

Anna Lefteratou
Corpus Christi College
Faculty of Classics,
Sub-Faculty of Languages and Literature

Dissertation submitted for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Oxford

Trinity Term 2010

Title:

MYTH AND NARRATIVE IN THE GREEK NOVELS



Anna Lefteratou, *Corpus Christi College*, Faculty of Classics, Sub_Faculty of Classical Languages and Literature

Dissertation submitted for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Oxford
Trinity Term 2010

Title:

MYTH AND NARRATIVE IN THE GREEK NOVELS

Abstract

This dissertation investigates how Greek myth is received and reinterpreted by the Greek novelists of the 1st to 4th centuries C.E. My core texts are the five 'ideal' Greek novels: Chariton's *Callirhoe*, Xenophon of Ephesus' *Anthia and Habrocomes*, Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, and Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*; occasionally I refer to some of the fragmentary novels too. These novels are characterised by their generic and thematic unity, describing a boy-girl love and adventure story. The novel's plot does not coincide with any of the previous classical mythological examples, although it makes ample use of them.

My research is original in that it presents a new interpretation of myth from a structural, not simply intertextual, point of view. My aim is to study the articulation of what I call 'the novelistic myth', the main story around which the Greek novels are woven. The thesis analyses the uses of terms such as 'myth', 'plot', and 'narrative' in the Greek novels and argues that the term 'myth' means at the same time: (i) a tale from mythology, often contradictory to truth; (ii) a dramatic plot, which structures specific chapters of the novel that are presented as dramas and which are mainly influenced by Euripides' *Helen*, *Hippolytoi*, and *Iphigeniai*; and (iii) the novelistic narrative as an extensive recognition pattern, inspired by the *Odyssey*.

To conclude, the dissertation builds on the last ten years of intertextual research, proposing a new categorisation and organisation of myth around its three meanings. Moreover, it suggests a more precise use of intertextuality that connects it with structural interpretation, while taking into consideration the point of view of ancient literary criticism. The aim is to draw the boundaries between the different genres (epic, tragedy and the novel) without letting them lose their generic autonomy.

Είναι παιδιά πολλών ανθρώπων τα λόγια μας.
Γιώργος Σεφέρης, *Ο γυρισμός του ξενιτεμένου*,
Ημερολόγιο καταστρώματος Α'.

Acknowledgements

A doctoral dissertation is never the product of one person alone. I would like to abuse this little space to thank Prof. Ewen Bowie for his academic and personal support, my supervisor Dr. Tim Whitmarsh for his insightful comments and encouragement, and my MPhil supervisor Prof. Alain Billault for being the first to give me the idea of studying *myth* in the Greek novel.

I would also like to express my gratitude for all those who read and comment on parts of my thesis when it was still a work-in-progress: Prof. Silvia Montiglio, Prof. Shadi Bartsch, Prof. Richard Hunter, Dr. Koen de Temmerman, and Dr. Johanna Akujärvi.

Moreover I would like to save some space for the non-academic cast who helped towards the completion of my doctorate: first of all my parents, who made me what I am, and the following: Dr. Véronique Perl, for teaching me, among others, how to think and write on literature; my high-school teacher Georgia Padouva for introducing me to the world of Classical literature; and my tutor Eleutheria Athanasopoulou for teaching me Greek.

I cannot leave out some friends who have been around for many years and coped patiently with all my complains the last four years: Gregory Moraitis, Sofia Farmasoni, Magda Rahioti, and Marianna Ventouratou; and also Kostas Stamatopoulos, Owen Hodkinson, Elizabeth Dollins, Bénédicte Williams, Almut Fries, Giorgos Kazantzidis, Natalia Tsoumpira, Despoina Magka, and Oleg Brandt.

Finally, I would like to thank the Academy of Athens and the Loverdos Foundation that has funded the first three years of my doctorate, and Corpus Christi College for awarding me the Richards Prize during my final year.

*

*Η διατριβή είναι αφιερωμένη στη μνήμη της μητέρας μου
Ευτυχούλας.*

* * *

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	2
Acknowledgements	3
Table of Contents.....	4
Foreword	8
From μῦθος to myth.....	8
About the 'Novel's μῦθος'	13
PART I: DEFINING MYTH IN THE GREEK NOVEL.....	20
1.1 Now	20
1.2...and Then... ..	28
1.2.1 Myth as tale from mythology	28
1.2.1.1 The presentation of mythological tales	31
Mῦθος...raw: the novel's mythological universe	31
Mῦθος...stirred: μῦθος as μυθολογία	35
Mῦθος...fried: non-μῦθος terms as μυθολογία	38
1.2.1.2 The context of mythological tales	40
Content, narrators, function	40
Did the narrators believe in their myths? Μῦθος as not-λόγος, not-ἱστορία.....	43
Definition of μῦθος as a tale from mythology.....	47
1.2.3 Myth as dramatic plot.....	48
1.2.3.1 Drama and the second sophistic	48
1.2.3.2 Drama and the novel	50
Chariton	50
Xenophon	54
Longus	55
Achilles Tatius	56
2.2.5 Heliodorus.....	59
Definition of μῦθος as δράμα	66
1.2.4 Μῦθος as διήγημα and/or λόγος	69
1.2.4.1 Terminology: διήγησις, διήγημα, and λόγος.....	71
1.2.4.1 The novels as narratives	74
Chariton	74
Xenophon	79
Longus	80
Achilles Tatius	81
Heliodorus.....	82
Definition of διήγησις	84
PART II - ΜΥΘΟΣ AS DRAMA	86
2.1 The myth of the Beauty: Helen.....	86
2.1.1 The implicit versions of the Beauty plot	87
2.1.1.1 Joseph and Aseneth.....	88
2.1.1.2 Metiochus and Parthenope	89
2.1.1.3 Ninus and Semiramis	91
2.1.1.4 Sesonchosis.....	91
2.1.1.5 Xenophon of Ephesus.....	92
2.1.1.6 Antonius Diogenes.....	95
2.1.1.7 Rhodanes and Sinonis	95
Preliminary conclusions.....	97
2.1.2 The explicit versions of Madame Swann	100
2.1.2.1 The second sophistic on Helen.....	101
Dio, Aristides, Lucian, Plutarch, and Philostratus	101
The text of the Helen.....	102
Structuring units of the Helen myth.....	102
2.1.2.2 The Greek novels on Helen.....	104
Chariton.....	104
1. Mythological models: myths ¹ and the Callirhoe.....	107
2. The Helen pattern.....	111
Chaereas' first reading: Callirhoe not in Egypt?.....	114
Dionysius' reading: Callirhoe in Troy.....	117

Artaxerxes' reading: Callirhoe in Egypt	122
Discussion.....	128
Longus	130
Three patterns and an allusion.....	131
Dorcon.....	131
The Methymnians	133
Lampis.....	136
Discussion.....	138
Achilles Tatius	139
1. Intertexts	140
2. Patterns	141
The Homeric version of Leucippe's seduction	141
The Homeric abduction of Calligone	142
Leucippe in Egypt	144
Discussion.....	149
Heliodorus.....	150
1. One allusion	150
2. Many patterns	151
The prodigious childhood and teenagehood of a god-like beauty.....	151
Charicles' Homeric Charicleia.....	152
Charicleia in the land of Proteus.....	158
Discussion.....	163
<i>Provisional conclusions</i>	164
 2.2 The myth of the 'other woman': Phaedra.....	167
2.2.1 The implicit versions of the 'other woman' plot.....	167
2.2.1.1 Joseph and Aseneth.....	168
2.2.1.2 Metiochus and Parthenope	170
2.2.1.3 Ninus and Semiramis	172
2.2.1.4 Rhodanes and Sinonis	172
Preliminary conclusions.....	173
2.2.2 The explicit versions of the myth of Milady de Winter.....	174
The popularity of the Phaedra myth	174
2.2.2.1 The second sophistic on Phaedra	174
Plutarch, Lucian, Philostratus	174
Structuring the Phaedra myth.....	176
Preliminary conclusionss	177
2.2.2.2 The Greek novels on Phaedra.....	178
Chariton.....	179
1. Intertexts	179
Pattern avoided	180
Discussion.....	181
Xenophon of Ephesus	182
1. Intertextuality: the larger Hippolytean project.....	182
Eros' vengeful plot and Xenophon's novel	182
2. Phaedra patterns and the structure of the novel	187
Manto	187
Cyno	191
Rhenaea.....	192
Discussion.....	195
Longus	195
1. Hippolytean intertextuality in the proem.....	195
2. Phaedra patterns in a 'green shade'	196
Lycaenion	196
Discussion.....	201
Achilles Tatius	201
1. Hippolytean echoes.....	201
Charicles	201
Hippolytean aetiology.....	204
2. Patterns: the Melite variations.....	205
Leucippe's misreading: Cleitophon as Hippolytus.....	205
Thersander's misreading : Melite as Phaedra	208
Cleitophon's reading: the Melite variations.....	209
Discussion.....	211

Heliodorus.....	212
Patterns only	212
Demaenete.....	212
Thisbe	217
Arsinoe.....	220
Arsace's plot – against Charicleia's reading.....	222
Cybele's plot.....	224
Discussion.....	229
<i>Provisional conclusions</i>	230
 2.3 The myth of Death's maiden: Iphigenia	234
Structuring the Iphigenia	235
2.3.1 The implicit versions of the 'Death's maiden' plot	238
2.3.1.1 Chariton in the land of the Indians.....	238
2.3.1.2 Xenophon	239
Anthia's triple death, a study in horror	239
A sacrifice	239
A suicide	240
The dogs' den	241
2.3.1.3 Iamblichus	243
2.3.1.4 Lollianus	243
Preliminary conclusionss	244
2.3.2 The explicit versions of Lady Jane Grey	244
2.3.2.1 The second sophistic on Iphigenia.....	245
Antoninus Liberalis.....	245
Lucian.....	245
Philostratus	246
Plutarch.....	247
2.3.2.2 The novels on Iphigenia	248
Chariton.....	248
A latent pattern.....	248
Polycharmus in the land of the Taurians.....	248
Discussion.....	251
Achilles Tatius	251
1. Intertexts	251
2. Patterns	252
Leucippe's sacrifice and resurrection	252
Leucippe's decapitation.....	254
Cleitophon in the land of the Taurians	255
Cleitophon murders Leucippe	256
Discussion.....	258
Heliodorus.....	259
Novelistic sacrifice in the land of bandits - Thisbe.....	259
A latent Iphigenia in a Helen motif	259
Charicleia in the land of Ethiopians	260
Συήνης πέρις	260
Iphigenia in Meroe.....	264
Theagenes in the land of Taurians	270
Discussion.....	273
Partial conclusions	275
 PART III: ΜΥΘΟΣ AS NARRATIVE	279
3.1 The novels as a διὰ δλου ἀναγνώρισις	279
3.1.1 Fragmentary recognition scenes	285
Joseph and Aseneth.....	285
Ninus, Sesonchosis and the <i>Babyloniaca</i>	286
Antonius Diogenes.....	286
3.1.2 Epic echoes and patterns of recognition in the novel	288
3.1.2.1 Chariton	288
1. Echoes of epic νόστοι	288
Departure and return of Chaereas-Telemachus	288
Callirhoe and Theron at Alcinous' palace	289
Departure of Chaereas Menelaus-Odysseus-Jason	290
The foretold return of Chaereas' son – Telegonus or Telemachus?.....	291
2. Recognising (the) <i>Callirhoe</i>	291
Is Callirhoe dead or alive?.....	292

Is Callirhoe faithful or not?	294
Who will be Callirhoe's husband?	300
3.1.2.2 Xenophon	304
Non-Homeric couple-recognition pattern	304
Is Anthia dead or alive?	304
Anthia is dead, but	305
Anthia is found	308
3.1.2.3 Longus	311
1. Homeric echoes and similes	311
Lycaenion as Penelope	311
Intertextuality: Theocritean Homer in pastoral prose	313
2. Recognition patterns	315
The recognition of Daphnis	317
Daphnis 'recognises' Chloe	317
Recognising Eros	319
Achilles Tatius	322
1. Homeric echoes	322
Ο Όμηρωτής	322
The Cyclops and Melantho	323
2. Recognising the narrative strategy	326
The AT-narrator	326
The Cleitophon-narrator	327
Recognising Leucippe	328
Is Leucippe dead or alive?	329
Is Leucippe a virgin or not?	335
Heliodorus	337
Two modes of storytelling	338
Cnemon as narrator: proleptic storytelling	340
Cnemon as reader: synchronic storytelling	343
Recognising Charicleia	348
Is Charicleia dead or alive? A recognition tale by Heliodorus	348
Thisbe as not-Charicleia	350
Charicleia as Thisbe	352
Who knows what περί Χαρκλείας	357
Charicles' version	358
Partial conclusions	364
Plots of recognition	364
The husband-wife reunion theme	366
Novelistic couple-recognition scenes	366
Odyssean recognition scenes	367
Other recognition scenes	368
Characterisation	368
Odyssean allusions and Penelopean chastity	368
Final Conclusions	372
Μύθος as a tale from mythology	372
Μύθος as dramatic plot	374
Μύθος as narrative	375
APPENDIX	380
BIBLIOGRAPHY	402

Foreword

Right from the start, the notion of myth seemed to me to explain these examples of the falsely obvious. At that time, I still used the word 'myth' in its traditional sense. But I was already certain of a fact from which I later tried to draw all the consequences: myth is a language. Roland Barthes, *Mythologies*, p.11.

From μῦθος to myth

What has μῦθος to do with *myth*? And what has *myth* to do with the Greek novel? If I state here that this written material is a dissertation on 'myth in the Greek novels', my declaration might seem obscure, since the centuries that separate μῦθος from *myth* have provided each term with a variety of interpretations: on the one hand, μῦθος is a term used equally for tales from mythology, fables, anecdotes, or simply speeches; on the other hand, *myth*, in the 19th and 20th centuries onwards, has shifted from denoting a sacred (creation) tale into being a symbol and finally into ideologically shaped *langage*, according to Barthes¹. Nevertheless, the birth of new meanings does not automatically cancel the previous ones; rather, an interpretation is born through a process of dialogue: agreement, contradiction, misidentification, elaboration, are some of the ways by which old terms are moulded into new semantics. This dissertation has tried to build on the previous scholarship, ancient and modern, in order to propose a tripartite understanding of the word μῦθος, as this is found mainly in the five extant novels. This

¹ Barthes, (1973).

interpretative triptych is reflected in the division of my dissertation into the following parts:

Part I is a binary approach to myth divided between contemporary scholarship (hereafter 'Now') and ancient criticism (hereafter 'Then'). The reason for this arrangement is that a discussion of *myth* cannot be conducted outside the temporality of the writer: the point of departure for every study is the 'Now' definition of a term for both, the writer and the reader; every reconstruction of the 'how the Greeks thought about *μῦθος*' is unavoidably shadowed by our 'Now' prejudices. Besides, the modern interest in 'Then', is, or should be, linked to our contemporary intellectual needs. The 'Now' study aims to present the relevant scholarship, set against its general theoretical, ideological, and literary backgrounds, which together shaped the different definitions of *myth*, such as psychoanalysis, Marxism, formalism, narratology, structuralism, and intertextuality; the 'Then' section examines the uses of the term *μῦθος* as these emerge from the narrative of the Greek novels. These are further divided into three categories: the first includes what I call, borrowing from Barthes, the '*traditional sense*' of the word, or *myth* as a tale from mythology; the second includes manifestations of the term related to drama, indicating both a dramatic plot and its *mise-en-scène*; the third section includes a discussion of *μῦθος* as a term used by the novelists in order to describe the ensemble of a novel's narrative.

Part II focuses mainly on the study of myth as plot and/or as a play.

This analysis moves around three myths which form the intertextual spine of the novels' narratives: *Helen*, whose myth represents the adventures of the Beauty and her lover, is the main intertext used to structure the sexual advances of the suitors against the heroine that constitutes a large part of the novel's plot; the myth of *Phaedra* is used to colour the advances of female rivals against the hero and the possible threats on his life; finally, the myth of *Iphigenia*, which is more loosely implemented than the previous two (and is not necessarily connected to the Helen story), is used to structure the death threats to the life of the heroine and her subsequent escape. These myths are classified under the function 'drama' because they tend to form self-contained episodes (and 'chapters') and are characteristically influenced by the eponymous Euripidean plays; their dramatic pedigree is often underlined by allusions, quotations, and their vivid theatricality on the level of both language and setting (stage-terms, lamentations or exclamations, gestures, elements of language). Of these dramatic intertexts the Helen myth is the only one that presents some difficulties, because of its double appearance: the epic version and its counter Euripidean treatment that represent the unfaithful and the chaste Helen respectively. My choice of placing it under the 'drama' category has to do with the concepts of 'fidelity and chastity', which are present only in the novels and in Euripides' *Helen*. The study of these chapters is based on an analysis of the structure of the common motifs found in the above-mentioned dramas and the novels. This structural approach has

features common with Lévi-Strauss's analysis of myth, but in this study the focus is on the enjambment of the compositional technique of the novels and not the mental structures of which these myths form the verbal expression.

Part III examines the cases in which *μῦθος* is used to describe a recapitulatory narrative. These recapitulations of the leading characters' adventures are a common feature of the Greek novels and they form the small-scale mirror of the larger narrative; Odysseus' first-person summary of his adventures is often thought to be a model for the equivalent passages in the novels and the *Odyssey* the *fons et origo*² of the genre. Because the *Odyssey* is a large-scale composition, it is impossible to approach it structurally in the same way as Attic dramas. This is the reason why I have focused on a main common feature of both the epic and the novel, the *recognition*. This part is inspired by Maronitis'³ analysis of the *Odyssey* as a plot of continuous recognition, a δι' ὅλου ἀναγνώρισις, in Aristotelian terms⁴, but instead of attempting to project the Homeric ideals of composition upon those of the novels, it tries to question the object of the novel's recognition-scene.

The originality of this dissertation does not lie only in the subject, but also in the approach adopted here. To the best of my knowledge there is so far neither a structural analysis of the myths in the Greek novels nor a detailed

² Reardon, (1991).

³ Maronitis, (1991).

⁴ Aristotle, *Poetics*, 1459b.

intertextual approach to their major intertexts, such as Homer and Euripides, which are examined here. This dissertation aspires to fill this gap by reviewing previous scholarship and by introducing a new way of interpreting *myth* in the Greek novels. The tripartite division of this thesis as described above aims at the following:

First, to prove that the novel in respect of its structure and its thematic is not predominantly indebted to any previous genre but that it forms a separate narrative category, with a specific structure, stereotyped motifs and an inherent reading goal.

Secondly, to show, on the one hand, how the classical tradition shaped the novel's structure and thematic by providing a well-known system of plot-expectations, of which some *do* correspond and some *do not* with the generic aims of the novel; on the other hand, this study aims to present how the novel re-shaped in its turn the inherited tradition.

Thirdly, to propose a set of possible explanations which account for this transformation of the novel as genre.

About the 'Novel's *μῦθος*'

C'est le livre des destinées, dit l'hermite, voulez-vous en lire quelque chose? Il mit le livre dans les mains de Zadig qui, tout instruit qu'il était dans plusieurs langues, ne put déchiffrer un seul caractère du livre. Cela redoubla sa curiosité. Voltaire, *Zadig ou la Destinée*, ch.xx.

The similar structure of the five ideal novels makes them a fertile ground for structural experimentations since they seem to offer a more or less uniform structural pattern. By this I do not mean that the five Greek novels are identical to each other, or that their plots lack imagination. Rather, their narrative creativity is a result of interplay between the observation of the rules of the genre and their simultaneous annihilation. However, although it is easy at a first reading to figure out the similarities between the five plots, the question of their individual originality and contribution appears to be more challenging. As any student can read in one of the standard companions to or collections of articles on the Greek novel, its typical plot is the following: 'archetypically, a supremely handsome young man and a supremely beautiful young woman fall in love at first sight. Somehow they are separated and launched into a series of adventures, which take them all over the Mediterranean world. They undergo shipwreck, meet pirates and bandits, attract the unwanted sexual attentions of third parties, and believe one another dead. But throughout everything they remain true to one another and

are eventually reunited to pass the rest of their lives in wedded bliss⁵.

The natural question, as Doody and Branham have already asked⁶, is whether this *is really* the *true(r) story of the novel*. Indeed, reading and interpreting a book are two different actions, of which the first unfolds synchronically with the actual syntactic deciphering of the words and the sentences of a text, and the other is achieved retrospectively. Or, on a first encounter, the reader is able to understand part of the truth, according to his level of 'literacy', but the full meaning reveals itself only as a final reconsideration, of which the simplest form is 'what is the story?' and 'what is the moral of the story'. But how is the 'moral' extracted?

Voltaire's abstract above can be very illuminating: at his first attempt Zadig cannot read 'the Book of Destinies', but in the next and final chapter he is able to provide the solution to two, among other – novelistic? – enigmas: those of time and of life. *Zadig éclairé* by Jesrad, can, if nothing else, interpret the book of his personal experiences in a universal, multi-applicable way; in other words he makes an intelligible abstraction from his adventures, which up to that point seemed to him as *coups du hasard* not causally related. Zadig then, from his partial experience, extracts a normative form by which he can classify his experience as a whole.

Like Zadig, in my quest for literary enlightenment, I have decided to

⁵ Morgan and Stoneman, (1994a) p.2.

⁶ Doody, (1996), Branham, (2002).

segment the *about* of the novelistic plot into smaller units, from which I then attempt to recreate a meaning of a secondary degree. The question that automatically arises from such a statement is the following: how can literature be segmented into its component elements? What is the procedure required that would enable such an operation?

The history of structural scholarship in the novel is discussed excellently in the introductory chapter of Lowe, and there is hardly anything I could add to it. 'By 1980', Lowe argues, 'the story-grammar model was generally felt to have failed, and with it the prevailing linguistic model of narrative structure ... above all out of frustration with its worryingly arbitrary application of what were supposed to be rigorous formal categories'⁷. Nevertheless, Lowe proposes another structural model for understanding the novel, one based loosely on a game-like theory, in which the board, narrative, is the area where principal and subordinate heroes move, following specific rules, in a specific way, in order to bring it to an end-game.

My task here is more humble than Lowe's; instead of attempting to discover the overall structure of the novel's narrative I am trying to analyse how the novel reworked and classified previous narratives' narrative structures, especially those of epic and drama⁸, which have unanimously been accepted as being the ancient novel's two major sources of inspiration. The

⁷ Lowe, (2000) p.11.

⁸ New Comedy and the novel work with the same material of the three tragedians, and mainly with Euripides.

relationship between the two is indeed *intertextual*, in Genette's definition of the term, but is it, as Lowe puts it, *hypertextual*? Could the novel's plot have existed without Homer or Euripides? In order to approach this question I think it is important to make two points, which may seem obvious:

- Not all intertextual references have the same impact on the genre; or, not all *intertexts* are *hypertexts*, nor, even less, generic *architexts*.
- Generic *architextuality* is in each case proved by intertextual affiliation, but not always and not irrefutably.

Having these in mind, I will try to proceed with an examination of what can be described as *mythological intertextuality* in the novels.

By later antiquity myth was classified and classical. By this I mean that Homer and the tragedians reworked and canonized myth on both levels, those of content and of form. But whereas no more new myths were created, a large imaginative repertoire of mythological variations emerged¹⁰. The inventiveness of these mythographical virtuosos is precisely the proof of the existence of a canonical version of the myth, upon which they crafted their subversive versions.

⁹ Genette, (1997 (1982)) p.1, *transtextuality*, the textual transcendence of the text; *intertextuality*, the relationship of co-presence between two text or among several texts...the actual presence of one text within another; p.3, *paratext*, title, subtitles...and many other kinds of secondary signals, whether allographic or autographic; p.4, *architextuality*, a silent relationship, articulated at most only by a paratextual mention; p.4, *metatextuality*, a critical – silent and allusive – relationship, a 'commentary'; p.5 *hypertextuality*, any relationship uniting a text B to an earlier text A, upon which it is grafted in a manner that is not that of commentary.

¹⁰ Morales, (2007) p.23: 'mythological correctness was, in any case, a kind of fraud'. Cameron, (2004), p.58: 'no one before Ptolemy the Quail invented more Greek mythology than Euripides'.

Secondly, in the novels' era, myth, in any form, was long since 'textualised' and 'authorialised'. By this I mean that classical myth unlike Near-Eastern mythology¹¹, came along with one or more set-text/s¹²: Odysseus was Homer's version, Medea's Euripides'; but Isiac myth was just a 'myth', which Plutarch attempted to canonise. Not only was myth disassociated with difficulty from its major *hypertext*, but also, this text circulated in different *metatextual* summarized versions more or less faithful to their original: stretched between Aristarchus, Dicaearchus and Apollodorus the tragic ὑποθέσεις had a long and adventurous transmission. Cameron rightly observes that the mythographers were more interested in the stories, the plot summaries, than the myths and that in some cases they depended not on the original text but on other summaries¹³, forming a meta-*metatextual* account of the de- contextualised myth.

In such a *transtextual* environment with such *liaisons dangereuses* between originals and re-workings, the novels seem to form a different category of 'myth manipulation' on a level of content, of ideology and of form.

First with respect to its content, the novel is not a new version of old myths, although they might cite, allude to or echo classical myths. There is no

¹¹ The Egyptian stories transmitted by Manetho, or the epic of Gilgamesh by Berossos are in the realm of saga or legend and their 'authorship' cannot be proved.

¹² A set-text, here, one, or more literary texts based that treat a story from mythology, epic and/or dramatic, and which were part of the canonical educational curriculum and/or widely known: e.g. Sophocle's *Ajax*, was part of the curriculum from the 1st. c. C.E. and throughout the Byzantine era, but the Andromeda was known much more via artistic representations of the myth, rather via the Euripidean text.

¹³ Cameron, (2004) p.60.

such myth similar to that of the novels¹⁴. Moreover, when they refer to myths they tend to recall the standard, classical versions, or some major variations of them, along with the texts, in most of the cases, in which these can be found. There is not much, if any, obscure mythography in the novels, unless local mythology is used as an 'exotic touch', like the myth of Icarius in Achilles Tatius (hereafter, AT), or Egyptian lore in Heliodorus¹⁵.

Secondly, the manipulation of specific explicit version myths, like the ones above mentioned, is linked to the structural connection between the novels and these myths. The structurality is also of two sorts: on the one hand (a), the novels rework, in a linear/*fabula*-like way¹⁶, classical myths found in Homer and/or the tragedians, and on some other occasions they refer to those myths as well as (b) to the generic structure of the epic or the play in which these myths are found: either explicitly¹⁷, and/or by alluding to the genre¹⁸, and/or, by conforming to the storyline of a specific text¹⁹. As to (a), the linear structural approach does not require any in-depth knowledge of a text, whereas (b) generic intertextuality does. By this I do not mean that the first is like the 'thematic' reworkings, de-textualised. What I mean is that the events of the myth are not alluded to according to the *suzhet*, but as *fabula*. Therefore the novels are not derived from these myths, although they

¹⁴ Fusillo, (1991 (1989)) p.196, about Eros.

¹⁵ See Lightfoot, (1999); Lavagnini, (1921); cf. the Ariadne myth in Cueva, (1996), and the Aeneas in Laplace, (1980).

¹⁶ Shklovsky, (1991 (1929)) p.170, the concept of plot (*-suzhet*) is too often confused with a description of the events in the novel, with what I'd tentatively call the storyline (*-fabula*).

¹⁷ Keyes, (1922).

¹⁸ Walden, (1894).

¹⁹ Cf. The Iphigenia myth in Book 10.

incorporate them variously in their own narrative structure.

If now the novels are, according to my hypothesis, autonomous structures, how do they make use of mythological structures so generically different to their own? Is there any third level of allusivity to which the novels appeal? In order to answer this question I have broadly applied a Lévi-Straussian analysis of the myths. The anthropologist applies three levels of approach to a myth: a horizontal/ syntagmatic, a vertical/paradigmatic and a simultaneous one, as in a musical score²⁰. In the context of the ancient novel now, this third parameter may be described as illustrating the compositional process during which – by selection, rejection, and adaptation – emerges the kernel of the problematic of novelistic composition: how to enlarge the main narrative *about* a boy and a girl into an extended, multilayered comprehensive *suzhet*.

I believe that investigating how the novel treats classical myths is the best approach to read the way they present comments on their own-*fabula*. Like Zadig, the process moves from the seemingly integral, to the partial, and back to a notion more extensive than the first.

²⁰ Lévi-Strauss, (1958).

PART I: DEFINING MYTH IN THE GREEK NOVEL

1.1 Now...

What critics say about the Novel is related to what those critics think about history, psychology, sociology, and their analyses in turn will affect history-writing and the making of history, as well as theories of sociology, psychology and so on. Margaret Doody, *The True Story of the Novel*, p.4.

A review of scholarship on myth in the Greek novels must cover the period from the late 19th century to the end of the 20th; I here follow Csapo's organisation of the relevant material regarding myth²¹, but only in respect to the Greek novel. For practical reasons, and in order to emphasise the polysemy of the term 'myth', while distinguishing its particular 'para-meanings', I have followed a tripartite categorisation of the term as follows: myth¹, is the most common view of myth, that of 'a tale from mythology'; myth² is connected to the Aristotelian definition of myth in the *Poetics* as plot²², and mainly, as dramatic plot; and myth³ is a prose narrative with myth-like qualities. Full definitions of these terms will be provided in the respective section '1.2....and Then...'.

