*); those

---

[222] I note a parallel for 'fill the countryside with "x"' at *Ecl.* 6.48: *Proetides <u>implerunt</u> falsis mugitibus <u>agros</u>*.

[223] Cf. Xen. Eph. 1.2.4, where the 'martial' (πολεμικά) elements of the procession are contrasted with the 'peaceful' (εἰρηνικά).

who hear it experience fear (ἐφόβει δὲ τοὺς ἀκούοντας... ἐταράττοντο; φοβερός; *contremuit nemus*; *trepidae matres*; *dira*); and the signals of both cause a rush to arms (ἐπὶ τὰ ὅπλα ἔθεον; *raptis concurrunt undique telis/ indomiti agricolae*). Whilst Allecto's *pastorale signum* functions only to catalyse hostilities, Pan's ποιμενικὸς ἦχος serves to restore Chloe and re-establish the harmony of the pastoral world.

If we accept that Book 7 of the *Aeneid*—home to the pastoral Italy whose peace is shattered by the Roman imperial project—[224]is a functional intertext within this episode, and that the Methymnaeans represent a caricatured version of the Romans, then further connections present themselves on the more global level. The abduction of Chloe from the Nymphs becomes a reboot of Aeneas' replacement of Turnus as Lavinia's bridegroom. On this reading, Daphnis' reacquisition of and marriage to Chloe render him a successful Turnus who has repelled the incoming Trojans and retained his bride. This is an alternative history in which the Roman Empire never happens. In Longus' hypothetical world, the Methymnaeans are only ever a momentary incursion—that is, the *Aeneid*, whose discourse serves to naturalise Rome's imperialising agenda,[225] fails ultimately to replace the *Eclogues*, and Rome never moves beyond its shepherd origins.

The anti-imperial thrust of the episode finds support in Daphnis and Chloe's significantly named son, Philopoimen (4.39.2). As Bowie has observed in connection with the end of the novel, Philopoimen features in one of Plutarch's double lives,

---

[224] A. Parry (1963) and Lyne (1987) explore the presence of 'further voices' in the *Aeneid*, which express sympathy for those characters who become the victims of Rome.
[225] Hardie (1986) is fundamental.

paired with Titus Flaminius.[226] He was general of the Achaean Confederacy in the second century BCE, turned it into an important military power, and was *strategos* on eight occasions. He attempted to rally the Greeks against the Romans when they tried to intervene in his policies; he rejected them, and refused to recognise any Roman competence in Achaean internal affairs. Plutarch transmits an anecdote recalling how a certain anonymous Roman had praised Philopoimen, calling him the 'last of the Greeks' (Plut. *Phil*. 1.7):

Ῥωμαίων δέ τις ἐπαινῶν ἔσχατον αὐτὸν Ἑλλήνων προσεῖπεν, ὡς οὐδένα μέγαν μετὰ τοῦτον ἔτι τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἄνδρα γειναμένης οὐδ' αὐτῆς ἄξιον.

Though it might be an obvious pastoral name ('lover of flocks'), it does not feature elsewhere in extant pastoral. It is therefore curious that Daphnis and Chloe bear a child with the name of a Greek general who famously stood up to the Romans, and who had more recently been celebrated by Plutarch. Perhaps the proleptic future embodied in the name Philopoimen functions as a fantasy of aggression on the part of the Greek elite. If so, it sits comfortably with Longus' de-imperialising of the *Aeneid*.

6.12   Conclusion

In the previous section I argued for Longus' close engagement with and remodelling of the outbreak of hostilities in *Aeneid* 7, in order to characterise the Methymnaeans as an unsuccessful and unambiguously guilty version of the Trojans who invade the pastoral world of central Italy, and as a caricature of aggressive Roman militarism and expansionism. They thereby explode the pretensions of the Roman justification for

---

[226] Bowie (2005b) 83-4. Pausanias also praises him as a benefactor and last hero of Greece (8.49.1, 8.51.4-52.1).

military action that parades itself as 'just' or 'pious' (*bellum iustum et pium*).[227] Indeed, the *Aeneid* is an obvious target for any such project. Longus mediates the parable of Roman imperialism embodied in the *Aeneid* and presses it into a new aesthetic form—[228]a prose romance in Greek—showing up the Romans as a cast of marauding adolescents on a hunting trip gone wrong. The Methymnaeans are thus available to be read as a negative model of Greco-Roman imperial relations (on the model of a 'hidden transcript'). Later in the novel this is thrown into relief by the arrival of the friendly overlord Dionysophanes and his son Astylus. These wealthy urbanites treat the rustics well, and even award them their freedom and some property. Longus therefore, in the final instance, offers the reader a more recuperative model of empire, which provides a corrective to the earlier, dysfunctional, and ultimately unsustainable model based on aggression.

Longus' sustained incorporation and rewriting of Roman cultural narratives and elements is buttressed by his obviously detailed knowledge of Latin literature; writing in the pastoral tradition, a collision with the *Eclogues* is inevitable, despite attempts to write Vergil out of the tradition through (for example) the playful diminution of Tityros to the role of errand-boy who must fetch the pipes for Philetas. Yet Longus' pastoral landscpape remains littered with Vergilian markers (woods, echo etc.). What we learn from Longus is that, even for an Atticising Greek, Latin literature is too important to ignore.

---

[227] E.g. Liv. 9.1.10; Cic. *Div. in Caec.* 63, *De Prov. Cons.* 4, *Ad Atticum* 7.14.3, 9.19.1, *De Off.* 1.36, *De Rep.* 2.31, 3.35, *Phillipp.* 11.37, 13.35. On the concept, see Drexler (1959), Badian (1968) *passim* and Harris (1979) 166-74.

[228] Althusser (1984) 177 calls this process 'distantiation'.

Conclusion

Reviewing Tilg's work on Chariton and the *Aeneid*, Montiglio comments: 'If other scholars can prove with substantial evidence the theses Tilg has advanced, we will witness a momentous development in novel studies'.[1] My thesis is intended to contribute to such a development. It is my contention that the Greek novelists not only have detailed knowledge of Latin literature (especially Vergil and the elegists) but also mobilise it in sophisticated, playful, and often subversive ways. The generic form of the novel offered the opportunity for displacement, allegory, and a certain elasticity of content, and so provided the perfect venue for the Greek elite to make Latin literature and the idea of Rome its playthings. In short, the Greeks have their cake and eat it: they affect disinterest in Latin literature whilst also mastering it.

The Greek elite collusion with Rome at the political level also explains their affected lack of interest in Roman cultural products as part of a guilty reflex. The novels themselves, with their emphasis on the integrity of the female protagonists, parade Greek cultural imperviousness; yet, as I have shown, their cultural integrity is problematised by obvious fraternisation with giants of the Augustan canon. It is no longer possible to say that the Greeks did not conceive of a 'Roman' literature or that it had no function for them. Why, for example, would Longus need to write Vergil's bucolics out of the tradition if he did not feel that the *Eclogues* had intruded into the Greek literary system? Yet within the semiotic economy of Greek elite culture, it is obvious that Latin literature signified very differently to, for example, Homer. But it is also the case that Greek elite authors tend not to cite or refer to each other *either*. It

---

[1] Montiglio (2011) 162.

would therefore be interesting to develop a model of allusion that caters for this, and see how it compares to the 'covert' model I have suggested in this thesis (though there would not, of course, be a need for the same type of 'hidden transcript' or 'mimicry').

It would be wrong to homogenise the experience of all the imperial Greek elite. For sure, not all of them may know Latin literature, but the novelists, who are the subject of this thesis, do. It would also be wrong to shoehorn each of the novelists into the same cultural narrative: each of them is modulating his experiences of Latin literature and the Roman Empire in slightly different ways. Chariton writes from the highly Romanised city of Aphrodisias, whilst Achilles (probably) reflects the experience of the same Alexandrian elite responsible for the overtly hostile *Acta Alexandrinorum*—indeed, the connections between the novels and the *Acta* would, I suspect, be a fruitful line of further enquiry. Chariton is interested in ideas about empire and imperial mechanics, and co-opts the *Aeneid*—a text that naturalises the story of Rome—into his exploration of what it means to be Greek in a Roman world, as well as mobilising the metaphors of Latin elegy to articulate his fantasy of a world where the Greek elite have military power.

Achilles (in his use of Roman cultural narratives) and Longus (in his rewriting of the seventh book of the *Aeneid*) articulate genuine 'hidden transcripts': Achilles loads the Roman rape narratives onto his antagonists, whilst Longus provides the reader with an image of Roman imperialism seen from the Greek perspective. Though perhaps from a family of Roman citizens, Longus may represent the most complex relationship to Latin literature and culture. His decision to write a pastoral novel brings him into head-on collision with Vergil. His novel therefore provides a

fascinating snapshot of an author struggling with a Bloomian father at both the literary and political levels. In their different ways, Chariton, Achilles, and Longus reflect authors who are grappling with the truth claims of imperial ideology.

Not everything, however, necessarily needs to be read as ideologically motivated. Chariton's interest in Ovidian epistolary and exilic tropes is to be explained primarily as a literary phenomenon; Xenophon's use of elegiac metaphors may ultimately derive from his reading of Chariton (though even Xenophon's is no slavish imitation); and Achilles' project of generic reorientation takes place through the literary prism of Latin elegy and erotodidactic models that marked literary production in late-Augustan Rome (though he does attempt to anonymise Ovid).

There are several lines of future enquiry that would bear fruit. In the first instance, a full treatment of Heliodorus (despite his later date and different socio-political circumstance) and the fragments is necessary in order to determine the extent to which they participate in the same literary Romanising as the other novelists. In connection with the fragments, there are a range of overlaps between Lollianos' *Phoinikika*, the *Iolaus* novel, and the Latin novels of Petronius and Apuleius,[2] as well as between the *Herpyllis* fragment and Petronius and the *Aeneid*. I suspect that a strong case can be made for the fragments *tout court*. The relationship between Achilles and Petronius also needs to be readdressed. In the context of Vergil, one might find it worthwhile to check putative allusions to the *Aeneid* in parallel with Vergilian word lists to see if they match up. In addition, post-Augustan Latin literature warrants examination as a potential participant of the literary system to

---

[2] Cioffi and Trnka-Amrhein (2010) explore similarities between Lollianos and Apuleius, for example the name Myrrhine, outlaws drinking and feasting, and the reference to Lapiths and Centaurs.

which the novelists belong. Finally, the evidence of the inscriptions, which points definitively to the presence of Latin poetry in Aphrodisias and Ephesus (as discussed in the introduction), is the tip of an iceberg, and a full-scale assessment is justified.

Appendix 1: Achilles and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

Theme	Greek	Latin	Comments
Truth and fiction	τὰ γὰρ ἐμὰ μύθοις ἔοικε (1.2.2, Clitophon speaking).	*res similis fictae* (13.935 Glaucus speaking).	
Nothing but wounds	ὅλος γὰρ τραῦμα ἦν (1.13.2, Charikles).	*unumque erat omnia uulnus* (15.529, Hippolytus/Virbius). *nec quidquam nisi uulnus erat* (6.388, Marsyas).	Cf. ὅλον στόμα (4.19.5, describing crocodile). Cf. Leucippe likened to Marsyas (3.15.4-5).
Charikles and Phaethon	δίκην νεὼς χειμαζομένης τοῖς νώτοις ἐκυμαίνετο… ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς ἱππείας ταλαντούμενος κύματος 1.12.4, Charikles loses control of his horse, and is tossed as if on a ship or a wave). τῶν δὲ ῥυτήρων οὐκέτι κρατεῖν	*utque labant curuae iusto sine pondere naues/ perque mare* (2.164f, Phaethon loses control of his chariot like a boat). *ita fertur ut acta/ praecipiti pinus Borea, cui uicta remisit/ frena suus rector, quam dis uotisque*	Cf. Phaethon hurtles like a shooting star (2.320f); Charikles is thrown from the horse as if from a catapult (1.12.5, see below).

	δυνάμενος, δοὺς δὲ ἑαυτὸν ὅλως τῷ τοῦ δρόμου πνεύματι, τῆς τύχης ἦν (1.12.5, Charikles gives up the reins and relinquishes control to the wind).	*reliquit* (2.185, Phaethon tossed like a boat whose helmsmen has relinquished control to the gods).
Slingshot similes	εἰς τοὐπίσω δίκην μηχανῆς ἀπεκρούετο καί με ὥσπερ ἀπὸ σφενδόνης ἐξερρίπισε (5.9.2, Clinias on the crest of a wave). ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ὡς ἀπὸ μηχανῆς βληθεὶς ἐπετόμην (7.15.3, Clitophon rushes to Temple of Artemis). ὡς ἀπὸ μηχανῆς προσαραχθείς (1.12.5, Charikles thrown from his horse).	*non secus exarsit quam cum Balearica plumbum/ funda iacit* (2.727, Mercury). *tantum aberat scopulis quantum Balearica torto/ funda potest plumbo...* (4.709f, sea-monster in Perseus episode). *ceu lata plumbea funda/ missa solet medio glans intebescere caelo* (14.825f, Mars' rapture of Romulus).

Europa	τῇ λαιᾷ τοῦ κέρως ἐχομένη (1.1.10, she holds the bull's horn by her left hand). ὁ δὲ κόλπος τοῦ πέπλου πάντοθεν ἐτέτατο κυρτούμενος (1.1.12, her robe billows)	*dextra cornum tenet* (2.874, she holds the bull's horn by her right hand). *tremulae sinuantur flamine uestes* (2.875, her robe billows)	Barkan (1986) 8 n. 20, citing both Achilles and Ovid, describes Europa as the most common pagan image.
Panthea and Leucothoe	μὴ λοιδόρει μου, μῆτερ, τὴν <u>παρθενίαν</u>· οὐδὲν ἔργον μοι πέπρακται τοιούτων ῥημάτων ἄξιον, οὐδὲ οἶδα τοῦτον ὅστις ἦν, εἴτε δαίμων, εἴτε ἥρως, εἴτε λῃστής. ἐκείμην δὲ <u>πεφοβημένη</u>, μηδὲ ἀνακραγεῖν διὰ τὸν <u>φόβον</u> δυναμένη. <u>φόβος</u> γὰρ γλώττης ἐστὶ δεσμός (2.25.1-2, Leucippe, almost caught with Clitophon by her mother Panthea, reassures her of her intact	*ipse* <u>*timor*</u> *decuit… at* <u>*uirgo,*</u> *quamuis inopino* <u>*territa*</u> *uisu,/… posita uim passa querela est… "ille/ uim tulit inuitae"* (4.230-9, Leucothoe, though scared, submits to Sol, but then tells her furious father Orchamus that she was raped).	The sequence of events, with its irate parents and emphasis on chastity and fear, is similar in both narratives. Esp. φόβος/φόβον ~ *timor* πεφοβημένη ~ *territa*

	virginity, disingenuously tells her that she doesn't know who was in her room, and emphasises her 'fright').		
Andromeda and Perseus	τὸ δὲ κῆτος ἀντιπρόσωπον τῆς κόρης κάτωθεν ἀναβαῖνον <u>ἀνοίγει τὴν θάλασσα</u>ν (3.7.6-7, the sea-monster). ἔοικε τὸ θέαμα, εἰ μὲν εἰς τὸ κάλλος ἀπίδοις, ἀγάλματι καινῷ (3.7.2, Andromeda like a statue).	*sic fera <u>dimotis</u> impulsu pectoris <u>undis</u>* (4.708, the sea-monster). *marmoreum ratus esset opus* (4.675, Andromeda like a statue).	The approach of the sea-monster is similar in both texts (3.7.6; 4.720-9).
Philomela and Tereus (the use of writing/tapestry in lieu of voice)			Bernsdorff (2009) 4-14 discusses the nexus of links between the episode in *Met*. 6.425-674, Ach. 5.3.4-5.10, and *PSI* 1177 (Antonius Diogenes), though he concludes that Ovid is not an influence.

Rumour	Φήμη ὕδατος ὑγροτέρα, πνεύματος δρομικωτέρα, πτερῶν ταχυτέρα… (6.10.2-6) ὁ δὲ ἀκούων ταχὺ πείθεται, καὶ ὀργῆς αὐτῷ πῦρ ἐξάπτεται, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν βληθέντα μαίνεται (6.10.5)	*fama malum qua non aliud uelocius ullum* (4.173-194); *plumae* (4.181). *incenditque animum dictis atque aggerat iras* (4.196)	Discussed by Tilg (2010) 256-7, 270, Hardie (2012) 115, who observe that in both Vergil and Achilles Rumour functions to crush a romantic relationship. Hardie also observes that they are both unique in giving Rumour a genealogy (Ach. 6.10.4; *Aen.* 4.178-80). Melite is slandered by Thersandros for taking as a lover a foreigner from Tyre (as is Dido) who has been shipwrecked (as has Aeneas) and to whom she has offered hospitality (as Dido has to the Trojans).
Melite and Dido	καὶ γὰρ τὸν ἄνδρα ἀπώλεσα διὰ σέ… οἶδα ὅτι ὁ ἀνήρ με μισεῖ καὶ	*te propter Libycae gentes Nomadumque tyranni/ odere,*	

μοιχείαν κατέγνωκεν ἐπὶ σοί (5.25.4-5, Melite rails at Clitophon for not providing sex).	*infensi Tyrii; te propter eundem/ exstinctus pudor et, qua sola sidera adibam,/ fama prior* (4.320-4, Dido rails at Aeneas for leaving).	
Melite curses Clitophon (5.25.8)	Dido curses Aeneas (4.382-7, 612-29)	Cf. in *Calligone* Calligone curses the day she saw Eraseinos at the hunt (16-20 S-W).
ἐμοὶ δὲ τὴν σὴν κατάλιπε, ὡς ἂν ἔχοιμι ἐνδυομένη σοι περικεχύσθαι (6.1.3, Melite keeps Clitophon's clothes as a keepsake).	*si quis mihi paruulus aula/ luderet Aeneas, qui te tamen ore referret*, (4.328f, Dido wishes for a son to remind her of Aeneas).	

Vintage	*D.C.* Bk.2 opens with vintage and grape-treading (2.1.1-4).	*Geo*. Bk.2 opens with invocation to Bacchus and request to help grape-treading (2.1.1-8).	
Farmers are glad to have time off in winter	3.3.1-2, 3.4.1.	1.299-310.	
Leafy branches to feed goats	φυλλάδα χλωρὰν κόπτοντα τοῖς ἐρίφοις τροφὴν (1.21.1; cf. 2.20.2).	*iubeo frondentia capris/ arbuta sufficere* (3.300f; cf. 320f).	Cf. Varro *D.R.R.* 2.2.2-3.
Less of a harvest than expected	εὑρὼν δὲ κἀκείνους κριθία μετροῦντας οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ λελικμημένα ἀθύμως τε ἔχοντας ὅτι μικροῦ δεῖν ὀλιγώτερα ἦν τῶν καταβληθέντων σπερμάτων (3.30.3).	*sed illos/ exspectata seges uanis elusit auenis* (1.225f; cf. 263).	
Goat sacrifice	πῦρ ἀνακαύσας καὶ τὰ μὲν ἑψήσας τῶν κρεῶν τὰ δὲ ὀπτήσας (2.31.1, roasting and boiling of	*in ueribus torrebimus exta colurnis* (2.396, roasting the meat)	In the *Georgics* the goat sacrifice occurs because of its propensity to chew foliage (2.380), but in

	meat)		Longus Philetas explicitly exonerates the goats from blame (2.17.1).
	Ἦσάν τινας καὶ ᾠδὰς εἰς τὰς Νύμφας (2.31.2, songs to Nymphs).	*et te, Bacche, uocant per carmina laeta* (2.388, songs to Bacchus; cf. 2.393).	
	ἐν τροφῇ ἦν καὶ πότῳ καὶ παιδιᾷ (2.31.1, Daphnis busy with food, drink, and games).	*ludi* (2.381); *inter pocula laeti* (2.383); *ludunt risuque* (2.386), drink and games.	
Care for the she-goats	4.4.3-5 (Daphnis' careful grooming regime of their horns and coats, and attention to their watering).	3.305-21 (emphasis on milking and feeding).	
Ars bucolica	ἐκδιδάξαντες ἕκαστα· πῶς δεῖ νέμειν πρὸ μεσημβρίας, πῶς ἐπινέμειν κοπάσαντος τοῦ καύματος (1.8.2, detailed instructions on care for sheep and goats; cf. 3.29.2).	3.322-38 (care of sheep and goats in summer, and their daily routine).	Cf. Varro *D.R.R.* 2.2.10-11.

| Low-lying Lesbian vines | πᾶσα γὰρ κατὰ τὴν Λέσβον ἡ ἄμπελος ταπεινή, οὐ μετέωρος οὐδὲ ἀναδενδράς, ἀλλὰ κάτω τὰ κλήματα ἀποτείνουσα καὶ ὥσπερ κιττὸς νεμομένη (2.1.4) | *non eadem arboribus pendet uindemia nostris/ quam Methymnaeo carpit de palmite Lesbos* (2.89f) | |

D.C. 1.24.2-3 and Prop. 1.3	ὁ μὲν οὖν τὴν πίτυν ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἁρπάζων αὐτὸς ἐστεφανοῦτο, πρότερον φιλήσας τὸν στέφανον· ἡ δὲ τὴν ἐσθῆτα αὐτοῦ λουομένου καὶ γυμνωθέντος ἐνεδύετο, πρότερον καὶ αὐτὴ φιλήσασα. ἤδη ποτὲ καὶ μήλοις ἀλλήλους ἔβαλον καὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς ἀλλήλων ἐκόσμησαν διακρίνοντες τὰς κόμας· καὶ ἡ μὲν εἴκασεν αὐτοῦ τὴν κόμην, ὅτι μέλαινα, μύρτοις, ὁ δὲ μήλῳ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς, ὅτι λευκὸν καὶ ἐνερευθὲς ἦν (1.24.2-3).	*et modo soluebam nostra de fronte corollas/ ponebamque tuis, Cynthia, temporibus/ et modo gaudebam lapsos formare capillos/ nunc furtiua cauis poma dabam manibus* (1.3.21-4)	(i) Daphnis puts Chloe's garland on himself. (ii) They pelt each other with apples. (iii) They comb each other's hair. ~ (i) Propertius takes his garland off and puts it on Cynthia. (ii) He combs her hair. (iii) He offers her an apple.
D.C. 1.25.1-3 and Prop. 1.3 (Daphnis/Propertius watches Chloe/Cynthia asleep)	πᾶσαν αὐτὴν ἔβλεπεν ἀπλήστως (1.25.1, Daphnis watches Chloe intently).	*sed sic intentis haerebam fixus ocellis* (1.3.19, Propertius watches Cynthia intently).	On the basis of Philod. *A.P.* 5.123, Paul. Sil. *A.P.* 5.275, Philostr. *Imag.* 1.15.3, Hunter (1983) 72

	οἷον δὲ ἀποπνεῖ τὸ στόμα (1.25.2, Chloe's breathing).	*et quotiens raro duxti suspiria motu* (1.3.27, Cynthia's breathing).	determines that 'Longus is here drawing upon earlier erotic literature'. Likewise Morgan (2004b) 170, noting also Aristaen. *Ep*. 1.12.
	ὀκνῶ δὲ μὴ καὶ φιλήσας αὐτὴν ἀφυπνίσω (1.25.3, Daphnis fears a kiss may wake her).	*osculaque admota sumere et arma manu,/ non tamen ausus eram dominae turbare quietem* (1.3.16f, Propertius fears his kiss may wake her)	See my discussion on Prop. 1.3 and Achilles at p. 145-6.
Cave offerings	ἀνέκειντο δὲ καὶ γαυλοὶ καὶ αὐλοὶ πλάγιοι καὶ σύριγγες καὶ κάλαμοι, πρεσβυτέρων ποιμένων ἀναθήματα (1.4.3, cave of the Nymphs; cf *pr*. 3).	*hic erat affixis uiridis spelunca lapillis,/ pendebantque cauis tympana pumicibus,/ orgia Musarum et Sileni patris imago/ fictilis et calami, Pan Tegeaee, tui* (3.3.27-30).	Cf. Prop. 3.1.1-5. Spanoudakis (2002) 228-30 argues that these go back to Philitas' *Demeter*, where Demeter reveals a spring in a cave to the local monarch Chalcon of Cos. Bowie (1985) 84 and Morgan (2011) 147-9 discuss the issue, preferring a common source in

			Philitas. Hunter (2006b) 31-2 also discusses these passages.
Cliff-jumping	πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐφέρετο <u>ῥίψων ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς μεγάλης πέτρας</u>. καὶ ἴσως ἄν, τὸ καινότατον, εὑρεθεὶς ἀπωλώλει Δάφνις, εἰ μὴ συνεὶς ὁ Ἄστυλος ἐβόα πάλιν· "στῆθι, Δάφνι, <u>μηδὲν φοβηθῇς</u>" (4.22.2-3, Daphnis runs to the sea to throw himself from a cliff, but stops when he realises that his assailant is his brother Astylus).	*iamque ego conabar <u>summo me mittere saxo</u>,/ cum mihi discussit talia visa <u>metus</u>* (2.26a.19f, Propertius dreams of jumping off a cliff to reach Cynthia, but fear wakes him up).	Cf. Theoc. *Id*. 3.25f, 5.15.f; Verg. *Ecl*. 8.59f; Hermesianax fr. 3 *CA*.
Lycaenion and Lycinna	Lycaenion takes Daphnis' virginity before Chloe (3.15-20). τὴν Λυκαίνιον ἱκέτευεν ὅτι τάχιστα διδάξαι τὴν τέχνην, δι' ἧς ὃ βούλεται δράσει Χλόην (3.18.1,	Lycinna takes Propertius' virginity before Cynthia (3.15). *illa rudes animos per noctes conscia primas/ imbuit* (3.15.5f, Lycinna taught untried	Yardley (1974) suggests the love-triangle derives from New Comedy. Bowie (1985) 83 derives Lycinna from Philitas.

	Daphnis begs Lycaenion to teach him the art of love).	Propertius).	
	ἔριφον αὐτῇ σηκίτην δώσειν ἐπηγγείλατο καὶ τυροὺς ἁπαλοὺς πρωτορρύτου γάλακτος καὶ τὴν αἶγα αὐτήν (3.18.2, Daphnis promises Lycaenion gifts).	*heu nullis capta Lycinna datis* (3.15.6, Lycinna is not won by gifts).	
	τὴν τέως ζητουμένην ὁδὸν (3.18.4, euphemism for Lycaenion's vagina; cf. 1.17.2 ὁδὸν ἔρωτος).	*Amoris iter* (3.15.4)	
	Lycaenion warns Daphnis that his defloration of Chloe will be bloody (3.19.2-3)	*prata cruentantur Zethi* (3.15.41, Amphion and Zethus kill Dirce).	

Appendix 5: Longus' Gnathon and Vergil's Gallus (*Ecl*. 10)

Dying of unrequited love	οἴχεταί σοι Γνάθων (*D.C.* 4.16.2).	*indigno cum Gallus amore peribat* (*Ecl*. 10.10).	
Unconquerable love	τὸν ἀήττητον Ἔρωτα νίκησον (4.16.3, Gnathon begging Astylus).	*omnia uincit amor et nos cedamus Amori* (10.69).	Cf. p. 55.
Pastoral shame/regret	ἐπυνθάνετο μειδιῶν εἰ οὐκ αἰσχύνεται Λάμωνος υἱὸν φιλῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ σπουδάζει συγκατακλιθῆναι νέμοντι αἶγας μειρακίῳ (4.17.2, Astylus asks Gnathon if he is not ashamed to love a goatherd). ὁ δέ, οἷα πᾶσαν ἐρωτικὴν μυθολογίαν ἐν τοῖς τῶν ἀσώτων συμποσίοις πεπαιδευμένος (4.17.3, Gnathon adduces	*nostri nec paenitet illas/ nec te paeniteat pecoris* (10.16f, Vergil tells Gallus not to be ashamed of the sheep). *et formosus ouis ad flumina pauit Adonis* (10.18, Vergil adduces Adonis as support).	Gnathon is a homosexualised version of Gallus, both of whom are urbanites whose discourse becomes pastoralised. Cf. [Theoc.] *Id*. 20 on Eunica the city-girl who rejects the smelly *boukolos*.

	mythological exempla).		
	οὐδεὶς ταῦτα, δέσποτα, ἐραστὴς πολυπραγμονεῖ (4.17.3, Gnathon replies that lovers don't care for such things).	*Amor non talia curat* (10.28, Pan to Gallus).	
	φυτοῦ τις ἠράσθη καὶ ποταμοῦ καὶ θηρίου (4.17.4, Gnathon adduces the fact that people fall in love with natural elements).	*nec lacrimis crudelis Amor nec gramina riuis/ nec cytiso saturantur apes nec fronde capellae* (10.29f, Pan compares Love's insatiable cruelty to the insatiability of natural elements).	

Abbreviations

CA	Powell, J.U. (1925), *Collectanea Alexandrina: reliquiae min[...] poetarum graecorum aetatis ptolemaicae, 323-146 A.C., epic[...] elegiacorum, lyricorum, ethicorum*. Oxford.
CIG	*Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*. Berlin (1825–1877).
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berlin (1862—).
CLE	Buecheler, F. ed., *Carmina Latina Epigraphica*, 3 vols. (189[...] Leipzig.
Courtney	Courtney, E. ed. (1993), *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxfo[...]
D-K	Diels, H. and Kranz, W. ed. (1951), *Die Fragmente der Vors[...] I-III*. ed. 6. Berlin.
G-S	Gow, A.S.F. and Scholfield, A. ed. (1953), *Nicander. The P[...] Poetical Fragments*. Cambridge.
GL	Keil, B. ed. (1855-80), *Grammatici Latini*. Leipzig.
GLP	Page, D.L. ed. (1942), *Greek Literary Papyri*. Cambridge, M[...]
Hense	Hense, O. ed. (1905), *C. Musonii Rufi reliquiae*. Leipzig.
IAph2007	Reynolds, J., Roueché, and Bodard, G. eds. (2007), *Inscripti[...] Aphrodisias*, available at <http://insaph.kcl.ac.uk/iaph2007>.
IEph	Engelmann, H., Knibbe, D., Merkelbach, R. eds. (1980), *Die[...] Inschriften von Ephesos. Teil 4: Nr. 1001–1445 (Repertoriun[...]*
IG	*Inscriptiones Graecae* (Berlin, 1873—).
IGUR	Moretti, L. ed. (1968—), *Inscriptiones Graecae Urbis Rom[...]*
ILI	Šašel, A. and J. ed. (1963), *Inscriptiones latinae quae in Iug[...] inter annos MCMMXL et MCMLX repertae et editae sunt*. Lj[...]
ILS	Dessau, H. ed. (1892-1916), *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae, [...] Berlin.
K-T	Körte, A. and Thierfelder, A. eds. (1959), *Menandri quae su[...] Leipzig.
Keil	Keil, B. ed. (1898), *Aelii Aristidis quae supersunt omnia*. Be[...]
Kock	Kock, K.T. ed. (1880-88), *Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta*, [...] [in 3]. Leipzig.

Lindsay   Lindsay, W.M. ed. (1926-31), *Glossaria latina*. Paris.

LDAB   *Leuven Database of Ancient Books*. Trismegistos. Available at <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/index.php>.

LGPN   Fraser, P.M. *et al.* (1987—), *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. Oxford.

LIMC   Ackermann, H.C., Gisler, J.-R., and Kahil, L. eds. (1981—), *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*. Zürich.

LSJ   Liddell, H.G. and Scott, R. eds. (1996), *A Greek-English Lexicon* (revised and augmented by H.S. Jones, with a revised supplement). Oxford.

Musurillo see Musurillo (1954).

N-H   see Nisbet and Hubbard (1970).

Nauck   Nauck, A. ed. (1926), *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. Leipzig.

OLD   Glare, P.G.W. ed. (1968-82), *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford.

PMG   Page, D.L. ed. (1962), *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford.

RG   Walz, C. ed. (1832-6), *Rhetores Graeci* I-IX. Stuttgart. Repr. Osnabrück (1968).

Rychlewska Rychlewska, L. ed. (1971), *Turpilii comici fragmenta.* Leipzig.

S-W   Stephens, S.A. and Winkler, J.J. eds. (1995), *Ancient Greek Novels: The Fragments.* Princeton.

SEG   Chaniotis, A., Stroud, R.S., and Strubbe, J.H.M. eds. (2003—), *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, available at <http://hum.leiden.edu/history/research/projects-umw/seg.html>.

SH   Lloyd-Jones, H., and Parsons, P. eds. (1983), *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. New York - Berlin.

SIG   Dittenberger, W. ed. (1915-24), *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 3 vols. Leipzig.

Sk.   Skutsch, O. ed. (1985*), The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford.

Sp.-H.   Spengel, L. and Hammer, C. eds. (1884), *Rhetores Graeci*. Leipzig.

Spengel Spengel, L. ed. (1853), *Rhetores Graeci*, I-III. Leipzig.

SSH   Lloyd-Jones, H. and Skempis, M. eds. (2005), *Supplementum Supplementi Hellenistici*. New York - Berlin.

Warm.   Warmington, E.H. ed. (1979), *Remains of Old Latin*, 4 vols. Cambridge, MA.

Bibliography

Adams, J.N. (1982), *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. Baltimore.

Adams, J.N. (2003), *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge.

Adams, J.N., Janse, M., and Swain, S.C.R. eds. (2002), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*. Oxford.

Ahl, F. (1984), 'The Art of Safe Criticism in Greece and Rome', *AJPh* 105: 174-208.

Alfonsi, L. (1948), 'L'importanza politico-religiosa della "Enunciazione" di Valerio Sorano (à proposito di *CIL*, I, I2, p.337)', *Epigraphica* 10: 81-9.

Alfonsi, L. (1981), 'Dall'ideale dell'otium all'ideale della Roma augustea', in F. Santucci and S. Vivona eds., *Colloquium Propertianum (secundum): atti: Assisi, 9-11 novembre 1979*. Assisi: 81-100.

Alperowitz, M. (1992), *Das Wirken und Walten der Götter im griechischen Roman*. Heidelberg.

Alpers, K. (2001), 'Der Garten des Philetas: Longos und Lukian', *ZPE* 136: 43-8.

Alpers, P. (1996), *What is Pastoral?* Chicago.

Althusser, L. (1984), 'A letter on art in reply to André Daspre', in *Essays on Ideology*. London: 173–9.

Altman, J.K. (1982), *Epistolarity: Approaches to a Form*. Columbus, Ohio.

Alvares, J. (1993), *The Journey of Observation in Chariton's Chaereas and Callirhoe*. Diss., The University of Texas at Austin.

Alvares, J. (1997), 'Chariton's Erotic History', *AJPh* 118: 613-29.

Alvares, J. (2001), 'Egyptian unrest of the Roman era and the reception of Chariton's *Chaireas and Callirhoe*', *Maia* 53: 11-19.

Alvares, J. (2001-2), 'Some Political and Ideological Dimensions of Chariton's *Chaireas and Callirhoe*', *CJ* 97: 113-44.

Alvares, J. (2002), 'Utopian Themes in Three Greek Romances', *Ancient Narrative* 2: 1-29.

Alvares, J. (2006), 'Reading Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* and Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* in Counterpoint', in S.N. Byrne, E. Cueva, and J. Alvares eds. (2006): 1-33.

Alvares, J. (2007), 'The Coming of Age and Political Accommodation in the Greco-Roman Novels', in M. Paschalis, S. Frangoulidis, S.J. Harrison, and M. Zimmerman eds. (2007): 3-22.

Alvares, J. (2012), 'Considering Desire in the Greek Romances Employing Lacanian Theory: Some Explorations', in M.P. Futre Pinheiro, M. B. Skinner, and F. I. Zeitlin eds. (2012): 11-25.

Alvares, J. (2014), '*Daphnis and Chloe*: Innocence and Experience, Archetypes and Art', in E.P. Cueva and S.N. Byrne eds. (2014): 26-42.

Amato, E. (2005), 'Rhetorike deipnizousa: il banchetto di Dione di Prusa, Favorino e Luciano', *Euphrosyne* 33: 341-53.

Ameling, W. (1986), 'Tyrannen und schwangere Frauen', *Historia* 35: 507-8.

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

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

Anderson, G. (1989), 'The *Pepaideumenos* in action: sophists and their outlook in the Early Empire', *ANRW* 2.33.1: 79-208.

Anderson, G. (1993), *The Second Sophistic: A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*. Routledge.

Anderson, G. (1997), 'Perspectives on Achilles Tatius', *ANRW* 2.34.3: 2278-99.

Anderson, G. (2014), 'Chariton: Individuality and Stereotype', in E.P. Cueva and S. Byrne eds. (2014): 13-25.

Anderson, R.D., Parsons, P.J., and Nisbet, R.G.M. eds. (1979), 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaṣr Ibrîm', *JRS* 69: 125-55.

Ando, C. (2000), *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*. Berkeley - Los Angeles - London.

André, J.-M. (1966), *L'Otium dans la Vie Morale et Intellectuelle Tomaine, des Origines à l'époque Augustéenne*. Paris.

André, J.-M. (1986), *Les Noms de Plantes dans la Rome Antique*. Paris.

Archer, L. ed. (1988), *Slavery and Other Forms of Unfree Labor*. London.

Auger D. (1983), 'Rêve, image et récit dans le roman de Chariton', *Ktèma* 8: 39-52.

Austin, R.G. ed. (1964), *Aeneidos Liber Secundus*. Oxford.

Badian, E. (1968), *Roman Imperialism in the Late Republic*. Oxford.

Badian, E. (1985), 'A Phantom Marriage Law', *Philologus* 129: 82-98.

Bakhtin, M. (1981), *The Dialogic Imagination*, trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin.

Baldwin, B. (1963), 'Crime and Criminals in Roman Egypt', *Aegyptus* 43: 250-263.

Baldwin, B. (1987), 'Dio Cassius and John Malalas: Two Ancient Readings of Virgil', *Emerita* 55: 85-6.

Balsdon, J.P.V.D. (1979), *Romans and Aliens*. London.

Barchiesi, A. ed. (1992), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistulae 1-3*. Florence.

Barchiesi, A. (1993), 'Insegnare ad Augusto: Orazio, Epistole 2, 1 e Ovidio, Tristia II', *MD* 31: 149-84. Repr. in A. Barchiesi (2001): 79-103.

Barchiesi, A. (1997), *The Poet and the Prince: Ovid and Augustan Discourse*. Berkeley.

Barchiesi, A. (2001), *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and other Latin Poets*. London.

Barkan, L. (1986), *The Gods Made Flesh: Metamorphosis and the Pursuit of Paganism*. New Haven.

Barnes, J. and Griffin, M.T. eds. (1989), *Philosophia Togata. Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society*. Oxford.

Barns, J.W.B. (1956), 'Egypt and the Greek Romance', in H. Gerstinger ed., *Akten des VIII Internationalen Kongress für Papyrologie*. Vienna: 29-36.

Barrett, A.A. (1970), 'The catalogue of trees in the *Culex*', *CW* 63: 230-232.

Bartsch, S. (1989), *Decoding the Ancient Novel: The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius*. Princeton.

Bartsch, S. (1994), *Actors in the Audience*. Cambridge, MA.

Bartsch, W. (1934), *Der Charitonroman und die Historiographie*. Diss. Leipzig.

Baslez, M.-F. (1992), 'De l'histoire au roman: la Perse de Chariton', in Baslez *et al*. eds. (1992): 199-212.

Baslez, M.-F., Hoffmann, P. and Trédé, M. eds. (1992), *Le Monde du Roman Grec: actes du colloque international tenu à l'Ecole normale supérieure (Paris 17-19 décembre 1987)*. Paris.

Basson, W.P. (1981), 'A Note on Georgics 2,83-102', *AClass* 24: 162-4.

Basson, W.P. (1982), 'The Catalogue of Trees in *Georgics* 2, 83-108', in J. den Boeft and A.H.M. Kessels eds., *Actus: Studies in Honour of H. L. W. Nelson*. Utrecht: 1-19.

Beard, M., North, R., and Price, S.R.F. (1998), *Religions of Rome*. Cambridge.

Becker, C. (1971), 'Die späten Elegien des Properz', *Hermes* 99: 469-70.

Ben-Porat, Z. (1976), 'The Poetics of Literary Allusion', *PTL* 1: 105-28.

Bernal, M. (1991), *Black Athena. The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization. Volume 1*. London.

Bernsdorff, H. (1999), 'Hesiod, ein zweiter Vergil? (Bemerkungen zu *P.Oxy.* 3537r, 3-28)", in S. Döpp eds., *Antike Rhetorik und ihre Rezeption. Symposion zu Ehren von Prof. Dr. C. J. Classen*. Stuttgart: 63-83.

Bernsdorff, H. (2006), 'The Idea of Bucolic in the Imitators of Theocritus, 3rd-1st century', in M. Fantuzzi and T. Papanghelis eds. (2006): 167-208.