Myth¹ in the novels, i.e. a tale from mythology with a central role in religious life and ritual, was an object of study by 19th century comparative philology. The myths of the Greek novels then were studied as possible evidence for the origins of the genre. The *Quellenforschung* took two forms,

²¹ Csapo, (2005) p.45.

²² For the definitions see below, notes 80 and 81, p. 28 (current document).

both centred on Huet's work on the oriental origins of the novels²³: the Hellenocentric and the non-Hellenocentric. The first is represented by Rohde²⁴, and later by Lavagnini²⁵. The oriental influences on the Greek novels were studied by Kerényi²⁶ and later Merkelbach²⁷. In the same spirit is Chalk's famous analysis of what he saw as an Orphic/Dionysiac cult in Longus²⁸. The tradition of this approach is loosely continued by Beck²⁹ and Heever³⁰. From a different point of view, Dowden³¹ and Lalanne³² propose a broader anthropological approach to the novels and their myths. In all these approaches the term '*myth*' is interpreted as a tale from mythology. It is difficult if not impossible to distinguish between the scholars working on the novel who are ritualists and those who are not³³. It appears that there was initially a preference for a ritualistic approach³⁴ that was later influenced by cultural anthropology³⁵.

Another approach to myth is the psychoanalytical-existential one.

Psychoanalysis, introduced in Europe by Freud and Jung and increasingly

²³ Huet, Gégou, and Chapelain, (1971).

²⁴ See Rohde, (1876) p.5; Nietzsche's *Birth of Tragedy*, published in 1872; explicitly in Kerényi's Foreword in tin Rohde's 4th edition (1960) p.viii.

²⁵ Lavagnini, (1921), on Hellenistic erotic myths.

²⁶ Kerényi, (1927).

²⁷ The novels as mystery-texts Merkelbach, (1962) and Merkelbach, (1988); Against Merkelbach see Turcan, (1963).

²⁸ Chalk, (1960).

²⁹ Beck, (2003).

³⁰ Heever, (2005) p.92, discussing Isis in AT.

³¹ Dowden, (1999).

³² Lalanne, (2006).

³³ Csapo, (2005) p. 132-180.

³⁴ Although Merkelbach cites Jane Harrison in his study of Isis and Zeus-Sarapis discussing the tale of Psyche and the initiation of Lucius; Merkelbach, (1995) p. 277, p. 456.

³⁵ E.g. Lalanne, (2006) p. 276.

popularised in America in the early 20th century³⁶, resulted in the study of myth as a symbol of an internal personal or social truth; in the Greek novel this found its best expression in the treatment of the novel's pattern as a mirror of the collective archetypes, as in Frye's *Anatomy of Criticism*³⁷ and his later *Secular Scripture*³⁸. Frye and his contemporary Dodds³⁹ show no sign of having read each other, although they were contemporaries and both wrote on *alienation* and *anxiety*. This is explicit in Frye's view of romance as the tale that stands in the space between legend and folktale and is perceived as summarizing 'man's vision of his own life as a quest'⁴⁰.

Further, Frye was a contemporary of Sartre and of Kaufmann⁴¹ who popularised Existentialism in the US⁴², and although he scarcely cites existentialist writers⁴³ he nevertheless appears to adopt a quasi-existentialist view when he claims that a novel begins with an 'illusion' which is 'an order of existence that is best called alienation of the hero's/heroine's identity'⁴⁴. Similar views are echoed in Dowden⁴⁵, who reads the *Odyssey* myth in Heliodorus as a metaphor for the 'ritual of life', and Pavel, who studies the novelistic plot as the literary response to the answers that the individual

³⁶ For a review see Hale, (1995).

³⁷ Frye, (1957).

³⁸ Frye, (1976).

³⁹ Dodds, (1965).

⁴⁰ Frye, (1976) p.15.

⁴¹ Kaufmann, (1956).

⁴² Cotkin, (2003) p.134.

⁴³ Frye, (1976) p. 174, p.196 (Camus); p. 184 (Sartre): 'in the descending hierarchical order, where the individual is primarily a unit of his society, there is a sense of growing isolation that intensifies as we reach a place in which we feel that as Sartre says, hell is other people. The creative act is an individualizing act'.

⁴⁴ Frye, (1976) p. 54.

⁴⁵ Dowden, (2005).

formulates facing a hostile world⁴⁶.

All the above approaches to the main story of the novel, then, share the view that the story of the novel is one of *alienation* and social reintegration. The same view was shared, in a more historical and social context, by Perry's⁴⁷ and Reardon's historical realism⁴⁸. For Perry romance is 'an extended narrative published apart by itself which relates...the adventures or experiences of one or more individuals in their private capacities and from the viewpoint of their private interests and emotions⁴⁹'; echoing Frye, but from a semi-Marxist point of view, since the reason for this isolation was the rise 'to prominence of a morally and realistically minded, middle-class citizenry⁵⁰'. The problem for Perry was how to interpret the out-of-social-context plot of the ancient romances, since unlike that of modern novels or romances, it gives little information on the background from which it emerged. Unlike historiography the novel can give information about its milieu when studied as 'a legitimate artistic creation (πλάσμα)⁵¹', as a (fictional) product of its time. Reardon, following Perry, argues that the novel 'is itself a form of myth, the late Hellenistic myth...a story embodying racial experience...the isolation of

⁴⁶ Pavel, (2003).

⁴⁷ Perry, (1967) p.331, mentions: 'I am not aware of having been influenced by recent literature on the theory of literary forms, except for the writings of Croce, G. Lukács and R.H.Hack especially'. About Perry, see also Wills, (1995) p.18.

⁴⁸ Reardon, (2008) p.i, Reardon remains faithful to the Fryean view of myth and distinguishes between mythical stories, legends, and fiction (the novel).

⁴⁹ Perry, (1967) p.44.

⁵⁰ Perry, (1967) p.63.

⁵¹ Perry, (1967) p.38.

the individual in the world⁵². The romance is then 'an allegory to be understood as a figure of a man's journey in life⁵³'. Similar escapist social ideas are also echoed in Doody's interpretation of the novel's myth as a product of 'magical realism'⁵⁴.

The socio-historical approach attempts to interpret myth as (social) structure. Reardon's five-stage classification of the form of the romance⁵⁵ organises the typical form of the novel around thematic units. Nevertheless, Reardon's classification, as he himself admits, is 'an equation with too many unknowns⁵⁶'. Efforts to study the novel as a narrative structure, outside its social context and not as a myth, have been made by Hägg⁵⁷. Nevertheless, the missing link to make the connection between the novel and its socio-historical context is, and will remain, the question of its authorship and readership⁵⁸. Therefore the social 'myth of late Hellenism⁵⁹' remains a problem to be solved.

De-contextualised studies of the narrative of the novel, other than Hägg, are those of Trenkner⁶⁰, who traces the novel's origins in oral storytelling and in the classical *novella*, Anderson, who ignores Trenkner but also traces the

⁵² Reardon, (1969) p.293.

⁵³ Reardon, (1991) p.34.

⁵⁴ Doody, (1996) p.469.

⁵⁵ Reardon, (1991) p.174: setting/big world; initial condition/isolation; activity/travel; experience/adventure-love; final condition/salvation.

⁵⁶ Reardon, (1991) p.180.

⁵⁷ Hägg studies the structure of the novel narratologically, although he argues that its content is historical: Hägg, (1987) p.81. He does not attempt to reconcile the form to the content. See Hägg, (1971b) p.14, for the analysis is narratological, although he claims not to have been influenced by any 'school of criticism', p.19.

⁵⁸ For more objections against the Perry/Reardon theses see Hägg, (2004 (1994)).

⁵⁹ Hägg, (1983) p.88.

⁶⁰ Trenkner, (1958) p xiv, argues for the societies progress of 'rationalization' of the narrative form the fabulous (Märchen) to the fictive (*novella*), bears a evolutionistic/ Spencerean echo.

origins of the novel in fairytale⁶¹, and the Proppian analysis of Ruiz-Montero⁶². However, because folkloric motifs are universal and easily fused in all literary genres disguised or undisguised, these studies are necessarily subjective since it is difficult to extract and study separately the folkloric elements of the novels' plots.

Of the narratological approaches it is Longus'⁶³ analysis by Morgan that is most closely related to my study. Morgan understands as *myth* both the 'traditional meaning' of the word and the 'Chloe tale'⁶⁴. Earlier, MacQueen undertook the same task, from a more structuralist point of view⁶⁵. 'The lap from myth to fiction', he argues, 'is so far behind us now that we have forgotten how dangerous it was'⁶⁶. But, because myth was fossilised by the second century CE, we are allowed, MacQueen argues, to identify as *myth* both the tale of Phatta and the tale of Chloe⁶⁷. However, Longus is the most productive terrain for such comparisons, being the only novelist who claims his plot to be a μῦθος⁶⁸.

The fear of methodologically unfounded abstractness prevented

⁶¹ Only once in Anderson, (1984) p.4, and not at all in Anderson, (2000b).

⁶² Ruiz-Montero, (1988).

⁶³ Morgan, (2004).

⁶⁴ Morgan, (2004) p.16-17: 'Chloe...lives as the very Book we have in our hands, and the deepest-level author of the Book is Eros himself'.

⁶⁵ MacQueen, (1990) p.107, but without a precise methodology. His main theoretical background in modern theory is Hawkes, (1977) and the more traditional Kirk, (1970); a polemical review of MacQueen by Nimis, (2001).

⁶⁶ MacQueen, (1990) p.109; further, p.113: 'myth is the retelling of traditional tales, rhetoric is a display of individual virtuosity in the use of words, and fiction is the display of individual virtuosity in the creation of a story'.

⁶⁷ MacQueen, (1990) p.31.

⁶⁸ Bowie, (2004) p.375.

structuralism from finding ardent supporters⁶⁹; this is due not only to the difficulty of defining a 'motif', but also to the complexity needed to inscribe it into a specific structure. This uneasiness was overcome with the growth of intertextual approaches that did not require a precise definition of the motifs and patterns - since all were classified as intertexts; however intertextuality, because of its abstractness, has not yet overcome the risk of becoming 'a more dynamic form of Quellenforschung'⁷⁰.

This is the negative aspect of studies like that of Cueva⁷¹, and López-Férez⁷²: in the latter's collection of papers, Ruiz-Montero argues that⁷³ 'myth' can be almost everything; for Reardon 'myths' are examined as rhetorical exemplum or ἑκφρασις⁷⁴, but in every case myth is equivalent of 'mythology'. Successful attempts to reconcile the novel's content to its myth and form are those of Branham⁷⁵ and of Fusillo⁷⁶, who claims that the novel describes 'l'expérience, strictement privée, d'un amour confrontée à une série des obstacles'⁷⁷, echoing the Fryeian maxim. A different, but still intertextual approach is that of Paulsen, for whom myth is the combination of dramatic plot, vocabulary, and gestures⁷⁸. The structure of the novel with respect to its

⁶⁹ On that see MacQueen, (1990) p.16: 'each structural model brings some of these patterns into the foreground and pushes others back'.

⁷⁰ de Jong and Sullivan, (1994) p.9.

⁷¹ Cueva, (2004).

⁷² López Férez, (2004).

⁷³ Ruiz-Montero, (2003 (1995)).

⁷⁴ Reardon, (2004)

⁷⁵ Branham, (2005).

⁷⁶ Fusillo, (1991 (1989)) p.19.

⁷⁷ Fusillo, (1991 (1989)) p.19.

⁷⁸ Paulsen (1992).

predecessors in literary form, epic and tragedy, has also been studied by Lowe, but without attention to 'myth'⁷⁹.

To recapitulate: so far, 'myth' has either been studied as a tale of mythology, and mainly a sacred one, or as fairy-tale/legend, or as form, in Shklovsky's terms, unrelated to its social context. It is however clear that modern scholarship is overwhelmed by the common sense of myth. Even when myth is structurally related to its social context this is always within an 'anxiety', an 'existential milieu', that of Reardon's 'late Hellenistic myth', so that myth cannot escape its 'symbolic' function, being understood as a 'mirror' of society. What I want to study here is rather the form of the novel, building on the work of Hägg, Morgan, Paulsen, and Lowe, although I want to free the novel and its myth from its negative psychoanalytical-existential characterisation and to argue that the novel is a reworking not only of classical 'literary' myths and genres, but of a range of specific mythical patterns, a reworking into which classical myth was inserted in such a way as to enrich – usually because of its predictability – the constraints of the main pattern of the novel's 'ideal' plot.

⁷⁹ Lowe, (2000) p. 34.

1.2...and Then...

Myth in antiquity does not seem to have been a source of definitional anxiety as it has been for the 19th century scholarship onwards. However, before presenting the different mythological intertexts in the novels, I judge necessary a brief survey of the term μῦθος. My aim is to show, that, just as today, myth had more than one meaning, of which the first is its 'traditional sense'⁸⁰, the second its Aristotelian definition as 'dramatic ploy'⁸¹, and the third and broadest the one that could be designated with the modern term 'narrative'. These semantic categories of myth, I will argue, are equivalent to other generic terms, which are often, but not always, presented as synonyms of μῦθος: these are, for the first group the term μυθολόγημα, for second the term δρᾶμα, and for the third διήγημα. I will try to nuance this point by clustering together relative evidence.

1.2.1 Myth as tale from mythology

Myth, in the commonly received 'traditional' sense of the word, refers to a tale from mythology, which sometimes is nuanced as 'fictive' or 'fallacious' in contrast to a truthful tale. Theon defines a myth as a λόγος ψευδῆς εἰκονίζων ἀλήθειαν⁸²; as for the subject of a myth this, according to Theon,

⁸⁰ Cf. Aristotle, *Poetics*, 1452b24, τῶν παραδεδομένων μύθων, περὶ οὓς αἱ τραγωδίαί εἰσι. However, Aristotle emphasises the second meaning of mythos, that of plot, over that of a 'traditional tale'. See below.

⁸¹ Aristotle, *Poetics*, 1450a4, ἔστιν δὲ τῆς μὲν πράξεως ὁ μῦθος ἢ μίμησις, λέγω γὰρ μῦθον τοῦτον τὴν σύνθεσιν τῶν πραγμάτων.

⁸² Theon, *Progymnasmata* (hereafter, Theon), 72. Cf. Hermogenes, *Progymnasmata* (hereafter, if not indicated otherwise, Hermogenes) 1, ψευδῆ μὲν αὐτὸν ἀξιοῦσιν εἶναι, πάντως δὲ χρήσιμον πρὸς τι τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ· ἔτι δὲ καὶ πιθανὸν εἶναι βούλονται. For a more detailed discussion of the category of 'myth' and the 'novelistic narrative' as fallacious tale see Ruiz-Montero, (2003 (1995)).

varies: his examples extend over Aesopic fables and Aristophanes' myths, Sappho's and Plato's⁸³. Myths are the subject of a διήγημα μυθικόν, which is to be distinguished from other narratives – τὸ δὲ πλασματικόν, ὃ καὶ δραματικόν καλοῦσιν, οἷα τὰ τῶν τραγικῶν, τὸ δὲ ἱστορικόν, τὸ δὲ πολιτικόν ἢ ἰδιωτικόν⁸⁴. Although it is not precisely clear what in particular distinguishes the δραματικόν from the μυθικόν, it appears that myth, as a fallacious tale, is thought more to be the subject of epic poets, or poets writing in hexameters, mythographers, logographers and historiographers, in the loose sense of the word, rather than dramatic poets, without this being always the case⁸⁵.

The difference between prose myths and poetic myths seems to be a crucial one since it appears on more than one occasion. Theon mentions τὰς μυθικὰς διηγήσεις τὰς τε ὑπὸ τῶν ποιητῶν καὶ τὰς ὑπὸ τῶν ἱστορικῶν λεγόμενας περὶ τε θεῶν καὶ ἡρώων, ἔτι τε καὶ τῶν ἐξηλλαγμένων κατὰ φύσιν⁸⁶. Nevertheless the examples he brings come from prose-writers such as Aesop⁸⁷, Plato⁸⁸, Hesiod⁸⁹, Herodotus⁹⁰ and Xenophon⁹¹. Yet, the names of the tragedians do not often figure among ancient discussions of myth, with

⁸³ Theon, 73.

⁸⁴ Hermogenes, 2.

⁸⁵ The reason is that they normally refer to myths as written by poets (epic and/or lyric poets mainly) or mythographers/logographers: cf. Theon. 95; Lucian, *True History*, 1.2, τῶν παλαιῶν ποιητῶν τε καὶ συγγραφέων καὶ φιλοσόφων πολλὰ, τεράστια καὶ μυθώδη συγγεγραφότων; Diodorus Siculus, *Historical Library*, 3.62.1 τῶν δὲ παλαιῶν μυθογράφων καὶ ποιητῶν περὶ Διονύσου γεγραφότων. Although there are some exceptions when tragic poets are also included, e.g. Plutarch, *Theseus*, 1.3.2, τὰ δ' ἐπέκεινα τερατῶν καὶ τραγικά, ποιηταὶ καὶ μυθογράφοι νέμονται.

⁸⁶ Theon, 95.

⁸⁷ Theon, 73.

⁸⁸ Theon, 73-75, for his myths in the *Phaedrus*.

⁸⁹ Theon, 74, for animal fables.

⁹⁰ Theon, 64, Hermogenes, 1.6, for the novellas or the anecdotes.

⁹¹ Hermogenes, *On ideas of speech*, 2.12, τὸ μέντοι περὶ τὸν Ἀβραδάτην καὶ τὴν Πάνθειαν...μυθικῶς πλασθέν.

the exception of Longinus. Theon mentions them only when he discusses characterisation, γνῶμαι and anecdotes⁹². The silence surrounding the tragedians is highly enigmatic: only Hermogenes mentions 'dramatic myths', when referring to a certain Nicostratos, ὅς γε καὶ μύθους αὐτὸς πολλοὺς ἔπλασεν, οὐκ Αἰσωπείους μόνον, ἀλλ' οἷους εἶναί πως καὶ δραματικούς⁹³. But even in this occasion the term δραματικοί is vague and subjected to different interpretations.

The obscurity concerning the definition of myth with respect to its content⁹⁴ and to its 'original' format makes it difficult to argue for a specific category. Indeed, the novel inherited a wide range of meanings for μῦθος, one that embraces beast-tales, Platonic myths, and historical 'legends', like the tale of Araspas and Panthea. However this alone is not enough to label it as part of those μυθικαὶ διηγήσεις, as Ruiz-Montero argues.

In order to study μῦθος in the Greek novels, I will make a list of what could count as a mythological tale. Secondly I will emphasise those of the previous tales that are consciously narrated as μῦθοι. Thirdly, I will present the occasions on which, although the term μῦθος is not referred to (i.e it is not an explicit version), the content of the passage refers ostensibly to a myth (i.e. it is an implicit version of the myth).

⁹² Theon, 69, τὸν δὲ Εὐριπίδην καταμεμφόμεθα, ὅτι παρὰ καιρὸν αὐτῷ Ἐκάβη φιλοσοφεῖ; 103 on a gnome, οἷον Εὐριπίδης ὁ ποιητὴς τὸν νοῦν ἡμῶν ἐκάστου ἔφησεν εἶναι θεόν; 66, an anecdote about Sophocles; 68, Menandrian drama and characterisation.

⁹³ Hermogenes, *On ideas of speech*, 2.12.

⁹⁴ I.e. bogey-tales, Platonic myths, historic legends.

1.2.1.1 *The presentation of mythological tales*

Mῦθος...raw: the novel's mythological universe

A first glance at what could comprise an extensive study of myths in the novels shows that there is abundant material for discussion. They mention gods, but not always their myths, the more frequently being those of Artemis, Aphrodite-Eros, Pan and Apollo; there are references to heroes, by then legendary historical persons and plenty of aetiological myths. They also include oriental myths, with the most preeminent being those of Isis, Zeus-Sarapis and Helios. These are listed in detail with full references in Tables 1 to 5 (of Part I) in the Appendix.

Chariton's narrative landscape is in general Aphrodite's shrine: from Syracuses, to Miletus and Aradus, Callirhoe's itinerary appears as homage to the goddess, of whom she is the terrestrial incarnation. Further, the two handsome heroes are compared to a plethora of mythological models: Callirhoe is likened to the Nymphs, the Nereids and Aphrodite, while Chaereas is presented as οἶος Achilles, Nireus, Hippolytus and Alcibiades⁹⁵. Chaereas' and Callirhoe's marriage is a doomed one ὥσπερ that of Thetis and Peleus⁹⁶. The two interesting points here are the following: first the mentions of Alcibiades and Cyrus in the line-up of mythological heroes, such as Achilles or Zethus and Amphion. The case should not be classified as an

⁹⁵ 1.1.1-3. (From now on, when the author is cited explicitly in the text, I won't cite him by name in the footnotes).

⁹⁶ 1.1.1-3.

exception, given that historiography (with the exception maybe of Thucydides) is listed by ancient critics as a source of myth. Secondly, Greek mythology is a rhetorical commonplace even for non-Greeks, since the Great King colours his thoughts with examples from Greek mythology, comparing Callirhoe to Thetis⁹⁷.

Xenophon's landscape is a sacred one, full of temples: from Ephesus and Artemis, the narrative visits Colophon and Apollo's oracle, Hera's temple in Samos, Helios in Rhodes, Isis and the Nile in Egypt. A more secular mythological reference is that found in the ἔκφρασις of the bed of Anthia, which describes the love of Aphrodite and Ares. However there is no mythological rhetoric by the inset narrators, unless as a supplication, like the one by Habrocomes to Eros or the Nile⁹⁸.

Longus's mythology extents from Pan's and the Nymph's pastoral landscape to the urban mythology of Dionysus, Apollo and Zeus. Myths are alluded to by the narrator, told by the internal narrators, like Philetas, Dryas and Lamon, and even performed. The two large mythological tableaux are the one at the beginning of the novel, which presents the painting that gave the narrator its subject, and the ἔκφρασις of the Dionysiac shrine in Dionysophanes' garden. Myth and novelistic narrative in Longus go hand-in-hand and will be discussed at length later. For the time being I would like to underline that Longus' narrative is the most conscious mythologically of all

⁹⁷ 6.3.5.

⁹⁸ 1.4.4 (Eros), 4.2.4 (Nile).

the five novels.

AT's novel proves to be a handbook of classical mythology. On many occasions a list of myths is available to top up the narrative: one of the most characteristic is the discussion of homoerotic versus heterosexual love, in which there appear without distinction, Phaedra, Rhodope, Philomela, Medea, Helen, Clytaemnestra, Penelope, Stheneboea, Alcmene, Danae and many more⁹⁹. The narrative also offers three ἐκφράσεις, the Europa-Selene one, and the paintings of Prometheus and Andromeda at Pelusium¹⁰⁰. As expected there are plenty of mentions of different gods and goddesses, especially of Aphrodite, Artemis, Zeus, Serapis and other gods and goddesses of Greece, Phoenicia and Egypt. AT's mythological universe is a multi-ethnic one, despite being mainly Hellenocentric: one of these markers is the double reading of the Europa-Selene ἐκφράσις, proposed by Morales¹⁰¹; other are the Tyrian aetiology of winemaking, or Callisthenes becoming priest of Heracles of Tyre, or Melqart-Baal.

Heliodorus' narrative is also populated by various mythological figures. Apollo and Artemis rule Delphi; Heracles of Tyre protects the Phoenicians, but also the couple when staying at Tyrrhenos' place for the winter; Isis, Helios and the Nile rule over Egypt, where as Ethiopia's patrons are Helios, Selene and amongst heroes, Perseus and Andromeda and Memnon. The

⁹⁹ 2.36.4.

¹⁰⁰ 3.6.1ff.

¹⁰¹ Morales, (2004) p.48: 'the painting of Europa/Selene is programatic in its foregrounding of visual appearance as a site for error...the Europa/Selene painting is effective as a site of divergence, mythological and narratological'.

different ἐκφράσεις are also masterpieces of mythography: only the chiton of Theagenes depicts the battle of the Lapiths with the Centaurs, not to mention that Chariclea's description likens her to Artemis and Athena¹⁰². Most characteristic of the *Aethiopica*'s mythological encyclopaedism is probably the hymn to Thetis and Peleus performed by Calasiris¹⁰³.

This variety of mythological references is not surprising. Mythology played a large role in everyday life and literature. Mimes, like Herondas' *Adoniazousae*, or New Comedy account for the examples 'mouthed' by apparently non-literary people, like Demeas¹⁰⁴; on the other hand it seems that the amount and the quality of these mythological 'exercises' was proportional to the literacy of the speaker and/or its audience¹⁰⁵.

What is perhaps interesting to point out here is that there is a separation between use of the myths of gods (when those are not related to any specific heroic myth) and of those of heroes. It appears that it is the heroic world of epic and drama that provides most of the models, whereas the divine myths are supervising the narrative 'from above' but are not treated at the same level as the heroes. Further, for my part, I cannot distinguish any sharp differences in the treatment of Greek or non-Greek deities: in the religious space of the *Ephesiaca*, the role of Isis is slightly more accentuated, but it is Apollo of Claros that delivers the initial oracle. In AT it is Artemis who leads

¹⁰² 3.4.2-5.

¹⁰³ 2.34.5

¹⁰⁴ A funny instance in Menander, *Samia*, 337, when Demeas calls Samia, τὴν ἐμὴν Ἑλένην. Cf. 3.9.5, Dionysius refers to Callirhoe as τὴν ἐμὴν Ἀφροδίτην.

¹⁰⁵ Gangloff, (2006) p.38, points out that Dio in his 18th discourse, suggests to the aspiring politician mainly the study of Homer and of Euripides, because: 'l'eloquence politique doit être simple et claire, accessible à un large public'.

the plot and Isis is subordinate; a religious syncretism of Sun-cult is found in Heliodorus, but the distribution is geographical – Apollo at Delphi, Helios at Meroe. I believe these cults are more a ‘realistic touch’ in the narrative landscape than actual representations of faith.

Mṽθος...stirred: μṽθος as μυθολογία

The large number of myths in the Greek novels makes obligatory a narrowing down of the research area. Myths are widespread in the novels and they are mainly introduced with or without an indication of their status as μṽθοι; the question then is when the term μṽθος is used and what mythological narrative it introduces. This section deals only with the lexical appearances of the term when these refer to a tale from mythology. The terms are fully cited in Table 6.

To start with Chariton: Dionysius asks Leonas for Callirhoe's background, her μṽθος, but his servant interprets the word to the letter and compares Callirhoe to a Nymph or a Nereid, since ταῦτα ἡμῖν ἱστοροῦσι ποιηταί τε καὶ συγγραφεῖς¹⁰⁶; Callirhoe herself recalls her past as a μṽθος, not real; and Dionysius in love revisits the old tales of love, which although he did not believe them at the time as being unrealistic seem to describe well his present situation¹⁰⁷. In Xenophon the term μṽθος is absent, despite the

¹⁰⁶ 2.4.8-9 The use of ἱστοροῦσι should not pose problems since it is here disconnected from the word ἱστορία qua history, but rather refers to genres like ‘μυθικὴ ἱστορία’. Cf. Diodorus Siculus, 6.3.1, Διόδωρος δὲ λέγει κατὰ μυθικὴν ἱστορίαν; Dionysius Halicarnasseus, *On Thucydides*, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλὴν ἔχων συγγνώμην, εἰ καὶ τῶν μυθικῶν ἦψαντο πλασμάτων, ἐθνικὰς καὶ τοπικὰς ἐκφέροντες ἱστορίας.

¹⁰⁷ 6.3.2, τίς γάρ ἐστιν Ἐρως πρότερον ἤκουον ἐν μύθοις τε καὶ ποιήμασιν. The verb ἤκουον here describes something to which one does not believe entirely.

allusions to several gods and one myth as presented above.

It is Longus who, among the novelists, makes the most precise use of the term μῦθος. All three inset tales are described as tales from mythology: for the inset tale of Phatta is employed the participle τὰ θρυλούμενα¹⁰⁸, whereas the verb μυθολογῶ is used for the tales of both Phatta and Echo; moreover, the noun μῦθος introduces the myth of Syrinx¹⁰⁹ and Echo¹¹⁰. These tales are presented strictly as tales with the brevity and the stylistic simplicity proper to the genre. Further, the noun μυθολογία is used to refer to Gnathon's encyclopaedic recapitulation of bucolic myths¹¹¹. In Longus, the bucolic mythological world seems to be divided into two: the bucolic world of the people of the country and that of the people of the city. Of course, the subject of Gnathon's examples is the same as that of the three virgin-girl tales, with the exception that here there is a virgin-boy. But this time the rapist is a 'mainstream' god or goddess, like Aphrodite, Apollo and Zeus. The other difference is that whereas in the pastoral mythological universe the myth provides an aetiology for an element of nature, the pigeon's song, the musical instrument and the echo, Gnathon's mythology is used to endorse his sexual appetites. He literally claims that in his desire for a goatherd he is imitating the gods¹¹². There is a curious link here between imitation of nature and imitation of art: what the pastoral mythography seems to be doing is to locate

¹⁰⁸ 1.27.1, διδάσκει αὐτὴν ὁ Δάφνις μυθολογῶν τὰ θρυλούμενα. Ewen Bowie, has pointed to me the irony between the θρυλούμενα, the well known story, and the fact that the Phatta tale is Longus' own artifact.

¹⁰⁹ 2.33.3.

¹¹⁰ 3.22.4.

¹¹¹ 4.17.3-4.

¹¹² 4.17.4.

a precise artistic aetiology at the root of every natural experience; on the other hand, Gnathon's alphabetic catalogue of lovers¹¹³, as Morgan observes, is the result of his sexual desire, which seeks to be embellished by mythological clothing; moreover he notes that Gnathon's catalogue of male rapes has a lot in common with similar catalogues in *Leucippe and Cleitophon*.

In AT, the Phoenician myths, such as Cadmus' founding myth, are joined by a large amount of other, more or less well known: the pestilent women of the stage¹¹⁴, the invention of purple¹¹⁵, the animal fables¹¹⁶, Niobe¹¹⁷, Procne and Philomela¹¹⁸, and Arion¹¹⁹, all are described as μῦθοι. When these μῦθοι are fully narrated they give the impression of being presented as an oral tale: the fables of Satyrus and Conops resemble those of Aesop and the myths of Syrix and Rhodope those found in the mythographical compilations. They are characterised by brevity, straightforwardness, lack of subordination, use of the past tense¹²⁰ and maintenance of the chronological succession of events.

Finally, Heliodorus reserves the use of the term μῦθος to indicate the allegorical tale of the love of Isis and Osiris which is delivered to the profane, as opposed to the allegorical, cosmic-scientific, explanation of the Nile's

¹¹³ Morgan, (2004) p.235.

¹¹⁴ 1.8.4.

¹¹⁵ 2.11.4.

¹¹⁶ 2.20.3, 2.21.5.

¹¹⁷ 3.15.6.

¹¹⁸ 5.5.1.

¹¹⁹ 6.13.3, μυθολογούντα.

¹²⁰ With the exception of the Philomela painting which is delivered in present form; the reason is that it is a painting which is explained and pointed at at the same time with the explanatory narrative: present thus makes it more vivid and helps the visualisation of it.

flooding which is known to the initiated¹²¹. Of the other two passages where Heliodorus employs the term, in the first the word μῦθος means proverb¹²², while the second is slightly controversial and we will discuss it later¹²³. Moreover, Heliodorus does not narrate any myth in detail; he simply presents, without lengthy descriptions, the tales from mythology that decorate Theagenes' cloth and the αἴτιον of Neoptolemus' ritual. Even his description of the Andromeda painting is allusive and not explicit, since he 'shows' the reader, and the Ethiopian public, the painting without giving a full, rhetorical description of it, as would have been expected. I think the choice Heliodorus makes here is conscious: he omits the fluid term 'myth' and simply presents a story, without lengthy descriptions. Myth, if it is not allegorical myth, has not much impact in Heliodoran narrative, which, as we will see further, opts for a different interpretation of myth.

Μῦθος...fried: non-μῦθος terms as μυθολογία

The examples above show that the first meaning of myth, that of a traditional tale of gods and heroes, of animals, of an aetiological story, is represented, unsurprisingly, by a large number of cases. But the terms μῦθος, and/or μυθολογῶ, and/or μυθολόγημα are not the only ones used to refer to myth. Tales from mythology can be designated alternatively as διήγημα, λόγος, δράμα, or in combination, διήγημα δράματος, for which see the

¹²¹ 9.9.5, ἐν εἶδει μύθου προκατηχούτων.

¹²² 2.21.6, εἶπον ἂν τάχα καὶ τοῖσδε τοῖς καλάμοις κατὰ τὸν μῦθον.

¹²³ 2.23.5.

asterisked labeled terms in Table 7 and Table 8¹²⁴.

In Chariton, Dionysius, before the judgement at Babylon, reflects on the παλαιῶν διηγημάτων, ὅσαι μεταβολαὶ γεγόνασι τῶν καλῶν γυναικῶν¹²⁵. A full book later we learn that what he has in mind is, among others, Helen of Sparta¹²⁶. Also, Dionysius' farmers διηγοῦνται the apparitions of Aphrodite, which are part of the local lore¹²⁷.

It is AT's narrative which gives a more varied impression of the available terminology. The aetiological myth of Syrinx is introduced as τὸ διήγημα τῆς σύριγγος¹²⁸; the description of the painting of the Philomela myth is described as τὸ διήγημα τοῦ δράματος, ὁ πέπλος, ὁ Τηρεὺς, ἡ τράπεζα¹²⁹. The term δράμα is used to describe mythological tales from the stage, as in the case of Cleinias' catalogue of women discussed above¹³⁰; these resemble more the concept of the tragic *hypotheses*-summaries as I discussed above and do not refer to specific plays by specific authors; equally Cleitophon mentions Andromeda's δράμα, when describing the painting¹³¹. Further, the love of Apollo and Daphne are described as λόγος ἐρωτικός¹³²; or occasionally, as in the myth about winemaking, there is a variation of the use

¹²⁴ Xenophon does not provide us with any such terminology. Longus too remains precise in his use of μῦθος. There is no imprecise varying terminology for μῦθος in Heliodorus.

¹²⁵ 4.7.7.

¹²⁶ 5.8.2, Μενέλαος ἐν τῇ σώφρονι Σπάρτῃ τὴν Ἑλένην οὐκ ἐτήρησεν.

¹²⁷ 2.2.6.

¹²⁸ 8.7.3; previously though mentioned as μῦθος, 8.6.2, τοῦ Πανὸς πάντα μῦθον.

¹²⁹ 5.3.4, 5.5.5.

¹³⁰ 1.8.4, τὰ τῶν γυναικῶν δράματα... ὅσων ἐνέπλησαν μύθων γυναῖκες τὴν σκηνήν. The reference to μύθων in the same sentence argues that here the dramatic plots are received as mythological tales and not dramatic plays.

¹³¹ 3.7.9.

¹³² 1.5.5-6, λόγος ἐρωτικός. Cleitophon's mythological rhetoric as observed above, has much in common with Gnathon's.

of μῦθος by that of λόγος¹³³.

The above study shows, that with a few exceptions, μῦθος, when introducing tales from mythology, or myths from the stage read as mythological narratives, is understood in its 'traditional sense'. Even in the cases where the term is replaced by one of its 'variants', like διήγημα, δῶμα, λόγος, these, in most cases, are accompanied by an indication that they refer to a narrative of 'old', like in Chariton, or they are preceded or followed by the term μῦθος, so that at least in AT's case it is obvious that the different terms are used for stylistic variation.

1.2.1.2 The context of mythological tales

Content, narrators, function

The next paragraphs discuss the genre of the novel's mythology: the way these *exempla* are introduced by the narrators, and finally their reliability. Tables 1 to 5 will be of use.

What are the myths that fill the pages of the Greek novels? Many. As already seen Homer and Euripides may be explicitly alluded to (i.e. the Homeric/Euripidean text is cited, or the name of the basic mythological models is mentioned) but there are occasions on which the mythic allusions are not mentioned by name, but can be easily conjectured, because of the common rhetorical, hence mythological, παιδεία of the narrator and his

¹³³ 2.2.6, ὡς ὁ Τυρίων λόγος.

readership. Therefore, in Chariton the emphasis is upon Homer, although Zethos and Amphion, Cyrus, Alcibiades, Medea and Ariadne are also mentioned. From these that of Ariadne seems to be the second most important after the Homeric material. In Xenophon there are no non-divine myths. Longus' universe is crowded by bucolic myths; even Gnathon's city-mythology is that of herdsmen. AT presents an extensive range of mythological allusions, as it appears from the Appendix. Heliodorus does not explicitly refer to any myth, besides the aetiology of the Nile's tides and the divine foundation myths of the Ethiopians.

The second important question is the following: by whom are these myths articulated in the narrative? In Chariton it is the narrator who introduces most of the mythological allusions. Second comes Dionysius, who in times of distress projects his life onto that of the mythological heroes. Third comes Chaereas with one mythological parallel and two Homeric citations. Callirhoe expresses herself in mythological terms only when trying to decide on her child's future and when, in front of Dionysius, she subtly mentions Alcinous' hospitality. It appears that a large amount of mythological allusions are assigned to Dionysius because of his παιδεία which is repeatedly emphasised by the narrative¹³⁴.

In Longus the tales of Phatta and of Echo are narrated by Daphnis and that of Syrinx by Lamon. Daphnis also alludes to the tales of goat-fed gods,

¹³⁴ Cf. 1.12.6, 2.1.5, 2.41, 2.5.11.

Zeus and Dionysus, as models of his own exposure. Gnathon alludes briefly to the three boy-rape tales. In contrast to Chariton, there is here an ironic reading of the mythological παιδεία, since the countrymen provide more enjoyable and artful tales than the educated urbanite.

In AT, with the exception of the Selene/Europa ἑκφρασις, the remaining mythological allusions are articulated by Cleitophon, Cleinias, Menelaus and Satyrus. Leucippe does not speak through myths and she needs the Philomela painting to be explained to her. The world of mythology, with the exception of the abstract from the *Iliad* that Leucippe sings and the song to the rose, seems to be forbidden to maidens. Only Melite is free to compare the current situation to tales from mythology, such as Achilles on Skyros.

These mythological examples are brought in mainly for the reason that they share a common element with the main narrative. Chariton often introduces them with a comparative pronoun or conjunction, such as οἷος¹³⁵, ὥσπερ¹³⁶, οὕτω¹³⁷, ὡς¹³⁸. Alternatively he uses verbs that express a subjective judgement and/or perception: δοκῶ¹³⁹, εἰκάζω¹⁴⁰, ἀκούω¹⁴¹.

Longus' first tale makes a clear comparison between the παρθένος of the inset tale and Chloe; the tale of Syrinx is played by Daphnis and Chloe and the tale of Echo is echoed, imitated – the word used is a comparative

¹³⁵ 1.1.3, οἷον Ἀχιλλέα; 1.1.16, τοιοῦτον γάμον Θέτιδος; 1.5.2, οἷον Πάτροκλον.

¹³⁶ 1.1.16, ὥσπερ Ἀρτέμιδος.

¹³⁷ 3.3.4, οὕτω καὶ Ἀριάδην.

¹³⁸ 8.1.2, οὐχ ὡς Ἀριάδην.

¹³⁹ 1.1.2, δοκοῦντες θεᾶ ἑωρακέσαι;

¹⁴⁰ 1.6.2, ὥστε πάντες εἰκάζον αὐτὴν Ἀριάδην καθευδούσῃ.

¹⁴¹ 2.3.7, οὐκ ἤκουσας οὐδὲ Ὀμήρου διδάσκοντος ἡμᾶς; 2.4.8, οὐκ εἶδον, δέσποτα, ἀλλὰ ἤκουσα; 2.9.5, ὅσους ἀκούομεν θεῶν παῖδας.

καθάπερ – by the landscape¹⁴². Daphnis' comparison of his exposure and recollection is also presented as a comparison¹⁴³.

Although AT does not have a well-defined introduction of the mythological allusions, he nevertheless mentions clearly that μυθολογία gives him the models and the excuse to pursue his erotic goals¹⁴⁴. Later when he is petrified staring at Leucippe's sacrifice he expresses the analogy with the Niobe myth using τοιοῦτον, of the same sort¹⁴⁵. The myth of Niobe is here rationalised since Cleitophon mentions that she gave the impression, δόξαν, of being petrified.

The primary use then of the mythological tales, whose subject varies from divine myth to genealogical myths and fables, is that of analogy and/or comparison. These myths are articulated by male, mainly well-educated, characters, and the facility and the swiftness with which the narrators are able to cite a list of models is perceived as a sign of their erudition¹⁴⁶. The practice is basic to the Greek education and the more eloquent one was the better one could mix myth in one's speech¹⁴⁷.

Did the narrators believe in their myths? Μῦθος as not-λόγος, not-ἱστορία

Since then there are so many myths in the novels, the next question is

¹⁴² 1.27.2, ἦν παρθένος, παρθένε, 2.37.1; 3.23.5, μικροῦ γὰρ καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ εἶπεν ἢ ἡχώ καθάπερ μαρτυροῦσα ὅτι μηδὲν ἐψεύσατο.

¹⁴³ 1.16.3, ἐμὲ αἰξ ἀνέθρεψεν, ὥσπερ τὸν Δία...ἀγένειός εἰμι, καὶ γὰρ ὁ Δίονυσος.

¹⁴⁴ 1.19.3.

¹⁴⁵ 3.15.3, δόξαν παρέσχεν ἐκ τῆς ἀκινήσιος ὥσει λίθος γενομένη.

¹⁴⁶ Not only well-educated men speak with mythological allusions, in Chariton, 2.4.8. (Leonas); in 6.3.5 Artaxates. Nevertheless, even in these cases one could argue that it is so because the slaves are used to the way of speech of their masters.

¹⁴⁷ Theon, 75, ἐκθέμενοι τὸν μῦθον ἐπιφέρομεν δίγηγμα, ἢ ἀνάπαλιν.

what degree of credibility is attributed to them¹⁴⁸. Are they μῦθος or λόγος, to apply the classicists' famous dichotomy since Nestle¹⁴⁹? We saw above that, at least in Chariton's case, the verbs that introduce mythological tales are characterised by subjectivity. A similar function is realised through verbs and adverbs that underline the implausibility of a mythological tale and its analogous novelistic 'reality': e.g. ἀληθῶς, οὐ ψευδῆ, πλάττω¹⁵⁰. These invocations of the 'veracity' of the tale are a cunning invitation to read the novelistic tale as not-myth-like, but as truth-like, while, simultaneously, they play with the fictitiousness of the novel's narrative, which they insist on presenting as 'truth-like'.

These comments go back to a long rhetorical tradition that connected μῦθος to πλάσμα as one meaningful category¹⁵¹, opposed to ἱστορία¹⁵². Indeed the novels seem to acknowledge the difference between what is mythical and what is not¹⁵³. The way to approach this question is to examine in which cases μῦθος and/or λόγος, and/or ἱστορία, appear hand-in-hand and what interpretation of the term the relevant passages convey.

¹⁴⁸ For the credibility in myths see the excellent Veyne, (1983).

¹⁴⁹ For an analysis of the polarity see Buxton, (1999).

¹⁵⁰ Chariton, 8.6.9, ὥστε ἀληθῶς εἶπες ἂν αὐτὴν ὁρᾶν τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ἀναδυομένην. Longus, 4.20.1, μηδὲ ὅμοια πλάττειν μύθοις ἐπὶ τῷ κατέχειν τὸν νύκτον. AT, 1.2.2, τὰ γὰρ ἐμὰ μύθοις ἔοικε; 2.15.4, εἰ δὲ ὁ μῦθος Εὐρώπης ἀληθῆς, Αἰγύπτιον βούν ὁ Ζεὺς ἐμμήσατο; 3.18.4, ἀληθῶς γὰρ ὦμην τὴν Ἑκάτην παρεῖναι; 3.15.6, ὁ τῆς Νιόβης μῦθος οὐκ ἦν ψευδής.

¹⁵¹ [Plutarch], *Parallela Minora*, 305a, τὰς ἀρχαίας ἱστορίας...οἱ πλείστοι νομίζουσι πλάσματα καὶ μύθους τυγχάνειν; Dionysius Halicarnasseus, *Roman Antiquities*, 9.22.3, μύθοις γὰρ δὴ ταῦτά γε καὶ πλάσμασιν ἔοικε θεατρικοῖς.

¹⁵² Strabo, 1.2.10, τὰ περὶ Κίρκης καὶ Μηδείας μυθεύόμενα καὶ ἱστορούμενα; [Aelius Aristides], *Ars Rhetorica*, 1.9.1, οἷον ἐξ ἱστοριῶν καὶ παροιμιῶν καὶ μύθων. Pausanias, *Collection of Attic names*, 32, ὅστερον δὲ μεταβάλλουσιν εἰς τὸ τραγῳδίας γράφειν κατὰ μικρὸν εἰς μύθους καὶ ἱστορίας ἐτράπησαν, μηκέτι τοῦ Διονύσου μνημονεύοντες.

¹⁵³ For a discussion of the novel as an offspring of historiography see Hägg, ((1987) 2004). Arguing against the 'historiographical titles' of the novels Whitmarsh, (2005). Chariton and historiography: Hunter, (1994) and Alvares, (1997).

Chariton avoids any straight confrontation of the terms μῦθος and/or λόγος. The only passage is Callirhoe's reminiscence of her previous life, which is 'true' in its novelistic 'reality', as ὄνειρος ἦν τὰ πρῶτα καὶ μῦθος¹⁵⁴. The passage highlights the implausibility of rendering μῦθος as 'false tale', although it does not refer to any specific mythological context. As far as concerns the term λόγος, whenever this term is used it refers to a speech inside the narrative, which is not associated with any mythological meaning. There is no reference to ἱστορία, although the verb ἱστορῶ appears in a couple of occasions, on the first of which it means 'to represent artistically - ἱστόρησε- and in the second, 'to examine'¹⁵⁵. Of these the first has a loose connection with mythological accounts since it refers to the 'artistic representation' of Artemis and/or Athena by a painter or a poet. However even if this mention recalls a poetic world the emphasis is upon the visual power of the image rather than on a specific mythological narrative.

Xenophon is reported as ἱστορικὸς only by the Suda¹⁵⁶, and never himself uses the term ἱστορία. Longus refers to his own story as ἱστορία ἔρωτος, playing on both meanings of the word as 'story in a painting' and 'history', as in Chariton above. The narrative also offers a distinction between mythological tales and reported speech: only Philetas' tale is presented in a liminal space between μῦθος and λόγος¹⁵⁷. In AT, Cleitophon warns his

¹⁵⁴ 2.5.7.

¹⁵⁵ 3.3.13, ἱστορήσωμεν τὸ παράδοξον.

¹⁵⁶ Suda, v.s. Ξενοφών.

¹⁵⁷ 2.7.1, πάνυ ἐτέρφθησαν ὥσπερ μῦθον οὐ λόγον ἀκούοντες.

interlocutor that what he is about to listen to might give the impression of myth, when ‘actually’ it is not¹⁵⁸. Later he gives a symbolic interpretation of the Niobe myth insisting that οὐκ ἦν ψευδής¹⁵⁹. The term ἱστορία appears in the description of the Philomela painting: Menelaus recommends the study of the μύθους τῶν εἰκόνων, ἃν ἐξιούσιν ἐπὶ πρᾶξιν ἡμῖν συντύχῳσι, καὶ ἐξομοιοῦν τὸ ἀποβησόμενον τῷ τῆς ἱστορίας λόγῳ¹⁶⁰. The phrase ὁ λόγος τῆς ἱστορίας could be interpreted here as either ‘the story of the (painted) myth’ or ‘the pattern / rationale of the story’.

In Heliodorus, Charicles uses the noun ἱστορία (in a very Herodotean manner) to describe his Egyptian sightseeing journey on the Nile¹⁶¹. Shortly before we had encountered the verb ἱστορῶ in the sense ‘to narrate’¹⁶²; the subject of narration was Egyptian stories that were popular among logographers and/or historiographers (in the non-Thucydidean tradition). The use of συνελόντι, ‘briefly’, indicates that there was no point in the narrator recapitulating what everybody knew were the hot topics of Egyptian paradoxography.

The conclusion is that, although a μῦθος seems not to be a realistic narrative, the novels do not provide any fixed alternative terminology for realistic accounts. Even when there is a criticism of μῦθος, or a comparison

¹⁵⁸ 1.2.2, twice: σμήνος ἀνεγείρεις, εἶπε, λόγων· τὰ γὰρ ἐμὰ μύθοις ἔοικε.

¹⁵⁹ 3.15.6.

¹⁶⁰ 5.4.1.

¹⁶¹ 2.29.3, καθ’ ἱστορίαν τῶν καταρρακτῶν τοῦ Νείλου.

¹⁶² 2.27.3, ὁ μὲν τις ὅπως τοὺς ἐγχωρίους οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι σέβομεν θεοὺς ἀνηρώτα, ὁ δὲ δι’ ἦν αἰτίαν ἄλλα παρ’ ἄλλοις τῶν ζῶν ἐκθειάζεται καὶ τις ὁ περὶ ἐκάστου λόγος ἐπυνθάνετο· ἄλλος πυραμίδων κατασκευὴν, ἕτερος συρίγγων πλάνην, καὶ συνελόντι τῶν κατ’ Αἰγύπτου ἐν οὐδὲν ἀπελίμπανον ἱστοροῦντες.

between it and λόγος and/or ἱστορία, the distinction is narrow and μῦθος can easily be interpreted in both ways, as meaning something true or something 'mythical'. Besides, in the fictive world of the novel, there is no 'true' narrative, but only truth-like narrative, fiction in modern terms, an argument which is supported by the abundant intratextual comments of the novels on their content as οὐκ ψευδῆ, ἀληθῆς, μύθοις ὅμοια¹⁶³.

Definition of μῦθος as a tale from mythology

Myth¹ is a traditional tale – about gods, heroes, nymphs, and/or animals – invoked mainly for its fictional content as contrasted to truth/ realistic narration (here, the novelistic tale); it is perceived as a straightforward and non-contextualised¹⁶⁴ narrative. It is used as a parallel to endorse, to shadow, and/or to comment on the main novelistic narrative according to the prescriptions of the rhetorical handbooks, thus potentially 'inviting confusion', in Morgan's terms¹⁶⁵, between myth and reality.

Mythological parallels like these are found throughout the literature of late antiquity and the novels are not an exception to the general rule. I will call this type of myth¹ *mythological tales*, or *mythology*. I am therefore retaining the term μῦθος, which is what the novels' texts offer in the majority of cases, as a term to describe mythological tales.

¹⁶³ Cf. footnote no.150.

¹⁶⁴ The term here as means that this category of myth is not connected to a specific set-text, where set-text is the collective textual literary evidence on a myth.

¹⁶⁵ Morgan, (1993) p.17. Cf. Hunter, (1994) p.1069, discussing the 'generic self references' in the novels that distinguishes between truth and myth, history and fiction.

1.2.3 Myth as dramatic plot

1.2.3.1 *Drama and the second sophistic*

I have pointed above that the majority of literary mythological parallels comes from Homer and/or Euripides. The choice is not random and it seems to follow the intertextual trend of later antiquity. As Gangloff has demonstrated, Dio's culture, which he shared with a large proportion of his audience, is also Homer-Euripides based¹⁶⁶; Lucian is in the same literary alignment¹⁶⁷ and Philostratus' background is shaped by the same pedigrees too¹⁶⁸. Indeed, the main school curriculum was based on Homer, Euripides and Menander¹⁶⁹. It is therefore not surprising that the novels follow the same rule. Besides, public and private life was one of spectacles and people were encouraged to approach them as 'onlookers'¹⁷⁰. What I will deal here with is a second meaning of the word μῦθος, that of 'drama'. How were plays referred to in the novels? Were dramatic myths, which came with a specific set-text(s), given a different treatment from the novelistic mythology discussed above? For the following discussion it is useful to consult Table 7.

The novels are full of dramatic elements: direct speech, occasionally tragic tirades, allusions to stage-terms, and clear marks of a theatrical

¹⁶⁶ Gangloff, (2006) p.41.

¹⁶⁷ Bompaire, (1958) for Homer; for Euripides see Karavas, (2005), although Bowie, (1989) argued for a preponderance of Sophoclean and Aeschylean quotations.

¹⁶⁸ Billault, (2000) and Bowie, (2009).

¹⁶⁹ Morgan, (1998).

¹⁷⁰ For performances see Jones, (1993); for theatricality in private life of public persons see Chaniotis, (1997) and Chaniotis, (2009).

conception of the plot. Hägg has pointed out that 44% of Chariton's narrative is in direct speech and Smith, among others, has rightly interpreted it as a sign of the text's 'dramatic quality'¹⁷¹. Even in Xenophon, where much more of the narrative is communicated by the third-person narrator, the characters seem to deliver occasionally dramatic *tirades*. Longus' pastoral universe does not seem very hospitable to drama, although Bowie has noted a considerable number of tragic intertexts¹⁷². It goes without saying that AT and Heliodorus are the more consciously theatrical narratives¹⁷³.

How, then, does the term 'μῦθος' relate to the above? The terms more broadly used to describe the constituent parts of the novels' narratives are μῦθος, and/or very frequently, δρᾶμα, and/or more rarely τραγωδία and/or κωμωδία. The way I would like to treat μῦθος *qua* δρᾶμα here is a different one: I believe, and I intend to show in Part II, that the relationship of the novel to New Comedy, is not that of a 'mother' to the 'child', but rather that of a distant cousin, or a 'half-sibling'; the novels, I suggest, while taking into consideration the 'happy endings' of the love-plots of New Comedy, focus primarily on 'elevating' the passion and the suspense of their plots, by assimilating tragic, rather comic, plots. Hence, instead of discussing linear, Darwinian, intertextuality from the tragedians, to Menander¹⁷⁴, and the novel, I would like to investigate the degree to which the passages referred to

¹⁷¹ Hägg, (1971b) p.91; Smith, (2007) p.105.

¹⁷² Bowie, (2007).

¹⁷³ Liapis, (2006), for Sophocles; for stage-terms in Heliodorus see Walden, (1894).

¹⁷⁴ For which see Corbato, (1968), and Lowe, (2000).

dramatic terminology; in other words, I will try to see how the term μῦθος *qua* δρᾶμα can be used as a generic structural tool to shape our reading of the novel's plot.

1.2.3.2 *Drama and the novel*

Chariton

Chariton, as we have seen, is parsimonious regarding the use of μῦθος. However the text seems more explicit when treating the term δρᾶμα. My intention is not to divide the novel into a Menandrian five-act plot as Reitzenstein suggested¹⁷⁵. Rather I would like to investigate the intratextual references to the novel's plot as a play. As might be expected, any supplementary stage-terms, like ὑποκριτής, or κάθαρσις, only endorse the argument by supplying supportive evidence for the hypothesis of a reading in terms of theatricality.

The first δρᾶμα of the *Callirhoe* occupies the length of Books 1 to 3, Callirhoe's marriage, burial, and resuscitation, and it is structured, as I will show in part III, on the myth of Helen. It is structured in two sub-parts of which the first includes Callirhoe's marriage to Chaereas and the suitors' first plot against them, the second their successful plot and her burial. The conspiracy of Chaereas' rivals is presented as a plot, 'δρᾶμα': after the first failed attempt the text tells the reader that ὁ δημιουργὸς τοῦ δράματος

¹⁷⁵ Reitzenstein, (1974 (1906)); against Chariton's division in a five-act structure see Hunter, (1994) p.1064, who proposes a division into books. For a discussion of Reitzenstein and related literature see Whitmarsh, (2007).

ὑποκριτὴν ἕτερον ἐξηῦρεν¹⁷⁶. The first part of Chaereas' 'drama' is also referred to in these terms by Mithridates when he advises him to move on with his life despite the σκυθρωπὸν δρᾶμα which Tyche had crafted for him and Callirhoe¹⁷⁷. Then Mithridates plots a second δρᾶμα for the couple, which according to Dionysius' reading, is patterned on the 'unfaithful Helen', too.

Mithridates restrains Chaereas from surrendering to Dionysius, prompting him to write Callirhoe a letter. This complicates the situation in a way that suits the nature of Eros who χαίρει ἀπάταις καὶ δόλοις¹⁷⁸. The second 'drama' centred on Callirhoe in Asia has its peak in the couple's first recognition in the court at Babylon and is staged around Chaereas' death and resurrection, which has been manipulated by Mithridates. The court setting with its numerous spectators underlines the theatricality of the passage, so that the narrator wonders:

ποιὸς ποιητὴς ἐπὶ σκηνῆς παράδοξον μῦθον οὕτως εἰσήγαγεν; ἔδοξας ἂν ἐν θεάτρῳ παρεῖναι μυρίων παθῶν πλήρει· πάντα ἦν ὁμοῦ, δάκρυα, χαρά, θάμβος, ἔλεος, ἀπιστία, εὐχαί¹⁷⁹.

The phrase ἔδοξας ἂν ἐν θεάτρῳ recalls Chariton's lexically equivalent treatments of μῦθος *qua* mythology. The comparison, however, is not to be read only as metaphor for the novel's plot as if it were a 'theatrical piece'. In my view it is a self-conscious narratorial comment – the direct question urges the reader to think about the event described – that signals the end of the

¹⁷⁶ 1.4.2.

¹⁷⁷ 4.4.2, ἡ φιλόκαινος Τύχη, δρᾶμα σκυθρωπὸν ὑμῖν περιτέθεικε.

¹⁷⁸ 4.12.5.

¹⁷⁹ 5.8.2.

second part of Callirhoe's adventures. This mid-narrative ending concludes with a closural tool that in narrative terms is very powerful, that of a (half)-recognition scene; simultaneously it is a bridge to a potential sequel. In this context the term παράδοξος μῦθος, which is used to describe the current tale of Callirhoe, is not interpreted as a tale of mythology but as a dramatic plot, μῦθος in Aristotelian terms¹⁸⁰. The use of εἰσήγαγεν, a verb indicating the introduction of a theatrical piece, a drama, on stage¹⁸¹, can in this context be read as a self-referential narratorial comment on the composition of the *Callirhoe* that invites the reader to observe the narrative's perplexity and meticulous composition. The theatricality of the passage is reinforced by the description of the emotions of the characters and of the audience's.