Bernsdorff, H. (2009), 'Antonios-Diogenes-Interpretationen', *in Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen Band 7: Studien zur Philologie und zur Musikwissenschaft*. Berlin: 1-52.

Berranger-Auserve, D. (2005), 'La ville comme cadre du roman grec', in B. Pouderon and D. Crismani eds. (2005): 43-55.

Bettini M. (1999), *The Portrait of the Lover*. Berkeley.

Bhabha, H.K. (1994), *The Location of Culture*. London.

Bienkowski, P. (1900), *De simulacris barbarorum gentium apud Romanos*. Cracow.

Bierl, A. (2006), 'Räume im Anderen und der griechische Liebesroman des Xenophon von Ephesos. Träume?', in A. Loprieno ed., *Mensch und Raum von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*. Munich: 71-103.

Billault, A. (1981), 'Aspects du roman de Chariton', *IL* 33: 205-211.

Billault, A. (1989), 'De l'histoire au roman. Hermocrate de Syracuse', *REG* 102: 540-548.

Billault, A. (1996a), 'Characterization in the Ancient Novel', in G. Schmeling ed. (1996): 115-30.

Billault, A. (1996b), 'La nature dans Daphnis et Chloé', *REG* 109: 506-26.

Billault, A. ed. (2001), *OPΩRA: La belle saison de l'hellénisme. Études de littérature antiques offertes au Recteur Jacques Bompaire*. Paris.

Billault, A. (2009), 'Remarques sur la jalousie dans les romans grecs antiques', in B. Pouderon and C. Bost-Pouderon eds. (2009): 171-84.

Bing, P. (2000), 'Text or Performance/Text and Performance', in R. Pretagostini ed., *La letteratura ellenistica*. Rome: 139-48.

Biraud, M. (1985), 'L'hypotexte homérique et les rôles amoureux de Callirhoé dans le roman de Chariton', in var. eds., *Sémiologie de l'amour dans les civilisations méditerraéennes*. Paris: 21-7.

Biraud, M. (1996), 'La dévotion à Aphrodite dans le roman de Chariton', in M. Dubrocard and C. Kircher eds., *Hommage au Doyen Weiss*. Nice: 137-46.

Blažek, V. (2002), 'The "Beech"-argument: State-of-the-Art', *Historische Sprachforschung* 115: 190-217.

Bömer, F. (1969), *P. Ovidius Naso: Metamorphosen. Kommentar. Buch I–III*. Heidelberg.

Bompaire, J. (1977), 'Le décor sicilien dans le roman grec et dans la littérature contemporaine', *REG* 90: 55-68.

Bonner, C. (1909), 'On Certain Supposed Literary Relationships I', *CPh* 4.1: 32-44.

Booth, J. ed. (1991), *Ovid. The Second Book of Amores*. Warminster.

Borg, B. ed. (2004), *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*. Berlin.

Borgeaud, P. (1977), *Recherches sur le Dieu Pan*. Rome.

Bornecque, H. (1902), *Les Déclamations et les Déclamateurs d'après Sénèque le Père*. Lille.

Bost-Pouderon, C. (2006), 'Discours et débats politiques dans le roman grec antique', in B. Pouderon and J. Peigney eds. (2006): 327-350.

Bost-Pouderon, C. and Peigney, J., eds. (2006), *Discours et Débats dans l'Ancien Roman. Actes du Colloque de Tours, 21-23 octobre 2004, Collection de la Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée n°36, série littéraire et philosophique n°10*. Lyon.

Bost-Pouderon, C. and Pouderon, B. eds. (2012), *Les Hommes et les Dieux dans l'Ancien Roman: actes du colloque de Tours, 22-24 octobre 2009. Collection de la Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée, 48. Série littéraire et philosophique, 16.* Lyon.

Boucher, J-P. (1966), *Caius Cornelius Gallus*. Paris

Bouffartigue, J. (2001), 'Un triangle symbolique: Eros, Aphrodite et Artémis dans la Roman de Leucippé et Clitophon', in A. Billault ed. (2006): 125-38.

Boulic, N. and Létoublon, F. (2014), 'Pirates in the Library', in M.P. Futre Pinheiro and E.P. Cueva eds., *The Ancient Novel and the Frontiers of Genre. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 18*. Groningen: 123-42.

Bowersock, G.W. (1994), *Fiction as History: Nero to Julian*. Berkeley.

Bowersock, G.W. (1969), *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*. Oxford.

Bowersock, G.W. ed. (1974), *Approaches to the Second Sophistic: Papers presented at the 105th annual meeting of the American Philological Association*. University Park, Pa.

Bowie, E.L. (1970), 'Greeks and their past in the second sophistic', *P&P* 46: 3-4. Repr. in M.I. Finley ed. (1974), *Studies in Ancient Society*. London: 166-209.

Bowie, E.L. (1977), 'The Novels and the Real World', in: B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Erotica Antiqua. Acta of the International Conference on the Ancient Novel*. Bangor: 91-96.

Bowie, E.L. (1982), 'The importance of sophists', *YCS* 27: 29-60.

Bowie, E.L. (1985), 'Theocritus' Seventh Idyll, Philetas and Longus', *CQ*: 35 67-91.

Bowie, E.L. (1991), 'Hellenes and Hellenism in writers of the early second sophistic', in S. Saïd ed. (1991), *ΈΛΛΗΝΙΣΜΟΣ: quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque*. Leiden: 183-204.

Bowie, E.L. (1994), 'The Readership of Greek Novels in the Ancient World', in J. Tatum ed. (1994): 435-59.

Bowie, E.L. (1996), 'The Ancient Readers of the Greek Novel', in G. Schmeling ed. (1996): 87-106.

Bowie, E.L. (2001), 'Inspiration and aspiration: Date, genre and readership', in S.E. Alcock, J.F. Cherry, and J. Elsner eds., *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*. Oxford: 21-32.

Bowie, E.L. (2002), 'The chronology of the Greek novel since B.E. Perry: revisions and precisions', *Ancient Narrative* 2: 47-63.

Bowie, E.L. (2004), ''Dénys d'Alexandrie. Un poète grec dans l'empire romain', *REA* 106: 177-85.

Bowie, E.L. (2005a), 'Metaphor in *Daphnis and Chloe*', in S.J. Harrison, M. Paschalis, and S. Frangoulidis eds. (2005): 68-86.

Bowie, E.L. (2005b), 'Les animaux dans le *Daphnis et Chloé* de Longus', in B. Pouderon and D. Crismani eds. (2005): 75-85.

Bowie, E.L. (2006a), 'The Construction of the Classical Past in the Ancient Greek Novels', in S. Eklund ed. (2006): 1-20.

Bowie, E.L. (2006b), 'Viewing and Listening on the Novelist's Page', in S.N. Byrne, E. P. Cueva, and J. Alvares eds. (2006): 60-82.

Bowie, E.L. (2007), 'Links between Antonius Diogenes and Petronius', in M. Paschalis *et al.* eds. (2007): 121-32.

Bowie, E.L. (2008), 'Literary milieux', in T. Whitmarsh ed. (2008): 17-38.

Bowie, E.L. (2009), 'Vertus de la campagne, vices de la cité dans *Daphnis et Chloé* de Longus', in B. Pouderon and C. Bost-Pouderon eds. (2009): 13-22.

Bowie, E.L. (2013), 'Masters, Slaves, and Freedmen: a Mytilenean Perspective', paper delivered at RICAN VII, Rethymnon.

Bowie, E.L. (2014), 'Becoming wolf, staying sheep', in J.M. Madsen and R. Rees eds. (2014a): 39-78.

Boyd, B.W. (1997), *Ovid's Literary Loves: Influence and Innovation in the Amores*. Ann Arbor.

Boyd, B.W. ed. (2002), *Brill's Companion to Ovid*. Leiden.

Boyle, A.J. (1978), 'Virgil's Pastoral Echo', *Ramus* 6: 121-31.

Bozia, E. (2014), *Lucian and his Roman Voices: Cultural Exchanges and Conflicts in the Late Roman Empire*. New York - London.

Braun, M. (1938), *History and Romance in Graeco-Oriental Literature*. Oxford.

Braund, D.C. (1993), 'Piracy under the Principate and the ideology of imperial eradication', in J. Rich and G. Shipley eds., *War and Society in the Roman World*. London: 195-212.

Braund, S. (1992), 'Juvenal – Misogynist or Misogamist', *JRS* 82: 71-86.

Braune, J. (1935), *Nonnos und Ovid*. Greifswald.

Breed, B. (2006), *Pastoral Inscriptions. Reading and Writing Virgil's Eclogues*. London.

Bremmer, J. and Horsfall, N. (1987), *Roman Myth and Mythography*. London.

Brenk, F. E. (1981), 'War and the Shepherd. The Tomb of Bianor in Vergil's Ninth *Eclogue*', *AJPh* 102: 47-30.

Brethes, R. (2001), 'Clitophon ou une anthologie de l'anti-héros', in B. Pouderon ed. (2001): 181-91.

Brethes, R. (2006), 'Le discours du prêtre chez Achille Tatius, VIII, 9: une déconstruction de la paideia', in B. Pouderon and J. Peigney, J. eds. (2006): 177-190.

Brethes, R. (2007), *De l'Idéalisme au Réalisme: une étude du comique dans le roman grec.* Salerno.

Brethes, R. (2012a), 'How to Be a Man: Towards a Sexual Definition of the Self in Achilles Tatius' Novel *Leucippe and Clitophon*', in M.P. Futre Pinheiro, M. B. Skinner, and F. I. Zeitlin eds. (2012): 127-46.

Brethes, R. (2012b), 'Hommes sacrés, sacrés hommes: fonction du prêtre dans le roman grec', in C. Bost-Pouderon and B. Pouderon eds. (2012): 101-16.

Bretin-Chabrol, M. (2013), *L'arbre et la lignée: Métaphores végétales de la filiation et de l'alliance en latin classique*. Grenoble.

Briand, M. (2006), 'Aesthetics and Ethics of *poikilia* in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*', in M. Skoie and S. Bjørnstad-Velázquez eds. (2006): 42-52.

Brioso Sánchez, M (1987), 'El personaje del amigo en la novela griega. Caritón', *Minerva* 1: 61-74.

Brioso Sánchez, M. (1992), 'Egipto en la novela griega antigua', *Habis* 3: 197-215.

Brodersen, K. (1994), *Dionysios von Alexandria, Das Lied von der Welt.* Hildesheim.

Brödner, E. (1983), *Die römischen Thermen und das antike Badewesen*. Darmstadt.

Brody, L.R. (2007), *The Aphrodite of Aphrodisias*. Mainz.

Broich, U. (1985), 'Formen der Markierung von Intertextualität', in U. Broich, M. Pfister, and B. Schulte-Middelich eds., *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*. Tübingen: 31-47.

Brooks, P. (1984), *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative*. Cambridge, MA - London.

Brooks, P. (1993), *Body Work: Objects of Desire in Modern Narrative*. Cambridge, MA.

Bulloch, A.W. ed. (1985), *Callimachus. The Fifth Hymn*. Cambridge.

Burger, R. (1901), *De Ovidi carminum amatoriorum inventione et arte*. Wolfenbüttel.

Burrus, V. (2005), 'Mimicking virgins: colonial ambivalence and the ancient romance', *Arethusa* 38: 49-88.

Butrica, J.L. (1996), 'Hellenistic Erotic Elegy', *PLILS* 9: 297-322.

Byrne, S.N., Cueva, E., and Alvares, J. eds. (2006), *Authors, Authority, and Interpreters in the Ancient Novel Essays in Honor of Gareth L. Schmeling. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 5*. Groningen.

Cahoon, L. (1988), 'The Bed as Battlefield: Erotic Conquest and Military Metaphor in Ovid's *Amores*', *TAPhA* 118: 293-307.

Cairns, F. (1969), ''Propertius i.18 and Callimachus, Acontius and Cydippe', *Classical Review* n.s. 20: 131-34.

Cairns, F. (1972), *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Michigan.

Cairns, F. (1979), *Tibullus. A Hellenistic Poet in Rome*. Cambridge.

Cairns, F. (1999), 'Virgil *Eclogue* 1.1-2: a literary programme?', *HSCPh* 99: 289-93.

Cairns, F. (2010), 'Roma and Her Tutelary Deity: Names and Ancient Evidence', in C.S. Kraus, J. Marincola, and C.B.R. Pelling eds., *Ancient Historiography and its Contexts: Studies in Honour of A.J. Woodman*. Oxford: 245-66.

Calder, W.M. (1983), 'Longus I.2: the she-goat nurse', *CPh* 78: 50-1.

Calvet-Sébasti, M.-A., (2005), 'Une ile romanesque: Arados', in B. Pouderon and D. Crismani eds. (2005): 87-99.

Cameron, A. (1976), *Circus Factions: Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium*. Oxford.

Carson, A. (1986), *Eros the Bittersweet*. Princeton.

Carver, R. (2007), *The Protean Ass: The Metamorphoses of Apuleius from Antiquity to the Renaissance*. Oxford.

Carver, R. (2013), 'Between Photis and Isis: Fiction, Reality, and the Ideal in The Golden Ass of Apuleius', in M. Paschalis and S. Panayotakis eds. (2013): 243-74.

Casali, S. (2006), 'The Art of Making Oneself Hated: Rethinking (Anti-)Augustanism in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*', in R.K. Gibson, S. Green, and A. Sharrock eds. (2006): 216-34.

Casali, S. (2008), 'The king of pain: Aeneas, Achates and ἄχος in *Aeneid* 1', *CQ* 58: 181-9.

Caston, R.R. (2012), *The Elegiac Passion: Jealousy in Roman Love Elegy*. Oxford.

Cataudella, Q. (1927), 'Riflessi virgiliani nel romanzo di Caritone', *Athenaeum* 5: 302-12.

Cataudella, Q. (1932), 'Sulla fortuna di Virgilio nel mondo greco-egiziano', *CdÉ* 7: 332-4.

Cataudella, Q. (1973), 'Recupero di un'antica scrittrice greca', *GIF* 4: 253-63.

Cataudella, Q. (1974), 'Initiamenta amoris', *Latomus* 33: 847-857.

Cavallo, G. (1996), 'Veicoli materiali della letteratura di consumo: maniere di scrivere e maniere di leggere', in O. Pecere and A. Stramaglia eds., *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino*. Cassoni: 11-46. Repr. in G. Cavallo (2005), *Il calamo e il papiro: la scrittura greca dall'età ellenistica ai primi secoli di Bisanzio*. Florence: 213-33.

Champlin, E. (2003), *Nero*. Cambridge, MA.

Chaniotis, A. (2003), 'The Perception of Imperial Power in Aphrodisias: The Epigraphic Evidence', in L. de Blois *et al*. eds., *The Representation and Perception of Roman Imperial Power*. Amsterdam: 250-60.

Chew, K. (2000), 'Achilles Tatius and parody', *CJ* 96: 57-70.

Chew, K. (2014), 'Achilles Tatius, Sophistic Master of Novelistic Conventions', in E.P. Cueva and S.N. Byrne eds. (2014): 62-75.

Cheyns, A. (2001), 'Le dieu Pan et l'expression de la violence dans *Daphnis et Chloé*', in B. Pouderon ed. (2001): 165-80.

Christenson, D. (2000), 'Callinus and *militia amoris* in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon*', *CQ* 50: 631-2

Cichorius, C. (1922), *Römische Studien*. Leipzig.

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

Cioffi, R. and Trnka-Amrhein, Y. (2010), 'What's in a Name? Further Similarities between Lollianos' *Phoinikika* and Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', *ZPE* 173: 66-8.

Claassen, J.-M. (1990), 'Ovid's wavering identity: personification and depersonalization in the exilic poems', *Latomus* 49: 102-16.

Claassen, J.-M. (1996), 'Exile, Death and Immortality: Voices from the Grave', *Latomus* 55: 571-90.

Claassen, J.-M. (1999), *Displaced Persons: The Literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius*. London.

Claassen, J.-M. (2003), 'Living in a place called exile: the universals of the alienation caused by isolation' *Literator* 24: 85-111.

Claassen, J.-M. (2009), 'Tristia', in P.E. Knox ed. (2009): 170-83.

Clare, R.J. (2002), *The Path of the Argo. Language, Imagery and Narrative in the* Argonautica *of Apollonius Rhodius*. Cambridge.

Clausen, W. ed. (1994), *Virgil:* Eclogues. Oxford.

Cockle, W. (1979), 'A New Virgilian Writing Exercise from Oxyrhynchus', *S&C* 3: 55-75.

Cody, J. M. (2003), 'Conquerors and conquered on Flavian coins', in A. J. Boyle and W. J. Dominik, eds., *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text*. Leiden: 103-24.

Comito, T. (1975), 'Exile and return in the Greek romances', *Arion* 2: 58-80.

Connolly, J. (2003), 'Like the labours of Heracles: *andreia* and *paideia* in Greek culture under Rome', in R.M. Rosen and I. Sluiter (eds.), Andreia: *Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden: 287-317

Connolly, J. (2007), 'The new world order: Greek rhetoric in Rome', in I. Worthington ed., *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*. Oxford: 139-65.

Connors, C. (2002), 'Chariton's Syracuse and its Histories of Empire', in M. Paschalis and S. Frangoulidis eds., *Space in the Ancient Novel. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 1*. Groningen: 12-26.

Connors, C. (2005), 'Metaphor and Politics in John Barclay's Argenis', in S.J. Harrison, M. Paschalis, and S. Frangoulidis eds. (2005): 245-74.

Connors, C. (2008), 'Politics and spectacle', in T. Whitmarsh ed. (2008): 162-81.

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

Conte, G.B. (1992), 'Proems in the Middle', in F.M. Dunn and T. Cole eds., *Beginnings in Classical Literature (Yale Classical Studies 29)*. Cambridge.

Conte, G.B. (1996), *The Hidden Author: An Interpretation of Petronius's Satyricon*. (Trans. E. Fantham). Berkeley, CA.

Cooley, A.E. ed. (2009), *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Text, Translation and Commentary*. Cambridge.

Cooper, K. (1996), *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA.

Copley, F. (1947), '*Seruitium amoris* in the Latin elegists', *TAPhA* 78: 285-300.

Corbier, M. (1995), 'Male Power and Legitimacy through Women: The *domus Augusta* under the Julio-Claudians', in R. Hawley and B. Levick eds., *Women in Antiquity: New Assessments*. London: 178-193.

Cornell, T. (1975), 'Aeneas and the Twins', *PCPhS* 21: 1-32.

Cornell, T. (1995), *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000-264 BC)*. London.

Courtney, E. (1980), *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*. London.

Courtney, E. ed. (1993) *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford.

Cribiore. R. (1996), *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Atlanta.

Cribiore, R. (2001), *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton.

Cribiore, R. (2003-4), 'Latin Literacy in Egypt', *KODAI* 13-14, 111-18.

Cribiore, R. (2007), 'Higher Education in Early Byzantine Egypt: Rhetoric, Latin, and the Law', in R. S. Bagnall ed., *Egypt in the Byzantine World, 300-700*. Cambridge: 47-66.

Cueva, E.P. (1998), 'Longus and Thucydides: A New Interpretation', *GRBS* 39: 429-40.

Cueva, E.P. and Byrne, S.N. eds. (2014), *A Companion to the Ancient Novel*. Oxford.

Curran, L.C. (1978), 'Rape and Rape Victims in the Metamorphoses', *Arethusa* II.1,2: 213-241.

Cusset, C. (2005), 'Fonctions du décor bucolique dans les Pastorales de Longus', in. B. Pouderon and D. Crismani eds. (2005): 163–178.

Cuypers, M. (2005), Review of A.W. James and K. Lee (2000), *A Commentary on Quintus of Smyrna* Posthomerica V (Leiden), in *Mnemosyne* 58: 605-13.

D'Ippolito, G. (1964), *Studi nonniani: l'epillio nelle* Dionisiache. Palermo.

D'Ippolito, G. (1976), *Trifiodoro e Virgilio. Il proemio della 'Presa di Ilio' e l'esordio del libro secondo dell' 'Eneide'*. Palermo.

D'Ippolito, G. (1990), 'Trifiodoro', in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 5. Rome: 268-71.

D'Ippolito, G. (1991), 'Nonno e Virgilio', in *Studi di filologia classica in onore di G. Monaco*. I, *Letterature Greca*. Palermo: 527-32.

D'Ippolito, G. (2007), 'Nonno di Panopoli e i poeti latini', in Á. Sánchez-Ostiz, J.B. Torres Guerra, and R. Martínez eds. (2007): 311-32.