The third drama of *Callirhoe*, Helen in Egypt, is that staged as a result of the judgment in Babylon. Its subject is the king's love for the beautiful heroine. For Artaxerxes the judgment is the excuse, πρόφασις, for a larger plot; he claims that Callirhoe προφάσει δὲ δίκης ἦλθεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ καὶ ὅλον τὸ δρᾶμα τοῦτο ἐκείνη κατεσκεύασε¹⁸².

The term κατεσκεύασε here functions on two levels: first as meaning 'conspiracy'¹⁸³ and secondly as a term borrowed from writing about the stage¹⁸⁴, especially because it is supported by the mention of the word ὑποκριτής. The drama that this passage alludes to is one in which Callirhoe

¹⁸⁰ Rijksbaron, (1984).

¹⁸¹ Cf. Plato, *Apologia*, 35b, ὅτι πολὺ μᾶλλον καταψηφιεῖσθε τοῦ τὰ ἐλαινὰ ταῦτα δρᾶματα εἰσάγοντος; or introduction/ presentation of an actor, cf. Plato, *Laws*, 817c, καλλιφώνους ὑποκριτὰς εἰσαγαγομένους.

¹⁸² 6.3.6.

¹⁸³ Polybius, 33.18.10, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν κατασκευὴν τοῦ δρᾶματος ἐνενόουν καὶ τὸν Ἡρακλείδην ἐβδελύττοντο.

¹⁸⁴ Dio, 52.13, *Philoctetes*.

would have to face a straightforward advance by the king. True, the king postpones the judgement for a month¹⁸⁵. Callirhoe remains in his custody even after the war with Egypt breaks out until she ends up in Chaereas' royal booty. However Chaereas initially (and ironically) refuses to see his beautiful captive:

ἐμελλε δὲ ἔργον ἢ Τύχη πράττειν οὐ μόνον παράδοξον, ἀλλὰ καὶ σκυθρωπὸν... ἀλλ' ἔδοξε τόδε δεινὸν Ἀφροδίτῃ...καὶ... πάλιν ἠθέλησεν ἀλλήλοις ἀποδοῦναι. νομίζω δὲ καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον τοῦτο σύγγραμμα τοῖς ἀναγινώσκουσιν ἥδιστον γενήσεσθαι· καθάρσιον γάρ ἐστι τῶν ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις σκυθρωπῶν¹⁸⁶.

The passage above plays with the possible double interpretation of *Callirhoe* as a drama, directed either by Tyche or by Aphrodite, or/and as a well thought out composition. Tyche is again ready to stage an incredible tale, παράδοξον, which is chiefly a σκυθρωπὸν tale. I will argue here that the adjective σκυθρωπὸς alludes to tragedy as a genre and designates the related passages of the novel as tragic:

When later Chaereas summarises his arrival at Miletus and his capture, the Syracusan audience bewails his sufferings; he then interrupts and asks the permission to end his narration because what follows are σκυθρωπότερα γάρ ἐστι τῶν πρώτων¹⁸⁷. Already, then, the first part of Chaereas' summary indicates that the first set of events, Books 1 to 3, from Callirhoe's burial to his own shipwreck, are lamentable. The next part is more tearful than the first

¹⁸⁵ 6.2.5.

¹⁸⁶ 8.1.4-6.

¹⁸⁷ 8.8.2, Chaereas' recapitulation follows the order of the narrative, hence the prolepsis in 8.8.1, ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἔμαθον ὕστερον.

and this is the one which narrates Mithridates' plot. Chaereas' narrative includes a long digression on friendship and Polycharmus' help and concludes with a happy ending¹⁸⁸. The audience, which previously has reacted with tears, now responds appropriately to the happy ending with prayers, just as had been the case in the court of Babylon¹⁸⁹. Besides, the text reminds us that the whole setting is that of the theatre, since during Chaereas' performance ἦν τὸ πλῆθος ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ¹⁹⁰.

Thus the final performance of Callirhoe's adventures can be divided into three separate dramas: first that in Syracuse and Miletus, then the court in Babylon, then the love of the Great King, finally a twist of the tragic expectations to achieve a tale with a happy ending. The dramatic contexts of the two emotionally charged dramas, which are placed in the middle and at the end of the narrative respectively, are underlined with supplementary theatricality, since they include more than one stage-term and are furthermore set against a theatrical background. Yet Chariton's novel, despite its affinities to drama as a genre, is not itself a drama.

Xenophon

Xenophon's novel does not mention tragedy as a genre, nor does he apply it to structure his narrative. The only instance of a direct allusion to

¹⁸⁸ The first part is narrated by Hermocrates, 8.7.5, τὰ μὲν πρῶτα τῶν διηγημάτων; and then by Chaereas 8.8.2, λέγε πάντα; the second part 8.8.2, ὁ πριάμενος ἡμᾶς, δούλος Μιθριδάτου; 8.8.6, Καλλιρρόην παραθέμενος ἐν τῷ μεταξύ Στατεΐρα τῇ βασιλίδι; 8.8.1, ποσάκις...Καλλιρρόην μὲν γὰρ ἡ βασιλις ἐπῆγετο; 8.8.11, Ἐρμοκράτους ἐκγονος.

¹⁸⁹ 8.8.12.

¹⁹⁰ 8.8.15.

tragedy is Hippothous' recapitulation of his past to Habrocomes, narrating him μεγάλα διηγήματα καὶ πολλὴν ἔχοντα τραγωδίαν¹⁹¹. The mention of tragedy here gives a dramatic undertone to Habrocomes' unhappy tale; in the same context should be included Anthia's description of her adventures as sufferings: 'πολλά, ὦ ξένε, καὶ δεινά...διαβόητα μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἔνδοξα¹⁹²'. On this occasion, as is also the case with Chaereas and later Cleitophon and Calasiris, the characterisation of a speech as 'drama', and here as 'tragedy', points to a common literary background that the narrator shares with the main characters and the readers alike, that of stage-culture. Hippothous' words then should be read as a theatrical metaphor, meaning that 'I suffered woes, like the ones staged in theatres'. Xenophon however makes use of 'dramatic' motifs and patterns, especially those of Helen and Iphigenia one, not inspired directly by the myths, but being non-contextualised versions of them, as I will show in the relevant discussion in Part II.

Longus

There is no drama-like structure in Longus' novel, which constructs itself as a variant of the pastoral genre, but this does not mean that it lacks a fair number of tragic intertexts¹⁹³. The narrative gives only one instance of ironic subversion of tragedy and its related mythology: Astylus ὑπεκρίνετο

¹⁹¹ 3.1.4.

¹⁹² 5.9.7.

¹⁹³ Bowie, (2007).

τὴν τραγικὴν δυσωδίαν μυσάττεσθαι¹⁹⁴. Gnathon then reciprocates with his mythological *exempla*, as discussed above. Bowie suggests a double reading of the phrase as both ‘the foul smell of goats’ and ‘the foul singing of tragedy’¹⁹⁵ and argues for a distinction of the novelistic presentation of Eros from its traditional mythological one. Indeed, Longus’ Lesbos is much further from Athens than Heliodorus’ Meroe, which is the reason why the author maintains the dramatic patterns typical for the novel and plenty of theatrical allusions¹⁹⁶.

Achilles Tatius

AT is inconsistent in his use of the term δῶμα with respect to the plot. Besides the term is used, as shown above, to replace μῦθος in the sense ‘mythology’. Only the first two books seem to be consciously presented as a drama, probably inspired by the Menandrian stage¹⁹⁷: i.e. the incidents that precede and follow the meeting of Leucippe and Cleitophon are described as δῶμα on many occasions; also Cleitophon retrospectively¹⁹⁸ interprets his dream of lovemaking as the beginning of his adventure¹⁹⁹; dreams are a common opening device in drama and they abound in Euripidean drama; tale-of-woe openings seem to be a characteristic of Menandrian and

¹⁹⁴ 4.17.2-3.

¹⁹⁵ Bowie, (2007) p.352.

¹⁹⁶ For Longus and Menander see Hunter, (1983); for tragedy see Bowie, (2007).

¹⁹⁷ Billault, (1998a).

¹⁹⁸ 1.3.2, αἱ δὲ Μοῖραι τῶν ἀνθρώπων κρείττονες ἄλλην ἐτήρουν μοι γυναῖκα.

¹⁹⁹ 1.3.3, ἤρχετο τοῦ δῶματος ἡ Τύχη. For dreams that anticipate the narrative see Bartsch, (1989) p.80ff. and the recent Harris, (2009) p.56ff.

Aristophanic drama, according to Most²⁰⁰- although there is no Menandrian or Aristophanic comedy that starts with a dream²⁰¹. To Cleinias the meeting of the two lovers is presented as caused by the workings of Tyche. Cleitophon portrays himself as a tragic hero when he narrates his δράμα to Cleinias: 'πῶς ἐγένετο²⁰²'. Cleinias then gives him advice, which if Cleitophon follows accurately he will not ἀπολέσῃ τὸ δράμα. Leucippe's seduction is then staged as if it were a play from New Comedy and Cleitophon constructs himself as its protagonist. This first 'Leucippe drama' comes to an end when Pantheia urges Leucippe to reveal the συσκευὴ τοῦ δράματος²⁰³. Hägg notices the structural autonomy of the first two books, from 1.3.3 to the flight from home, 2.31.1, and observes that the pace of the narrative is slower in the chapters that deal with the falling in love of the characters, whereas in the next thematic unit, from 2.31.1- 3.1.1 onwards the time scheme is accelerated until 5.8.1²⁰⁴.

The next book until Ephesus, is structured around main myths like those of Helen and of Iphigenia, with Leucippe being pursued by different suitors or being sacrificed: Book 3 describes the tempest, the separation of the four friends, Leucippe's sacrifice, the reunion of Cleitophon with Satyrus and

²⁰⁰ Most, (1989) argues for a similarity between AT and Menander (and also Aristophanes) on the basis that they both start their narrative as a 'tale of woe'. However there are no opening scenes, which use a dream as a device, at least not in the surviving Menandrian plays.

²⁰¹ The dream in the *Wasps* may recall the Euripidean prologues starting with a dream (cf. *Helen, IT*), see Harris, (2009) p.151, on Aristophanic parody of Euripidean dreams; however it does not have further implication for the plot. For connection with the introductory dream in the *Persians* (cf. *Wasps*, named because they had fought the Persians in their youths), Borthwick, (1992).

²⁰² 1.9.1.

²⁰³ 2.28.1, τὴν συσκευὴν τοῦ δράματος.

²⁰⁴ Hägg, (1971b) p.76, on the day-night articulatory units.

Menelaus, and Leucippe's resurrection; only Cleinias is still missing, which makes Cleitophon deliver a lamentation in a tragic style, blaming the sea for not having provided them with a fully happy ending to their *δοῦμα*²⁰⁵. Book 4 introduces a not entirely new plot in Leucippe's epileptic fit. Cleitophon presents a recapitulation of their previous adventures and fears that, even if Leucippe recovers, a new disaster will befall them²⁰⁶: the new adventures are the Pharos incidents, which is later recalled as *μῦθος, αἰνιγμα*, and *δοῦμα*²⁰⁷.

AT's narrative reverts to the chronological pace that favours the separation between days and nights after the departure of Melite and Cleitophon to Ephesus²⁰⁸. With Leucippe dead Cleitophon becomes the centre of the narrative. The Melite episode, based on the Phaedra myth, is *ἐν μόνον τῶν δραμάτων* that Cleitophon does not confess to Leucippe after their reunion²⁰⁹. Leucippe's and Cleitophon's adventures seem to be over with their first recognition and Melite's promises to free Leucippe, when *ἡ συνήθης Τύχη* crafts for Cleitophon a *δοῦμα καινόν*²¹⁰. In Sosthenes' hands Leucippe needs to continue playing her role as the Spartan Queen, named Lacaena, which she herself perceives as her personal *δοῦμα*²¹¹. This drama, a hybrid between the Helen and Iphigenia patterns, occupies the length of Books 6 to 8 and is solved with the arrival of Leucippe's father and the test of Syrinx and

²⁰⁵ 3.23.4.

²⁰⁶ 4.9.7, *παιζέτω πάλιν ἡ Τύχη*.

²⁰⁷ 8.15.4, *τοῦτο γὰρ μόνον ἐνδέει πρὸς ἀκρόασιν τοῦ παντὸς δράματος*.

²⁰⁸ Hägg, (1971b) p.77.

²⁰⁹ 8.5.3.

²¹⁰ 6.3.1.

²¹¹ 6.16.6; Leucippe's adventure is again referred to as *δοῦμα* in Cleinias' prosecution speech against Thersander in 8.9.13, *τὸ γὰρ δοῦμά σου τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγρῶν ἠκούσαμεν*, here interpreted as 'your (Thersander's) plot against Leucippe in the fields'.

Styx for Leucippe and Melite respectively.

AT, then, is less persistent in his use of terminology that describes the plot as a play from the stage – when this *does not* use δράμα to refer to a dramatic hypothesis *qua* mythology as described above. The narrative is focalised though Cleitophon's point of view; Cleitophon as narrator is prompt to present himself as a protagonist of a dramatic plot. This narrative, however, is marked by some clear cuts between its main dramatic episodes; these segmentations are also supported by the time-scheme brought out by the novel's changes of pace. Therefore one can distinguish at least three and perhaps four sub-plots: Leucippe's seduction and elopement; the sea-adventures of the couple in 'pirate-land'; Cleitophon's seduction by Melite and/or the last part of the novel which can either be assigned to the third episode as its final section, a dramatic ἔξοδος, or form a dramatic episode on its own. It is really difficult to distinguish the two since the chief characters remain the same, but there is a clear shift towards the centrality of Leucippe who is the protagonist of the Syrix test. Hence there is indeed a fourth episode, that of Leucippe and her recognition by her father. I think that discussion of the dramatic motifs attributed to each of these units will cast more light on the segmentation.

2.2.5 Heliodorus

Heliodorus is the most eloquent of the novelists when it comes to 'stage

terms'. Walden and Paulsen²¹² have dealt thoroughly with the subject and there is not much to add to their observations. For Walden²¹³ the term 'δράμα' (but not 'τραγωδία', which he does not study independently), means 'action', or 'narrative of action', rather than 'tragedy'; but this is a very restricted view, especially when the term is in most of our examples helped out by other 'stage' terms. I would like to investigate here the occasions on which the narrative is presented as a δράμα²¹⁴ and how these dramatic allusions help to create divisions between the main episodes of the novel, which are patterned, as I will show, on three main δράματα, the *Helen*, the *Iphigenia*, and the *Phaedra*. My aim is to show that δράμα can be read more as a tragic play, or as a tragic plot, than as a 'narrative of action'²¹⁵. Because the plot of the *Aethiopica* is a linear narrative, I follow the linear re-ordering of the events adopted in Calasiris' tale beginning at 2.24.5.

Cnemon is enjoying Calasiris' company over wine when he asks him to fulfil his promise. Cnemon indicates to Calasiris that Dionysus χαίρει μύθοις καὶ κωμωδίας φιλεῖ and prompts the priest to τὸ δράμα καθάπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τῷ λόγῳ διασκευάζειν²¹⁶. Walden has limited the word μύθοις in this example to meaning 'tragedies' and not 'stories' and, further, argued that 'tragedies' means 'drama' as a narrative of action. I hereafter argue for a precise use of the term δράμα as a segmentation tool to structure the plot of

²¹² Paulsen (1992).

²¹³ Walden, (1894) p.8.

²¹⁴ The non dramatic uses of the term in Walden, (1894).

²¹⁵ Of course tragedy is by the Aristotelian definition a μίμησις πράξεως. So action as πράξις falls within his definition.

²¹⁶ 2.23.4-5.

the *Aethiopica*. The reason for my interpretation emerges from the Heliodoran text: Calasiris has barely started his tale when he interrupts himself with a reference to Nausicles' tale about Thisbe's capture by the bandits. Cnemon then, who has tactfully omitted to narrate his own tale²¹⁷, repeats his request, claiming that all this has nothing to do with Dionysus:

ἄλιν, ἔφη, βουκόλων καὶ σατραπῶν καὶ βασιλέων αὐτῶν...ἐπεισόδιον δὴ τοῦτο οὐδέν φασι πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον ἐπεισκευκλήσας. ὥστε ἐπάναγε τὸν λόγον πρὸς τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν²¹⁸.

Calasiris, when starting his tale, informs his impatient interlocutor that he will do it ἐπιτέμνων, οὐ σοφιστεύων, summarising the events of his life and not deferring his interlocutor, and then he will bring up the story in a linear way²¹⁹. Calasiris then proceeds in a way that is not linear, omitting his Ethiopian adventure and his personal meeting with Persinna²²⁰, and narrates the events at Delphi, the procession of the young Thessalians²²¹ and gives a full recital of the Thetis hymn²²²; thus Calasiris is urged to perform rather than to narrate. These details enable the tightening of the theatrical illusion to the point that, when Calasiris introduces Charicleia and Theagenes in the narrative, he reacts as if he were seeing them in front of him, exclaiming οὔτοι ἐκεῖνοι²²³. This first episode narrates the loves and the elopement of the central couple and is structured around the Homeric Helen myth.

²¹⁷ 2.24.1, φεῦ, εἶπεν ὁ Κνήμων καὶ ἀθρόον ἐσιώπησε ὥσπερ ἑαυτοῦ λαβόμενος.

²¹⁸ 2.24.4.

²¹⁹ 2.24.5, εὐτακτόν σοι καὶ προσεχῇ.

²²⁰ Winkler, (1982).

²²¹ 3.1.1-2, παρατρέχεις ὁμοῦ τε ἀνοίξας καὶ λύσας τὸ θέατρον.

²²² 3.2.3, ὥσπερ θεατὴν...ἀλλ' οὐχὶ καὶ ἀκροατὴν καθίσας.

²²³ 3.4.7.

Calasiris' theatrical narrative is characterised by ἐνάργεια²²⁴. And ἐνάργεια is a quality more easily achieved in a slowly paced narrative, since Cnemon tells him that he παρατρέχει. The first narrative about Charicleia, the first episode, covers her adoption by Charicles and her flight with Theagenes, until the separation of Calasiris from the couple by the Nile. It is not entirely narrated on the authority of Calasiris alone: part of it is told by an inset narrator, Charicles, her adoptive father, who presents his narrative to the Egyptian priest in the same way the latter presents his tale to Cnemon; just like Calasiris who distinguishes the two narratives, the summary of his own life and the tale of Charicleia, Charicles separates his own life into two dramas²²⁵: the loss of his daughter on her wedding day and the following death of his wife which initiated his travel to Egypt, where he met Charicleia²²⁶. Charicles' tale of his πάθος is structured upon this binary basis²²⁷, where 'drama', reinforced by ἐπετραγῶδει, is interpreted as both 'tragic event' and 'tragic plot'. It is only after Charicleia's abduction that Charicles is able to see the analogy between the two parts of his life, the death of his first daughter on her wedding day and the disappearance of his second daughter before her wedding²²⁸. Charicles' tale is, like Calasiris', characterised by ἐνάργεια. When Calasiris reports Charicles' disappointment at

²²⁴ Cf. Hermogenes, 10, δεῖ γὰρ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν διὰ τῆς ἀκοῆς σχεδὸν τὴν ὄψιν μηχανάσθαι. See Bartsch, (1989) p.111.

²²⁵ 2.29.4.

²²⁶ 2.29.2.

²²⁷ The first part is presented as the side-narrative, παρενθήκην, whereas his encounter with Charicleia as the main story; 2.30.1, ἦν δέ σε βούλομαι παρενθήκην γνῶναι τοῦ διηγήματος, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀληθέστερον εἰπεῖν, αὐτὸ δὴ τὸ κεφάλαιον.

²²⁸ 4.19.8.

Sisimithres' disappearance – and the associated loss of data regarding Charicleia's origin – Cnemon expresses his compassion towards the ignorance of the Greek priest²²⁹.

If we now return to Cnemon's reaction to Calasiris' digression regarding Thisbe and Nausicles, we encounter a storytelling oxymoron. Cnemon asks Calasiris for 'no more stories about bandits, satraps and their kings'; indeed of Calasiris' tale fifty sub-chapters are dedicated to the love of Theagenes and Charicleia and their elopement, whereas only seventeen sub-chapters include their maritime adventures in 'pirate-land'²³⁰. At the novel's very beginning Charicleia had already argued that their drama should reach its end: she begged the bandits to deliver them from their suffering and φόνῳ τῷ καθ' ἡμῶν δρᾶμα τὸ περὶ ἡμᾶς καταστρέψαντες²³¹. Therefore, what Cnemon asks Calasiris for is a δρᾶμα and not for a novel-like tale. Calasiris' review of the first part of the '*Charicleia and Theagenes*' adventures has then all the characteristics of a good dramatic plot: descriptions, processions, spectacles, ἐκφράσεις, and all the details²³² that, as I will argue in Part III, postpone the main action and create out of it a tragic tableau, which is largely based on the Helen pattern.

The second dramatic episode, which continues with a Euripidean reworking of the Helen myth, includes the events at the mouth of the Nile,

²²⁹ 2.32.3, ἀσχάλλω γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς οὐκ ἀκούσας.

²³⁰ Books 2.26.1-4.21.5; the Delphic oracle occurs at 2.35.5, and is the closure of Book 2; the actual meeting is in 3.5.4. The sea adventures start at 5.17.1 and finish at 5.33.2, with Calasiris' last glimpse of Charicleia bent over Theagenes' body.

²³¹ 1.3.1.

²³² Bartsch, (1989) p.130ff.

and the separation of the lovers. Before the last battle Theagenes urges Charicleia not to fight but to surrender. The terms he uses indicate that their adventure is to be interpreted as a play, a tragedy, whose plot the actors may change at will:

τί οὖν οὐχ ὑποτέμνομεν αὐτοῦ τὴν τραγικὴν ταύτην ποίησιν καὶ τοῖς βουλομένοις ἀναιρεῖν ἐγχειρίζομεν; μή πη καὶ ὑπέρογκον τὸ τέλος τοῦ δράματος φιλοτιμούμενος καὶ αὐτόχειρας ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῶν ἐκβιάσῃται γενέσθαι²³³.

Charicleia's refusal to commit suicide leads to the next big unit of the *Aethiopica*, which occupies the whole of Book 6. It is a crucial sub-plot whose theatricality is underlined by three recognition scenes. The first is the dramatic mutual recognition of Charicleia and Calasiris at Nausicles' place²³⁴. Then follows their departure and arrival at Memphis, where a double drama takes place: that of Calasiris's miraculous, ἐκ μηχανῆς, reunion with his children²³⁵ and that of Charicleia and Theagenes, in which the virgin bursts in as a παρεγκύκλημα τοῦ δράματος²³⁶ and she is happily reunited with Theagenes. The narrator takes care to inform the reader that everybody enjoyed the happy ending, and ἐφ' ἅπασιν τὸ ἐρωτικὸν μέρος τοῦ δράματος ἡ Χαρίκλεια καὶ ὁ Θεαγένης...ἀλλήλους ἀπειληφότες²³⁷.

The passage corresponds to the general idea of 'μύθοις καὶ κωμωδίας' that Cnemon had asked to hear earlier. In Book 7 the two different narrative threads, that of Calasiris and that of Charicleia, are unified in a single story.

²³³ 5.6.3-4.

²³⁴ 5.11.2, ὁ δὲ Ναυσικλῆς ἐνεὸς ἐγγεγόνει...τίς ὁ καθάπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς ἀναγνωρισμὸς διαπορῶν.

²³⁵ 7.6.4.

²³⁶ 7.7.4.

²³⁷ 7.8.1-2.

But a few lines further a new episode is introduced:

νυνὶ δὲ ἢ τὰ κατ' αὐτοὺς ἀθλοθετοῦσα τύχη πρὸς ὀλίγων ὥρων μέρος
ἀναπαύσασα καὶ εἰς χαρὰν ἐφήμερον ἀνεῖσα, παραχρῆμα τὰ λυποῦντα
ἐπισυνῆπτε καὶ δεσμώτας ὥσπερ αὐθαιρέτους τῇ πολεμίᾳ προσῆγε²³⁸.

Meanwhile, the stage is set for the third play, which is based on the Phaedra myth: the scene is that of Arsace's palace, described in tragic terms as τὸ τραγικὸν τῆς οἰκίσεως καὶ ὑπέρογκον²³⁹. The same terms have been used before by Theagenes to describe the τραγικὴν ποίησιν and the ὑπέρογκον τέλος of their sufferings²⁴⁰. Therefore the passage above refers to both the theatrical setting of the passage and the overwhelming tragedy of the chief characters, which awaits them once they step in. Indeed once they accept Arsace's hospitality Theagenes and Charicleia find themselves to be her captives.

The next, fourth, and final sub-plot of the *Aethiopica* begins with the capture of the couple by the Ethiopians, is patterned on the two *Iphigenias*, and is introduced ὥσπερ ἐν δράματι προαναφώνησις καὶ προεισὸδιον²⁴¹. The dramatic character of the last chapters of the novel which find their culmination in the phrase ὥσπερ λαμπάδιον δράματος²⁴² is clear: this is the recognition of Theagenes as Charicleia's husband, after she herself has been recognised as an Ethiopian princess, treated fully in my Part III. The

²³⁸ 7.12.2.

²³⁹ 7.12.1; cf. Plutarch, *Publicola*, 10.3, καὶ γὰρ ὄντως ὁ Οὐαλέριος ᾧκει τραγικώτερον ὑπὲρ τὴν καλουμένην Οὐελίαν οἰκίαν ἐπικρεμαμένην τῇ ἀγορᾷ καὶ καθορώσαν ἐξ ὕψους ἅπαντα.

²⁴⁰ 5.6.4.

²⁴¹ 8.17.5.

²⁴² 10.39.2.

culmination of their adventures is underlined by the abolition of the custom of human sacrifice in Ethiopia.

The four dramas of the Ethiopian tale are introduced precisely by a comparative adverb. Thus Cnemon asks Calasiris to τὸ δρᾶμα καθάπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τῷ λόγῳ διασκευάζειν; Theagenes complains about their misfortunes to Tyche, who has made of their travails ὥσπερ σκηνὴν τὰ ἡμέτερα καὶ δρᾶμα; the Memphis chapters are introduced ὥσπερ εἰς ἀνταγώνισμα δράματος and the Ethiopian events of the finale begin ὥσπερ ἐν δράματι προαναφώνησις καὶ προεισόδιον²⁴³. The emphasis on the comparison speaks for itself: the Ethiopian tale is a narrative staged by the narrator as if it were a theatrical piece. However the same comparison argues in favour of similarities between the two genres, since λόγος if used ἐναργῶς is capable of communicating the content and the emotional impact of a drama.

Definition of μῦθος as δρᾶμα

The above study reaches two different conclusions. On the one hand, Heliodorus' persistence in using a comparative every time a new episode begins – as against the cases in which the term δρᾶμα is used without any particular introduction – recalls Chariton's meticulous effort to introduce mythological parallels by a similar comparative phrasing. An exact equivalent can be found in Chariton's staging of the couple's first meeting, which is

²⁴³ 2.23.5, 5.6.3, 7.6.4, 8.17.5.

presented ‘as if in the theatre²⁴⁴’. AT does not offer as precise terminology as Chariton and Heliodorus, although he follows a more or less precise segmentation of his narrative. Xenophon and Longus should be placed among the least theatrical. The insistence on stage terms that introduce narrative parts when these terms do not invite a direct comparison with a particular mythological tale or dramatic hypothesis should be interpreted as a pointer to generic intertextuality.

Yet this does not mean that the novel ‘imitates’ drama, be that tragedy or, in fewer cases, comedy; alongside the ὥσπερ-cases I have listed occasions on which the stage terms are implemented directly in the narrative without particular indications. The ὥσπερ-cases and the non-simile metaphors, at least in Chariton’s and Heliodorus’ narratives, emphasise the role of drama in the novel. Rather than an imitation of the stage, the novels’ narrative seems to engage in a free dialogue and terminological exchange with drama.

The second observation is that Chariton’s, AT’s, and Heliodorus’ novels seem, according to my study, to be divided into four sub-chapters. The generic δρᾶμα-terminology is used precisely for these sub-sections of the novels and not for the overall narrative. I am aware that different scholars might wish to see the segmentation of the individual novels differently. However I believe to have shown that the δρᾶμα-terminology is related to subordinate phases of the narrative. These can be further analysed into four

²⁴⁴ 5.8.2, ἔδοξας ἂν ἐν θεάτρῳ παρῆναι.

structural chapters: the love-drama; the adventure-drama; the temptation of the hero; and (the final chapter) the recognition. These four chapters show affinities with Euripides' *Helen* (for the love and occasionally for the adventure dramatic chapter), with *Iphigenia* (for the adventure and 'escape' dramatic scenarios of the novel), and with the two *Hippolytoi* (for the motif of the temptress). Nevertheless, because these mythological patterns may be found without specific allusions to the plays mentioned above I have separated between 'implicit versions' of the *Helen/Phaedra/Iphigenia* myths and 'explicit versions' of them. The reason is that the popularity of the pattern in folktale does not always allow the classification of a novel under a precise e.g. 'Helen' title, and therefore terminological flexibility is required. The freedom with which these chapters engage with the dramatic myths that they allude to will be further explored in Part II of this study.

Myth^{II} then describes one of the various dramatic sub-plots which articulate the novels' main plot. They are generally referred to as δράμα and/or with different stage-terms, e.g. ἐπεισόδιον, σκηνή. Seldom are they referred to as μῦθος (once in Chariton 5.8.2; once in AT 8.15.4; once in Heliodorus 2.23.5), but even on these occasions there are adjacent indicators that direct a reader to a 'dramatic' interpretation of the passage. These dramatic chapters, which are based on the *Helen*, the *Phaedra* and the *Iphigenia* motifs, are not direct mythological parallels although they may be interpreted as generic intertexts. Most of them, although not all, can be

associated with the relevant dramas from the classical stage. Nevertheless, even on these occasions the intertextuality is of a broader dramatic calibre, regardless the allusion to specific plays.

From now on I will call these sections of the novels ‘dramas’ and/or ‘dramatic plots’. Photius too classified the works of Iamblichus, AT and Heliodorus as imitations of ἐρωτικὰ δράματα²⁴⁵. Photius’ use of ὑπεκρίθησαν seems to point in the same direction as the ὥσπερ-cases that we discussed above: occasions on which the sub-sections of the novels are introduced as ‘dramas’ and their theatricality are supported by an abundance of stage-terms. However, Photius offers another term for the novels, that of διήγημα, which I will discuss below²⁴⁶.

1.2.4 Μῦθος as διήγημα and/or λόγος

In the above chapters I discussed the use of μῦθος (a) *qua* tale from mythology and (b) *qua* dramatic plot. Now I would like to proceed to a study of μῦθος as a term describing the overall plot of a novel.

²⁴⁵ Photius, codex 94,73b.

²⁴⁶ It is difficult to include in this research what Photius had in mind when he classified most of the novels’ plots as δράματα: regarding 87.66a; Iamblichus, 166.111a; AT 99.73b, οἱ γὰρ τρεῖς οὗτοι σχεδόν τι τὸν αὐτὸν σκοπὸν προθέμενοι ἐρωτικῶν δραμάτων ὑποθέσεις ὑπεκρίθησαν. Photius’ judgement seems to be inspired by the theatricality of the novels’ setting and, probably, by their affinities with classical dramas, other wise the ὑπεκρίθησαν, imitate or rather ‘acted out’ is not clear (Wilson, (1994) p.104 translates: ‘writing a novel with a love interest’). Besides Photius does not use the term διηγήσεις and διηγήματα for the novels: at 186.130b he uses it for a collection of various tales: ἀνεγνώσθη βιβλιδάριον Κόνωνος Διηγήσεις. We also find διήγημα referring to the Book of an ascete, Ioannes, at 198.162.a; the tale about Susanna is referred to as διήγημα at 34.7a; In the case of Iamblichus the term refers to the structure of the narrative not the genre, ὁ μὲντοι Ἰάμβλιχος, ὅσα γε εἰς λέξεως ἀρετὴν καὶ συνθήκης καὶ τῆς ἐν τοῖς διηγήμασι τάξεως, 94.73b.

Towards this interpretative direction, I find useful to refer to an important passage from Chariton, which describes Callirhoe's tactful silence about her past, since it now seems to her that ὄνειρος ἦν τὰ πρῶτα καὶ μῦθος²⁴⁷; Calliroe makes clear that she does not want to narrate διηγήματα ἄπιστα τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι. Dionysius then reassures her that whatever her past is, πᾶν ἐστὶ σου σμικρότερον λαμπρὸν διήγημα²⁴⁸. The most significant instance in the novels is probably the beginning of AT, where he makes clear that his story is a σμῆνος λόγων, which μύθοις ἔοικε²⁴⁹. Longus' narrative presents Philetas' tale as a λόγος οὐ μῦθος²⁵⁰; also it insists on presenting Chloe as the protagonist of a μῦθος that Eros is plotting and makes Dionysophanes ask Lamon to tell (λέγειν) the truth, and not to invent μύθοις²⁵¹. Finally, Calasiris' characterization of the Charicleia-tale starts with an echo of AT's *incipit*, advising Cnemon that he is releasing σμῆνος κακῶν καὶ τὸν ἐκ τούτων βόμβον ἄπειρον ἐπὶ σεαυτὸν κινεῖς²⁵². Later Calasiris asks him to move to a more appropriate place for the narration of μακρότερα διηγήματα²⁵³. Thus, there are two terms which refer to the novels' narrative besides μῦθος, which is the more ambivalent term: διήγημα and/or λόγος.

²⁴⁷ 2.5.7.

²⁴⁸ 2.5.10.

²⁴⁹ 1.2.2.

²⁵⁰ 2.7.1.

²⁵¹ 2.27.2; 4.20.1.

²⁵² 2.21.5.

²⁵³ 2.21.6.

1.2.4.1 Terminology: διήγησις, διήγημα, and λόγος

The term for used for a prose narrative is διήγημα. The term refers only to a component narrative, whereas longer narratives are described by Hermogenes as διήγησις: 'διαφέρει δὲ διήγημα διηγήσεως, ὡς ποίημα ποιήσεως· ποίημα μὲν γὰρ καὶ διήγημα περὶ πράγματα ἓν, ποίησις δὲ καὶ διήγησις περὶ πλείονα²⁵⁴'. Hermogenes' definition seems to be appropriate for the novels' narratives since the content of their story presents πράγματα both as γεγονότα and as ὡς γεγονότα; true and truth-like/fictional narratives. Indeed, in Chariton, setting aside the implausibility of Callirhoe's and/or Cleitophon's tales, both narrators claim that they are 'true', although they might seem untrue. On the other hand, Dionysius' reaction is positive, arguing that even without a tale – καὶν μὴ λέγεις – Callirhoe does not need to defend the truthfulness of her story. Longus' narrator too rewrites a ἱστορία ἔρωτος in the form of a novel. The Thucydidean background of the introduction hints at a 'true' 'history-like' narrative, although Chloe's tale is presented *qua* μῦθος. As Morgan argues 'whereas Thucydides renounced the pleasures of myth for the utility of history...for Longus, pleasure and utility are inseparable²⁵⁵'.

More striking differentiation between possible and impossible, truth and mythological/fictional narrative is to be found in the reaction of Cleitophon's

²⁵⁴ Hermogenes, 2.

²⁵⁵ Morgan, (2004) p.16. Cf. Lucian's programmatic aims in his treatise *How to write history*.

interlocutor who requests the tale εἰ καὶ μύθοις ἔοικε²⁵⁶, although Cleitophon has anticipated the fictiveness of his, overall 'real' narrative.

Heliodorus presents Calasiris' narrative as a tale of Homeric dimensions - Ἰλιόθεν²⁵⁷. The opposition between the true narrative and Calasiris' myth-like one is underlined by Cnemon's reactions every time the tale happens to mention names of people who are 'real and known to him'. In this cases, Cnemon, who has already met the couple, is not surprised by the βόμβος of Calasiris' talk but wishes to hear the full story as if it were a spectacle, tactfully hides his emotions every time the narrative introduces someone already known to him and thus does not allow 'reality' to interfere with the fictiveness of Calasiris' tale²⁵⁸.

The cases above show that in this set of texts the margin between myth and fiction is not unbridgeable. The πράγματα γεγονότα might evoke the province of history, on which there is not much in the novels, as discussed above, although they share the same prose medium; yet the internal audience of the novels, like Dionysius, the AT narrator and Cnemon is more than willing to hear the most incredible stories, whether these are presented as γεγονότα or as ὡς γεγονότα. It appears that the long-term habit of Greek thought of viewing as μῦθος both a sacred tale about the gods, which might have an allegorical interpretation, and a fictive and fallacious tale, facilitated

²⁵⁶ 1.2.2.

²⁵⁷ 1.21.5.

²⁵⁸ 2.25.7, συνεστάλη πάλιν ὁ Κνήμων ὥσπερ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Θυάμιδος βληθεὶς τὴν ἀκοήν, καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐκατέρωθεν σωπῆσαι τῶν ἐξῆς ἔνεκεν.

the transition from myth to fiction²⁵⁹.

Scholars have been eager to interpret the novels as διήγηματα although their results do not agree. The influence of the rhetorical handbooks has been most often underlined: Rohde traced the origins of the novels in the ‘dramatischen Erzählungen’ of the rhetorical categories²⁶⁰ and Ruiz-Montero gives the novel the label ‘διήγημα πλασματικόν/μυθικόν’²⁶¹. However even Ruiz-Montero’s attractive argument does not seem to maintain its solidity if one reconsiders Theon’s text: the handbook identifies a category of mythological narratives’, διήγημα μυθικόν, to be distinguished from other narratives – τὸ δὲ πλασματικόν, ὃ καὶ δραματικόν καλοῦσιν, οἷα τὰ τῶν τραγικῶν, τὸ δὲ ἱστορικόν, τὸ δὲ πολιτικόν ἢ ιδιωτικόν²⁶². Theon’s terminology does not make clear what distinguishes the δραματικόν from the μυθικόν. However I agree with Ruiz-Montero that the closest generic term that one can attach to the novels is διήγημα, although this does not need to be classified as δραματικόν, μυθικόν, and/or πλασματικόν. One should take for granted the lack of theoretical terminological precision, which is also clear, six hundred years later, in Photius’ terminology, and investigate how the texts of the novels refer to their own content.

I will here argue that the novels share a conscious self-referential terminology to describe the linear narrative of a tale of novelistic content and

²⁵⁹ MacQueen, (1990) p.109: ‘to the modern reader, the obvious solution to the resulting artistic impasse is to dispense with the constant retelling of traditional myths, and write fiction; but this is only obvious because the leap from myth to fiction is so far behind us now that we have forgotten how dangerous it was’.

²⁶⁰ Rohde, (1876) p.350, p. 262; against Rohde’s thesis see Walden, (1894) p.3ff.

²⁶¹ Ruiz-Montero, (2003 (1995)).

²⁶² Hermogenes, 2.

that these terms are provided by the novels' texts alone:

- διήγημα, for a short narrative of an event.
- διηγήματα in the plural, for a collection of short narratives.
- διήγησις, and διηγοῦμαι for the act of narration.
- and διηγοῦμαι, as the main verb used to refer to describe the action of narrating a novel-like tale.
- occasionally the more general term λόγος, when used to describe a narrative, may be used for a recapitulatory narrative; but in these occasions there are always external indicators, since the term is very broad and could mean 'speech', 'words', 'talk', and more.

The list with the relevant references can be found in Table 8 of the Appendix.

1.2.4.1 The novels as narratives

Chariton

The terms διήγημα, διηγήματα, and διηγοῦμαι are very frequent in Chariton. They are mainly used to describe a narrative that happened in the past which is presented and/or accepted as being true within the framework of the novel.

It is Callirhoe who recapitulates the events of Book 1 to Dionysius and refers to them as διηγήματα ἄπιστα τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι although Dionysius

comforts her that her beauty shines more than any διήγημα²⁶³. Dionysius is convinced that Callirhoe will tell him τὴν ἀλήθειαν; but the beautiful Syracusan narrates πάντα, μόνον Χαιρέαν ἐσίγησεν²⁶⁴. Later, when Callirhoe considers aborting her child, one of her arguments is that it will not learn of τῶν περὶ τῆς μητρὸς διηγημάτων²⁶⁵; yet, when the incident of Callirhoe's pregnancy is introduced we learn that it is a (unimaginable) fact, πρᾶγμα παράδοξον, μᾶλλον ἄπιστον²⁶⁶. The phrasing recalls the earlier διηγήματα ἄπιστα and comments on the content of the tale narrated.

The second use of διήγημα is on the occasion of Chaereas' discovery of the empty tomb. This time Dionysius is contemplating the upcoming spread of the καινὸν εἰς Σικελίαν διήγημα²⁶⁷.

Dionysius has guessed well that the unbelievable tale will soon reach Syracuse and will be received with an excess of passion: καὶ ἦν ὁμοῦ πάθη ποικίλα κλαόντων, θαυμαζόντων, πυνθανομένων, ἀπιστούντων· ἐξέπληττε γὰρ αὐτοὺς τὸ καινὸν διήγημα²⁶⁸. But the news travels fast the other way too. Soon after Dionysius learns about Callirhoe's identity, Chaereas' boat arrives, but Phocas has it burned. When Phocas is interrogated he anticipates his narrative as follows:

²⁶³ 2.5.9, 2.5.10; the request formulated with the verb: 2.5.8, διηγησαί μοι, Καλλιρόη, τὰ σπαντῆς.

²⁶⁴ 2.4.10, 2.4.11.

²⁶⁵ 2.9.3; the verb: 2.9.5, τὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῖς διηγήσῃ.

²⁶⁶ 2.8.3.

²⁶⁷ 3.2.7.

²⁶⁸ 3.4.1.

Δέσποτα, μεγάλων γὰρ ἀγαθῶν φέρω σοι διηγήματα. ἐπεὶ δὲ σκυθρωπότερά ἐστιν αὐτοῦ τὰ πρῶτα μὴδὲ λυπηθῆς, ἀλλὰ περιμένον ἕως οὗ πάντα ἀκούσης²⁶⁹.

Phocas' twofold story is mentioned in the plural because the first part, the σκυθρωπόν, narrates Chaereas' quest, but the second part tells of Chaereas' eventual death. Dionysius then constructs a convincing way to deliver the news to his wife, although he tells her only half the truth of the διηγήματα²⁷⁰. When Dionysius himself learns the whole truth about τῶν ἐν Καρίᾳ διηγημάτων via Chaereas' own letter, he tightens the control of information that reaches Callirhoe. Even in front of the court he contests the letter's authority and presents his own verisimilar version, διήγημα, of Mithridates' plot²⁷¹.

The new event, the arrangement for the trial, is also part of τὸ τῆς δίκης διήγημα²⁷². Callirhoe laments her fate in the same words, mentioning that she has become διήγημα καὶ τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης²⁷³. The new tale about Callirhoe approaches the status of a legend. On his part, Chaereas' rebellion against the king is presented as capable of becoming a long-lasting ἐνδοξον διήγημα for the generations to come²⁷⁴. These new narratives are not ἄπιστα but rather ἐνδοξα, not mere tales, but tales worthy of eternal glory. Lastly, the final recapitulation of the couple's adventures is also described as

²⁶⁹ 3.9.8.

²⁷⁰ 3.10.1-2.

²⁷¹ 5.6.9.

²⁷² 4.7.5.

²⁷³ 5.5.3.

²⁷⁴ 7.1.18.

διηγήματα²⁷⁵. The recapitulation of Chaereas' adventures to the Syracusans is also presented as a two-fold set of διήγηματα: those before his departure and τὰ μετὰ τὴν ἀποδημίαν διηγήματα²⁷⁶.

The same terminology is used by the Chariton-narrator to describe his work. The novel begins with the phrase: πάθος ἐρωτικὸν ἐν Συρακούσαις γενόμενον διηγῆσομαι²⁷⁷. The narrator grasps every occasion to remind the reader of his work-in-progress as a διήγημα. This is realised by a set of direct questions: τίς ἂν φράσῃ τὴν νύκτα ἐκείνην πόσων διηγημάτων μεστή²⁷⁸; or in a more direct way, as in the recapitulation at the beginning of Book 5, where the narrator intervenes in the first person: τὰ δὲ ἐξῆς νῦν διηγῆσομαι²⁷⁹. It is the last authorial recapitulation at the beginning of Book 8 that might appear as less precise, terminology-wise. Chariton-narrator informs the reader of the shift in Aphrodite's plans, and comments as follows: νομίζω δὲ καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον τοῦτο σύγγραμμα τοῖς ἀναγινώσκουσιν ἥδιστον γενήσεται. καθάρσιον γάρ ἐστι τῶν ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις σκυθρωπῶν...πῶς οὖν ἡ θεὸς ἐφώτισε τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ τοὺς ἀγνοουμένους ἔδειξεν ἀλλήλοις λέξω²⁸⁰.

The passage is interesting because it replaces the key-term with σύγγραμμα, which I will argue here is to be understood as διήγημα. This is to be taken into account together with the closure of the novel: τοσαῦτα περὶ Καλλιρόης συνέγραψα. The formulation of the phrase corresponds to the

²⁷⁵ 8.1.17, 8.1.15.

²⁷⁶ 8.7.3; cf. the recapitulation to the King by Stateira 8.5.9.

²⁷⁷ 1.1.1.

²⁷⁸ 8.14.1; cf. 4.1.11, πῶς ἂν τις διηγήσῃ κατ' ἀξίαν τὰ τελευταῖα τῆς πομπῆς;

²⁷⁹ 5.1.2.

²⁸⁰ 8.1.3-5.

equivalent phrase in the opening of the novel and the one at the beginning of Book 5. The difference here is the breaking of the illusion. In the previous occasions the Ego-narrator's work-in-progress was assimilated to the equivalent inset narratives, which are also works in progress, gradual revelations of the truth, but now that the end is close the whole story has been transposed from a narrative into a book.

Indeed there are many occasions on which a narrator promises to tell πάντα, and on most of these he/she omits one crucial element of the truth, which will be studied in detail in Part III; but this final recapitulation leaves no gaps. Chariton's narrative then seems to be a well-woven narrative, which reveals its truth gradually, like Aphrodite, who in the very end uncovers the truth. The only reason for the description of the last narrative as τελευταῖον σύγγραμμα seems to have to do with the shift from storytelling to story-writing. Besides, what the reader has in his hands is a written *περὶ Καλλιρόην ἐρωτικά διηγήματα*.

Alternative terms to refer to storytelling are those of λόγος²⁸¹ and λογοποιῖαι²⁸². However these refer to non-certified tales and are partly interpreted as rumours, φῆμαι. Therefore there seems to be a distinction between unofficial reports, which are spread almost simultaneously with the event, and the official version of the story, which is related *a posteriori* in one of the recapitulations.

²⁸¹ 3.4.11, ὁ λόγος εἰς πλείονας διεδόθη.

²⁸² 3.2.15, on Callirhoe's identity in Dionysius' court, λογοποιῖαι; on the empty-tomb, 3.3.4, λογοποιῖαι πολλαὶ καὶ διάφοροι; 6.8.3, λογοποιοὶ καὶ μάντιες.

Xenophon

Xenophon also uses the term with specific reference to the recapitulated action. When Hippothous and Habrocomes first meet they exchange narratives, their personal stories, which are both described as διηγήματα: Hippothous describes his love affair as ‘μεγάλα διηγήματα καὶ πολλὴν ἔχοντα τραγωδίαν’ and urges Habrocomes to narrate (διηγῆσασθαι) τὰ καθ’ αὐτὸν²⁸³. When Habrocomes finishes his tale Hippothous remembers one tale that he did not mention, the very tale about Anthia²⁸⁴.

The term is used again to describe a love-narrative when the old woman ChrySION tells Habrocomes the διήγημα of the unhappy marriage of Perilaus and Anthia²⁸⁵; ChrySION's story recalls the opening of Chariton, since the subject is described in both as πάθος. An old man's διήγημα is also the one that Aegialeus tells Habrocomes about his elopement with Thelxinoe²⁸⁶. Finally Anthia recapitulates her διαβόητα and ἔνδοξα διηγήματα to Hippothous amazed that he already knows part of it²⁸⁷. The notion of incredible tales, such as we encountered above in Chariton, emerges in Habrocomes words, when he hesitates to go to Ephesus without his wife. Had he done so, without any witness, he would have to narrate διηγήματα ἴσως ἄπιστα²⁸⁸. In Xenophon the main διηγήματα are ἔνδοξα although ἄπιστα.

²⁸³ 3.1.4; 3.1.5.

²⁸⁴ 3.3.3, ἄλλο σοὶ διήγημα παρήλθον.

²⁸⁵ 3.9.4.

²⁸⁶ 5.1.3.

²⁸⁷ 5.9.7.

²⁸⁸ 5.10.4.

The ‘facts’ of a novelistic narrative, then, seem incredible and unbelievable, but worthy of commemoration.

Longus

Longus, whom we have cited above for his precision regarding the use of the term μῦθος, does not use διήγημα as a noun, but he does use the verb διηγοῦμαι for short recapitulatory narratives: Lamon διηγείται to his wife how he found Daphnis; so does Dryas to Nape concerning Chloe²⁸⁹; Chloe too διηγείται to Daphnis πάντα that happened during his kidnapping although she tactfully omits the kiss²⁹⁰.

The term λόγος in Longus has a different weight. Because of his precision of terminology regarding μῦθος, λόγος is presented as a ‘true’, non-mythological narrative. Therefore, when Gnathon attempts to get Daphnis to the city, Lamon decides to ἐκκαλύπτειν τὰ κρυπτά. Therefore he asks Dionysophanes to hear παρ’ ἀνδρὸς γέροντος ἀληθῆ λόγον²⁹¹. Dionysophanes interrogates Lamon thoroughly and asks him τὰληθῆ λέγειν μηδὲ ὅμοια πλάττειν μύθοις ἐπὶ τῷ κατέχειν τὸν υἱόν²⁹². The same need urges Dryas to reveal τὰ ἄρρητα²⁹³. The revelation of truth, then, is what leads to the completion of Eros’ μῦθος regarding Chloe, her marriage to Daphnis and their happy end.

²⁸⁹ 1.3.2, πάντα αὐτῇ διηγείται; 1.6.2, τῇ γυναικὶ διηγείται τὰ ὀφθέντα.

²⁹⁰ 1.31.2.

²⁹¹ 4.18.3, 4.19.4.

²⁹² 4.20.1.

²⁹³ 4.30.3.

Achilles Tatius

As already stated above, AT programmatically delivers a myth-like narrative. As also observed above, the term διήγημα is used in the narrative to describe the mythological tales of Cadmus, Syrinx and Philomela. However the term is used in a non-mythological context, just as in Chariton, Xenophon and Longus, to describe a recapitulatory truthful narrative.

The first of these occasions is when a slave reports in full detail, διηγείται, Charicles' death²⁹⁴. Cleitophon's companions also διηγούνται their personal stories and Cleitophon tells the general the whole truth, ἅπαντα²⁹⁵. Again, when he recapitulates his adventures to Cleinias he διηγείται τὰ περὶ τῆς Λευκίππης ἅπαντα²⁹⁶. Leucippe also considers whether to διηγήσασθαι the truth to Thersander²⁹⁷ in the same terms.

The term διήγησις is used in Cleitophon's final recapitulation of his adventures to Sostratus and Leucippe, with the exception of his affair with Melite²⁹⁸. Nonetheless this post-event narrative seems to have all the qualities of an artistic tale, one that is meant for ψυχαγωγία. The same pleasure in storytelling is evident in Leucippe's recapitulation of the Pharos events²⁹⁹. Μῦθος, as an artistic narrative meant to entertain, can even be used of retelling the main narrative. It is at the table that the main characters

²⁹⁴ 1.12.1.

²⁹⁵ 3.14.1, διηγείτο δὲ ἄλλος ἄλλο τι, καὶ γὰρ τὰ ἐμὰ εἶπον. ἐπεὶ οὖν ἅπαντα ἔμαθεν.

²⁹⁶ 5.8.3; also the same phrasing for the recapitulation of Calligone's adventures 8.18.1, ὁ Καλλισθένης διηγείται...περὶ τὴν Καλλιγόνην.

²⁹⁷ 6.16.4, διηγήσομαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν;

²⁹⁸ 8.4.4, ἔπειτα τῶν ἔργων παρελθόντων ἢ διήγησις τὸν οὐκέτι πάσχοντα ψυχαγωγεῖ μᾶλλον ἢ λυπεῖ.

²⁹⁹ 8.15.3, τὰ συμβάντα μετὰ ἡδονῆς διηγείτο.

μυθολογοῦσι their tales³⁰⁰.

AT's use of διήγησις, for the act of recapitulating a series of events, maintains its previous connotations as truthful narrative, which is not always fully revelatory. Moreover, AT's narrative presents much more explicitly than the previous texts the affinities between διήγησις and μῦθος, this time not as a tale of mythology, but as an extraordinary tale of 'γενόμενα'.

Heliodorus

It is clear that Heliodorus uses the term διήγημα and the verb διηγοῦμαι in very precise contexts: those of recapitulated retrospective narrative, without exception. Hence, Cnemon's narration of his adventures to Charicleia and Theagenes is a διήγημα³⁰¹, Calasiris διηγείται in summary form his personal adventures³⁰², and Thermouthis διηγείται to Theagenes³⁰³ his passion for Thisbe; further, Persinna's band is an exposition of the διήγημα κατὰ τὴν παῖδα³⁰⁴. Charicleia too, makes a selection of the important incidents of her story, τὰ καιριώτερα τῶν διηγημάτων, in order to inform Persinna about her relationship to Theagenes³⁰⁵.

A διήγημα, then, is a part of a story in Heliodoran terminology. When there is need to refer to a lengthy narrative then supplementary terms are used: thus, Calasiris asks Cnemon to follow him to Nausicles' place because

³⁰⁰ 8.15.3.

³⁰¹ 1.8.7, τὸ διήγημα τῆς νυκτός; cf. 1.10.2 ἐρυθρῶ διηγούμενος.

³⁰² 2.24.5.

³⁰³ 2.14.3.

³⁰⁴ 2.31.2; and again at the reading of the band, 4.8.1, τὸ γράμμα διηγούμενον.

³⁰⁵ 10.33.4.

the Nile is not a convenient place for μακρότερα διηγήματα³⁰⁶. Charicles' twofold narrative, the death of his biological daughter and his adoption of Charicleia, is marked as μακρότερον διήγημα³⁰⁷. Occasionally these narratives might seem unbelievable, but true, like Charicleia's whiteness³⁰⁸. The same notion is woven around Thisbe's death, which certifies the accuracy of her διήγησις³⁰⁹, as opposed to her previous mischievous lies.

Διήγημα then may refer to the structural parts of a longer διήγησις, which is an alternative term used to describe a long narrative. The term does not refer only to the narrative but also to the act of narrating; Calasiris' tale is twice referred to as explicit, ἐναργὴς διήγησις, by Cnemon:

οὕτως ἐναργῶς τε καὶ οὖς οἶδα ἰδὼν ἢ παρὰ σοῦ διήγησις ὑπέδειξεν...ὥστε, εἰ σπεύδεις τὴν θέαν, πλήρου τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν καὶ εἰς τέλος ἄγε τὴν διήγησιν³¹⁰.

The narration in the quotation is the extended subject of a narrative but also an act unfolding in time, with a beginning, middle and end. Calasiris does not stop his tale even during the night and he is amazed at Cnemon's auditory resilience:³¹¹.

Calasiris' extended narrative, though ambiguous and not always truthful, as Winkler has discussed, at least reveals to Charicleia the full truth³¹². Whereas on the other occasions Calasiris at each stage discloses to Cnemon the right amount of information he needs in order to get along with

³⁰⁶ 2.21.6.

³⁰⁷ 2.33.6, μακροτέρου πρὸς σε τοῦ διηγήματος ἐδεήθην.

³⁰⁸ 4.8.6, οὐ γὰρ πιστεύσειν οὐδένα.

³⁰⁹ 2.11.1.

³¹⁰ 3.4.10; 5.1.3..

³¹¹ 4.4.2.

³¹² 4.12.1; cf. Winkler, (1982).

the narrative. So we, along with Cnemon, do not learn about Calasiris' visit to Ethiopia, before this is revealed to Charicleia, and poor Charicles learns the truth only at the very end. Calasiris also does not give a straightforward interpretation of the oracle at Delphi, mentioning only that he partially understood the meaning although he appears to be a metaphor for the omniscient Heliodorus-narrator³¹³. Therefore the policy of the Egyptian priest is analogous to the one displayed by Callirhoe-narrator, Dionysius-narrator, Dryas and Lampon and AT, i.e. the delivery of a verisimilar narrative while retaining crucial information; and the term for this account is διήγησις. Finally, Heliodorus' closural line about the composition of his σύνταγμα advertises the particular narrative strategy he applied in order to make an intriguing composition out of the μακρότερα διηγήματα.

Definition of διήγησις

What then may be identified as Myth^{III} is the novel as a compilation of διηγήματα, as the product of an extensive act of διήγησις. This last interpretation of myth, whose definition is best found in Chariton, Xenophon, and Heliodorus, has several points in common with the previous two definitions of the term.

On the one hand it appeals to the fictitiousness of μῦθος, being itself a tale of incredible content, while maintaining the illusion that it is a διήγημα, a truth-like narrative, an ὡς γεγονός. The difference is that the mythological

³¹³ Winkler, (1982) p.329.

tales are in most cases introduced as similes, whereas the incredibility of the narrative is not stressed. On the other hand, the term διήγημα, like δράμα, enables the segmentation of the novels' plots into shorter narrative units, which form the content of the recapitulations. The difference between the two lies in their presentation: whereas διήγημα refers to an event focusing mainly on its informative function (hence the accumulation of information), the dramatic chapters of the novel are the ones that provide its theatricality and are largely characterised by description.