D'Orville, J. P. ed. (1783 [1750]), *Charitonis Aphrodisiensis de Chaerea et Callirrhoe amatoriarum narrationum libri VIII*. Leipzig.

Dällenbach, L. (1977), *Le récit spéculaire. Essai sur la mise en abyme*. Paris. Trans. (1989), *The Mirror in the Text*. Chicago.

Darbo-Peschanski, C. ed. (2004), *La citation dans l'antiquité: actes du colloque du PARSA Lyon, ENS LSH, 6-8 novembre 2002*. Grenoble.

Daude, C. (1990), 'Éléments de la modélisation spatiale dans le roman de Chariton', *Recherches en linguistique étrangère, sémiotique, lexicologie, didactique xv, Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon*. Paris: 67-94.

Daude, C. (2006), 'La rhétorique de Callirhoé au livre II du roman de Chariton', in B. Pouderon and J. Peigney eds. (2006): 191-216.

Davis, P. J. (1995), '*Praeceptor amoris*: Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* and the Augustan idea of Rome', *Ramus* 24: 181-95.

Davis, P. J. (1999), 'Ovid's *Amores*: a political reading', *CPh* 94: 431-49.

De Angelis, P. (1947), *Roma: Il nome arcano*. Rome - Milan.

de Romilly, J. (1993), 'Les Barbares dans la pensée de la Grèce classique', *Phoenix* 47: 283-92.

de Jong, I., Nünlist, R., and Bowie, A. eds. (2004), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Literature, Volume 1*. Leiden.

de Jong, I. and Nünlist, R. eds. (2007), *Time in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative, Volume 2*. Leiden.

de Jong, I., Nünlist, R., and Bowie, A. eds. (2012), *Space in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative, Volume 3*. Leiden.

de Souza, P. (1999), *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman World*. Cambridge.

de Souza, P. (2011), 'War, slavery and empire in Roman imperial iconography', *BICS* 54: 31-62.

De Stefani, C. (2006), 'Paulo Silenziario leggeva la letteratura latina?', *JÖByz* 56: 101-112.

De Temmerman, K. (2006), 'Caractérisation et discours direct: le cas de Plangon', in B. Pouderon and J. Peigney eds. (2006): 63-76.

De Temmerman, K, (2007), 'Blushing beauty: characterizing blushes in Chariton's *Callirhoe*', *Mnemosyne* 60.2: 235-252.

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

Dench, E. (2005), *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian*. Oxford.

Denniston, J.D. (1954), *The Greek Particles*. Oxford.

Derrida, J. (1980), *The Post Card. From Socrates to Freud and Beyond*. Trans. A. Bass. Chicago - London.

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

Di Marco, M. (2006), 'The Pastoral Novel and the Bucolic Tradition', in M. Fantuzzi and T. Papanghelis (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral*. Leiden: 479-97.

Di Virgilio, R. (1991), *La narrativa greca d'amore: Dafni e Cloe di Longo*. Rome.

Dickey, E. (1996), *Greek Forms of Address from Herodotus to Lucian*. Oxford.

Dickey, E. (2002) *Latin Forms of Address from Plautus to Apuleius*. Oxford.

Dickey, E. ed. (2012), *The Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana Volume 1. Colloquia Monacensia-Einsidlensia, Leidense-Stephani, and Stephani*. Cambridge.

Dillon, J.M. (1994), 'A Platonist *Ars Amatoria*', *CQ* 44: 387-92.

Dillon, S. (2006), 'Women on the columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius and the visual language of Roman victory', in S. Dillon and K. E. Welch, eds., *Representations of War in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: 244-71.

Doblhofer, E. (1987), *Exil und Emigration: zum Erlebnis der Heimatferne in der römischen Literatur*. Darmstadt**.**

Doody, M.A. (1996), *The True Story of the Novel*. New Brunswick.

Dougherty, C. (1998), 'Sowing the seeds of violence: rape, women and the land', in M. Wyke (ed.), *Parchments of Gender: Deciphering the Bodies of Antiquity*. Oxford: 267-84.

Douglas, M. (1966) *Purity and Danger. An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London.

Dowden, K. (2013), '"But there is a difference in the ends...": brigands and teleology in the ancient novels', in M. Paschalis and S. Panayotakis eds. (2013): 41-60.

Drexler, H. (1959), 'Iustum Bellum', *RhM* 102: 97-140.

Drinkwater, M. (2013), '*Militia amoris*: fighting in love's army', in T. Thorsen ed. (2013b): 194-206.

Dubel, S. (2011), 'Le phénix, le crocodile... et le flamant rose: sur le bestiaire égyptien d'Achille Tatius', in R. Poignault ed. (2011): 389-404.

duBois, P. (1988), *Sowing the Body: Psychoanalysis and Ancient Representations of Women*. Chicago - London.

Dubuisson, M. (1985), *Le latin de Polybe: les implications historiques d'un cas de bilinguisme*. Paris.

Durham, D.B. (1938), 'Parody in Achilles Tatius', *CPh* 33: 1-19.

DuQuesnay, I. M. Le M. (1979), 'From Polyphemus to Corydon. Vergil, *Eclogue* 2 and the Idylls of Theocritus', in D. West and A.J. Woodman eds., *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*. Cambridge; 35-69.

DuQuesnay, I. M. Le M. (1981), 'Vergil's First *Eclogue'* in F. Cairns ed., *PLLS* 3: 29-182.

Easterling, P.E. (1977), 'Character in Sophocles', *Greece and Rome* 24: 121-9.

Eco, U. (1990), *I limiti dell'interpretazione*. Milan.

Edmonds, J.M. (1916), *Daphnis and Chloe by Longus*. London - New York.

Edmunds, L. (2001), *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry*. Baltimore.

Edwards, C. (1993), *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge.

Edwards, D.R. (1991), 'Surviving the Web of Roman Power: Religion and Politics in the *Acts of the Apostles*, Josephus, and Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*', in A. Loveday ed., *Images of Empire*. Sheffield: 179-201.

Edwards, D. R. (1994), 'Defining the Web of Power in Asia Minor: The Novelist Chariton and His City Aphrodisias', *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 62: 699-718.

Edwards, D.R. (1996), *Religion and Power: Pagans, Jews and Christians in the Greek East.* New York.

Edwards, D.R. (1998), 'Pleasurable Reading or Symbols of Power? Religious Themes and Social Context in Chariton', in R.F Hock, J.B. Chance, and J. Perkins eds., *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative*. Atlanta: 31-46.

Edwards, M. J. (1997), 'The Art of Love and Love of Art in Longus', *AC* 66: 239-48.

Egan, R.B. (1996), 'Corydon's Winning Words in "*Eclogue* 7"', *Phoenix* 50.3/4: 233-9.

Egger, B. (1988), 'Zu den Frauenrollen im griechischen Roman: Die Frau als Heldin und Leserin', *GCN* 1: 33-66.

Egger, B. (1994), 'Looking at Chariton's Callirhoe', in J. R. Morgan and R. Stoneman eds. (1994): 31-48.

Eklund, S. ed. (2006), *Syncharmata. Studies in Honour of Jan Fredrik Kindstrand*. Uppsala.

Elsner, J. (1998), *Imperial Rome and Christian Triumph: The Art of the Roman Empire A.D. 100-450*. Oxford.

Elsom, H.E. (1992), 'Callirhoe: Displaying the Phallic Woman', in A. Richlin ed. (1992): 212-30.

Engelmann, R. (1904), 'Ein neues Urtheil Salomonis und die Friesbilder der Casa Tiberina', *Hermes* 39: 149-54.

Enk, P.J. (1946), *Sex. Propertii Elegiarum liber I (Monobiblos), cum prolegomenis, conspectu librorum et commentationum ad IV libros Propertii pertinentium, notis criticis, commentario exegetico, 2 voll.* Leiden.

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

Epstein, S.J. (2002), 'The education of Daphnis: goats, gods, the birds and the bees', *Phoenix* 56: 25-39.

Erim, K. T. (1986), *Aphrodisias: City of Venus Aphrodite*. London.

Eshleman, K. (2012), *The Social World of Intellectuals in the Roman Empire: Sophists, Philosophers, and Christians*. Cambridge.

Evans, H.B. (1983), *Publica Carmina: Ovid's Books from Exile*. Lincoln, Neb.

Evans J.D. (1992), *The Art of Persuasion: Political Propaganda from Aeneas to Brutus*. Ann Arbor.

Evans-Grubbs, J. (1989), 'Abduction Marriage in Antiquity: A Law of Constantine (*CTh* IX.24.1) and Its Social Context', *JRS* 79: 59-83.

Fakas, C. (2005), 'Charitons Kallirhoe und Sybaris', *RhM* 148: 413-17.

Fantham, E. (1986), '*Zelotupia*: a Brief Excursion into Sex, Violence, and Literary History', *Phoenix* 40: 45-57.

Fantazzi, C. (1976), The Revindication of Roman Myth in the Pomona-Vertumnus Tale', in N. Barbu, E. Dobroiu, and M. Nasta eds., *Ovidianum: Acta conventus omnium ovidianis studiis fovendis.* Bucharest: 283-93.

Fantuzzi, M. and Papanghelis, T. eds. (2006), *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral*. Leiden.

Farrell, J. (1998), 'Reading and Writing the *Heroides*', *HSCPh* 98: 307-38.

Farrell, J. (1999), 'The Ovidian Corpus: Poetic Body and Poetic Text', in P. Hardie, A. Barchiesi, and S. Hinds eds., *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on the Metamorphoses and its Reception. Cambridge Philological Society Suppl. 23*. Cambridge: 127-41.

Farrell, J. (2004), 'Ovid's Virgilian Career, *MD* 52: 41-55.

Farrington, A. (1987), 'Imperial bath-buildings in south-west Asia Minor', in S. Macready and F.H. Thompson eds., *Roman architecture in the Greek world*. London: 50-9.

Faulkner, A. (2008), *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Oxford.

Fedeli, P. (1980), *Sesto Properzio. Il primo libro delle elegie. Introduzione, testo critico e commento*. Florence.

Fedeli, P, Dimundo, R, and Ciccarelli, I. (2015), *Properzio. Elegie Libro IV*. 2 vols. Studia Classica et Mediaevalia 7. Nordhausen.

Fenton, A. (2008), 'The Forest and the Trees: Pattern and Meaning in Horace, Odes', *AJPh* 129.4: 559-80.

Ferrary, J.-L. (2014), *Les mémoriaux de délégations du sanctuaire oraculaire de Claros, d'après la documentation conservée dans le Fonds Louis Robert.* Paris.

Ferri, R. (2008), 'New evidence on the meaning of ῥωμαιστής in IG xi.2 133: "Actor of Latin comedies"?', *ZPE* 166: 165-8.

Ferris, I. M. (2000), *Enemies of Rome: Barbarians through Roman Eyes.* Stroud.

Finkelpearl, E. (2007), 'Apuleius, the *Onos*, and Rome', in M. Paschalis, S. Frangoulidis, S.J. Harrison, and M. Zimmerman eds. (2007): 263-76.

Fish, S. (1980), *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities.* Cambridge, MA.

Fisher, E. (1982), 'Greek translations of Latin literature in the fourth century A.D.', *YCS* 27: 173-216.

Fitzgerald, W. (2000), *Slavery and the Roman Literary Imagination.* Cambridge.

Fögen, T. ed. (2009a), *Tears in the Graeco-Roman World.* New York - Berlin.

Fögen, T. (2009b), 'Tears in Propertius, Ovid and Greek Epistolographers', in T. Fögen ed. (2009a): 179-208.

Fontanella, F. (2008), 'The Encomium on Rome as a Response to Polybius' Doubts About the Roman Empire', in W.V. Harris and B. Holmes eds., *Aelius Aristides between Greece, Rome and the Gods.* Leiden: 203-16.

Forbes-Irving, P. (1990), *Metamorphosis in Greek Myths.* Oxford.

Forehand, W.E. (1976), 'Symbolic gardens in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*', *Eranos* 74: 103-12.

Forni, G. (1989), *Plutarco. La fortuna dei Romani.* Naples.

Forsythe, G. (2005), *A Critical History of Early Rome. From Prehistory to the First Punic War.* Berkeley.

Forte, B. (1972), *Rome and the Romans as the Greeks saw them.* American Academy in Rome.

Foucault, M. (1981), *The history of sexuality,* vol. 1, *Introduction.* Trans R. Hurley. Harmondsworth.

Foucault, M. (1984), 'What Is an Author?', in P. Rabinow ed., *The Foucault Reader.* New York: 101-20.

Fowler, D. (2000), 'The Didactic Plot', in M. Depew and D. Obbink ed., *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*. Cambridge: 205-19.

Fox, M. (1996), *Roman Historical Myths: The Regal Period in Augustan Literature*. Oxford.

Frank, T. (1940), *Rome and Italy of the Empire*. Baltimore.

Freud, S. (1922), *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. London.

Frier, B. (1979), *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum: The Origins of the Annalistic Tradition*. Rome.

Frye, N. (1957), *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton.

Frye, N. (1976), *The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance*. Cambridge, MA.

Fuchs, H. (1938), *Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom in der antiken Welt*. Berlin.

Fulkerson, L. (2013), '*Seruitium amoris*: the interplay of dominance, gender and poetry', in T. Thorsen ed. (2013b): 180-93.

Fusillo, M. (1988), 'Textual patterns and narrative situations in the Greek novel', *GCN* 1: 17-32.

Fusillo, M. (1989), *Il romanzo greco: Polifonia ed eros*. Venice.

Fusillo, M. (1991), *Naissance du Roman*. Paris.

Futre Pinheiro, M.P., Skinner, M.B., and Zeitlin, F.I. eds. (2012), *Narrating Desire: Eros, Sex, and Gender in the Ancient Novel*. Trends in Classics Supplementary Volume 14. Berlin.

Gaertner, J.F. (2005), *Ovid: Epistulae ex Ponto, Book I*. Oxford.

Gaertner, J.F. ed. (2007), *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Leiden.

Galasso, L. ed. (1995), *Ovidii Nasonis Epistularum ex Ponto Liber II*. Florence.

Galasso, L. (2009), 'Epistulae ex Ponto', in P.E. Knox ed. (2009): 194-206.

Gale, M. (1997), 'Propertius 2.7: Militia Amoris and the Ironies of Elegy', *JRS* 87: 77-91.

Gale, M. (2000), *Virgil on the Nature of Things*. Cambridge.

Galinsky, G.K. (1969), *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*. Princeton.

Galand-Hallyn, P. (1994), *Le reflet des fleurs: description et métalangage poétique d'Homère à la Renaissance*. Geneva.

Gamel, M.-K. (1989), '*Non sine caede*: Abortion Politics and Poetics in Ovid's *Amores*', *Helios* 16: 183-206.

Garrison, E. (1991), 'Attitudes Towards Suicide in Ancient Greece', *TAPhA* 121: 1-34.

Garstad, B. (2003), 'The Assyrian hero's romantic interlude in Libya: a topos from Virgil in Pisander of Laranda, the Picus-Zeus narrative, and Nonnus of Panopolis', *Eranos* 101: 6-16.

Gärtner, U. (2005), *Quintus Smyrnaeus und die* Aeneis. *Zur Nachwirkung Vergils in der griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit*. Munich.

Gärtner, U. (2013), 'Das griechische Epos der Kaiserzeit und die Bezüge zur lateinischen Literatur', in P. Schubert, P. Ducrey, and P. Derron eds. (2013): 87-146.

Gärtner, V.T. (2009), 'Die Syrinx-Erzählung im Hirtenroman des Longos und ihre mythischen Parallelversionen', *Eranos* 105: 22-8.

Gauly, B.M. (1990), *Liebeserfahrungen: zur Rolle des elegischen Ich in Ovids Amores*. Studien zur klassichen Philologie, 48. Frankfurt am Main.

Gély-Ghédira, V. (2000), *La nostalgie du moi: Écho dans la littérature européenne*. Paris.

Giangrande, G. (1962), 'On the Origins of the Greek Romance: The Birth of a Literary Form', *Eranos* 60: 132-59.

Giangrande, G. (1974), Review of Papanikolaou (1973), in *JHS* 94: 197-8.

Giangrande, G. (1977), 'Aphrodite and the oak-trees', *Museum Philologum Londiniense* 2: 177-86.

Giangrande, G. (1983), 'Artemis and the Oak-trees in Callimachus', *CL* 3: 69-71.

Giangrande, G. (1991), 'Topoi ellenistici nell'Ars amatoria', in G. Italo and N. Luciano eds., *Cultura, poesia, ideologia nell'opera di Ovidio*. Naples: 61-98.

Gibbon, E. (1909), *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, (5th ed., by J.B. Bury). London.

Gibson, R.K. (1995), 'How to win girlfriends and influence them: *Amicitia* in Roman Love Elegy', *PCPhS* 41: 62-82.

Gibson, R.K. ed. (2003), *Ovid, Ars Amatoria Book 3*. Cambridge.

Gibson, R.K., Green, S., and Sharrock, A. eds. (2006), *The Art of Love. Bimillenial Essays on Ovid's Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris*. Oxford.

Gibson, R.K. and Morrison, A.D. (2007), 'Introduction: What is a Letter?', in R. Morello and A.D. Morrison eds., *Ancient Letters. Classical and Late Antique Epistolography*. Oxford: 1-16.

Gillespie, C. (2012), 'Creating Chloe: The Aesthetics of Education in Daphnis and Chloe', in I. Sluiter and R.M. Rosen eds., *Aesthetic Value in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden: 421-46.

Giovannini, A., and van Berchem, D., eds. (1986), *Opposition et résistances a l'Empire d'Auguste a Trajan*. Geneva.

Goldhill, S. (1995), *Foucault's Virginity: Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality*. New York - Cambridge.

Goldhill, S. ed. (2001a) *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*. Cambridge.

Goldhill, S. (2001b), 'Setting an agenda: "Everything is Greece to the wise."', in S. Goldhill ed. (2001a): 1-28.

González Senmartí, A. (1985), 'Virgili a la poesia grega tardana', in *Studia Virgiliana: Actes del VIe simposi d'estudis clàssics*. Barcelona: 199-205.

Goold, G.P. ed. (1990), *Propertius: Elegies*. Cambridge, MA.

Goold, G.P. ed. (1995), *Chariton: Callirhoe*. Cambridge, MA.

Gow, A. ed. (1965), *Theocritus* (2nd ed.), Cambridge.

Gowers, E. (2000), 'Vegetable Love: Virgil, Columella and Garden Poetry', *Ramus* 29: 127-48.

Graindor, P. (1927), *Athènes sous Auguste*. Cairo.

Grant, M. (2004), 'Continuity in Pastoral: Plants and Food in Virgil', *PVS* 25: 125-134.

Green, P. M. (1994), 'Text and Context in the Matter of Xenophon's Exile', in I. Worthington ed., *Ventures into Greek History*. Oxford: 215-27.

Greenblatt, S. (1980) *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago.

Greene, E. (1997), *The Erotics of Domination. Male Desire and the Mistress in Latin Love Poetry*. Baltimore.

Griffin, J. (1985), *Latin Poets and Roman Life*. London

Grube, G.M.A. (1965), *The Greek and Roman Critics*. London.

Gruen, E.S. (1992), *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca, NY.

Grünewald, T. (2004), *Bandits in the Roman Empire. Myth and Reality*. London.

Guez, J.-P. (2009), 'Homme tyrannique, homme royal dans le roman de Chariton', in B. Pouderon and C. Bost-Pouderon eds (2009): 23-38.

Guida, A. (1985), 'More on the she-goat nurses', *CPh* 80: 142.

Gunderson, E. (2003), *Declamation, Paternity, and Roman Identity: Authority and the Rhetorical Self*. Cambridge.

Gutzwiller, K.J. (1991), *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies: The Formation of a Genre*. Madison and London.

Gutzwiller, K.J. (1996), 'The Evidence for Theocritean Poetry Books', in M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, and G.C. Wakker eds., *Theocritus. Hellenistica Groningana 2*. Groningen: 119-48.

Hadjittofi, F. (2007), 'Res Romanae: Cultural Politics in Quintus and Nonnus', in M. Baumbach and S. Bär eds., *Quintus Smyrnaeus: Transforming Homer in the Second Sophistic Epic*. Berlin: 357-78.

Hägg, T. (1971a), *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romance: Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius, and Achilles Tatius*. Stockholm.

Hägg, T. (1971b), 'The Naming of the Characters in the Romance of Xenophon Ephesius', *Eranos* 69: 25-59.

Hägg, T. (1983), *The Novel in Antiquity*. Oxford - Berkeley - Los Angeles.