It is not enough to tell a story; one has to be able to present it accordingly, and this is where stage terms enter. The use of διήγησις (and of διηγοῦμαι) then as an act of ordering the novelistic content is the term that links the two. And the key technique for doing this is the withholding of information. In what follows then, part II, I will try to show how the manipulation of a particular set of plays enriched the novels' structure and in Part III I will discuss the narrative techniques shared by the novel and the *Odyssey*. Therefore, Part I will have examined the dramatic structure of the above mentioned dramatic episodes of the novels, and Part II will engage with the techniques of structuring a lengthy narrative of epic dimensions around the subject of the gradually revealed novelistic διήγησις.

PART II - ΜΥΘΟΣ AS DRAMA

2.1 The myth of the Beauty: Helen

I will here study the 'Tale of the Beauty and her suitors'³¹⁴ as follows: first I will examine the relevant motifs in the implicit versions and then I will proceed with the study of the extant, explicit versions. The motif is classified as μῦθος-drama, because the novel makes use of it in its dramatic 'chapters' and not throughout. The main Greek mythological model is of course Helen, although the pattern refers to the 'Beauty' in general terms, since in the implicate uses of the motif, there is no mention of Helen, and besides it is a universal tale pattern. In the occasions when we deal with an explicit Helen-version the closer to the novel mythological sub-text is the eponymous Euripidean drama, because it represents the chaste version of the Beauty.

I am aware that it is not always possible to separate the very popular Homeric version of the pattern from its Euripidean reworking. However, if an explicit novel-version does not bear sufficient witness to the myth, allusions to the myth or intertexts from major Helen texts, like Homer and/or the tragedians, will be classified alongside the implicit versions. It is only natural that the fragmentary novels are not dealt with in the explicit versions section

³¹⁴ The title of the chapter is inspired by the tale of the 'Beauty and the Beast', where the 'Beauty' is endowed not only with physical attractiveness but of moral purity; cf. the versions of Gabrielle-Suzanne Barbot de Villeneuve (1740) and of Jeanne-Marie Le Prince de Beaumont (1756); motif AT 425 in the Aarne and Thompson, (1928) classification.

– unless linguistic evidence and/or precise allusion is available. This classification is based only upon the current state of the texts; should more evidence emerge, a shift of category may be needed. Therefore in every study of the three myths the classification will remain the following:

First, I will study the motifs of the myth and equivalent non-mythological motifs, what I will call here, the 'implicit versions', this meaning on the occasions where the pattern is used but without a specific allusion to the Helen myth as such. This approach aims to identify the major thematic characteristics of prose erotic fiction and detect the patterns from which it is constructed. Secondly, I will deal with the conscious treatment of these motifs in the 'explicit versions'. The criteria for placing a novel in this category are, on the one hand, direct allusions to the relevant myth and/or text, which are classified as intertexts, and on the other, the reworking of particular structural units of a particular text, which are classified as textual mythological motifs.

2.1.1 The implicit versions of the Beauty plot

There is no more widespread motif than that of the beautiful and seductive woman, who captivates the eyes of men and ends up captured by them. The variations on the motif are charmingly developed in Gorgias' *Encomium of Helen*: fate, gods' will, persuasion or love. In other words a woman can be kidnapped, unwillingly, or she can elope, willingly. The Greek novels play with both these versions; the first is normally reserved for the bandits and the pirates that crowd the world of fiction, whereas the second is

reserved for the beloved.

However, the pattern of the 'tale of the Beautiful' and her lovers is not necessarily associated only with the Helen myth. Implicit version prose-fiction, like *J&A*, the *Babyloniaca*, and *Sesonchosis*, as well as Xenophon of Ephesus, attests the popularity of the motif, without using the Helen myth as a pattern. *Metiochus and Parthenope* and *Ninus and Semiramis* are categorized here with them due to lack of concrete evidence and hence are examined only at the level of plot. The texts are listed more or less chronologically³¹⁵.

I will study hereafter the motif of the love triangle with a male antagonist. The pattern is very thoroughly developed in the Helen myth³¹⁶, which gives the title to this section, although its background has a lot of folk-tale material³¹⁷.

2.1.1.1 *Joseph and Aseneth*

The *J&A* narrative in its second part³¹⁸ presents a fight for the beautiful Egyptian princess³¹⁹. This time it is the son of the Pharaoh who tries to steal Aseneth from Joseph. The young prince employs Gad and Dan, whom he sends after the couple. But Benjamin protects his brother's wife by throwing a

³¹⁵ For the chronology used here see Bowie, (2008). When I was writing my dissertation the Book of Tilg, (2010), *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the invention of the Greek love novel*, was not available. Tilg argues for a very early date for Chariton, suggesting him to be the inventor of the first novel, in the mid first century A.D.

³¹⁶ See Table 1 in Appendix.

³¹⁷ Trenkner, (1958) p.50, on the folk-tale elements in the *Helen* and the *IT*.

³¹⁸ For the discussion of the 'originality' of the second part Kraemer, (1998) p.40.

³¹⁹ For the similarities with the Greek novels see Philonenko, (1968) p.43 and Wills, (1995) p.176, on the motif of the jealous rival; against the similarities with the Greek novel see Kraemer, (1998) p.11, p.200.

stone. The assault on Aseneth ends with the reconciliation of both parties, unlike the standard model³²⁰.

In *J&A* the motif has no real importance for the action except for stating the moral of the story: Aseneth, although a περιμάχητος γυνή, gives herself an Egyptian lesson of fraternal concord and succeeds in reuniting the rival brothers³²¹. This could also be read as a reaction to the stereotypical pattern that wants the beautiful woman to be kidnapped. Therefore, the Jewish-Egyptian reconstruction of the pagan myth minimizes the 'romance' of the story by emphasising the power of God's the grace over his subjects: Aseneth claims to be saved by God and not by Joseph, contrary to how the motif was exploited in the later novels³²², and the narrative's closure with God's will stated is one that cannot be contested, therefore the motif of fraternal strife cannot be repeated.

2.1.1.2 *Metiochus and Parthenope*

It is more difficult to reconstruct what happens in *Metiochus and Parthenope*³²³: here one of Metiochus' rivals seems to be Polycrates' successor, Maiandrios, who imprisons Parthenope; we have no idea how Parthenope is sold as a slave and how, four years later, her master, Anaxilaus of Rhegium,

³²⁰ 28.16.

³²¹ Rautman, (2000) p. 197, on the similarities of the myth of Osiris and Seth and the *Tale of the two brothers*. There seems to be a tradition in Ancient Egyptian story-telling regarding fraternal discord.

³²² 28.9, διότι κύριος υπερέσπισέ μου.

³²³ The plot in Hägg, ((1987) 2004).

recognises her³²⁴. We cannot know securely whether Metiochus is captured by Phoenicians during this time and/or arrives in Persia – where his historically mentioned Persian wife might have been treated as a temptress for the novelistic purposes³²⁵. What is important for this study is that the novel starts only when a rival threatens the heroine's chastity and, eventually, separates her from Metiochus. Eustathius' summary emphasises the motif of male rivalry as follows:

λέγουσι Παρθενόπη πολλοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐπιβουλευθεῖσα, καὶ τὴν παρθενίαν φυλάξασα, εἴτα Μητιόχου Φρυγὸς ἐρασθεῖσα, τὰς τε τρίχας ἔτεμεν ἀκοσμίαν ἑαυτῆς καταψηφιζομένη, καὶ εἰς Καμπανοὺς ἐλθοῦσα ὤκησε· καὶ τάχα διὰ τὴν τοιαύτην σωφροσύνην ἀγνὴν ὁ Διονύσιος τὴν Παρθενόπην ὠνόμασεν³²⁶.

If Anaxilaus of Rhegium was the same sort of enlightened king as Artaxerxes in Chariton, then we may guess that there was here another instance of an unconventional love triangle, when Parthenope arrives in Rhegium with the rest of the Samians and the Ionians, whom Anaxilaus encouraged to besiege the later Messina³²⁷. But all this is highly speculative. The only plausible conclusion seems to be that the plot was arranged around the different rivals fighting for Parthenope's beauty until her reunion with Metiochos, according to Eustathius' summary³²⁸.

³²⁴ Stephens, (1996) p.659, although I disagree with her separation between 'Ideal-Romantic Novels', 'Nationalistic Novels', 'Criminal-Satiric Novels' and 'Antonius Diogenes'.

³²⁵ Cf. Herodotus, 6.41 and Hägg, ((1987) 2004) p.265-266, studies the historical sources of Metiochus' second wife, not the Athenian one. My suggestion is that much of the historical material has been used with liberty; therefore this detail could have been used, outside its historical context, only in order to spice up the story.

³²⁶ Eustathios, *Comentary on Dionysius Periegetes*, 358.

³²⁷ Herodotus, 6.22.23.

³²⁸ Stephens, (1996), thinks that this is speculative too and that this early novel was atypical. Bowie, (2002) has suggested a chronology for *Metiochus and Parthenope* that makes it almost contemporary with Chariton (Chariton 50's, late 60's; Metiochus early 70's). Given the stereotyped form that Chariton presents it would have been odd to classify Chariton as typical and the later novel as 'atypical'.

2.1.1.3 *Ninus and Semiramis*

The fragments of this novel do not allow us to guess whether Semiramis followed Ninus in his campaigns or remained waiting for him at home, like Sesonchosis' fiancée³²⁹. This leads to two possible scenarios: in the first her active participation would only lead to her kidnapping by one of his enemies and his campaign might have resulted in a fight to recover her, as is the case in Chariton and Iamblichus. But there is no concrete evidence for such a development, although Ctesias' accounts³³⁰ mention that Semiramis was indeed a capable military leader; if now Semiramis remained at home waiting for his return, it could have turned out that an internal rival, like in Parthenope's case, might have tried to seduce Semiramis. In both cases though, I am keen to accept that Ninus' campaigns could have been related to the recovery of his beloved as well, as in the case of Chaereas and, to some extent, Sesonchosis.

2.1.1.4 *Sesonchosis*

The Sesonchosis novel seems to be more about the military campaigns of the hero than about the love-tale. The return of the exiled king to the throne of Egypt is effective after his 'reunion' with his 'former fiancée', Meameris, the daughter of Webelis, former king of Arabia, and now his vassal. But the sequence of the love pattern is problematic: Sesonchosis appears to be

³²⁹ For Semiramis Braun, (1938) p7 ff.

³³⁰ Jacoby, *FGrHist*, 688.

betrothed to the girl before his military campaigns, although she only falls in love with him after his return from Egypt. There seems to be no abduction of the wife, although recognition – or a first encounter – does not seem impossible³³¹; it is tempting to imagine how Sesonchosis returned to Arabia, disguised, to check the reliability of his fiancée, who instead fell in love with the handsome stranger, as P. Oxy.47.3319 describes³³². It would have been interesting to show the husband/fiancé in the role of suitor of his wife³³³. But the fragment does not allow further speculation.

2.1.1.5 Xenophon of Ephesus

There is no reference to Helen in Xenophon's novel, either by name or by any other explicit parallels. This is why I prefer to discuss it here and not with the explicit version-texts. The only reference to the myth is a geographical one, when Habrocomes crosses Schedia, a bridge allegedly constructed by Menelaus³³⁴. Despite the similarities to the myth of Helen, which is the reason why there have been attempts to associate the novel directly with the myth, the novel does not mention Helen explicitly as one of Anthia's models. Indeed, the novel presents strong structural similarities to the plot of the 'Beauty' and there seems to be direct influence from, at least,

³³¹ O'sullivan, (1984) p.44.

³³² Winkler (1995). p.247, speculates them having met at all, or the fatehr being present, but he opts for neither.

³³³ 3.6.8.

³³⁴ 4.1.5, only in a geographical detail we are told that Hippothous and his bandits cross διώρυγα τοῦ ποταμοῦ τὴν ὑπὸ Μενελάου γενομένην. The bed-scene has also been presented as an allusion to Demodocus' song in the *Odyssey*, 8.266-366, Blázquez, (2003); however the ἐκφρασις in Xenophon is there because of its eroticism and may be read as an Stoic echo of the merge of the male and the female element. For allegorical interpretations of myth see Brisson and Jamme, (1995).

the first part of Chariton³³⁵; hence there is no need to argue, like O'Sullivan, for an orally transmitted story of the epic cycle³³⁶.

The beautiful Anthia marries the handsome Habrocomes in the very first chapters, and they sail off to Egypt. On their way they are captured by pirates and then sold off to Apsyrtos. The narrative time of Anthia's adventures is spread between her being the object of a suitor (Corybos, Moiris, Hippothous, Perilaus, Psammis, Anchialus, Polyidus, and the pimp in Sicily), and her attempts at self-defence: she is sold by Corybos and Moiris (because of Manto), immolated by Hippothous, commits suicide when wedded to Perilaus, tricks Psammis by pretending to belong to the Isiac priesthood, kills Anchialus, and tricks the pimp into believing she is mad/epileptic. Every suitor carries Anthia to a different land, or threatens to diminish the chances of a reunion with Habrocomes.

The protagonist, on the other hand, searches all around the world for Anthia, not taking part in military campaigns but following Hippothous' bandits until he sets off alone to Alexandria in the hope of capturing the thieves of Anthia's body³³⁷. Habrocomes' despair is a new addition to the motif, since it emphasizes not the military skills of the protagonist but the depth of his emotional distress; Habrocomes is said to be driven to

³³⁵ For Xenophon as an imitator of Chariton and not of the genre, see Reardon, (2004a) p.190, The *Ephesiaca* is neither folk-tale nor novel; Reardon suggests that it should be classified with Lucian's *Toxaris*, *Philopseudes*, *Vera Historiae* than with *Callirhoe*. The summary of Chrysiôn's tale describes its content as *πάθος*, 1.1.1; cf. Xenophon 3.9.4.

³³⁶ O'Sullivan, (1995) p.173: 'the story of Paris and Helen, the archetypal romance'.

³³⁷ 3.10.5.

Alexandria by an ἐλπίς δυστυχής³³⁸, without concrete plan. The passivity of Habrocomes results in his being sold as a slave to Cyno, at which point he shares the same treatment as Anthia. More surprisingly, it is Hippothous who takes up the role of Anthia's saviour. The latent homosexual relationship between Hippothous and Habrocomes results in him searching for his beloved along with his company of bandits, a search that brings him as far as Ethiopia gathering a large amount of spoils³³⁹. It is with this money, supplemented by Psammis's wealth, that Hippothous buys Habrocomes' freedom³⁴⁰ and it is again Hippothous' gold that frees Anthia from the Sicilian pimp³⁴¹, something which helps the reunion of the couple.

The plot of Xenophon does not have the precise Helen myth in its background but only the pattern of the 'Beauty': since Anthia has much in common with more than one character of the rest of the novels it is difficult to argue for a Helen myth, via some other novel: she is buried alive like Callirhoe, she is shy, like Semiramis, kills, like the violent Sinon, lets herself be seduced like the reluctant Leucippe, and she is as cunning as Charicleia. If compared with the rest of the fragmentary novels, Xenophon, regardless of its dating - circa 117 C.E., although O'Sullivan and others argue for an earlier date³⁴²- presents an alteration in the motif: the male hero is no long in centre stage, military exploits are not required, and the focus is upon the main

³³⁸ 3.10.4.

³³⁹ 4.1.5.

³⁴⁰ 4.4.5.

³⁴¹ 5.9.9.

³⁴² O'Sullivan, (1995) p.169; for an earlier dating of c. 90 AD see Bowie, (2002) and Rife, (2004) p.106.

couple. This alteration should not be considered as a development of the genre, but as an alternative narrative choice.

2.1.1.6 Antonius Diogenes

Antonius Diogenes' narrative is not one of love and faithfulness but rather one of adventure; thus the motif of the 'Beauty' and her suitors can be found as a sub-plot. Photius' summary mentions that when Derkyllis, chased by Paapis, reaches Thule, Thruscanos, one of her suitors, kills himself after killing Paapis, believing his beloved dead³⁴³.

Unfortunately this summary does not give enough information about the relationship of Derkyllis to Thruscanos, although it seems there might be a parallel in Thermouthis' suicide over the body of Thisbe or Thyamis' attempted suicide 'in battle' after having, as he thinks, immolated Charicleia³⁴⁴. Moreover, given that this is a tale of Derkyllis to her lover, Deinias, we cannot be certain of the amount of information she might have hidden from him, as in the examples of Callirhoe or Chloe. But the passage is important because it emphasises the repetitive nature of the male antagonist pattern - τούτων ἕτερα πολλά παραπλήσια – or of the pattern of the 'Beauty'.

2.1.1.7 Rhodanes and Sinonis

Another controversial case is that of Sinonis in the *Babyloniaca*. Photius

³⁴³ Photius, 166, 110b.

³⁴⁴ 1.31.4.

tells us that Garmus desires her, although she is in love with and already wedded to Rhodanes; yet, somehow, we find Rhodanes on the cross and Sinonis urged to marry Garmus³⁴⁵. The following part of Photius's account is patterned around Garmus' pursuit of Sinonis and Rhodanes. The plot is reflected in the inset tale about Mesopotamia, with whom Sinonis is compared, her three suitors, the judgement of Borochos and the killing of the suitors³⁴⁶. Another suitor appears in the person of Setapos, whom Sinonis pretends to desire, but whom she kills after making him drunk³⁴⁷. The rest of the plot describes Sinonis' jealousy towards the farmer's daughter, whom Rhodanes appears to have kissed; Sinonis, to get revenge, announces her wedding to Garmus, but she later appears to be marrying the young king of Syria. Garmus sends Rhodanes against the Syrian king, planning to kill him on his return, but Rhodanes returns with Sinonis and gets the throne of Babylon, having eliminated Garmus. How faithful Sinonis has been to Rhodanes is impossible to judge given her wild emotional reactions; but we still know that both for her and for Rhodanes αἰρετώτερον γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὁ θάνατος ἢ Γάμον ἰδεῖν³⁴⁸.

The incident with Setapos, whom Sinonis beguiles and kills, may be indicative for the interpretation of Sinonis' double wedding. Rather than read it as faithlessness to Rhodanes, it might be taken as a ploy that allows her to

³⁴⁵ Photius, 94, 74a.

³⁴⁶ Photius, 94, 75b.

³⁴⁷ The name of Sinonis in Greek means 'wild'; cf. the verb σίνομαι, σινέομαι, σίννομαι, to hurt. Russell, (1993) p.78.

³⁴⁸ Photius, 94,75a, the phrase ends up to be typical in the Greek romances cf.7.6.8, γάμον οὐχ ὑπομενῶ θάνατον εὐχομαι; 4.11.3, ἡ δὲ, Ἀλκαμένει μὲν, ἔφη, τάφον πρότερον ἢ γάμον τὸν ἐμὸν εὐτρεπιζέτω.

avoid difficult situations; hence she promises marriage to Garmus, and in order to escape her promise, she pretends to want the Syrian king, who has to fight against Garmus to get her. Anthia and Charicleia perform similar beguilements in respect to Perilaus and Thyamis and/or Peloros respectively. Photius' disapproval of the *Babyloniaca*, which he summarizes much less diligently than Antonius Diogenes, is a sign that we are either missing something from the plot, or that Photius' account is not precise. The oracle at the end argues for a happy conclusion to the couple's adventures. Rhodanes' campaign against the Syrian king echoes Chariton's end, especially Garmus' trick to send a lover against a rival³⁴⁹. Just as for Callirhoe, Sinon's beauty is a prize for the winner on the battlefield, a winner, who also happens to be, in the end, the beloved.

Preliminary conclusions

The common motif in the plots above is that of the περιμάχητος γυνή. Iamblichus' novel is exemplary among the fragments in that it makes of the pattern continuous variations which constructs the narrative whereas in *J&A* and in Diogenes it is used as a side motif to vary the main narration. Perhaps *Metiochus and Parthenope* would have been interesting from this point of view, but given the situation, there is no way to count Parthenope's suitors. Among the extant novels, Xenophon is unique in that Anthia moves non-stop

³⁴⁹ Photius, 94.78a, Ροδάνην ἄκοντα τοῦ σταυροῦ...κοσμεῖ στρατηγικῶς, καὶ πέμπει τοῦ πολέμου...στρατηγὸν ὡς ἐραστὴν κατὰ τοῦ ἀντεραστοῦ. Cf. 7.2.6, δύο τὰ προτρεπτικώτατα εἰς ἀνδρείαν ἔχοντες, θανάτου καὶ ἀμύνης ἐρωτα.

from suitor to suitor until her final reunion with Habrocomes. So far the 'Beauty' pattern consists of the following quadripartite structural motifs:

a. The heroine falls in love with the hero at a very early stage of the narrative and their love is mutual: cf. *Aseneth*, *Semiramis*, *Sinonis*, *Anthia* – but not *Parthenope*; *Meameris* is an obscure case.

b. The suitor(s) react/s by plotting against the heroine – kidnapping, death penalty, selling as a slave; the oracle's request as motivation for the departure³⁵⁰ seems to be Xenophon's innovative touch.

c. The heroine defends herself with violence and/or guile: cf. *Sinonis* and *Aseneth* (who nevertheless uses a more peaceful approach). *Semiramis*, if we take under consideration Ctesias' tradition, would have been a good candidate for such a plot too.

d. The hero recovers the heroine – recognition included: this part may include military campaigns like that in the *Ninus* and in Iamblichus, or a quarrel as in *Aseneth*; *Metiochus*, as the older Miltiades' descendant, seems to be a good candidate for heroic exploits, although so far we lack textual evidence. Nevertheless, there is a second option, in which there might be no battle, like in *Habrocomes*' case – although the part of the accomplishment of heroic deeds is transferred to Hippothous. Recognition scenes seem to be the case in the *Metiochus and Parthenope*, the *Sesonchosis* and in the *Rhodanes and Sinonis*. The frequency with which they are used and varied in the extant

³⁵⁰ Griffiths, (1978) p.416: 'destiny, according to stoic thought, cannot be defied or change but endured'.

novels possibly indicates that the recognition scene was one of the novel's main closural tools.

The main characteristics of the pattern discussed here is the dynamic exchange between motifs of passion or retarding and motifs of action: the beginnings of Eros, which are the *pathétique* part of the novel are part of motif (a); however a novel needs to cover pages and space, therefore an external force is required to unbalance the perfect bliss of the couple, which is the function of motif (b); motif (c) is equally characterised by its extreme dramatic impact whereas the final one, (d), includes both action, the battle, and emotional scenes. Xenophon is probably the most characteristic, switching between highly expressive scenes, like Anthia's wedding night, or Anthia in the tomb, and scenes of overwhelming action. Further, emotional motifs are characterised by their lack of mobility, whereas action motifs stretch over time and space.

The pattern of the recovery of the beautiful has much in common with equivalent folk-tale material. However there seem to be no other examples in Greek mythology that approximate this plot, besides the Helen myth. Moreover, one has to rely only upon the Euripidean version of the story, so that motif (c) remains unchanged. Indeed there were not many women in Greek literature, who were allowed to travel, while remaining faithful³⁵¹. For models one would have to look further at the East, where the *Ramayana* is

³⁵¹ Lalanne, (2008).

probably the best example of the kind: in the Indian epic poem Rama's faithful wife, who followed him into exile, Sati, is kidnapped, and the hero begins a great war to win her back. It may then be that for national heroes, like Ninus, Sesonchosis and Rhodanes, the explicit demonstration of heroism is a necessary ingredient of the plot, as confirmation of their identity, whereas for individuals, like Habrocomes, the need may have appeared less urgent, hence the emphasis on the emotional distress of the hero.

2.1.2 The explicit versions of Madame Swann³⁵²

The above study has shown that, despite the lack of intertextual evidence, there is a strong connection between the pattern of the 'Beauty' and the plot of the fragmentary novels. The extant novels, on the other hand, make explicit use of the Helen myth, as a simile, model or plot. If there existed a myth of the 'Beauty' in the Greek mythological language, she could not have been other than Helen. The Helen myth was one of the hot topics of Homeric criticism, which was constantly contested, reshaped and reinterpreted. The first centuries C.E. inherited a large mythological tradition *autour de Madame Swann* of the Greek mythology, which they further questioned and readapted.

³⁵² The wife of the educated Charles Swann, in Proust's *À la recherche du temps perdu*, *Un amour de Swann*. Mme Swann, born Odette de Crécy, is a courtesan with dubious past, but through her marriage she made it into the higher class. She is here cited as a modern model of the Odyssean Helen.

2.1.2.1 *The second sophistic on Helen*

Dio, Aristides, Lucian, Plutarch, and Philostratus

Despite Stesichorus' and Euripides' efforts to re-establish Helen's chastity³⁵³, the writers of later antiquity³⁵⁴ do not seem to follow this innovative approach, but when they are attracted by the Stesichorean version it is always because of its moral message of Stesichorus' blindness and not because of the myth; among Dio's multiple references to the unfaithful Helen, only two allude to the Stesichorean *Helen* and are used only as similes³⁵⁵. His Trojan discourse is not a reworking of the main pattern but a transposition of it, since Helen is still in Troy and cause of the war. Lucian shows no mercy to Helen even in the underworld, where she is still the faithless wife of Menelaus³⁵⁶. For Aristides Stesichorus is the vague hypotext of his Palinode, although the majority of his Helen-related intertexts come from Homer, including *Sacred Tales* which alludes to *Odyssey* 4³⁵⁷. For Pausanias³⁵⁸ and Plutarch³⁵⁹ Helen is mainly the Homeric version of the myth and it is only Philostratus who gives an idealised version of Helen in the Second

³⁵³ See Wright, (2005), who contests Stesichorus' authorship of the myth 'chaste Helen'.

³⁵⁴ The reception of Helen in Kahil, (1955), Lindsay, (1974), Clader, (1976), Austin, (1994); see Gumpert, (2001) for an interesting revisiting of Helen in myth and as philosophical, theatrical, rhetorical metaphor and text; for the Euripidean treatment of Helen as a parallel to Penelope see the seminal Holmberg, (1995). For the text see the commentaries of Kannicht, (1969) and the recent Allan, (2008).

³⁵⁵ 2.13 (Stesichorus' blindness and the poet who is bribed by the kings); 80.4 (freedom is like Helen's ghost).

³⁵⁶ *Dialogues of the Dead* 5.1.

³⁵⁷ Aristides 47.1 (Keil), *Sacred Tales*, 1.1, δοκῶ μοι κατὰ τὴν Ἑλένην τὴν Ὀμήρου τὸν λόγον ποιήσεσθαι καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνη πάντας μὲν οὐκ ἂν φησιν εἰπεῖν ὅσοι Ὀδυσσεύς ταλασίφρονός εἰσιν ἄεθλοι. πράξιν δέ τινα αὐτοῦ μίαν ἀπολαβοῦσα, οἶμαι, διηγείται.

³⁵⁸ For Pausanias as a 'classic', like Plutarch in his interpretation of myths see Veyne, (1983).

³⁵⁹ Hardie, (1992).

Sophistic³⁶⁰: Helen in the *Heroicus* lives in the Islands of the Blessed not with Menelaus, who is unworthy of being the husband of such a chaste beauty, but with the bravest and handsomest of the Achaeans, Achilles, with whom she fell in love only by hearing his story: 'μηδὲ ὁφθέντας ἀλλήλους, ἀλλ' ἢ μὲν κατ' Αἴγυπτον, ὁ δὲ ἐν Ἰλίῳ ὄντες³⁶¹'. But, given that Philostratus comes chronologically later than the majority of the novels, the influence should be traced from the novels to the *Heroicus* and not vice versa.

The text of the *Helen*

The textual tradition of Euripides' *Helen* presents some problems concerning the reception of the play: only one papyrus survives and the text has come down in a single manuscript, not forming part of the Hellenistic 'selection'. The interest of the novelists in plays like the *Helen*, the *Iphigenia* and the *Andromeda* indicates that the selection might have been mainly a scholarly or educative initiative, as Barrett argues³⁶², despite the fascination of authors of non-scholarly prose-fiction works with those plays.

Structuring units of the Helen myth³⁶³

The structure of the Helen myth viewed in its totality provides us with a well defined pattern, analogous to the one described in my treatment of the implicit versions myths of the 'Beauty': it includes (a) a romance (her

³⁶⁰ See Bowie, (2008) p.30, for Philostratus and the Persian tale of Odatis for Zariadres.

³⁶¹ *Heroicus*, 54.3ff (De Lannoy).

³⁶² Barrett, (1964) p. 52.

³⁶³ See Table 1 (Appendix for Part II).

wedding with Menelaus or romance with Paris) and a set of disappointed suitors; (b) the suitors' reaction to the Beauty's romance and their plot (Paris forces Helen to follow him/ the Greeks besiege Troy, in Dio's version), (c) Helen's wit in avoiding the suitors' advances (only in the Egyptian episodes) (d) Helen's recovery by a lover, who has proven his value on the battlefield (Menelaus/ Achilles). What is not a main part of the Helen myth is motif (c), the self-defence of the heroine against occasional suitors, which figures only in the Euripidean *Helen*. The play does indeed contain the four basic parts of the pattern: (a) Helen marries Menelaus, (b) there is a plot against the heroine (by the gods/Paris), (c) the heroine defends herself (against Theoclymenus) and outwits him; (d) Menelaus recovers Helen after a fight, a parody of the fight for Troy³⁶⁴.