Hägg, T. (1987), '*Callirhoe* and *Parthenope*: the beginnings of the historical novel', *CA* 6: 184-204. Repr. in S. Swain ed. (1999) 137-60; repr. in T. Hägg (2004) 73-98.

Hägg, T. (1994), 'Orality, literacy and the "readership" of the early Greek novel', in R. Eriksen ed., *Contexts of Pre-Novel Narrative: the European Tradition*. Berlin: 47-81.

Hägg, T. (2002), 'Epiphany in the Greek Novels: The Emplotment of a Metaphor', *Eranos* 100: 51-61.

Hägg, T. (2004), *Parthenope: Selected Studies in Ancient Greek Fiction (1969-2004)*, ed. L.B. Mortensen and T. Eide. Copenhagen.

Hahn, L. (1906), *Rom und Romanismus im griechisch-römischen Osten*. Leipzig.

Haight, E.H. (1943), *Essays on the Greek Romances*. New York.

Halfmann, H. (1979), *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jh. n. Chr.* (Hypomnemata 65). Göttingen.

Halfmann, H. (2001), *Städtebau und Bauherren im römischen Kleinasien: ein Vergleich zwischen Pergamon und Ephesos*. Tübingen. (Trans. (2004) *Ephèse et Pergame: urbanisme et commanditaires en Asie mineure romaine*. Pessac.).

Hall, E. (1995), 'The ass with the double vision: politicizing an ancient Greek novel', in D. Margolies and M. Joannou eds., *Heart of the Heartless World: Essays in Cultural Resistance in Memory of Margot Heinemann*. London: 47-59.

Hall, J. (1981), *Lucian's Satire*. New York.

Hallett, J. P. (1973), 'The role of women in Roman elegy: counter-cultural feminism', *Arethusa* 6: 103-24.

Halperin, D. (1983), *Before Pastoral, Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry*. New Haven.

Hansen, P. (1972), 'Ille Ego Qui Quondam... Once Again', *CQ* n.s. 22: 139-49.

Harder, A. (2012), *Callimachus. Aetia*. (2 vols.). Oxford.

Hardie, P.R. (1986), *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford.

Hardie, P.R. (2002a), *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*. Cambridge.

Hardie, P.R. ed. (2002b), *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*. Cambridge.

Hardie, P.R. (2006), 'Cultural and Historical Narratives in Virgil's *Eclogues* and Lucretius', in M. Fantuzzi and P. Papanghelis eds. (2006): 275-300.

Hardie, P.R. (2012), *Rumour and Renown: Representations of Fama in Western Literature*. Cambridge.

Hardie, P.R. and Moore, H. eds. (2010), *Classical Literary Careers and their Reception*. Cambridge.

Harker, H. (2008), *Loyalty and Dissidence in Roman Egypt: The Case of the Acta Alexandrinorum*. Cambridge.

Harris, W.V. (1979), *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome: 327-70 B.C.* Oxford.

Harris, W.V. and Holmes, B. eds. (2008), *Aelius Aristides between Greece, Rome and the Gods*. Leiden.

Harrison, S.J. (1998), 'The Milesian Tales and the Roman Novel', *GCN* 9: 61-73.

Harrison, S.J. ed. (1999), *Oxford Readings in the Roman Novel*. Oxford.

Harrison, S.J. (2004), 'Virgil's *Corycius senex* and Nicander's *Georgica*: *Georgics* 4.116-48', in M. Gale ed., *Latin Epic and Didactic Poetry*. Swansea: 109-23.

Harrison, S.J. (2007a), 'The Primal Voyage and the Ocean of Epos: Two Aspects of Metapoetic Imagery in Catullus, Virgil and Horace', *Dictynna* 4: 1-17.

Harrison, S.J. (2007b), 'Exile in Latin Epic', in J.F. Gaertner ed. (2007): 155-72.

Harrison, S.J. (2007c), *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*. Oxford.

Harrison, S.J., Paschalis, M. and Frangoulidis, S. eds. (2005), *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel: Ancient Narrative Supplement 4*. Groningen

Haynes, K. (2000-2001), 'Power of the Prude: Configurations of the Feminine in the Greek Novel', *Ancient Narrative* 1: 73-92.

Haynes, K. (2003), *Fashioning the feminine in the Greek novel*. London - New York.

Headlam, W. and Knox, A.D. eds. (1922), *Herodas: the Mimes and the Fragments*. Cambridge.

Heerink, M. (2010), *Echoing Hylas A Study in Hellenistic and Roman Metapoetics*. Diss at University of Wisconsin at Madison.

Heinze, R. (1899), 'Petron und der griechische Roman', *Hermes* 34: 494-519. Repr. in H. Gärtner ed. (1984), *Beiträge zum griechischen Liebesroman*. Hildesheim: 15-40.

Heinze, R. (1915)[3], *Virgils Epische Technik*. Leipzig - Berlin.

Heiserman, A. (1977), *The Novel before the Novel. Essays and Discussions*. Chicago.

Helm, R. (1906), *Lukian und Menipp*. Leipzig.

Helzle, M. (1988), 'Ovid's Poetics of Exile', *ICS* 13.1: 73-83.

Hemker, J. (1985), 'Rape and the founding of Rome', *Helios* 12: 41-7.

Henderson, J. (1975), *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*. New Haven.

Henrichs, A. (2011), 'Missing Pages: Papyrology, Genre, and the Greek Novel', in D. Obbink and R. Rutherford eds., *Culture in Pieces. Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons*. Oxford: 302-22.

Hercher, R. ed. (1859), *Erotici Scriptores Graeci. vol. 2*. Leipzig.

Herrmann, L. (1981), 'Velius Longus auteur de *Daphnis et Chloé*', *Latomus* 40: 378-83.

Heusch, H. (1954), *Das Archaische in der Sprache Catulls*. Bonn.

Heyworth, S.J. (2005), 'Pastoral', in S.J. Harrison ed., *A Companion to Latin Literature*. Oxford: 148-58.

Heyworth, S.J. ed. (2007a), *Sexti Properti Elegi*. Oxford.

Heyworth, S.J. (2007b), *Cynthia. A Companion to the Text of Propertius*. Oxford.

Heyworth, S.J. (2007c), 'Propertius, patronage and politics', *BICS* 50: 93-128.

Heyworth, S.J. (forthcoming), 'Hard verses and soft books: the materials of elegy', in A. Petrovic, I. Petrovic and E. Thomas (eds), *The Materiality of Text: Placements, Presences and Perceptions of Inscribed Text in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden.

Hidber, T. (2006), 'Vom Umgang der Griechen mit lateinischer Sprache und Literatur', *Paideia* 51: 237-54.

Hill, H. (1961), 'Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the Origins of Rome', *JRS* 51: 88-93.

Hiltbrunner, O. (1981), 'Die neue Lesung des pompeianischen Epigramms vom Siegelring', *Gymnasium* 88: 45-53.

Hilton, J. L. (2005), 'War and peace in the ancient Greek novel', *AClass* 48: 57-85.

Hilton, J.L. (2009), 'Contemporary elements in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*', *AClass* 52: 101-12.

Hindermann, J. (2009), *Der elegische Esel Apuleius' Metamorphosen und Ovids Ars Amatoria.* Frankfurt am Main.

Hindermann, J. (2010), 'Does Lucius Really Fail to Learn from Socrates' Fate?: Elegiac Themes in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* (Books 1-3)', *CW* 104: 77-88.

Hindermann, J. (2013), 'Eros und Wissensvermittlung im Garten: Zum Exkurs im griechischen Roman (Achilles Tatius: Leucippe und Cleitophon, Longus: Daphnis und Chloe) und in der 'Buntschriftstellerei' (Aelian: De natura animalium; Varia historia)', *Gymnasium* 120: 343-360.

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

Hingley, R. (2005), *Globalizing Roman Culture: Unity, Diversity and Empire*. London - New York.

Hirschig, G.A. ed. (1856), *Erotici Scriptores: Parthenius, Achilles Tatius, Longus, Xenophon Ephesius, Heliodorus, Chariton Aphrodisiensis, Antonius Diogenes, Iamblichus*. Paris.

Hobsbawm, E. (1969), *Bandits*. London.

Hock, R.F. (1997), 'An extraordinary friend on Chariton's *Callirhoe*: the importance of friendship in the Greek romances', in J.T. Fitzgerald ed., *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*. Atlanta: 145-62.

Hodkinson, O. (2009), *Brief Encounters: studies in the letters of Alciphron, Aelian and Philostratus*. Oxford DPhil. thesis.

Hodkinson, O. (2012), 'Attic idylls: hierarchies of herdsmen and social status in Alciphron and Longus', *JHS* 132: 41-53.

Hodkinson, O. and Rosenmeyer, P.A. (2013), 'Introduction', in O. Hodkinson, P.A. Rosenmeyer, and E. Bracke eds. (2013): 1-36.

Hodkinson, O., Rosenmeyer, P.A., and Bracke, E. eds. (2013), *Epistolary Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*. Leiden.

Hollander, J. (1981), *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and after*. Berkeley.

Hollis, A. ed. (1977), *Ovid Ars Amatoria I*. Oxford.

Hollis, A. ed. (2007), *Fragments of Roman Poetry c.60 BC-AD 20*. Oxford.

Holzberg, N. (1995), *The Ancient Novel: An Introduction*. London.

Hopwood, K. (1998), '"All that may become a man": the bandit in the ancient novel', in L. Foxhall and J. Salmon eds., *When Men were Men: Masculinity, Power, and Identity in Classical Antiquity*. London.

Horsfall, N. (1971), 'Numanus Remulus: ethnography and propaganda in *Aeneid* 9.598ff', *Latomus*: 117 1108-16.

Horsfall, N. (2000), *Virgil, Aeneid 7: A Commentary*. Leiden.

Horsfall, N. (2001), *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*. Leiden.

Horsfall, N. ed. (2008), *Virgil Aeneid 2: a commentary*. Leiden.

Horstmann, E. (1979), *Der geheime Name der Stadt Rom*. Stuttgart.

Hose, M. (1994a), 'Die römische Liebeselegie und die griechische Literatur. Überlegungen zu *POxy* 3732', *Philologus* 138: 67-82.

Hose, M. (1994b), *Erneuerung der Vergangenheit: die Historiker im Imperium Romanum von Florus bis Cassius Dio*. Stuttgart - Leipzig.

Hose, M. (1999), 'Post-Colonial Theory and Greek Literature in Rome', *GRBS* 40: 303-26.

Hose, M. (2007), '"The Silence of the Lambs"? On Greek Silence about Roman Literature', in Á. Sánchez-Ostiz, J.B. Torres Guerra, and R. Martínez eds (2007): 333-45.

Howard, A.P. (2009), *Making Change Happen: The Adaptation and Transformation of Ovid's Metamorphoses in Longus' Daphnis and Chloe*. Masters Thesis, University of Texas at Austin.

Howgego, C., Heuchert, V., and Burnett, A. eds. (2005) *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*. Oxford.

Hubaux, J. (1953), 'Le dieu amour chez Properce et chez Longus', *BAB* 39: 263-70.

Hubbard, T.K. (1998), *The Pipes of Pan: Intertextuality and Literary Filiation in the Pastoral Tradition from Theocritus to Milton*. Ann Arbor.

Hubbard, T. K. (2006a), 'Virgil, Longus, and the Pipes of Pan', in M. Fantuzzi and T. Papanghelis eds. (2006): 499-514.

Hubbard, T.K. (2006b), 'The Pipe That Can Imitate All Pipes: Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* and the Intertextual Polyphony of Pastoral Music', in M. Skoie and S. Bjørnstad-Velázquez eds. (2006): 101-6.

Humphrey, J.H (1986), *Roman Circuses*. Berkeley - Los Angeles.

Hunter, R.L. (1977) 'Longus and Plato', in M. Picone and B. Zimmermann eds., *Der antike Roman und seine mittelalterliche Rezeption*. Basel: 15-28. Repr. in R.L. Hunter (2008): 775-89.

Hunter, R.L. (1983), *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe*. Cambridge.

Hunter, R.L. (1994), 'History and Historicity in the Romance of Chariton', *ANRW* 2.34.2: 1055-86.

Hunter, R.L. (1996), '*Longus*, Daphnis and Chloe', in G. Schmeling ed. (1996): 361-86.

Hunter, R.L (1999), *Theocritus: a Selection. Idylls 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11 and 13* Cambridge.

Hunter, R.L. (2003), *Theocritus: Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus*. Berkeley.

Hunter, R.L. (2006a), 'Virgil's *Ecl*. 1 and the Origins of Pastoral', in M. Fantuzzi and T. Papanghelis eds. (2006): 263-74.

Hunter, R.L. (2006b), *The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome*. Cambridge.

Hunter, R.L. (2008), *On Coming After*. Berlin.

Hutchinson, G.O. ed. (2006), *Propertius: Elegies Book IV*. Cambridge.

Hutchinson, G.O. (2013), *Greek to Latin. Frameworks and Contexts for Intertextuality*. Oxford.

Hutton, W. (2008), 'The disaster of Roman rule: Pausanias 8.27.1', *CQ* n.s. 58.2: 622-37.

Irmscher, J. (1985), 'Vergil in der griechischen Antike', *Klio* 67: 281-5.

James, A. (2007), 'Quintus of Smyrna and Virgil: a Matter of Prejudice', in M. Baumbach, S. Bär, and N. Dümmler eds., *Quintus Smyrnaeus: Transforming Homer in Second Sophistic Epic*. Berlin - New York: 145-57.

James, S. L. (2003), *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion: Gender and Reading in Roman Love Elegy*. Berkeley.

Jameson, F. (1981), *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. London.

Jocelyn, H.D. (1999), 'Code-switching in the *Comoedia Palliata*', in G. Vogt-Spira and B. Rommel eds., *Rezeption und Identität. Die kulturelle Auseinandersetzung Roms mit Greichenland als europäisches Paradigma*. Stuttgart: 169-195.

Johne, R. (1987), 'Dido und Charikleia: Zur Gestaltung der Frau bei Vergil und im griechischen Liebesroman', *Eirene* 24: 21-33.

Johne, R. (1996), 'Women in the Ancient Novel', in G. Schmeling ed. (1996), 151-207.

Jones, C.P. (1971) *Plutarch and Rome*. Oxford.

Jones, C.P. (1978) *The Roman world of Dio Chrysostom*. Cambridge, MA.

Jones, C.P. (1992), 'La personnalité de Chariton', in M.-F. Baslez, P. Hoffmann, and M. Trédé eds. (1992): 161-7.

Jones, C.P. (2010) *New Heroes in Antiquity: from Achilles to Antinoos*. Cambridge, MA.

Jones, H.S. (1926), 'Claudius and the Jewish Question at Alexandria', *JRS* 16: 17-35.

Jones, M. (2012), *Play the Man: Performing Masculinities in the Ancient Greek Novel*. Oxford.

Joplin, P.K. (1990), 'Ritual work on human flesh: Livy's Lucretia and the rape of the body politic', *Helios* 17: 51-70.

Joshel, S.R. (1992), 'The Body Female and the Body Politic: Livy's Lucretia and Verginia', in A. Richlin ed. (1992b): 112-30.

Joshel, S.R. and Murnaghan, S. eds. (1998), *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture: Differential Equations*. London

Kaldellis, A. (2007), *Hellenism in Byzantium: the transformation of Greek identity and the reception of the classical tradition*. Cambridge.

Kapparis, K.A. (2000), 'Has Chariton Read Lysias 1 'On the Murder of Eratosthenes'?', *Hermes* 128: 380-383.

Kapparis, K.A. (2002), *Abortion in the Ancient World*. London.

Karabélias, E. (1990), 'Le roman de Chariton d'Aphrodisias et le droit: Renversements de situation et exploitation des ambiguités juridiques', in G. Nenci and G. Thür eds., *Symposion 1988: Vorträge zur griechischen und*

hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Siena-Pisa, 6-8 Juni 1988). Cologne: 369-96.

Kaspryzk, D. (2009), 'Morale et sophistique: sur la notion de σωφροσύνη chez Achille Tatius', in B. Pouderon and C. Bost-Pouderon eds. (2009): 97-116.

Kassel, R. (1958), *Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen Konsolationsliteratur*. Munich.

Kaster, R. ed. (1995), *Suetonius. De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus*. Oxford.

Kauffmann, L.S. (1992), *Special Delivery: Epistolary Modes in Modern Fiction*. Chicago.

Kayachev, B. (2011), '*Ille ego qui quondam*: Genre, Date, and Authorship', *Vergilius* 57: 75-82.

Keith, A. (2000), *Engendering Rome. Women in Latin Epic*. Cambridge.

Kennedy, D. (1987), 'Arcades ambo: Virgil, Gallus and Arcadia', *Hermathena* 143: 47-59.

Kennedy, D. (2002), 'Epistolarity: the *Heroides*', in P.R. Hardie ed. (2002): 217-32.

Kennedy, G. A. (1974), 'The Sophists as Declaimers', in G.W. Bowersock ed. (1974), 19-20.

Kerkhecker, A. (1999), *Callimachus' Book of Iambi*. Oxford.

Kim, L. (2008), 'Time', in T. Whitmarsh ed. (2008): 145-61.

Kim, L. (2010), *Homer between History and Fiction in Imperial Greek Literature*. Cambridge.

King, D. (2012), 'Taking It Like a Man': Gender, Identity and the Body in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*', in M.P. Futre Pinheiro, M.B. Skinner, and F.I. Zeitlin eds. (2012): 147-57.

Kleve, K. (1983), 'Naso magister erat—sed quis Nasonis magister?', *SO* 58: 89-109.

Knox, P.E. (1988), 'Phaethon in Ovid and Nonnus', *CQ* n.s. 38: 536-51.

Knox, P.E. (1995), *Ovid's Heroides: Select Epistles*. Cambridge.

Knox, P.E. (2002), 'The *Heroides*: Elegiac Voices', in B.W. Boyd. ed. (2002): 117-40.

Knox, P.E. ed. (2006), *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Ovid*. Oxford.

Knox, P.E. ed. (2009), *A Companion to Ovid*. Oxford.

Koetting, B. (1973), 'Univira in Inschriften', in W. den Boer and J.H. Waszinnk eds., *Romanitas et Christianitas: studia Iano Henrico Waszink AD VI Kal Nov A MCMLXXIII XIII lustra complenti oblata*. Amsterdam: 195-206.

König, J. (2008), 'Sympotic dialogue in the first to fifth centuries CE', in S. Goldhill ed., *The End of Dialogue in Antiquity*. Cambridge: 85-113.

König, J. (2009) *Greek Literature in the Roman Empire*. Bristol.

König, J. (2013a), 'Alciphron and the Sympotic Letter Tradition', in O. Hodkinson, P.A. Rosenmeyer, and E. Bracke eds. (2013): 187-206.

König, J. (2013b), *Saints and Symposiasts: The Literature of Food and the Symposium in Greco-Roman and Early Christian Culture*. Cambridge.

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

Konstan, D. (2009), 'Meleager's Sweet Tears: Observations on Weeping and Pleasure', in T. Fögen ed. (2009a): 311-34.

Konstan, D. and Ramelli, I. (2014), 'The Novel and Christian Narrative', in E.P. Cueva and S.N. Byrne eds. (2014): 180-97.

Koskenniemi, H. (1956), *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des Griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* Helsinki.

Kossaifi, C. (2011), 'Le mythe bucolique de Théocrite à Longus', in R. Poignault ed. (2011): 71-92.

Kossaifi, C. (2012), 'The Legend of Phatta in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*', *AJPh* 133.4: 573-600.

Kraggerud, E. (2010/11), 'The False Incipit of the 'Aeneid' and '*arma virumque cano*', *Eranos* 106: 90-2.

Kramer, J. (2001), *Glossaria bilinguia altera*. Munich.

Kristeva, J. (1968), 'Problèmes de la structuration du texte', in *Théorie d'ensemble*. Paris: 297-316.

Kristeva, J. (1986), *The Kristeva Reader* ed. T. Moi. New York.

Kudlien, F. (1989), 'Kindesaussetzung im antiken Roman: ein Thema zwischen Fiktionalität und Lebenswirklichkeit', *GCN* 2: 25-44.

Küppers, J. (1989), 'Tityrus in Rom: Bermerkungen zu einem vergilischen Thema und seiner Rezeptionsgeschichte', *ICS* 14: 13-47.

La Penna, A. (1990), 'L'allitterazione dell'esilio in latino', *RFIC* 118: 64-72.

Labate, M. (1987), 'Elegia triste ed elegia lieta. Un caso di riconversione letteraria', *MD* 19: 91-129.

Labate, M. (2006), 'Erotic Aetiology: Romulus, Augustus, and the Rape of the Sabine Women', in R.K. Gibson, S. Green, and A. Sharrock eds. (2006): 193-215.

Lacey, P. (1968), *The Family in Classical Greece*. Ithaca, N.Y.

Lalanne, S. (2006), *Une éducation grecque: rites de passage et construction des genres dans le roman grec ancien*. Paris.

Lansdown, R. (2001) *The Autonomy of Literature*. Basingstoke.

Laplace, M. (1980), 'Les légendes troyennes dans le roman de Chariton Chairéas et Callirhoé', *REG* 93: 83-125.

Laplace, M. (2008), 'For the Dating of the novel of Chariton: the Figure of Demetrius the Cynic', paper delivered at ICAN 2008, Portugal.

Lateiner, D. (2003), 'Tlepolemus and the Spectral Spouse', in S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman, and W. Keulen eds. (2003): 219-38.

Lavan, M. (2007), 'Slaves to Rome: the rhetoric of mastery in Titus's speech to the Jews (Josephus *Bellum Judaicum* 6.328-50)', *Ramus* 36, 25-38.

Lavan, M. (2013a), *Slaves to Rome: Paradigms of Empire in Roman Culture*. Cambridge.

Lavan, M. (2013b), 'Florus and Dio on the Enslavement of the Provinces', *CCJ* 59: 125-51.

Leach, E.W. (1964), 'Georgic Imagery in the *Ars amatoria*', *TAPhA* 95: 142-54.

Leach, E.W. (1974), *Vergil's Eclogues. Landscapes of Experience*. Ithaca, New York.

Lee-Stecum, P. (1998), *Powerplay in Tibullus: Reading Elegies in Book One*. Cambridge.

Lee-Stecum, P. (2013), 'Tibullus in first place', in T. Thorsen ed. (2013b): 68-82.

Lefteratou, A. (2010), *Myth and Narrative in the Greek Novels*. Oxford DPhil thesis.

Leigh, M. (1994), 'Servius on Vergil's Senex Corycius: New Evidence', *MD* 33: 181-95.

Leo, F. (1903), 'Vergils erste und neunte Ekloge', *Hermes* 38: 1-18.

Létoublon, F. (1993), *Les lieux communs du roman: stéréotypes grecs d'aventure et d'amour*. Leiden.

Létoublon, F. (2003), 'La lettre dans le roman grec ou les liaisons dangereuses', in S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman, and W. Keulen eds. (2003): 271-87.

Létoublon, F. (2006), 'La rhétorique du suicide', in C. Bost-Pouderon and J. Peigney eds. (2006): 263-80.

Létoublon, F. (2013), 'Mythological Paradigms in the Greek Novels', in M. Paschalis and S. Panayotakis eds. (2013): 127-46.

Levick, B.M. (2014), *Faustina I and II: Imperial Women of the Golden Age. Women in Antiquity*. Oxford.

Levin, D.N. (1977), 'The pivotal role of Lycaenion in Longus' Pastorals', *RSC* 25: 5-17.

Lieberg, G. (1982), *Poeta creator: Studien zu einer Figur der antiken Dichtung*. Amsterdam.

Lightfoot, J.L. ed. (1999), *Parthenius of Nicaea: Extant works edited with introduction and commentary*. Oxford.

Lightfoot, J.L. ed. (2014), *Dionysius Periegetes, Description of the known world*. Oxford.

Lilja, S. (1965), *The Latin elegists' Attitude to Women*. Helsinki.

Lindsell, A. (1937), 'Was Theocritus A Botanist?', *Greece and Rome* 6 (17): 78-93.

Lipka, M. (2001), *Language in Vergil's* Eclogues. Berlin.

Lipka, M. (2002), 'Notes on *fagus* in Vergil's *Eclogues*', *Philologus* 146: 133-8.

Littlefield, D. (1965), 'Pomona and Vertumnus: a fruition of history in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', *Arion*. 4.3: 465-73.

Liveley, G. and Salzman-Mitchell, P. eds. (2008), *Latin Elegy and Narratology: Fragments of Story*. Columbus, Ohio.

Liviabella Furiani, P. (1984), 'La Musica nel Romanzo "Erotico" Greco, tra Natura e Cultura', *Quaderni Istituto di Filosofia* 1: 27-43.

Liviabella Furiani, P. (1989), 'Di Donna in Donna. Elementi "Femministi" nel Romanzo Greco d'Amore', in P. Liviabella Furiani and A. Scarcella eds. (1989): 43-106.

Liviabella Furiani, P. (2010), 'Il V secolo, tra fiction e realtà, nel romanzo di Caritone,' in S. Giombini and F. Marcacci eds., *Il Quinto Secolo. Studi di Filosofia Antica in Onore di Livio Rossetti*. Perugia: 617-644.

Liviabella Furiani, P. and Scarcella, A. eds. (1989), *Piccolo Mundo Antico*. Perugia.

Lloyd-Jones, H. and Parsons, P.J. (1978), 'Iterum de "Catabasi Orphica"', in H.G. Beck *et al.* eds., *Kyklos: Griechisches und Byzantinisches, Rudolf Keydell zum neunzigsten Geburtstag*. Berlin - New York.

Luck, G. (1967-77), *P. Ovidius Naso. Tristia*. Heidelberg.

Luginbill, R. D. (2000), 'Chariton's Use of Thucydides' History in Introducing the Egyptian Revolt (*Chaireas and Callirhoe* 6.8)', *Mnemosyne* 53: 1-11.

Luraghi, N. (2008), 'Meeting Messenians in Pausanias' Greece' in C. Grandjean ed., *Le Péloponnèse d'Épaminondas à Hadrien*. Pessac: 192-202.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1979), '*Seruitium amoris*', *CQ* 29: 117-30

Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1980), *The Latin Love Poets: From Catullus to Horace*. Oxford.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1983), 'Lavinia's Blush: Vergil, *Aeneid* 12.64-70', *Greece and Rome* 30.1: 55-64.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1987), *Further Voices in Vergil's* Aeneid. Oxford.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1989), *Words and the Poet: Characteristic Techniques of Style in Vergil's Aeneid*. Oxford.

MacAlister, S. (1996), *Dreams and Suicides: The Greek Novel from Antiquity to the Byzantine Empire*. London.

Macleod, C. (1983), 'Catullus 116', in O. Taplin ed., *The Collected Essays of Colin Macleod*. Oxford: 181-6.

MacMullen, R. (1964), 'Nationalism in Roman Egypt', *Aegyptus* 44: 179–99.

MacMullen, R. (1966), *Enemies of Roman Order: Treason, Unrest, and Alienation in the Empire*. Cambridge, MA.

MacQueen, B.D. (1990), *Myth, Rhetoric, and Fiction: A Reading of Longus' Daphnis and Chloe*. Lincoln, Nebraska.

Madsen, J.M. (2009), *Eager to be Roman: Greek Responses to Roman rule in Pontus and Bithynia*. London.

Madsen, J.M. (2014), 'Patriotism and Ambitions: Intellectual Response to Roman Rule in the High Empire', in J.M. Madsen and R. Rees eds. (2014a): 16-38.

Madsen, J.M. and Rees, R. eds. (2014a), *Roman Rule in Greek and Latin Writing: Double Vision.* (Impact of Empire, 18). Leiden.

Madsen, J.M. and Rees, R. (2014b), 'Introduction: A Roman Greek', in J.M. Madsen and R. Rees eds. (2014a): 1-15.

Maggiulli, G. (1995), *Incipiant Silvae Cum Primum Surgere: Mondo Vegetale e Nomenclatura della Flora di Virgilio*. Rome.

Magie, D. (1950), *Roman Rule in Asia Minor: To the End of the Third Century after Christ*, 2 vols. Princeton.

Malkin, I. ed. (2001), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Washington D.C.

Maltby, R. ed. (2002), *Tibullus*: Elegies: *Text, Introduction, and Commentary*. Cambridge.

Manuwald, G. (2000), 'Zitate als Mittel des Erzählens: Zur Darstellungstechnik Charitons in seinem Roman Kallirhoe', *WJA* 24: 97-122.

Marc, J.-Y. and Moretti, J.-C. eds. (2001), *Constructions publiques et programmes édilitaires en Grèce entre le IIe siècle av. J.-C. et le Ier siècle ap. J.-C.* (*BCH* Supplement 39). Paris.

Marganne, M.-H. and Rochette, B. eds. (2013), *Bilinguisme et digraphisme dans le monde gréco-romain: l'apport des papyrus latins. Actes de la Table Ronde internationale (Liège, 12-13 mai 2011). Collection Papyrologica Leodiensia, 2*. Liège.

Marinčič, M. (2007), 'Advertising One's Own Story. Text and Speech in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*', in V. Rimell. ed. (2007): 168-200.

Maritz, J. (1991), 'The Role of Music in *Daphnis and Chloe*', *GCN* 4: 57–67.

Markus, D. and Schwendner, G.W. (1997), 'Seneca's *Medea* in Egypt (663-704)', *ZPE* 117: 73-80.

Martin, D.B. (1990), *Slavery and Salvation*. New Haven.

Martindale, C. (1997a), 'Green politics: the *Eclogues*', in C. Martindale ed. (1997b): 107-24.

Martindale, C. ed. (1997b), *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*. Cambridge.

Mason, H.J. (1979), 'Longus and the topography of Lesbos', *TAPhA* 109: 149-63.

Mason, H.J. (1995), 'Romance in a limestone landscape', *CP* 90: 263-6.

Mattingly, D.J. (2011), *Imperialism, Power, and Identity: Experiencing the Roman Empire*. Princeton.

Maurer, J. (1990), *Untersuchungen zur poetischen Technik und den Vorbildern der Ariadne-Epistel Ovids*. Frankfurt am Main.

Mazzoni, C. (2010), *She-Wolf: The Story of a Roman Icon*. Oxford.

McCarthy, K. (1998), '*Seruitium amoris*: *Amor servitii*', in and S.R. Joshel and S. Murnaghan eds., *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture: Differential Equations*. London: 174-92.

McCarthy, K. (2000), *Slaves, Masters and the Art of Authority in Plautine Comedy*. Princeton.

McClintock, A. (1995), *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. London.

McCulloh, W.E. (1970), *Longus*. New York.

McGing, B.C. (1998), 'Bandits, real and imagined in Greco-Roman Egypt', *BASP* 35: 159-83.

McGowan, M.M. (2009), *Ovid in Exile: Power and Poetic Redress in the Trista and Epistulae ex Ponto*. Leiden.

McKeown, J.C. (1979), 'Augustan elegy and mime', *PCPhS* n.s. 25: 71-84.

McKeown, J.C. ed. (1989), *Ovid:* Amores. *II*: *A Commentary on Book One*. Leeds

McKeown, J.C. ed. (1998), *Ovid*: Amores. *III*: *A Commentary on Book Two*. Leeds

McKie, D.S. (2009), *Essays in the Interpretation of Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.

McLynn, N. (2008), 'Crying Wolf: The Pope and the Lupercalia', *JRS* 98: 176–81.

McNay, L. (1994), *Foucault. A critical introduction.* Cambridge.

Merkelbach, R. (1951), 'Eine orphische Unterweltsbeschreibung auf Papyrus', *MH* 8: 2-11.

Merkelbach, R. (1962), *Roman und Mysterium in der Antike*. Munich.

Merkelbach, R. (1988), *Die Hirten des Dionysos*. Stuttgart.

Mersmann, H. (1931), *Quaestiones Propertianae*. Diss. Münster.

Mesk, J. (1912), 'Lucians Nigrinus und Juvenal I', *WS* 34: 373-82.

Mesk, J. (1913), 'Lucians Nigrinus und Juvenal II', *WS* 35: 1-33.

Méthy, N. (1992), 'La représentation des provinces dans le monnayage de l'époque imperiale', *NAC* 21: 267-95.

Mignona, E. (1995), 'Roman und Paradoxon: die Metamorphosen der Metapher in Achilles Tatios' *Leukippe und Kleitophon*', *GCN* 6: 21-37.

Miguélez-Cavero, L. (2008), *Poems in Context. Greek Poetry in the Egyptian Thebaid 200-600 AD*. Berlin - New York.

Miguélez-Cavero, L. (2013), *Triphiodorus 'The Sack of Troy': a general study and commentary*. Berlin - New York.

Millar, F. (1964), *A Study of Cassius Dio*. Oxford.

Millar, F. (1969), 'P. Herennius Dexippus: The Greek World and the Third-century Invasions', *JRS* 59: 12-29.

Millar, F. (1977), *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC-AD 337)*. London.

Millar, F. (1981), 'The World of the Golden Ass', *JRS* 71: 63-75. Repr. in S.J. Harrison ed. (1999): 247-68.

Miller, P.A. (2004), *Subjecting Verses. Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real*. Princeton.

Milne, J.G (1927), 'The Ruin of Egypt by Roman Mismanagement', *JRS* 17: 11-12.

Miralles, C. (1973), 'Πενία y κῆπος. Sobre algunos ideales de vida humana en la antiguedad tardía', *BIEH* 7: 79-99.

Mitchell, E. (2014), 'The Boy's Own love story: The romantic adventures of Leukippe, Kleitophon, and Kleitophon's friends', *Ancient Narrative* 11: 43-74.

Mitsis, P., Schiesaro, A., and Clay, J. eds. (1994), *Mega nepios: il destinatario nell'epos didascalico*. Pisa.

Mittelstadt, M.C. (1967), 'Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* and Roman narrative painting', *Latomus* 26: 752-61.

Moles, J.L. (1988), *Plutarch: The Life of Cicero*. Warminster.

Moles, J.L. (2014), 'Accommodation, Opposition or Other? Luke-Acts' Stance Towards Rome', in J.M. Madsen and R. Rees eds. (2014a): 79-104.

Momigliano, A. (1934), 'Livio, Plutarco e Giustino su virtù e fortuna dei Romani', *Athenaeum* 12: 45-56.

Montiglio, S. (2011), Review of S. Tilg (2010), *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the Invention of the Greek Novel*, in *Ancient Narrative* 9: 153-62.

Montiglio, S. (2012), 'The (Cultural) Harmony of Nature: Music, Love, and Order in *Daphnis and Chloe*', *TAPhA* 142.1: 133-56.

Montiglio, S. (2013), *Love and Providence: Recognition in the Ancient Novel*. Oxford - New York.

Moorby, S. (2008), 'Achates: faithful friend or poetic fraud?', *PVS* 26: 66-75.

Morales, H. (2004), *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius'* Leucippe and Clitophon. Cambridge.

Morales, H. (2005), 'Metaphor, Gender and the Ancient Novel', in S.J. Harrison, M. Paschalis, and S. Frangoulidis eds., *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel: Ancient Narrative Supplement 4*. Groningen: 1-22.

Morales, H. (2006), 'Marrying Mesopotamia: female sexuality and cultural resistance in Iamblichus' *Babylonian Tales*', *Ramus* 35: 78-101.

Morelli, A.M. (1994), 'Sul papiro di Ossirinco LIV 3723. Considerazioni sui caratteri dell'elegia erotica ellenistica alla luce dei nuovi ritrovamenti papiracei', *RFIC* 122: 385-421.

Morello, R. (2002), 'Livy's Alexander Digression (9.17-19): Counterfactuals and Apologetics', *JRS* 92: 62-85.

Morford, M. (1991), 'How Tacitus defined liberty', *ANRW* 2.33.5: 3420-50.

Morford, M. (1992), '*Iubes esse liberos*: Pliny's *Panegyricus* and liberty', *AJPh* 113: 575–93.

Morgan, J.R. (1995), 'The Greek Novel: towards a sociology of production and reception', in A. Powell ed., *The Greek World*. London: 130-52.

Morgan, J.R. (1997), 'Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe*: a bibliographical survey, 1950-1995', *ANRW* 2.34.3: 2208-76.

Morgan, J.R. (2003), 'Nymphs, Neighbours and Narrators: a Narratological Approach to Longus', in S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman, and W. Keulen, eds. (2003): 171-90.

Morgan, J.R. (2004a), 'Achilles Tatius', in I. de Jong, R. Nünlist, and A. Bowie eds. (2004): 493-506.

Morgan, J.R. (2004b), *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe*. Warminster.

Morgan, J.R. (2007a), 'The Representation of Philosophers in Greek Fiction', in J.R. Morgan and M. Jones eds., *Philosophical Presences in the Ancient Novel. Ancient Narrative Summmplementum 10*. Groningen: 23-52.

Morgan, J.R. (2007b), 'Kleitophon and Encolpius: Achilleus Tatios as hidden author', in M. Paschalis *et al*. eds. (2007): 105-20.

Morgan, J.R. (2009), 'Petronius and Greek Literature', in J.R.W. Prag, and I. Repath, eds., *Petronius: a Handbook*. Chichester and Malden, MA: 32-47.

Morgan, J.R. (2011), 'Poets and Shepherds: Philetas and Longus', in K. Doulamis ed., *Echoing Narratives: Studies of Intertextuality in Greek and Roman Prose Fiction. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 13*. Groningen: 139-60.

Morgan, J.R. (2012), 'Longus' in I. de Jong, R. Nünlist, and A. Bowie eds. (2012): 537-56.

Morgan, J.R. and Stoneman, R. eds. (1994), *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, London - New York.

Morgan, L. (2003), 'Child's Play: Ovid and his Critics', *JRS* 93: 66-91.

Morgan, T. (1998), *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge.

Mowbray, C. (2015), 'Amber Tears and Swan Songs: Ovid and Poetic Authority in Lucian's Ἠλέκτρου'. Paper delivered at *SCS* 2015, New Orleans.

Muir, J. (2009), *Life and Letters in the Ancient Greek World*. London.

Mullen, A. (2011), 'Latin and Other Languages: Societal and Individual Bilingualism', in J. Clackson ed., *A Companion to the Latin Language*. Oxford: 527-48.

Müller, C. W. (1976), 'Chariton von Aphrodisias und die Theorie des Romans in der Antike', *A&A* 22: 115-36.

Müller, C. W. (1981), 'Der griechische Roman', in E. Vogt and O. Gigon eds., *Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft* 2: 377-412.

Müller, C.W. (1990), 'Philetas oder Philitas', in P. Steinmetz ed., *Beiträge zur hellenistischen Literatur in ihrer Rezeption in Rom*. Stuttgart: 27-37.

Murgatroyd, P. (1975), '*Militia amoris* and the Latin elegists', *Latomus* 34: 59-79

Murgatroyd, P. ed. (1980), *Tibullus 1*. Pietermaritzburg (repr. Bristol, 1991).

Murgatroyd, P. (1981), '*Seruitium Amoris* and the Latin elegists', *Latomus* 40: 589-600.

Murgatroyd, P. ed. (1994), *Tibullus. Elegies II*. Oxford.

Murphy, T.M. (2004), 'Privileged Knowledge: Valerius Soranus and the Secret Name of Rome', in A. Barchiesi, J. Rüpke, and S. Stephens eds., *Rituals in Ink: A Conference on Religion and Literary Production in Ancient Rome held at Stanford University in February 2002*. Stuttgart: 127-37.

Musurillo, H. (1954), *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs: Acta Alexandrinorum*. Oxford.

Naber, S. A. (1901), 'Ad Charitonem', *Mnemosyne* 29: 92-9.

Nagle, B.R. (1980), *The Poetics of Exile: Program and Polemic in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto of Ovid*. Collection Latomus 170. Brussels.

Navarro Antolín, F. (1996), *Corpus Tibullianum III. 1-6: Lygdami elegiarum liber*. Leiden.

Nesselrath, H.-G. (2007), 'Later Greek Voices on the Predicament of Exile: from Teles to Plutarch and Favorinus', in J.F. Gaertner ed. (2007): 87-108.

Nethercut, W. R. (1967), 'Trees and Identity in Aeneid *viii* and Bucolic *ii*', *Vergilius* 13: 16-27.

Nevett, L. (2002), 'Continuity and change in Greek households under Roman rule: the role of women in the domestic context', in E.N. Ostenfeld ed. (2002): 81-97.

Nimis, S. (1998), 'Memory and Description in the Ancient Novel', *Arethusa* 31.1: 99-122.

Nimis, S. (1999), 'The Sense of Openendedness in the Ancient Novel', *Arethusa* 32.2: 215-38.

Nimis, S. (2003), 'In mediis rebus: Beginning Again in the Middle of the Ancient Novel', in S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman, and W. Keulen eds. (2003): 255-70.

Nimis, S. (2004), 'Egypt in Greco-Roman History and Fiction', *ALIF* 24: 34-67.