The above classification shows the distribution of retardation and motion between the different motifs of the pattern (Table 10). The marriage and/or love romance is not a parameter for action, but the plot of the suitors is, since it carries the heroine away from her house/husband. Penelope is included in my Table because, just like the Homeric Helen, the Penelope myth uses motifs (a), (c) and (d) of the classification. Both the Homeric Helen and the Penelope do not conform fully to the pattern. It is only the Euripidean Helen, which follows exactly the structure of the motifs; faithfulness, adventure and reunion could not be found in one myth. The *καινή* Helen is

³⁶⁴ *Helen*, 1602-1604, φόνω δὲ ναῦς ἐρρεῖτο. παρακéléυσμα δ' ἦν/πρόμνηθεν Ἑλένης· ποῦ τὸ Τρωϊκὸν κλέος;/ δείξατε πρὸς ἄνδρα βαρβάρους.

the only evidence for this merge.

As we have seen *J&A* as well as Iamblichus and the Sesonchosis novel attest a non-Helen-based tradition of the pattern. Moreover, the more Hellenocentric Xenophon does make explicit use of the 'Beauty' pattern, but not of the Helen. It is therefore plausible to claim that the already existing 'pattern of the faithful Beauty and her suitors' was eventually transcribed into a 'Helen pattern'. The existence of the Euripidean *Helen* facilitated the process by joining the two incomplete versions of the tale, the Homeric Helen and the Homeric Penelope. The gradual adaptation of the Helen myth in each novel argues for an already existing pattern, which the Helen myth enriched by providing new dramatic possibilities for the treatment of the motif.

2.1.2.2 The Greek novels on Helen

Chariton

The most thorough study so far of the Helen myth in Chariton³⁶⁵ is Laplace's seminal work 'sur les légendes Troyennes³⁶⁶', which deals with the double aspect of Callirhoe as Helen, thus related to the Greek past, and as Aphrodite mother of Aeneas, thus related to Roman mythology. Laplace makes use of all possible intertextual triggers of the Trojan myth at the level of plot and especially of characterisation; she concludes that 'pour Chariton la légende de la guerre de Troie se résout en un ensemble de thèmes rhétoriques

³⁶⁵ For intertexts and patterns Table 2.

³⁶⁶ Laplace, (1980) p.100.

symbolisés par les mots – δῶρον, εἶδωλον, ὄνομα, Ἰλίου ἄλωσις - celles du concours et du feu, des proverbes, le jugement de Paris, la pomme de discorde, la palinodie, la guerre pour un fantôme. Leur interprétation romanesque s'appuie sur l'*Illiade* et surtout sur l'*Helene* d'Euripide. L'imitation d'Homère n'apparaît que dans les scènes de dénouement (le procès de Babylone, la guerre des Égyptiens contre le Grand Roi, où elle s'avoue par des citations. Au contraire les situations romanesques empruntées à Euripide (le transport du fantôme, les fausses funérailles, la fuite de l'épouse aux côtés de son premier mari) sont mentionnées plusieurs fois au cours de l'intrigue, mais seulement par allusions ou jeu de mots'.

Laplace interprets the myth symbolically, on the level of thematic words/meanings, and not structurally, which is the reason why she does not follow the allusions to the 'légendes Troyennes' in the order they appear but makes of them an un-contextualised semantic composition. Laplace's reading of the *Callirhoe* is on a secondary level, which means that it is to be understood by those who have finished the first, straightforward reading of the novel and can judge the mythological intertexts retrospectively. I here follow her analysis, although I start with a first-reading interpretation of the *Callirhoe*. Unlike Laplace, I am trying not to choose between a prevailing Homeric and/or a Euripidean intertext, but to apply different focalisations of the Helen myth, that of Callirhoe, of Chaereas, of Artaxerxes, and of Dionysius.

A closer reading is that of Hirschberger, who studies the epic and tragic intertexts. Hirschberger gives more credit than Laplace to the Homeric parallels, studying more closely the two texts and taking into account the many citations. He reads Chariton as an ambitious imitator, or rather an avatar, of Homer³⁶⁷. Hirschberger's study is intertextual and does not insist on pointing out systematically the structural parallels between the Homeric myth of Helen and the *Callirhoe*. Just like Laplace, when it comes to the proper discussion of myths, he presents a mythological biography of Hermogenes' daughter, in which figure all of Helen, Penelope, and Alcestis³⁶⁸. Another mythological biography of Callirhoe is given by Cueva, who traces the mythological hypotext of the novel in an obscure mythographical account by Paeon of Amathus³⁶⁹, discussed by Plutarch. The same idea with a hasty mention of the Homeric parallels is further elaborated in his more recent book³⁷⁰. Finally Marini presents Chariton as the first novelist to incorporate theatrical elements in his work, therefore adapting the *Helen*³⁷¹.

But the problem of the structural parallelism between the variations of the Helen myth and the *Callirhoe* remains, resulting in a confusion that is visible on the level of tentative characterisation: who is Callirhoe's legal husband? Is Chaereas Paris or Dionysius, who takes Chaereas' wife, or is Chaereas a Menelaus model, whose marital bliss is threaten by Mithridates

³⁶⁷ Hirschberger, (2001) p.157, on Chariton 7.1.8 and *Iliad*, 7.357-8 in respect to the forthcoming fame of his composition, inscribes *Callirhoe* in the epic tradition.

³⁶⁸ Hirschberger, (2001) p.167-168.

³⁶⁹ Jacoby, *FGrH*, 757 F2.

³⁷⁰ Cueva, (2004) p.18ff.

³⁷¹ Marini, (1993).

and Artaxerxes³⁷²? What is the role of the Great King³⁷³? Is Callirhoe a Euripidean faithful Helen or a Homeric one³⁷⁴?

In the following analysis I will try to differentiate between the reading of mythological intertexts at two different reading levels: I will distinguish between intertexts qualifying as myth^I, i.e. tales from mythology often introduced as a comparison and/or simile, and intertexts major for the plot, the Helen motifs, which belong to myth^{II} and can be interpreted only during a second reading of the novel.

1. Mythological models: myths^I and the Callirhoe

Chariton makes the most out of the intertextuality with the Helen myth in both its Homeric and its Euripidean versions. Callirhoe is on many occasions compared to Helen, especially with respect to her divine appearance. Callirhoe, like Helen, is the image of the goddess upon earth, the most beautiful woman that captivates both male and female gazes.

The instances in which Callirhoe is compared to a goddess or a mythological figure are in most cases introduced with a comparative or equivalent. On the first occasion her beauty is presented with the schema 'οὐδὲ...ἢ...ἀλλά³⁷⁵' and in the procession to the temple she appears ὥσπερ Ἀρτέμιδος ἐν ἐρημίᾳ κυνηγέταις ἐπιστάσης. Callirhoe on her deathbed is

³⁷² For Chaereas as Menelaus see Hirschberger, (2001) p.165 and Dionysius as Paris see Marini, (1993); for the capture of Tyre as an model for the capture of Troy, hence Chaereas as Menelaus, see Laplace, (1980) p.99.

³⁷³ Artaxerxes as Theoclymenus and Stateira as Theonoe Hirschberger, (2001) p.166; for Artaxerxes as an expansion of the amorous-trio motif by a third person see Fusillo, (1991 (1989)) p. 26.

³⁷⁴ Schmeling, (2005) in respect to Callirhoe abandoning her child, like the Homeric Helen.

³⁷⁵ 1.1.1, κάλλος θεῖον, οὐδὲ Νηρηίδος ἢ Νύμφης...ἀλλὰ αὐτῆς Ἀφροδίτης.

compared to Ariadne³⁷⁶ and when she has returned to life Dionysius' servants are stunned by her presence *οἷα θεὰ ἑωρακέναι*³⁷⁷. The same comparative formula is used to describe Chaereas' handsomeness³⁷⁸. Dionysius too when comparing her to Helen uses a superlative phrasing 'οὐδὲ...οὕτως³⁷⁹' to describe the difference between his 'would-be' reality and the 'would-be' reality of the myth. These comparisons are common mythological parallels that are used throughout the literary prose of later antiquity and on a first level they have the same function as that of myth¹ discussed above³⁸⁰: i.e. they provide the reader with a well known story upon which he can reconstruct the current, not well known, story. In other words the mythological models provide, at a first reading (the second will be analysed later), the context in which fiction becomes more accessible. For Dionysius then Callirhoe is indeed the most beautiful woman on earth.

These comparisons illustrate physical or moral analogies between the characters and their mythological models, here Helen, but they can also be used to describe scenes and situations. The most illuminating example is the comparison of Dionysius to Menelaus: Dionysius receives Callirhoe as a present from Aphrodite and he starts to imagine his life, *μακάριον ὑπὲρ*

³⁷⁶ 1.6.2, εἰκαζον αὐτὴν Ἀριάδνη; the verb in the active voice meaning compare, in the passive resemble.

³⁷⁷ 1.14.1.

³⁷⁸ 1.1.2, οἷον Ἀχιλλέα.

³⁷⁹ 2.6.1, οὐδὲ γὰρ τὴν Ἑλένην εὐμορφον οὕτως ὑπολαμβάνω.

³⁸⁰ cf. Dio, 3.31, Εὐρξῆς ὁ τῶν Περσῶν βασιλεὺς τὴν μὲν γῆν ἐποίησε θάλατταν...ὥσπερ οἶμαι τὸν Ποσειδῶνά ὀησιν Ὅμηρος; Lucian, *Hippias*, 1.15, (on wise generals) οἷον πάλοι μὲν Ἀγαμέμνονα καὶ Ἀχιλλέα, τῶν κάτω δὲ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ Πύρρον ἴσμεν; Lucian, *Philopseudes*, 5, ὅποσοι ἡ πολέμιους ἐξηπάτησαν ...οἷα πολλὰ καὶ ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐποίηι τὴν τε αὐτοῦ ψυχὴν ἀρνύμενος.

Μενελέων τὸν τῆς Λακεδαιμονίας γυναικός³⁸¹.

Dionysius here does not, on a first reading, refer to the pattern of the Helen myth, but to Menelaus' marital bliss, although the reader can interpret it differently: for him/her the comparison is of course ironic since he/she knows about Callirhoe's background and her prior marriage to Chaereas³⁸², which is enough evidence for a possible Helen pattern. Dionysius will continue to compare his situation with that of Menelaus when he is invited to Babylon; there, in the centre of Asia, he sees Paris³⁸³ everywhere. Later, Chariton-narrator will let us know that Callirhoe, as δῶρον τὸ κάλλιστον, οἶον οὐδὲ ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Πάρις³⁸⁴, was first given to Chaereas by Aphrodite. The phrase is a comparison again, but this time the analogy has been repeated so many times, and especially the word δῶρον³⁸⁵, that it is no longer a mythological analogy but a mythological pattern embedded in the novel's plot.

Another example is Thetis as mythical model for Callirhoe's wedding (-s): in her first wedding to Chaereas we learn that the marriage was perfect, like that of Thetis and Peleus, πλὴν καὶ ἐνταῦθα τις εὐρέθη βάσκανος δαίμων ὥσπερ φασὶν τὴν ἐκεῖ Ἑρῖν. Accordingly Callirhoe's second wedding is compared to the wedding of Aphrodite with the same phrasing,

³⁸¹ 2.6.1.

³⁸² 4.1.8, ὑπὲρ τὴν Λευκώλενον καὶ Καλλίσφυρον ἐφαίνετο τὰς Ὀμήρου.

³⁸³ 5.2.8, Μενέλαος ἐν τῇ σῶφρονι Σπάρτῃ τὴν Ἑλένην οὐκ ἐτήρησεν...πολλοὶ Πάριδες ἐν Πέρσῃς.

³⁸⁴ 8.1.3.

³⁸⁵ 6.1.10 (for Artaxerxes).

since on the same day the βάσκανος δαίμων was not absent³⁸⁶.

The passages above should not be interpreted to the letter. Indeed both Callirhoe's marriages are compared to mythological ones but the important point for the plot is not the Nereid or goddess with whom Callirhoe is compared³⁸⁷, but the repetition of the phrase 'βάσκανος δαίμων' that acts as a reminder for the reader. It is not the mythological model but the novel's first wedding that foretells the fate of the second wedding; in other words, it is not Eris, the cause of the Trojan War and/or Aphrodite's vanity, but the novel's treatment of the amorous jealousy that ruins the lives of characters and varies the typical plots of the Greek novels.

Therefore, the model is there to facilitate the first reading – in the case of Thetis' marriage the reader knows from the myth that a misfortune is coming – but it is the repetition within the novel's very plot that makes the model a pattern. This is the reason why other examples, like the Ariadne and/or the Thetis myth, although brought up more than once, cannot be fully developed into patterns³⁸⁸. The Helen myth leaves the realm of model and enters the sphere of pattern not because of its comparative introduction – οἷος, ὥσπερ, οἷα – but because the repetitive Helen motifs, which, as Laplace has observed, may also be clustered around connotative words, like ἀγών, ἄθλον, πόλεμος, εἰδωλον, κάλλος, δῶρον. But in this case the reader does not

³⁸⁶ 1.1.16; and 3.2.17.

³⁸⁷ 3.3.5-6, τίς θεῶν ἀντραστής μου γενόμενος Καλλιρόην ἀπενήνοχε... οὕτω καὶ Θησέως Ἀριάδνην ἀφείλετο Διόνυσος καὶ Ἀκταίωνος Σεμέλην ὁ Ζεὺς...Θέτις...Πηλεῖ παρέμεινε; 6.4.3, ἡ ἐκ θαλάττης ἀναβέβηκεν ἄλλη Θέτις.

³⁸⁸ For a discussion of the educational background of Chariton see Hock, (2005).

interpret the model linearly but is engaged in a dialogue with the respective intertexts, here the *Iliad*, the *Helen*, and the *Callirhoe*.

2. The Helen pattern

The first Helen-pattern of the *Callirhoe* is not necessarily based on the Helen myth, although its development may appear thematically dependent on the Euripidean version, as suggested by Laplace. Callirhoe the Beautiful, daughter of Hermocrates, is given in marriage to her chosen one with the aid of Aphrodite, whose priestess she is. This first motif of the pattern is followed by the jealousy of the unsuccessful rivals, who are now united against Chaereas: the narrator informs us that οἱ γὰρ μνηστῆρες ἀποτυχόντες τοῦ γάμου...ὠμονόησαν, because of their common Φθόνος³⁸⁹.

This last verb makes the reader consider the difference between Helen's wedding, which is alluded to in the simile of 1.1.16, and Callirhoe's: instead of solidarity between all the suitors, initiated by Odysseus, Callirhoe's wedding resembles the marriages which in the novelistic world are threaten by various rivals. The second motif of motion consists of the suitors 'conspiracy against Callirhoe's chastity: Callirhoe, as the tyrant of Acragas mentions, is not only above suspicion, εὐσταθής, but she is also incapable, ἄπειρος κακοήθους ὑποψίας³⁹⁰, hence cannot be corrupted, which is the reason why the first plot against her chastity, the κῶμος³⁹¹, fails. Therefore, much unlike Helen,

³⁸⁹ 2.1.1, ἐστρατολόγη αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον ὁ Φθόνος.

³⁹⁰ 1.2.6.

³⁹¹ 1.3.3.

Callirhoe is not prone to flirting or adultery, but her slave is, who is described as the τιμιωτάτην τῶν θεραπαινίδων of her maidens³⁹². A double of Callirhoe is then used for the role of the unfaithful woman in a plot which assimilates it more to tragedy than comedy. Regarding the double of Callirhoe as his 'unfaithful' wife, Chaereas storms into the house and kicks her dead. The plot against Callirhoe results in her burial and transportation to Miletus by Theron and his bandits, who find her recovering her senses in the tomb.

The pattern, unlike the one discussed in the implicit version-section, does not include detention of the protagonist by one of the suitors, because the text opts for a different choice: Callirhoe is handed over to Dionysius, who, not respecting the law of hospitality, wishes to keep her for himself. Callirhoe defends her chastity until she discovers her pregnancy by Chaereas upon which she consents to marry Dionysius. Meanwhile Chaereas, finding her tomb empty, decides to search for her, captures Theron from whom he learns the truth, and he sails to Miletus.

This pattern has nothing in common with the Helen myth so far; rather it appears to be much more a tragic version of a New Comedy, with certain comic elements avoided, as discussed in the section above. However, the main four motifs of the pattern are included: (a) marriage and chastity; (b) plot against the heroine and her transportation; (c) the heroine's defence of

³⁹² 1.4.1.

her chastity against her suitors, waiting for her husband's return; and (d) the husband's sailing to recover his wife. The first part of Callirhoe's drama does not have strong allusions to any Greek myth in particular, despite Laplace's claims, and one should congratulate the inventiveness of the narrator for making Chaereas and not the suitors responsible for the apparent death of his wife – this is the reason why I believe it is more plausible to search for Chaereas' mythological background in Achilles rather than anyone else, a choice which would serve the development of two mythical patterns, those of Helen and Iphigenia. Whichever mythological or historical source is the most plausible candidate for this variation³⁹³, the result is that Chaereas, unlike Menelaus, discovers the truth immediately after and has no reason to doubt his wife's subsequent chastity.

The plot of Chariton could have been closer to historiography than fiction if it weren't for Callirhoe's resuscitation³⁹⁴, which brings the story closer to the Helen myth. Myth in Chariton, like his mythological simile, is not only a matter of pattern but also of interpretations: thus the Helen myth as we will see is inscribed in Chaereas's and Callirhoe's readings of the plot and in Dionysius' separate reading, and it depends on the amount of information, and literary background each of them has.

³⁹³ Chaereas may allude to Chabrias, for which see Salmon, (1961); or Cassius Chaereas, the assassinating of Caligula, for which see Bowie, (2002); for Chaereas' resemblance to Polycrates, Nero, and Herodes Atticus see Hunter, (1994) p.1079-1080. The mythological 'characterisation' of Chaereas assimilates him to Achilles and Nireus (the most handsome hero of the Trojan war), Hippolytus (most chaste), and Alcibiades (for his fierce nature); Alexander the Great as a 'semi-historical' model for Chaereas is echoed in the capture of Tyre in 7.2.7. Cf. also Arrian, *Alexander's Anabasis*, 1.12.1 for the relationship of Alexander and Hephæstion as a model for Achilles and Patroclus; Alexander, like Chaereas, had a reputation for killing his lovers, e.g. Clitus in *Alexander's Anabasis*, 4.8.9 and 4.9.3.

³⁹⁴ Chariton's 'historical fiction' in Hunter, (1994) p.1084.

Chaereas' first reading: Callirhoe not in Egypt?

Callirhoe, in a prolepsis of Book 2, adds in her recapitulation and lamentation at the end of Book 1 the following comment:

καὶ σὺ μὲν πενθεῖς καὶ μετανοεῖς καὶ τάφῳ κενῷ παρακάθῃσαι, μετὰ θάνατόν μοι τὴν σωφροσύνην μαρτυρῶν³⁹⁵.

Callirhoe sketches here the flow of the story: eventually the truth will emerge and Chaereas will exculpate her, only too late; then he will visit her tomb in remorse, to find it empty. In front of the empty tomb, Chaereas delivers a lament:

ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἀνατείνας 'τίς ἄρα θεῶν ἀντεραστής μου γενόμενος Καλλιρόην ἀπενήνοχε καὶ νῦν ἔχει μεθ' αὐτοῦ μὴ θέλουσαν, ἀλλὰ βιαζομένη ὑπὸ κρείττονος μοίρας;...ζητήσω σε διὰ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης, κἂν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναβῇ τὸν ἀέρα δύνωμαι³⁹⁶.

Chaereas' theatrical gestures, the lifting of his hands and his monologue, have the appropriate impact: the crowd, which has come urged by Φήμη to witness the ἄπιστον event³⁹⁷, laments the supposedly 'dead' Callirhoe, as if she had just died³⁹⁸. For Chaereas at this early stage, only a god could have kidnapped Callirhoe – the similes that we examined above introduce Ariadne and Semele; yet, whereas both Ariadne and Semele willingly gave themselves to Dionysus and Zeus respectively, the detail μὴ θέλουσαν, ἀλλὰ βιαζομένη in combination with Chaereas' vow to look for her upon earth and sea points to the Helen myth; the supplementary broadening of the quest to the air is

³⁹⁵ 1.14.10.

³⁹⁶ 3.3.7.

³⁹⁷ 3.3.2.

³⁹⁸ 3.3.7.

reminiscent of Helen's aerial transportation to Egypt by Hermes³⁹⁹. The reason is that Helen, alone among the other famous kidnapped beauties of antiquity, left behind a loving husband, whereas Ariadne was deserted by Theseus, Jason used Medea to achieve his goals, and Io and Europa, whom Cadmus tried to recover, were not married⁴⁰⁰.

Chaereas' speech cannot allude directly to the Helen myth because Hermocrates' son-in-law does not know what has happened in Dionysius' household. It is the reader who can interpret this comment retrospectively, as part of the Helen pattern, knowing that Dionysius cannot let this beauty go. In order to extend the suspense, Dionysius is not presented immediately as a rival, since he appears ready to marry the newly bought slave to a cowherd or a shepherd, following other possible novelistic motifs, in which the heroine is sold and thus kept moving by passing from hand to hand⁴⁰¹. But Aphrodite has reserved a better (p)lot for her protégée. The first part of Callirhoe's tale at Dionysius' house has strong connections to the *Helen*. Dionysius is presented as well educated and φιλόανθρωπος and his household as an ἀγαθὴ οἰκία⁴⁰². Dionysius' παιδεία⁴⁰³ hints at a better treatment of Callirhoe. Indeed the beautiful protagonist, when asked, recapitulates her adventures to her master, closing her speech with a supplication:

³⁹⁹ Cf. *Helen*, 44-45; Theron as Hermes in Laplace, (1980) p.90.

⁴⁰⁰ For Chaereas' expedition to save Callirhoe patterned on Menelaus' Trojan expedition in Alvares, (1997) p.619.

⁴⁰¹ 2.3.1; this is the case of Anthia inof Leucippe at Sosthenes' hands and probably t of Parthenope. The excuse for selling Callirhoe as a handmaiden from Sybaris is also analogous to Anthia's treatment by Manto: she is sold because of the jealousy of her mistress, 1.12.9.

⁴⁰² 2.2.1, Plangon to Callirhoe.

⁴⁰³ 2.4.1, πεπαιδευμένος ἀνὴρ καὶ ἐξαιρέτως ἀρετῆς ἀντιποιοῦμενος.

τὸν Ἀλκίνοον ἀγάμεθα δὴ καὶ πάντες φιλοῦμεν ὅτι εἰς τὴν πατρίδα ἀνέπεμψε
τὸν ἰκέτην· ἰκετεύω σὲ κἀγώ⁴⁰⁴.

Callirhoe is requesting hospitality, as implied by the comparison with Alcinous; moreover, in contrast with the Homeric intertext, Dionysius does not behave according to the laws of hospitality, despite promising her his help. Hence the delay in dealing with Callirhoe's return changes Dionysius from a potential wise Proteus⁴⁰⁵ to a Paris⁴⁰⁶. The major difference is that, at least in the beginning, Dionysius is unaware of Chaereas' existence and even when he learns about him he is not ready to cede his, by then, wife; yet he knows from the beginning the other dangers of keeping Callirhoe, especially with the expected arrival of Hermocrates' fleet⁴⁰⁷.

Dionysius is represented in a liminal position between a potential Theoclymenus and a Paris, who ends up being a Menelaus⁴⁰⁸. Being Greek, he is not willing to force Callirhoe into marrying him nor is he willing to return her⁴⁰⁹. Tyche, however, decides upon a third option. Callirhoe's pregnancy compels her to give up her fidelity for the sake of her unborn child⁴¹⁰. And with this twist of the plot maternal φιλοστοργία wins over female chastity⁴¹¹. The traditional pattern is altered although the function of the motif, retardation, remains the same: further, more than in the traditional scheme

⁴⁰⁴ 2.5.11-12.

⁴⁰⁵ *Helen*, 46-47, Ζεὺς –τόνδ' εἰς οἶκον Πρωτέως ἰδρύσατο,/ πάντων προκρίνας σωφρονέστατον βροτῶν.

⁴⁰⁶ 2.4.5, ἐφιλονίκηκε δὲ ὁ Ἑρως βουλευομένων καλῶς καὶ ὕβριν ἐδόκει τὴν σωφροσύνην τὴν ἐκείνου.

⁴⁰⁷ 3.2.7.

⁴⁰⁸ For Dionysius as Theoclymenus see Laplace, (1980) p.94.

⁴⁰⁹ 2.6.4, ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ σωφροσύνῃ περιβόητος.

⁴¹⁰ 2.10.8, περὶ μεγίστων ἢ αἰφροσύνῃς ἢ τέκνου. Contrary to *Helen*, as in Sappho, Fr.16, οὐδὲ παῖδος οὐδὲ φίλων τοκῆων πάμπαν ἐμνάσθη.

⁴¹¹ 2.9.1, εὐρεῖται πειθοῦς ἐνέχυρον. νικήσει σωφροσύνην γυναικὸς μητρὸς φιλοστοργία.

Callirhoe's wedding to Dionysius makes the permanence of the situation even more durable. Unlike the other chaste female heroines, who expect a reunion with their partner or an 'apparent death' that will allow them to move forward in the plot, Callirhoe's marriage to Dionysius diminishes her hopes of meeting Chaereas again⁴¹², the child would appear to be Dionysius' and she will have to wait until her son grows up so that his looks confirm his descent from Chaereas⁴¹³.

Chaereas' first reading of the *Callirhoe* plot is misleading since he lacks information and instead of finding his wife in slavery⁴¹⁴, as a traditional novelistic plot could have had us expect, he finds her married and seemingly happy, beyond every novelistic expectation. This is the first, meta-novelistic reading of the *Callirhoe*.

Dionysius' reading: Callirhoe in Troy

Dionysius receives Callirhoe as a present from Aphrodite and he is willing to make her his legal wife, dreaming that at her side he will lead a life happier than Menelaus did⁴¹⁵. This ironical dream is realised sooner than he hopes in all its details, so that one could argue that the simile classified as myth¹ above may function on two levels: within the narrative, as pure comparison, and (mis-)understood only by Dionysius or as a hint to the reader that pre-sketches what the plot has in store.

⁴¹² Indeed it is only Plangon who tries to persuade her to do the opposite. Cf. 2.10.6-7 (Plangon), οὐδὲν ὑπώπτενε Καλλιρόη...πανουργίας ἀπειρος δουλικῆς.

⁴¹³ 2.11.2.

⁴¹⁴ 3.5.9, εἰ μὴ δύναμαι τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν ἐμὴν ἀπολαβεῖν θέλω κἀν δουλεύειν μετ' αὐτῆς.

⁴¹⁵ 2.6.1.

Callirhoe's second wedding is described in more detail than her first and it is compared to Aphrodite's wedding⁴¹⁶. She gives herself freely to him in marriage⁴¹⁷, according to Dionysius' official version, and in the popular opinion she remains a simulacrum of the goddess⁴¹⁸. The marriage of Callirhoe to Dionysius appears to be one of perfect bliss, especially after she gives birth to 'his' son. A second Helen pattern starts without completing the part (d) of the previous motif.

Chaereas, arriving on the shore, not only finds his wife married but, soon after his capture, also learns from Mithridates that she is the mother of Dionysius' child. The interpretation thus given of her is full of Homeric undertones that point directly to Helen, the *πασῶν ἀσεβεστάτη* among women:

ἄπιστε Καλλιρόη καὶ πασῶν ἀσεβεστάτη γυναικῶν...σὺ δὲ ἐτρύφας καὶ γάμους ἔθυες ἐμοῦ δεδεμένου. οὐκ ἤρκεσεν ὅτι γυνὴ γέγονας ἄλλου Χαϊρέου ζῶντος, γέγονας δὲ καὶ μήτηρ⁴¹⁹.

And here is when the first and the second patterns of Callirhoe's abduction intermingle. Callirhoe, as a wife and mother, has a more than legal place at Dionysius' side. Chaereas then has no reason to continue his quest and motif (d) of the first pattern is threatened since he wishes to be crucified. But Mithridates' cunning persuasion keeps him alive. The satrap is not a traditional part of motif (d) but he is also a rival: hence although he promises

⁴¹⁶ 3.2.16.

⁴¹⁷ 3.2.9, ἐγὼ γυναῖκα ἐλευθέραν...φανερῶς κατὰ νόμους ἔγημα.

⁴¹⁸ 3.2.15.

⁴¹⁹ 4.3.10.

to bring Callirhoe to Chaereas, his actions result in making the distance between the two greater. With Mithridates' plot a new pattern appears which is structured as follows:

(a) Callirhoe marries Dionysius and seems to live happily ever after. On the fake news of Chaereas' death Callirhoe leads a public funeral for her reported dead husband, which is attended by Mithridates and Pharnakes. These two satraps are the new suitors of the Sicilian Beauty:

παρῆσαν δὲ καὶ δύο σατράπαι...Μιθριδάτης καὶ Φαρνάκης...πρόφασιν...τιμῆσαι Διονύσιον, ἥ δὲ ἀλήθεια Καλλιρόην ἰδεῖν⁴²⁰.