Nisbet, R.G.M. and Hubbard, M. (1970), *A Commentary on Horace Odes Book I*. Oxford.

Nisbet, R.G.M. and Hubbard, M. (1978), *A Commentary on Horace Odes Book II*. Oxford.

Nisbet, R.G.M. and Rudd, N. (2004), *A Commentary on Horace Odes Book III*. Oxford.

Noreña, C.F. (2011), *Imperial Ideals in the Roman West: Representation, Circulation, Power*. Cambridge.

O'Connor, E.M. (1991), 'A bird in the bush: the erotic and literary implications of bucolic and avian imagery in two related episodes of Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*', *RhM* 134: 393-401.

O'Hara, J.J. (1996), *True names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. Ann Arbor.

O'Sullivan, J.N. (1980), *A Lexicon to Achilles Tatius*. Berlin.

Ogilvie, R.M. (1965), *A Commentary on Livy. Books 1-5*. Oxford.

Öhrman, M. (2008), *Varying Virtue. Mythological Paragons of Wifely Virtues in Roman Elegy*. Lund.

Oliensis, E. (1997), 'Return to Sender: The Rhetoric of *Nomina* in Ovid's *Tristia*', *Ramus* 26: 172-93.

Oliver, J.H. (1953), *The Ruling Power: A Study of the Roman Empire in the Second Century after Christ through the Roman Oration of Aelius Aristides* (*TAPhS* n.s. 43.4). Philadelphia.

Opelt, I. (1987), 'Fidus Achates', *GB* 14: 187-98.

Ostenfeld, E. N. ed. (2002), *Greek Romans and Roman Greeks: Studies in Cultural Interaction*. Aarhus.

Otis, B. (1963), *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*. Oxford.

Ottaviano, S. and Conte, G.B eds. (2013), *P. Vergilius Maro: Bucolica; Georgica. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, 2011*. Berlin.

Otto, A. (1980), *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*. Leipzig.

Paglialunga, E. (2000a), 'Amor y celos en los personajes masculinos de Caritó de Afrodisia', *FlorIlib* 11: 181-94.

Paglialunga, E. (2000b), 'Mujeres celosas en la novela griega', in M. Alganza Roldán, J.M. Camacho Rojo, P.P. Fuentes Gonzáles, and M. Villena Ponsoda eds., Ἐπιείκεία: *studia Graeca in memoriam Jesús Lens Tuero*. Granada: 371-86.

Palm, J. (1959), *Rom, Römertum und Imperium in der griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit*. Lund.

Palmer Bonz, M. (2000), *The Past as Legacy: Luke-Acts and Ancient Epic*. Minneapolis.

Panayotakis, S., Zimmerman, M. and Keulen, W. eds (2003), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*. Leiden.

Pandiri, T.A. (1985), '*Daphnis and Chloe*: the art of pastoral play', *Ramus* 14: 116-41.

Papanghelis, T.D. (1987), *Propertius: A Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death*. Cambridge.

Papanghelis, T.D. (2006), 'Friends, Foes, Frames and Fragments: Textuality in Virgil's *Eclogues*', in M. Fantuzzi and T.D. Papanghelis eds. (2006): 369-402.

Papanghelis, T.D. (2013), 'Too Much Semiotics will Spoil the Genre. The Pastoral Unscription in Virgil, *Ecl*. 10.53–4', in T.D. Papanghelis, S.J. Harrison, and S. Frangoulidis eds., *Generic interfaces in Latin literature: encounters, interactions, and transformations*. Berlin: 205-16.

Papanikolaou, A.D. (1973), *Chariton-Studien: Untersuchungen zur Sprache und Chronologie der griechischen Romane.* Göttingen.

Parker, H.N. (1989), 'Another go at the text of Philaenis (*P.Oxy*. 2891)', *ZPE* 79: 49-50.

Parker, H.N. (1992), 'Love's body anatomized: the Ancient Erotic Handbooks and the Rhetoric of Sexuality', in A. Richlin ed. (1992b): 90-111.

Parry, A. (1963), 'The two voices of Virgil's *Aeneid*', *Arion* 2: 66-80.

Parry, H. (1964), 'Ovid's Metamorphoses: Violence in a Pastoral Landscape', *TAPhA* 95: 268-82.

Parsons, P. J. and Bremmer, J. (1987), '3723: elegy', in R. A. Coles, H. Maehler, and P.J. Parsons eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. LIV. London.

Parsons, P.J. (1988), 'Eine neugefundene griechische Liebeselegie', *MH* 45: 65-74.

Paschalis, M. (2005), 'The Narrator as Hunter: Longus, Virgil and Theocritus', in S.J. Harrison, M. Paschalis, and S. Frangoulidis eds. (2005): 50-67.

Paschalis, M. and Panayotakis, S. eds. (2013), *The Construction of the Real and Ideal in the Ancient Novel. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 17*. Groningen.

Paschalis, M. (2014), 'Ovidian Metamorphoses and Nonnian *poikilon eidos*', in K. Spanoudakis ed., *Nonnus of Panopolis in Context: Poetry and Cultural Milieu in Late Antiquity, with a Section on Nonnus and the Modern World. Trends in classics supplementary volumes, 24*. Berlin - Boston: 97-122.

Paschalis, M., Panayotakis, S., and Schmeling, G. eds. (2009), *Readers and Writers in the Ancient Novel. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 12*. Groningen.

Paschalis, M., Frangoulidis, S., Harrison, S.J., and Zimmerman, M. eds. (2007), *The Greek and the Roman Novel: Parallel Readings, Ancient Narrative Supplementum 8*. Groningen.

Pattoni, M. (2004), 'I Pastorali di Longo e la contaminazione dei generi. Alcune proposte interpretative', *MD* 53: 83-123.

Pelling, C.B.R. (1979), 'Plutarch's Method of Work in his Roman Lives', *JHS* 99: 74-96.

Pelling, C.B.R. (1988), *Plutarch: Life of Antony*. Cambridge.

Pelling, C.B.R. (1989), 'Plutarch: Roman Heroes and Greek Culture', in J. Barnes and M.T. Griffin eds., *Philosophia Togata. Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society*. Oxford: 199-232.

Perkins, J. (1995), *The Suffering Self: Pain and Narrative Representation in the Early Christian Era*. London.

Perkins, J. (2009), *New Identities: Pagan and Christian Narratives from the Roman Empire*. London.

Pernot, L. (2008), 'Aelius Aristides and Rome', in W.V. Harris and B. Holmes eds. (2008): 175-202.

Perry, B. E. (1930), 'Chariton and his Romance from a Literary-Historical Point of View', *AJPh* 51: 93-134.

Perry, B.E. (1950), 'Literature in the second century', *CJ* 50: 295-8.

Pervo, R. (1994), 'Early Christian Fiction', in: J.R. Morgan and R. Stoneman eds. (1994): 239-54.

Phinney, E. (1965), 'Dido and Sychaeus', *CJ* 60: 355-359.

Piccaluga, G. (1968), *Lycaon, un tema mitico*. Rome.

Pichon, R. (1902), *De sermone amatorio apud Latinos elegiarum scriptores*. Paris.

Pierce, K. F. (1997), 'The portrayal of rape in New Comedy', in S. Deacy and K. Pierce eds., *Rape in Antiquity*. London: 163-84.

Plazenet, L. (1995), 'Le Nil et son delta dans les romans grecs', *Phoenix* 40: 5-22

Plepelits, K. ed. (1976), *Chariton von Aphrodisias: Kallirhoe*. Stuttgart.

Plepelits, K. ed. (1980), *Achilleus Tatios, Leukippe und Kleitophon*. Stuttgart.

Plepelits, K. (1996), 'Achilles Tatius', in G. Schmeling ed. (1996): 387-416.

Pohlenz, M. (1913), *De Ovidi carminibus amatoriis*. Göttingen.

Poignault, R., ed. (2011), *Présence du roman grec et latin. Actes du colloque tenu à Clermont-Ferrand (23-25 novembre 2006)*. Clermont-Ferrand.

Poinssot, L. (1929), *L'autel de la Gens Augusta à Carthage*. Direction des antiquités et des arts. Tunis - Paris.

Pomeroy, S.B. (2002), *Spartan Women*. Oxford.

Porter, R. (1986), 'Rape-Does it have a historical meaning?', in S. Tomaseli and R. Porter eds., *Rape: An historical and social enquiry*. Oxford: 216-36.

Pöschl, V. (1968), 'Der Katalog der Bäume in Ovids Metamorphosen,', in M. von Albrecht and E. Zinn eds., *Ovid*. Darmstadt: 393-404.

Potter, D. (1993), 'Martyrdom as Spectacle', in R. Scodel ed., *Theater and Society in the Classical World*. Ann Arbor: 53-88.

Poucet, J. (1976), 'Fabius Pictor et Denys d'Halicarnasse: Les enfances de Romulus et Rémus', *Historia* 25: 201-16.

Pouderon, B. ed. (2001), *Les personnages du roman grec. Actes du colloque de Tours, 18-20 novembre 1999*. Lyon.

Pouderon, B. and Crismani, D. eds. (2005), *Lieux, décors et paysages de l' ancien roman des origines à Byzance. Actes du 2e colloque de Tours, 24-26 octobre 2002*. Lyon.

Pouderon, B. and Bost-Pouderon, C. eds. (2009), *Passions, vertus et vices dans l'ancien roman. Actes du colloque de Tours, 19-21 octobre 2006, organisé par l'université François-Rabelais de Tours et la UMR 5189, Histoire et Sources des Mondes Antiques. Collection de la Maison de l'Orient Mediterraneen, 42, série littéraire et philosophique 14*. Lyon.

Powell, L. (2015), *Marcus Agrippa: Right-hand Man of Caesar Augustus*. Barnsley.

Pretzler, M. (2007), *Pausanias: Travel Writing in Ancient Greece*. London.

Puelma, M. (1949), *Lucilius und Kallimachos. Zur Geschichte einer Gattung der hellenistich-römischen Poesie*. Frankfurt am Main.

Putnam, M.C.J. (2010), 'Some Virgilian unities', in P.R. Hardie and H. Moore eds. (2010): 17-38.

Quet, M.-O. (1978), 'Rhétorique, culture et politique: le fonctionnement du discours idéologique chez Dion de Pruse et dans les *Moralia* de Plutarque', *DHA* 4: 51-118.

Ramage, E.S. (1987), *The Nature and Purpose of Augustus' Res Gestae* (Historia Einzelschriften no. 54). Stuttgart.

Reardon, B.P. (1969), 'The Greek Novel', *Phoenix* 23: 291-309.

Reardon, B.P. (1971), *Courants littéraires grecs des IIe et IIIes siècles après J-C*. Paris.

Reardon, B.P. ed. (1989), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Berkeley.

Reardon, B.P. (1991), *The form of Greek romance*. Princeton.

Reardon, B.P. (1994), 'Achilles Tatius and Ego-Narrative', in J.R. Morgan and R. Stoneman eds. (1994): 80-96.

Reardon, B.P. (1996), 'Chariton', in G. Schmeling ed. (1996): 309-35.

Reardon, B.P. ed. (2004), *Chariton Aphrodisiensis: De Callirhoe narrationes amatoriae*. Munich.

Reed, J.D. (2006), 'Continuity and change in Greek bucolic between Theocritus and Virgil', in M. Fantuzzi and T.D. Papanghelis eds. (2006): 209-34.

Reeson, J. ed. (2001), *Ovid Heroides 11, 13, and 14: A Commentary*. Leiden.

Reeve, M.D. ed. (1982), *Longus. Daphnis and Chloe*. Leipzig.

Reichmann, V. (1943), *Römische Literatur in griechischer Übersetzung*. Philologus 34 (3), supplement. Leipzig.

Reitzenstein, E. (1936), *Wirklichkeitsbild und Gefühlsentwicklung bei Properz. Philolologus Suppl. 36*. Leipzig.

Repath, I. (2007), 'Callisthenes in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon*: Double Jeopardy?', *Ancient Narrative* 6: 101-129.

Repath, I. (2013), 'Yours Truly? Letters in Achilles Tatius', in O. Hodkinson, P.A. Rosenmeyer, and E. Bracke eds. (2013): 237-62.

Revell, L. (2009), *Roman Imperialism and Local Identities*. Cambridge.

Révész M.B. (1972), 'Fidus Achates', *AUB(Class)* 1: 53-58.

Reynolds, J. (1982), *Aphrodisias and Rome*. London.

Reynolds, J. (1986), 'Imperial Cult at Aphrodisias', *Studii Clasice* 24: 109-17.

Reynolds, J. (1996), 'Ruler-Cult at Aphrodisias in the late Republic and under the Julio-Claudian Emperors', in A. Small ed., *Subject and Ruler: The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity*. Ann Arbor: 41-50.

Richlin, A. (1983), *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*. New Haven - London.

Richlin, A. (1992a), 'Reading Ovid's Rapes', in A. Richlin ed. (1992b): 158-79.

Richlin, A. ed. (1992b), *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*. Oxford - New York.

Ridley, R. (2003), *The Emperor's Retrospect: Augustus' Res Gestae in Epigraphy, Historiography and Commentary*. Leuven - Dudley.

Riess, W. (2001), *Apuleius und die Räuber: ein Beitrag zur historischen Kriminalitätsforschung*. Stuttgart.

Riess, W. (2001-2002), 'Between Fiction and Reality: Robbers in Apuleius' *Golden Ass*', *Ancient Narrative* 1: 260-82.

Riffaterre, M. (1979) 'La syllepse intertextuelle', *Poétique* 10: 496-501.

Riffaterre, M. (1980), 'Syllepsis', *Critical Inquiry* 6: 625-38

Riffaterre, M. (1981), 'L'intertexte inconnu', *Littérature* 41:4-7

Riffaterre, M. (1990), 'Compulsory Reader Response', in M. Worton and J. Still eds. *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices*. Manchester: 56-78.

Rimell, V. ed. (2007), *Seeing Tongues, Hearing Scripts. Orality and Representation in the Ancient Novel. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 7*. Groningen.

Robert, F. (1946), *L'humanisme. Essai de definition*. Paris.

Robert, L. (1940), *Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec*. Paris.

Robert, L. and Robert, J. (1981), *Bulletin épigraphique*.

Robert, L. and Robert, J. (1983), *Bulletin épigraphique*.

Robiano, P. (2000), 'La citation poétique dans le roman érotique grec', *REA* 102: 509-29.

Robiano, P. (2002), 'Lycénion, Mélité, ou la satisfaction du désir', *Pallas* 60: 363-73.

Robiano, P. (2007), 'La voix et la main: la lettre intime dans *Chéréas et Callirhoé*', in V. Rimell ed. (2007): 201-22.

Rochette, B. (1990), 'Les traductions grecques de l'Énéide sur papyrus. Une contribution a l'étude du bilingualisme gréco-romaine au Bas-Empire', *Les études classiques* 58: 333-46.

Rochette, B. (1994), 'Traducteurs et traductions dans l'Égypte gréco-romaine', *C d'É* 69: 313-22.

Rochette, B. (1997), *Le latin dans le monde grec. Recherches sur la diffusion de la langue et des lettres latines dans les provinces hellénophones de l'Empire romain.* Brussels.

Rochette, B. (2010), 'Greek and Latin Bilingualism', in E.J. Bakker ed. *A Companion to the Greek Language.* Oxford: 281-93.

Rochette, B. (2011), 'Language Policies in the Roman Republic and Empire', in J. Clackson ed. *Blackwell Companion to the Latin Language.* Oxford: 549-63.

Rodgers, R. (2003), 'Female representations in Roman art: feminising the provincial "other"', in S. Scott and J. Webster eds., *Roman Imperialism and Provincial Art.* Cambridge: 69-93.

Rodríguez Mayorgas, A. (2010), 'Romulus, Aeneas and the cultural memory of the Roman Republic', *Athenaeum* 98: 89–109.

Rodríguez Pantoja, M. (2007), 'Los *Halieutica* de Ovidio y Opiano', in Á. Sánchez-Ostiz, J.B. Torres Guerra, and R. Martínez eds. (2007): 361-74.

Rohde, E. (1914), *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorlaüfer 3*, rev. W. Schmid, Berlin; repr. (1960). Hildesheim.

Roller, M. (2001), *Constructing Autocracy: Aristocrats and Emperors in Julio-Claudian Rome.* Princeton.

Roncali, R. (1991), 'Zelotypia/daimon in Caritone', *QS* 17 (34): 183-6.

Rosati, G. ed. (1996), *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistulae XVIII-XIX: Leander Heroni, Hero Leandro.* Florence.

Rosati, G. (2013), 'The Loves of the Gods: Literature as Construction of a Space of Pleasure', in M. Paschalis and S. Panayotakis eds. (2013): 89-104.

Rosen, R.M and Sluiter, I. eds. (2003), Andreia: *Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity.* Leiden.

Rosenmeyer, T.G. (1969), *The Green Cabinet: Theocritus and the European Pastoral Lyric.* Berkeley.

Rosenmeyer, P.A. (1997), 'Ovid's *Heroides* and *Tristia*: Voices from Exile', *Ramus* 26: 29-56.

Rosenmeyer, P.A. (2001), *Ancient Epistolary Fictions: The Letter in Greek Literature*. Cambridge.

Ross, D.O. (1975), *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*. Cambridge.

Rossi, L. (1971), *Trajan's Column and the Dacian Wars*. Ithaca, New York.

Roueché, C. (1993), *Performers and partisans at Aphrodisias in the Roman and late Roman periods: a study based on inscriptions from the current excavations at Aphrodisias in Caria*. London.

Ruiz-Montero, C. (1989), 'Caritón de Afrodisias y el Mundo Real', in P. Liviabella Furiani and A. Scarcella eds. (1989): 107-49.

Ruiz-Montero, C. (1991), 'Aspects of the Vocabulary of Chariton of Aphrodisias', *CQ* 41: 484-9.

Ruiz-Montero, C. (1994), 'Chariton von Aphrodisias: Ein Überblick', *ANRW* 2.34.2: 1006-54.

Ruiz-Montero, C. (2011), 'La Mirada de las Mujeres', in F. De Martino and C. Morenilla eds., *Teatro y sociedad en la antigüedad clásica*. Bari: 381-402.

Russell, D. A. (1983), *Greek Declamation.* Cambridge.

Rutherford, I. (2000), 'The genealogy of the *Boukoloi*: how Greek literature appropriated an Egyptian narrative-motif', *JHS* 120: 106-21.

Said, E. (1993), *Culture and Imperialism*. New York.

Saïd, S. ed. (1991), *ʽΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΜΟΣ: quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque*. Leiden.

Salmon, P. (1961), 'Chariton d'Aphrodisias et la révolte eˊgyptienne de 360 avant J.C.', *CE* 36: 365-76.

Sánchez-Ostiz, Á., Torres Guerra, J. B., and Martínez, R. (2007), *De Grecia a Roma y de Roma a Grecia: Un camino de ida y vuelta*. Pamplona.

Sanz Morales, M. and Laguna Mariscal, G. (2003), 'The relationship between Achilles and Patroclus according to Chariton of Aphrodisias', *CQ* 53: 292-5.

Sargeaunt, J. (1920), *The Trees, Shrubs, and Plants of Virgil*. Oxford.

Scanlon, T. (2002), *Eros and Greek Athletics*. Oxford

Scappaticcio, M.C. (2013), *Papyri Vergilianae: l'apporto della Papirologia alla Storia della Tradizionee virgiliana (I-VI d.C.). Papyrologica Leodiensia, 1*. Liège.

Scarcella, A. (1993), *Romanzo e Romanzieri. Note di Narratologia greca*. Perugia.

Scarcella, A. (1996), 'The Social and Economic Structures of the Ancient Novels', in G. Schmeling ed. (1996): 221-76.

Scheid, J. and Huet, V. eds. (2000), *Autour de la Colonne Aurélienne: geste et image sur la colonne de Marc Aurèle à Rome*. Tournhout.

Schmeling, G. (1974), *Chariton*. New York.

Schmeling, G. ed. (1996), *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Leiden.

Schmeling, G. (2005), 'Callirhoe: god-like beauty and the making of a celebrity', in S.J. Harrison, M. Paschalis, and S. Frangoulidis eds. (2005): 36-49.

Schmeling, G. (2011), *A Commentary on The* Satyrica *of Petronius.* Oxford.

Schmid, W. (1887-97), *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus*, 5 vols. Stuttgart.

Schmitz, T. (1997), *Bildung und Macht: Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit*. Munich.

Schmitz, T. (1999), 'Performing history in the Second Sophistic', in M. Zimmermann ed. (1999): 71-92.

Schönbeck, G. (1962), *Der Locus amoenus von Homer bis Horaz*, (= Heidelberg, Phil. F., Diss. v. 29.).

Schubert, P., Ducrey, P., and Derron, P. eds. (2013), *Les Grecs héritiers des Romains: huit exposés suivis de discussions. Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique, 59*. Geneva.

Schulz-Vanheyden, E. (1969), *Properz und das griechische Epigramm*. Diss. Münster.

Schwartz, S.C (1998), *Courtroom Scenes in the Ancient Greek Novels*. Diss. Columbia University.

Schwartz, S.C. (1999), 'Callirhoe's Choice: Biological vs. Legal Paternity', *GRBS* 40: 23-52.

Schwartz, S.C. (2000-2001), 'Clitophon the *Moichos*: Achilles Tatius and the Trial Scene in the Greek Novel', *Ancient Narrative* 1: 93-113.

Schwartz, S.C. (2003), 'Rome in the Greek novel?: images and ideas of empire in Chariton's Persia', *Arethusa*: 36 375-394.

Schwegler, A. (1867), *Römische Geschichte*. Tübingen.

Scobie, A. (1973), *More Essays on the Ancient Romance and its Heritage*. Meisenheim am Glan.

Scott, J.C. (1990), *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*. New Haven.

Scott, K. (1930), 'Emperor Worship in Ovid', *TAPhA* 61: 43-69.

Scott, S. and Webster, J. eds. (2003), *Roman Imperialism and Provincial Art.* Cambridge.

Scourfield, J.H.D. (2003), 'Anger and Gender in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*', in S. Braund and G.W. Most eds., *Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen. YCS* 32: 163-84.

Sebesta, J. L. (2000), 'The Wedding Gifts in Catullus 64', *SyllClass* 11: 127–40.

Sedelmeier, D. (1959), 'Studien zu Achilleus Tatios', *WS* 72: 113-43.

Segal, C. (1981), *Poetry and Myth in Ancient Pastoral: Essays on Theocritus and Virgil.* Princeton.

Segal, C., (1969), *Landscape in Ovid's Metamorphoses.* Wiesbaden.

Selden, D. (1994), 'Genre of genre', in J. Tatum ed. (1994): 39-64.

Sharrock, A. R. (1994a), *Seduction and Repetition in Ovid's Ars Amatoria II.* Oxford.

Sharrock, A. R. (1994b), 'Ovid and the politics of reading', *MD* 33: 97-122. Repr. in P.E. Knox ed. (2006): 238-61.

Sharrock, A.R, (2006), 'Love in Parentheses: Digression and Narrative Hierarchy in Ovid's Erotodidactic Poems', in R.K. Gibson, S. Green, and A. Sharrock eds. (2006): 23-39.

Shaw, B.D. (1984), 'Bandits in the Roman Empire', *P&P* 105: 3-52.

Shaw, B.D. (1996), 'Body/Power/Identity: Passions of the Martyrs', *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4 (3): 269–312.

Shea, C. (2005), 'Imitating Imitation: Vergil, Homer, and *Acts* 10:1-11:18', in A. Brant, C. Hedrick, and C. Shea eds., *Ancient Fiction: The Matrix of Early Christian and Jewish Narrative.* Leiden: 37-59.

Shorrock, R. (2001), *The Challenge of Epic: Allusive Engagement in the Dionysiaca of Nonnus.* Leiden.

Shumate, N. (1996), *Crisis and Conversion in Apuleius' Metamorphoses.* Ann Arbor.

Skoie, M. (2006a), 'City and Countryside in Vergil's Eclogues', in R.M. Rosen and I. Sluiter eds., *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organisation of Value in Classical Antiquity, Mnemosyne Suppl. 279*: 297–325.

Skoie, M. (2006b), 'Passing on the Panpipes: Genre as Reception' in C. Martindale and R. Thomas eds., *Classics and the Uses of Reception.* Oxford: 92-103.

Skoie, M. and Bjørnstad-Velázquez, B. eds (2006), *Pastoral and the Humanities: Arcadia Re-inscribed.* Exeter.

Skulsky, S. (1985), '"Invitus, regina . . . ": Aeneas and the Love of Rome', *AJPh* 106: 447-55.

Skutsch, F. (1901), *Aus Vergils Frühzeit*. Leipzig - Berlin

Smith, E.M. (1927), 'The Egypt of the Greek Romance', *CJ* 23: 531-37

Smith, R.R.R. (1987), 'The imperial reliefs from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias', *JRS* 77: 88-138.

Smith, R.R.R. (1988), '*Simulacra gentium*: the *ethne* from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias', *JRS* 78: 50-77.

Smith, R.R.R. (1990), 'Myth and Allegory in the Sebasteion', in C. Roueché and K. T. Erim eds., *Aphrodisias papers*. Ann Arbor: 89-100.

Smith, R.R.R. (1993), *The Monument of C. Julius Zoilos*. Mainz.

Smith, R.R.R. (1994), 'Spear-won land at Boscoreale: on the royal paintings of a Roman villa', *JRA* 7: 100-28

Smith, R.R.R. (2013), *The Marble Reliefs from the Julio-Claudian Sebasteion. Aphrodisias, 6*. Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern

Smith, S.D. (2007), *Greek Identity and the Athenian Past in Chariton: the Romance of Empire. Ancient Narrative Supplementum 9*. Groningen.

Solin, H. (1975), *Epigraphische Untersuchungen in Rom und Umgebung*. Helsinki.

Sordi, M. (1984), 'Il fr. 29 Jacoby di Timeo e la lettura augustea di un passo di Filisto', *Latomus* 43: 534-9.

Spanoudakis, K. ed. (2002), *Philitas of Cos. Mnemosyne Supplement 229*. Leiden.

Spawforth, A.J.S. (2001), 'Shades of Greekness: a Lydian case-study' in I. Malkin ed., *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Cambridge, MA: 375-400.

Spawforth, A.J.S. (2012), *Greece and the Augustan Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge.

Spies, A. (1930), *Militat omnis amans: Ein Beitrag zur Bildersprache der antiken Erotik*. Diss. Tübingen.

Stadter, P.A. (2014) *Plutarch and his Roman Readers*. Oxford.

Stadter, P.A. and Van der Stockt, L. eds. (2002), *Sage and Emperor: Plutarch, Greek Intellectuals, and Roman Power in the Time of Trajan (98-117 A.D.)*. Leuven.

Stahl, H.-P. (1985), *Propertius: 'Love' and 'War'. Individual and State under Augustus*. Berkeley.

Stanley, K. (1963), 'Rome, *Eros*, and the Versus Romae', *GRBS* 4: 237-49.

Stephanes, I. (1988), *ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΑΚΟΙ ΤΕΧΝΙΤΑΙ*. Heraklion.

Stephens, S.A. (1994), 'Who Read Ancient Novels?', in J. Tatum ed. (1994): 405-18.

Stephens, S.A. (2006), 'Ptolemaic Pastoral', in M. Fantuzzi and T.D. Papanghelis eds. (2006): 91-118.

Stephens, S.A. (2008), 'Cultural identity', in T. Whitmarsh ed. (2008): 56-71.

Stroh, W. (1971), *Die römische Liebeselegie als werbende Dichtung*. Amsterdam.

Suerbaum, W. (1997), 'Am Scheideweg zur Zukunft: Alternative Geschehensverlaüfe bei römischen Historikern', *Gymnasium* 104: 36-54.

Svennung, J. (1945), *Catulls Bildersprache: vergleichende Stilstudien*. Uppsala.

Swain, S.C.R. (1989), 'Plutarch's *de Fortuna Romanorum*', *CQ* n.s. 39: 504-516.

Swain, S.C.R. (1991), 'Arrian the Epic Poet', *JHS* 111: 211-14.

Swain, S.C.R. (1996), *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek world, AD 50-250*. Oxford.

Swain, S.C.R. ed. (1999) *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*. Oxford.

Syme, R. (1939), *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford.

Syme, R. (1958), *Tacitus*. 2 vols. Oxford.

Tatum, J. ed. (1994), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*. Baltimore - London.

Teske, D. (1991), *Der Roman des Longos als Werk der Kunst*. Orbis Antiquus 32. Münster.

Thalmann, W. (1977), 'Versions of Slavery in the *Captivi* of Plautus', *Ramus* 25.2: 112-45.

Thibodeau, P. (2001), 'The Old Man and his Garden (Verg. *Georg*. 4, 116-148)', *MD* 47: 175-95.

Thomas, E. (2013), 'Translating Roman Architecture into Greek Regional Identities', in P. Schubert, P. Ducrey, and P. Derron eds. (2013): 147-200.

Thomas, R.F. (1992), 'The Old Man Revisited: Memory, Reference and Genre in Virg., Georg. 4, 116-48', *MD*: 29 35-70.

Thomas, R.F. (2001), *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*. Cambridge.

Thonemann, P. (2012), 'A Copy of Augustus' *Res Gestae* at Sardis', *Historia* 61.3: 282-8.

Thorsen, T. (2013a), 'Introduction: Latin love elegy', in T. Thorsen ed. (2013b): 1-20.

Thorsen, T. ed. (2013b), *The Cambridge Companion to Latin Love Elegy*. Cambridge.

Thorsen, T. (2014), *Ovid's Early Poetry: From his Single Heroides to his Remedia Amoris*. Cambridge.

Tilg, S. (2010), *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the Invention of the Greek Love Novel*. Oxford.

Tomaseli, S. and Porter, R. eds. (1986), *Rape: An historical and social enquiry*. Oxford.

Toohey P. (1996), *Epic Lessons: An Introduction to Ancient Didactic Poetry*. London.

Torres Guerra, J. B. (2007), 'Longo y Virgilio: Huellas romanas en suelo griego', in Á. Sánchez-Ostiz, J.B. Torres Guerra, and R. Martínez eds. (2007): 375-90.

Torres Guerra, J.B. ed. (2011), *Utroque sermone nostro: bilingüismo social y literario en el Imperio de Roma / Social and literary bilingualism in the Roman Empire*. Pamplona.

Toynbee, J. M. C. (1934), *The Hadrianic School*. Cambridge.

Tracy, S.V. (1982), 'Sepulcrum Bianoris: Virgil *Eclogues* 9.59-61', *CPh* 77: 328-330.

Treggiari, S. (1991), *Roman Marriage. Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the time of Ulpian*. Oxford

Treu, M. (1954), 'Die neue "orphische" Unterweltsbeschreibung und Vergil', *Hermes* 82: 24-51.

Trzaskoma, S. (2005), 'A Novelist Writing "History": Longus' Thucydides Again', *GRBS* 45: 75-90.

Turner, P. (1960), '*Daphnis and Chloe*: an interpretation', *G&R* 7: 117-23.

Valley, G. (1926), *Über den Sprachgebrauch des Longus*. Uppsala.

Van den Hout, M.P.J. (1999), *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto*. Leiden.

Van der Stockt, L. (2013), 'Loyalty divided or doubled? Plutarch's hellenism saluting Rome', in P. Schubert, P. Ducrey, P. Derron eds. (2013): 15-55.

Van Tress, H. (2004), *Poetic Memory: Allusion in the Poetry of Callimachus and the Metamorphoses of Ovid*. Leiden.

Vaughn, J.W. (1981), 'Theocritus Vergilianus and Liber Bucolicon;, *Aevum* 55: 47-68.

Viansino, G. (1963), *Epigrammi. Paolo Silenziario: Testo traduzione e commento*. Turin.

Viellefond, J.-R. (1987), *Longus Pastorales*. Paris.

Vilborg, E. (1955), *Achilles Tatius, Leucippe and Clitophon*. Stockholm.

Volk, K. (2002), *The poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius*. Oxford.

Vollenweider, H.M.-L. (1955), 'Verwendung und Bedeutung der Porträtgemmen für das politische Leben der römischen Republik', *MH* 12.2: 96-111.

Vout, C. (2007), *Power and Eroticism in Imperial Rome*. Cambridge.

Vukovic, K. (2015), *The Roman festival of the Lupercalia: history, myth, ritual and its Indo-European heritage*. Oxford DPhil. thesis.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1985), 'Propaganda and dissent? Augustan moral legislation and the love poets', *Klio* 67: 180-4.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. (2008), *Rome's Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge.

Watanabe, A. (2003a), 'The masculinity of Hippothous', *Ancient Narrative* 3: 1-42.

Watanabe, A. (2003b), *Hippothoos the Lover, Bandit, and Friend. A Study of Elite Masculinity in the Novel*. Diss. Yale.

Waywell, G.B. and Walker, S.E.C. (2001), 'Rome in Sparta: the early imperial phases of the Roman theatre', in J.-Y Marc and J.-C. Moretti eds. (2001): 285-95.

Webb, R. (2013), 'Mime and the Romance', in T. Whitmarsh and S. Thomson eds. (2013): 285-99.

Wesseling, B. (1988), 'The Audience of the Ancient Novels', *GCN* 1: 67-79.

West, G.S. (1983), 'Andromache and Dido', *AJPh* 104: 257-267.

Wheeler, A.L. (1910), 'Propertius as *praeceptor amoris*', *CPh* 5, 28-40.

Wheeler, A.L. (1910/1911), 'Erotic teaching in Roman elegy and the Greek sources', *CPh* 5: 440-50; 6: 56-77.

Whitaker, R. (1983), *Myth and Personal Experience in Roman Love-Elegy*. Göttingen.

Whitmarsh, T. (2000), 'The politics and poetics of parasitism: Athenaeus on parasites and flatterers', in D. Braund and J. Wilkins eds., *Athenaeus and his World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*. Exeter: 304-15.

Whitmarsh, T. (2001a), *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*. Oxford.

Whitmarsh, T. (2001b), '"Greece is the world". Exile and identity in the Second Sophistic', in S. Goldhill ed. (2001a): 269-305.

Whitmarsh, T. (2003), 'Reading for pleasure: narrative, irony, and erotics in Achilles Tatius', in S. Panayotakis *et al*. eds. (2003): 191-205.

Whitmarsh, T. (2004a), 'The Cretan lyre paradox: Mesomedes, Hadrian and the poetics of patronage', in B. Borg ed. (2004): 377-402. Repr. in T. Whitmarsh (2013c): 154-75.

Whitmarsh, T. (2005a), *The Second Sophistic*. Oxford.

Whitmarsh, T. (2005b), 'Dialogues in love: Bakhtin and his critics on the Greek novel', in R. Bracht Branham ed., *The Bakhtin Circle and Ancient Narrative, Ancient Narrative Supplementum 3*. Groningen: 107-129.

Whitmarsh, T. (2005c), 'The lexicon of love: Longus and Philetas grammatikos', *JHS* 125: 145-148.

Whitmarsh, T. ed. (2008) *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel*, Cambridge.

Whitmarsh, T. (2009), 'Divide and Rule: Segmenting *Callirhoe* and Related Works', in M. Paschalis, S. Panayotakis, and G. Schmeling eds (2009): 36-50.

Whitmarsh, T. ed. (2010a), *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World*. Cambridge.

Whitmarsh, T. (2010b), 'Domestic poetics: Hippias' house in Achilles Tatius', *ClAnt* 29: 327-48.

Whitmarsh, T. (2011), *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel: Returning Romance*. Cambridge.

Whitmarsh, T. (2013a), 'The Romance between Greece and the East', in T. Whitmarsh and S. Thomson eds. (2013): 1-22.

Whitmarsh, T. (2013b), 'Resistance is futile? Greek literary tactics in the face of Rome', in P. Schubert, P. Ducrey, P. Derron eds. (2013): 59-85.

Whitmarsh, T. (2013c), *Beyond the Second Sophistic: Adventures in Greek Postclassicism*. Berkeley.

Whitmarsh, T. and Thomson, S. eds. (2013) *The Romance between Greece and the East*. Cambridge.

Whittaker, C.R. (2004a), 'Sex on the frontiers', in C.R. Whittaker ed., *Rome and its Frontiers: The Dynamics of Empire*. London.

Whittaker, C.R. ed. (2004b), *Rome and its Frontiers: The Dynamics of Empire*. London.

Wiedemann, T. (1992), *Emperors and Gladiators*. London.

Wigtil, D.N. (1982a), 'The translator of the Greek *Res Gestae*', *AJPh* 103: 189-195.

Wigtil, D.N. (1982b), 'The ideology of the Greek *Res Gestae*', *ANRW* 2.30.1: 624-38.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U.v. (1906), *Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker*. Berlin.

Wiles, D. (1988), 'Greek Theater and the Legitimation of Slavery', in L. Archer ed., *Slavery and Other Forms of Unfree Labor*. London - New York: 53-67

Williams, C.D. (1999), *Roman Homosexuality*. Oxford.

Williams, G.D. (1994), *Banished Voices: Readings in Ovid's Exile Poetry*. Cambridge.

Williams, G.D. (2002), 'Ovid's Exilic Poetry: World's Apart', in B.W. Boyd ed. (2002): 337-82.

Williams, G.W. (1968), *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*. Oxford.

Williams, G.W. (1978), *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire*. Berkeley - London.

Winkler, J. J. (1980), 'Lollianos and the Desperadoes', *JHS* 100: 155–81.

Winkler, J.J. (1990), 'The Education of Chloe: the Hidden Injuries of Sex', in J.J. Winkler ed., *The Constraints of Desire*. New York: 101-126.

Wirszubski, C. (1950), *Libertas*. Cambridge.

Wiseman, T. (1986), *Catullus and His World: A Reappraisal*. Cambridge.

Wiseman, T. (1995), *Remus: A Roman Myth*. Cambridge.

Wisse, J. (1995), 'Greeks, Romans and the rise of Atticism', in J.G.J. Abbenes *et al.* eds., *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle*: *Festschrift D. M. Schenkeveld*. Amsterdam. 65-82.

Wistrand, E. (1968), *Sallust on Judicial Murders in Rome. A Philological and Historical Study. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia XXIV*. Gothenburg.

Wolftal, D. (1999), *Images of Rape*. Cambridge.

Woolf, G. (1994), 'Becoming Roman, staying Greek: culture, identity and the civilizing process in the Roman east', *PCPhS* 40: 116-43.

Wörrle, M. (1988), *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien: Studien zu einer agonistischen Stiftung aus Oinoanda*. Munich.

Wyke, M. ed. (1998), *Parchments of Gender: Deciphering the Bodies of Antiquity*. Oxford.

Wyke, M. (2002), *The Roman Mistress: Ancient and Modern Representations*. Oxford.

Yardley, J.C. (1974), 'Propertius' Lycinna', *TAPhA* 104: 429-34.

Yardley, J.C. (1980), 'Paulus Silentiarius, Ovid and Propertius', *CQ* 30: 239-243.

Yardley, J.C. (1991), 'The symposium in Roman elegy', in J.W. Slater ed., *Dining in a Classical Context*. Ann Arbor: 149-55.

Yatromanolakis, Y. (1990), *Leukippe kai Kleitophon*. Athens.

Yegül, F. (1992), *Baths and Bathing in Classical Antiquity*. New York.

Young, R.J.C. (1995), *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in theory, culture and race.* London.

Zanker, P. (2000), 'Die Frauen und Kinder der Barbaren auf der Markussäule', in J. Scheid and V. Huet eds., *Autour de la Colonne Aurélienne: geste et image sur la colonne de Marc Aurèle à Rome.* Turnhout: 163-74

Zeitlin, F.I. (1990a), 'Thebes: Theater of Self and Society in Athenian Drama', in J.J. Winkler and F.I. Zeitlin eds., *Nothing to do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context.* Princeton: 130-67.

Zeitlin, F.I. (1990b), 'The poetics of *eros*: nature, art and imitation in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*', in D.M. Halperin, J.J. Winkler, and F.I. Zeitlin eds, *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World.* Princeton: 417-64.

Zeitlin, F.I. (2003), 'Living Portraits and Sculpted Bodies in Chariton's Theater of Romance', in S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman, and W. Keulen, eds. (2003): 53-70.

Zeitlin, F.I. (2012), 'Gendered Ambiguities, Hybrid Formations, and the Imaginary of the Body in Achilles Tatius', in M.P. Futre Pinheiro, M. B. Skinner, and F. I. Zeitlin eds. (2012): 105-26.

Zimmermann, F. (1961), 'Chariton und die Geschichte', in H.-J. Diesner, R. Günther, and G. Schrot eds., *Sozialökonomische Verhältnisse im alten Orient und im klassischen Altertum.* Berlin: 329-45.

Zimmermann, M. ed. (1999) *Geschichtsschreibung und politischer Wandel im 3. Jh. n.Chr. Historia Einzelschriften, 127.* Stuttgart.