(b) On getting hold of Chaereas' letter to Callirhoe, Dionysius does not interpret it in the straightforward way (i.e. that Chaereas is indeed alive), but questions its authorship. As a well-educated man, he sees in Mithridates a rival. In the court that takes place to decide on Callirhoe's chastity Dionysius accuses Mithridates of having acted διὰ τὸ τῆς ξενίας δίκαιον...οὔτε ὡς φίλος οὔτε ὡς ἀνὴρ σῶφρον⁴²¹. Mithridates is then cast from Dionysius' point of view as the seducer, the rival, or in his Homeric reading of his and Callirhoe's tale, as a Paris, who has disgraced his friend's hospitality. The invitation to Babylon makes Dionysius, who is well versed in mythology, question the outcome of such a public exposure:

⁴²⁰ 4.1.5., 4.3.12, Μιθριδάτης...ἑφεδρος μένων μεταξύ Χαιρέου τε καὶ Διονυσίου αὐτὸς ἀκονεῖ τὸ ἄθλον ἀποισεται.

⁴²¹ 5.6.6.

τολμηρὲ καὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἀπροόρατε, εἰς Βαβυλῶνα Καλλιρόην ἄγεις, ὅπου Μιθριδάται τοσοῦτοι; Μενέλαος ἐν τῇ σώφρονι Σπάρτῃ τὴν Ἑλένην οὐκ ἐτήρησεν, ἀλλὰ παρευδοκίμησε καὶ βασιλέα βάρβαρος ποιμήν. πολλοὶ Πάριδες ἐν Πέρσαις⁴²².

It is not the similes which Dionysius inserts in each of his speeches, but a narratorial comment that offers a more solid ground for basing the interpretation of the Callirhoe plot within the limits of the Helen myth. Before Dionysius' claims the narrator presents the gnomic φύσει δέ ἐστι τὸ βάρβαρον γυναιμανές⁴²³, recalling the famous characterisation of Paris from the *Iliad*: Δύσπαρι εἶδος ἄριστε γυναιμανές ἠπεροπεντά⁴²⁴. Hence, Callirhoe's second adultery insult is based on the notions of hospitality and of womanising, appealing to the readers' knowledge of the Homeric text⁴²⁵.

Mithridates' conspiracy does not result in a new kidnapping of Callirhoe, but it initiates her long trip to Babylon. Callirhoe regards this expedition as more distressing than the previous one; ὥς δ' ἦκεν ἐπὶ ποταμὸν Εὐφράτην...τότε ἤδη πόθος αὐτὴν ὑπεδύετο πατρίδος τε καὶ συγγενῶν⁴²⁶. Callirhoe's homesickness at the beginning of the new action motif recalls Helen on the towers of Troy, who is invited by Aphrodite in disguise to watch the duel between Paris and Menelaus⁴²⁷.

The meticulous reader gets more hints regarding the further

⁴²² 5.2.8.

⁴²³ 5.2.6.

⁴²⁴ *Iliad*, 3.39, and 13.719, Hector to Paris.

⁴²⁵ Especially since the word γυναιμανές in the post-Homeric tradition appears only once again in Quintus 1.726; hence it is a rare gloss.

⁴²⁶ 5.1.3.

⁴²⁷ *Iliad*, 3.139-140, ὥς εἰπούσα θεὰ γλυκὺν ἡμερον ἔμβαλε θυμῷ/ἀνδρός τε προτέρου καὶ ἄστεος ἠδὲ τοκῆων.

development of the plot. The full intertext, that underlines a first level of reading, comes a bit later when Callirhoe's entrance into the court is followed by a couplet from the *Odyssey*:

εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον, οἷαν ὁ θεῖος ποιητὴς τὴν Ἑλένην ἐπιστῆναί φησι τοῖς ἄμφι Πρίαμον καὶ Πάνθοον ἠδὲ Θυμοίτην...πάντες δ' ἡρήσαντο παρὰ λεχέεσι κλιθῆναι⁴²⁸.

The chapters at Babylon, however, present the reader with another version of retardation, whereas the Homeric intertext alludes to an action motif⁴²⁹: the duel. Artaxerxes, smitten by the beauty of the heroine, postpones the decision without being able to choose between being Callirhoe's ἐραστής or her δικαστής⁴³⁰. This time it is Dionysius' Homeric reading that classifies Artaxerxes as Paris⁴³¹, against whom he has to fight for the prize Callirhoe⁴³². But Dionysius' readings of the *Callirhoe* are misleading too, like Chaereas' previous one. Blinded into believing that he is Callirhoe's rightful husband he refuses to make place for another reading: the one proposed by Mithridates, who asks him to reconsider his accusations and make a recantation, a παλινωδία⁴³³. The recantation of Mithridates alludes to the Stesichorean recantation and suggests a second level of reading, a more suggestive one: like in the Euripidean play, Menelaus, who is thought to be dead at the beginning of the play, is proved to be alive. Equally, the court session

⁴²⁸ 5.5.8-9; cf. *Iliad* 3.146 (Helen on the wall), *Odyssey*, 18.231 (Penelope and the suitors).

⁴²⁹ Laplace, (1980) p.96, has argued that the legendary duel between Menelaus and Paris is transposed at the court of Babylon. However, the court only postpones the action until the Egyptian revolt. The motif of action, the war for the Beloved, is still to come.

⁴³⁰ 6.1.10.

⁴³¹ 6.2.7, ἐνδον ἔχων ἀλλοτρίαν γυναῖκα.

⁴³² 6.2.1, ἦν δὲ τὸ ἄθλον...κάλλος τὸ πρῶτον.

⁴³³ 5.7.7.

between Mithridates and Dionysius resuscitates Chaereas from his Milesian tomb and brings forth another possible pattern: that of the chaste Callirhoe in Egypt, as in the *παλινωδία*.

Artaxerxes' reading: Callirhoe in Egypt

This second plot of suitors against Callirhoe does not result in a war but it introduces a new pattern with Artaxerxes figuring as the potential rival. The third plot against Callirhoe's chastity is manipulated by Artaxates, the Great King's eunuch, who encourages him to court Callirhoe. This pattern is analysed into the following motifs:

(a) Callirhoe is legally wedded to two husbands (one should marvel here at Chariton's inventiveness). But the King wants her for himself.

(b) The King tries to persuade Callirhoe of his love insisting that Artaxertes should use everything but eschew two ways of persuasion: μήτε ἄκουσαν μήτε φανερωῶς⁴³⁴. The king does carries away Callirhoe twice: first he invites her into the forest for hunting – a passage suspiciously echoing the *Hippolytus* in its treatment of hunting as a remedy for love; but the passage also alludes to the loves of Aeneas and Dido in *Aeneid* IV, and to the *Helen*, regarding the hunting practices of the king⁴³⁵ – and secondly, when the war is declared against him, he keeps her with his wife, who follows him on his campaign.

(c) The advances of the King however are not successful and Callirhoe

⁴³⁴ 6.4.10.

⁴³⁵ *Helen*, 314.

tactfully avoids direct confrontation, arguing that the king is showing her not his love, but his pity, ἐλεεῖ⁴³⁶.

Callirhoe, whose eloquence Dionysius has already praised⁴³⁷, behaves here much like the Euripidean Helen, defending herself without offending her barbarian interlocutor. Artaxates cannot believe that she is refusing the love of the Great King since οὐκ ἤδει δὲ φρόνημα Ἑλληνικὸν εὐγενὲς καὶ μάλιστα τὸ Καλλιρόης τῆς σώφρονος καὶ φιλάνδρου⁴³⁸. Once Artaxates leaves she throws herself into a tragic lamentation, which recalls that of the *Helen*⁴³⁹:

ὦ κάλλος ἐπίβουλον, σύ μοι πάντων κακῶν αἴτιον... ἄγε δὴ, Καλλιρόη...ἀπόσφαξον σεαυτήν...ἂν δὲ βιαιότερόν τι γένηται, τότε ἔσται σοι καιρὸς ἐπιδειῖναι Χαιρέα παρόντι τὴν πίστιν⁴⁴⁰.

The passage shows an interesting twist in the pattern. Contrary to Callirhoe's, and the reader's, expectations it is not the King's wrath (cf. Garmus or Paapis), which she should fear but the Queen's, introducing therefore a possible Phaedra pattern. In other words, the point reminds Callirhoe and the audience that we are not altogether in the world of classical mythology. These words describe Callirhoe as the most faithful, promising to offer her death to Chaereas as evidence of her innocence. Therefore the Helen plot has reverted to its starting point, with Callirhoe ready to die rather than

⁴³⁶ 6.5.10.

⁴³⁷ 2.6.1, πρόσσεστι δὲ αὐτῇ καὶ ἡ τῶν λόγων πειθώ.

⁴³⁸ 6.4.10.

⁴³⁹ *Helen*, 260-297, τέρας γὰρ ὁ βίος καὶ τὰ πράγματ' ἐστὶ μου, / τὰ μὲν δι' Ἥραν, τὰ δὲ τὸ κάλλος αἴτιον... δούλη καθέστηκ' οὐς' ἐλευθέρων ἄπο...θανεῖν κράτιστον.

⁴⁴⁰ 6.6.4-5.

marry Dionysius. Callirhoe's passionate reaction is closer to what is expected from the novel's heroines than the story of Helen and the mythological pattern seems unable to provide all the choices that the novel's plot does.

Another opportunity for a twist of the mythological pattern is offered by Chaereas' arrival in Miletus. In an interesting mélange of the plots of the *Helen* and of the *IT*, Chaereas, like Menelaus and Orestes, ends up shipwrecked, like Menelaus and Orestes, on the shore where Callirhoe/Helen/Iphigenia lives. Entering a temple, they are told by the priestess – who is not Callirhoe, unlike in the myth – that the image of Callirhoe is that of Dionysius' wife. Like Menelaus in his first encounter with Helen on the Egyptian shore, Chaereas cannot believe his eyes: he is surprised to learn that what he believed the current situation of Callirhoe was, i.e. Dionysius' slave, is diametrically opposite to the truth, i.e. that she is the mistress. In the *Helen*, the situation is different: whereas Menelaus thinks that he has Helen, when he meets the real Helen, his queen, he discovers that she is a prisoner of Theoclymenus and a slave in the foreign land⁴⁴¹. Both Chaereas and Menelaus are tricked by appearances, Helen-Nephele or Callirhoe's golden image, and fail to see the real woman, or the real plot.

Chaereas needs someone to explain to him what he has read as a perfect Helen pattern, i.e. the infidelity of his wife. It is from Mithridates that Chaereas learns of the ploy Dionysius has used on Callirhoe – convincing her

⁴⁴¹ Cf. *Helen*, 260-297.

that he is dead – and it is only then that he believes in her innocence⁴⁴². But Chaereas is still wrong since he does not know that, just like the Euripidean Helen⁴⁴³, Callirhoe would have preferred death, whether Chaereas was alive or not, if it were not for the child. Callirhoe's decision to commit suicide if the King forces her is the evidence that she is indeed 'most faithful and chaste' and echoes vividly its tragic model.

The first mutual recognition of the couple takes place at the Babylonian court but they are not allowed to talk or touch each other. Not believing her eyes and being convinced that Chaereas is dead, as Dionysius reported, she wonders whether she is seeing a ghost of Chaereas, an εἰδωλον⁴⁴⁴. Her surprise is equivalent to that of Helen, who, having learned from Teucer of Menelaus' death, cannot believe that the news was false once she meets him in person⁴⁴⁵. However this short recognition does not promote the action. It is the second recognition that is important for the pattern.

(d) Artaxerxes' desire results in bringing Callirhoe along with his family to the battlefield. The war in Chariton is not over Callirhoe – and in this respect it appears that the narrative is criticising Homer by protecting the heroine from more accusations. However, Chaereas' participation in it is a result of his love for his lost – as he believes – Callirhoe⁴⁴⁶. Chaereas fights against Artaxerxes and Dionysius but he is not fighting a war for a woman;

⁴⁴² 5.2.5, σὺ μὲν οὖν οὐδὲν ἀδικεῖς. οὐ γὰρ οἶδας ὅτι Χαιρέας ζῇ.

⁴⁴³ *Helen*, 290ff.

⁴⁴⁴ 5.9.5.

⁴⁴⁵ *Helen*, 126, ὡς κεῖνος ἀφανῆς σὺν δάμαρτι κληῖζεται, 132, θανῶν δὲ κληῖζεται καθ' Ἑλλάδα.

⁴⁴⁶ 7.4.2, δύο τὰ προτρεπτικώτατα εἰς ἀνδρείαν ἔχοντες, θανάτου καὶ ἀμύνης ἔρωτος.

yet his fight is to prove him to be the most brave and handsome among his men, recalling in a subtle way an element essential for the plot, the initial resemblance to Achilles⁴⁴⁷. The Tyrian War, just like the Trojan War, presents the capture of a city, without capturing the woman, and is also an opportunity for Chaereas to display his heroism, thus evoking the Homeric ἀριστεία⁴⁴⁸.

This last pattern of the 'Beauty' and her suitors ends in Arados, where Chaereas captures the Queen and her followers along with the King's treasure. The threat of another pattern, one in which Callirhoe is captured by an Egyptian general, is introduced⁴⁴⁹, but it is consciously left unfinished. Chaereas, unlike the previous suitors of Callirhoe, does not plan to force her, promising to let her choose 'the man she prefers'⁴⁵⁰, whereupon he recognizes her as his wife. The recognition is followed by Polycharmus' warning that they should not rejoice before they can escape from this foreign land. This warning corresponds to both the plots of the *Iphigenia* and of the *Helen*, where the escape from the barbarian land shapes the second part. This is not accentuated in Chariton, because of Callirhoe's trick: in exchange for herself, Callirhoe advises Chaereas to return Stateira and Rhodogoune⁴⁵¹ to Artaxerxes and Megabyzus respectively and warns him that, should he not do

⁴⁴⁷ 7.5.11.

⁴⁴⁸ Laplace, (1980) p.99.

⁴⁴⁹ 7.5.4, Callirhoe compares Babylon to Arados, 7.6.8, θάνατον εὐχομαι.

⁴⁵⁰ 8.1.8.

⁴⁵¹ Cf. Alexander's respect for the captive Sisygambis, in Arrian, *Alexander's Anabasis*, 2.12.6.

this, he would cause a bigger war to fall upon him⁴⁵².

What is this war that Callirhoe mentions? Is it the one that the Great King would lead, with the pretext of recovering his wife and treasure, but in reality with the intention to re-seize Callirhoe: in this scenario, Artaxerxes would have been in the role of Stateira's legal husband and Chaereas in that of Paris. The text following Stateira's recovery hints at this possible development⁴⁵³. When Artaxerxes receives the Queen as a δῶρον from Callirhoe, when the better present would have been Callirhoe, as we have seen on other occasions, he is deeply disappointed, ἐλυπεῖτο, and envious of Chaereas, just as the Sicilian suitors and Mithridates have been⁴⁵⁴. In an ironic twist, Callirhoe the chaste is not only the cause of the Tyrian war, but she is also the peacemaker, who protects Greece from another Trojan and Persian war⁴⁵⁵.

This is the reading that Callirhoe, Artaxerxes and Chaereas know, although we cannot be sure about the amount of information Stateira gave to her husband or Callirhoe gave to Chaereas; rather one could argue that the two women are the only ones who know the real story, whereas their husbands have to rely on their narratives. And Dionysius? Dionysius is left to believe in his own Homeric reading of Callirhoe. Remaining behind, he is left to believe, from Callirhoe's letter, that she has not willingly followed

⁴⁵² 8.2.5, μέγαν πόλεμον κινήσεις σεαυτῶ...πείσόμεθα τῶν πρώτων βαρύτερα.

⁴⁵³ The two reunion scenes, this of Callirhoe and Stateira with Chaereas and Artaxerxes respectively, are introduced with the same formula: 8.17.1, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἄλις ἦν δακρῶν καὶ διηγημάτων...περιεπλάκησαν; 8.5.9, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἄλις ἦν τῶν διηγημάτων Στάτειρα εἶπε.

⁴⁵⁴ 8.5.8.

⁴⁵⁵ 8.3.7, Χαίρεας ὁ ἐμός...πέπνυται δὲ καὶ διήλλακται καὶ οὐκέτι ὑμῖν ἐστι πολέμιος.

Chaereas and that she still cares for him: Callirhoe writes that her soul remained only with him and their, as he is left to believe, son⁴⁵⁶. Dionysius' misreading goes so far as to interpret her words as an ἀπολογία, a speech in defence, that ὑπεδήλου ὡς ἄκουσα αὐτὸν καταλίποι⁴⁵⁷. This is again a hint at the Homeric Helen that Dionysius has been using to interpret the narrative all along⁴⁵⁸. Hence, Callirhoe's chastity and tale depends on each narrator's point of view.

Discussion

Our analysis of the Helen myth leads to some interesting observations. On the one hand it is possible to distinguish between the importance of the similes and the motifs and patterns for the structuring of the novel. Secondly it examines the structure of the *Callirhoe* in respect to the four motifs of the Helen myth discussed above. Table 2a shows the similarities of the patterns. It is difficult, if not impossible, to classify Chariton's treatment of the Helen myth only under the 'epic' or 'drama' intertextuality. More than any other of the novelists he is making use of both, depending on the focalisation.

The first pattern – the novelistic one – has the form (a), (b), (c), (*d-alluded*).

The second pattern – the Homeric one – has the form (a), (b) ...(*d-alluded*) and starts at the end of motif (c) of the previous sequence.

⁴⁵⁶ 8.4.5.

⁴⁵⁷ 8.5.14.

⁴⁵⁸ About Callirhoe's child and Helen's see Schmeling, (2005).

The third pattern – the Euripidean/ Stesichorean – is complete: (a), (b), (c) and (d) and starting at the motif (b) of the previous pattern. The accumulation of motifs results, as in a musical canon, in an acceleration of the action that is completed with the full elaboration and conclusion of motif (d) of the third plot. The attempt to insert another variation on the motif – Rhodogune and Stateira as Chaereas' captives – and Callirhoe's letter to Dionysos are reminiscent of the previous themes/patterns. Just as in a musical piece the repetition of the motif builds up the expectation of the readers, thus making the ending more *καθάρσιον*, just as the narrator of the *Callirhoe* implies⁴⁵⁹. It is precisely the threat of not attaining an ending, of having an infinite narrative⁴⁶⁰, that makes the ending more desirable.

And a final observation: despite the dependence of the Callirhoe plot on the epic and the Euripidean drama, the narrative presents us with a novelistic pattern proper (i.e. not influenced by the above mentioned genres): the conspiracy of the suitors against Chaereas in Book 1. Moreover the treatment of the Homeric version of the myth brings up an interesting observation: Aphrodite in the end does not bring together Chaereas-Menelaus with Callirhoe-Helen, but a *ζευγος καλλίστων*⁴⁶¹: Callirhoe-Helen and Chaereas-Achilles. This last is an implied critique of Homer, which as we have seen above was fully developed later by Philostratus. Thus with the omission of the dubious moral strength of Menelaus, the idealisation of the myth becomes

⁴⁵⁹ 8.1.4.

⁴⁶⁰ Whitmarsh, (2009), discusses closure in the Greek novels.

⁴⁶¹ 8.1.3.

proportional to the idealisation of the novel.

Chariton's reinterpretation of the Helen myth is seminal not just for the way AT and especially Heliodorus make later use of the citations/intertexts/myth^I but also for the crystallization of the pattern, myth^{II}. But before moving to the adventures of Leucippe and Charicleia, I will present an important rupture in the reception of the Helen myth, Longus' version.

Longus

How far can one travel in/from Lesbos? Not too far from Troy. This is the concept that surrounds Longus' treatment of the Helen myth - the patterns are in Table 3. *Daphnis and Chloe* might at first sight have nothing to do with Helen and the various suitors' motifs could have been included in the general, implicit version, pattern of the 'Beauty'. Nevertheless, Longus is already working within a well-defined generic context and the irregularities of his plot can be interpreted not as exceptions that confirm the rule, but as variations of the canonical Helen pattern. I will here argue that Longus's novel adapts the Helen pattern in the miniature world of Lesbos and reproduces it as a pastoral echo. The elements that enable this 'Helen' reading are the relevant motifs, and especially their articulation, which alludes to both the mythological pattern and the equivalent novelistic treatments of it.

Three patterns and an allusion

Dorcon

The first two books seem to play with the pattern of the Beauty without explicitly introducing the Helen myth. Hence the first triangle of Chloe, Daphnis, and Dorcon is as follows:

(a) Chloe might be in love with Daphnis and vice versa; the reader can decipher their emotions, but the characters cannot. So the reading of the 'Beauty' pattern relies only upon the reader.

(b) Dorcon challenges Daphnis in a beauty contest – using the very evoking phrasing ὑπὲρ κάλλους ἔρις – whose ἄθλον⁴⁶² is a kiss from Chloe. Unlike Dorcon, Daphnis cannot appreciate the prize, until after he has received Chloe's kiss. The contest is an opportunity for Daphnis since he too ἔδει γνῶναι τὰ ἔρωτος ἔργα⁴⁶³. The phrasing which describes the contest – κάλλος, ἔρις – is indicative of the Helen myth but here we are presented with a funnier twist of the motif: on the one hand, the traditional beauty contest involved female beauties (Athena, Hera, Aphrodite, and Helen as a prize) and not two young boys, and on the other hand, the βουκόλος of the Longan competition, who should have been in Paris' stead, fails to win over the goatherd Daphnis. Daphnis is further equipped for this role, because, like Paris, he has been exposed by his parents and he herds their animals;

⁴⁶² 1.16.1.

⁴⁶³ 1.15.4.

moreover, Daphnis, like all the exposed Destiny-infants – Zeus, Paris – was fed by an animal, a goat and a bear respectively. Dorcon is eager to use this as an evidence of Daphnis' social inferiority⁴⁶⁴, whereas mythology is full of foundlings with exceptional lives.

(b) Dorcon asks officially for Chloe's hand from her father, giving him presents, but Dryas refuses, believing that, his daughter, according to her tokens, deserves a better husband⁴⁶⁵. Then Dorcon reacts like Callirhoe's suitors and tries to force Chloe. Dorcon's device, the wolf's skin, is not one from the mundane world, but a naïve, pastoral one. The narrator remarks that the jealous cowherd ἐπιτεχνᾶται τέχνην ποιμένι πρόεπουσαν⁴⁶⁶.

Dorcon's plot fails accidentally: Chloe is saved by the dogs that attack the fake 'wolf' as if he were a real one. When Daphnis and Chloe recognise who is under the animal skin they are not able to understand his motivation, since, ὑπὸ τε ἀπειρίας ἐρωτικῶν τολμημάτων, they interpret the attack as a ποιμενικὴν παιδίαν⁴⁶⁷.

(c?) Dorcon's narrative life is spared because because he is a central actor in the next plot: a few paragraphs later we learn that Pyrrhian bandits attack the seashore where Daphnis and Chloe herd. With suspicious realistic care the narrator informs us that Daphnis was on the shore alone – hence ends up

⁴⁶⁴ 1.16.1.

⁴⁶⁵ 1.19.3.

⁴⁶⁶ 1.20.1.

⁴⁶⁷ 1.21.5.

captured – because Chloe βραδύτερον ὥς κόρη τὰ πρόβατα ἐξῆγγε⁴⁶⁸. The comment may be interpreted as an allusion to the typical mythological motif, in which the girl walking by the seaside is captured by pirates or others⁴⁶⁹. However, it is Daphnis that is captured and this gives the opportunity for a more intimate focus for the triangle Daphnis, Chloe, Dorcon. In order to save Daphnis, Chloe kisses Dorcon –who gives her in exchange his ‘extraordinary’ syrinx that frees Daphnis. The young goatherd is happy to be saved from both fates, being ληστήριον καὶ ναυάγιον, and these two words imply the possible narrative choices, which are not adopted by Longus here. In the rehearsal of the incident, Chloe does not confess the kiss, just as Callirhoe does not mention her letter to Dionysius to Chaereas. Chloe’s secret kiss is the pastoral variation of the traditional triangle pattern and the only sign of betrayal. Yet, even this small detail is a massive subversion of the typical pattern, since, with the exception of Callirhoe, no other heroine allows herself such infidelity.

The Methymnians

Book 2 presents a more elaborate exposition of the ‘Beauty’ pattern, this time with Chloe in the central role.

(a) Daphnis is in love with Chloe: by now, they have been taught by Philetas the name of Eros and they have further ‘practised’ kissing and

⁴⁶⁸ 1.28.2.

⁴⁶⁹ Cf. Callirhoe, Calligone, (and the myths of Europa and Persephone).

hugging, during their *νυχτερινὸν παιδευτήριον*⁴⁷⁰. Their bond is more mature and this makes them more able to understand the consequences of assaults, like the Methymnian attack.

(b) The Methymnian youths sail to the nearby shore. Daphnis' goats eat the rope by which their ship is attached and, in retaliation, they capture – against all expectations – Daphnis. This time the locals save the boy but the whole incident results in a war between the two main cities of Lesbos. The passage is inspired by Thucydides and according to Morgan it recalls a 'recurrent feature of romance'⁴⁷¹. Indeed, wars are a part of the pattern of the 'Beauty' and mainly because of the 'Beauty', although in more 'ideal' fiction, the woman is not held responsible for them; even the Egyptian rebellion is not because of Callirhoe but still provides the 'means' to recover Callirhoe. The attack threatens to displace Chloe by removing her, in Daphnis' words, as far as the city⁴⁷². However, despite the small geographical scale, the action motif is there. Daphnis hides himself in a cowardly way- like Habrocomes or Cleitophon? or Paris?- and relies upon the Nymphs. The narrative summons Pan to save Chloe, who is restored to Daphnis untouched⁴⁷³. The incident ends when the Mytilenians and the Mythemnians learn the real cause of the *ἀρπαγή*⁴⁷⁴, therefore they opt for peace, *τὴν εἰρήνην εὕρισκον*

⁴⁷⁰ 2.9.1

⁴⁷¹ Morgan, (2004) p.186.

⁴⁷² 2.22.2, *Χλόη δὲ λοιπὸν πόλιν οἰκήσει.*

⁴⁷³ 2.27.2.

⁴⁷⁴ 3.2.3.

κερδαλεωτέραν⁴⁷⁵.

The quotations may recall the Helen myth, especially the mentions of the abduction and the war, but the mutual accord for peace is the new implementation; besides the pastoral world of Longus has nothing to do with epic, or epic-novelistic warfare, in which men can prove their courage. The link between the war and Chloe is further underlined in the description of the coming winter, which γίνεται δὲ χειμῶν Δάφνιδι καὶ Χλόῃ τοῦ πολέμου πικρότερος⁴⁷⁶. It is the winter that calls upon Daphnis' courage: having to walk through frost and snow Daphnis is smuggled into Dryas' house, where he sees Chloe and they exchange oaths of love⁴⁷⁷.

The third manifestation of the Helen pattern takes place after Daphnis' sexual induction by Lycaenion. Book 3 ends with Chloe's coming of age and the preparations for her engagement to one of the μνηστήρων πλῆθος⁴⁷⁸. Daphnis is among the suitors, but being a goatherd, does not stand a chance next to his wealthier rivals. Like the other poor herdsman, Paris, Daphnis succeeds in getting Chloe's hand, with divine help: the Nymphs provide them with δῶρα, which Dryas accepts⁴⁷⁹. The Nymphs not only give Daphnis a temporary monetary remedy but also foretell that in the near future he will be rich too⁴⁸⁰. Daphnis is officially betrothed to Chloe when the first allusion to the Helen myth appears: under an apple tree, Daphnis cuts the ripest apple

⁴⁷⁵ 3.2.5.

⁴⁷⁶ 3.3.1.

⁴⁷⁷ 3.11.3, we learn that Daphnis saw Chloe on other occasions too.

⁴⁷⁸ 3.25.1.

⁴⁷⁹ 3.27.1.

⁴⁸⁰ 3.27.5.

for Chloe:

τάχα δὲ καὶ ἐφυλάττετο τὸ καλὸν μῆλον ἐρωτικῶ ποιμένι... Δάφνις δὲ ἀναδραμῶν ἐξίκετο τρυγῆσαι καὶ κομίσαι δῶρον Χλόη καὶ λόγον τοιόνδε εἶπεν ὠργισμένη· ὦ παρθένε, τοῦτο τὸ μῆλον ἔφυσαν Ὕραι καλαὶ καὶ φυτὸν καλὸν ἔθρεψε πεπαίνοντος Ἥλιου, καὶ ἐτήρησε Τύχη... τοῦτο Ἀφροδίτη κάλλους ἔλαβεν ἄθλον· τοῦτο ἐγὼ σοὶ δίδωμι νικητήριον. ὁμοίους ἔχετε τοὺς μάρτυρας· ἐκεῖνος ἦν ποιμὴν, αἰπόλος ἐγώ'.... ἔλαβε γὰρ κρεῖττον καὶ χρυσοῦ μῆλου φίλημα⁴⁸¹.

Daphnis describes himself as an ἐρωτικὸς ποιμὴν, which is an allusion to Paris⁴⁸², while being also an allusion to Sappho. Daphnis, more experienced than his companion, recalls an event from the Epic Cycle, one that fits best the bucolic atmosphere of the story. Paris, as a shepherd, was a favourite theme of bucolic poetry, and Theocritus employed the story in one of his Daphnis' songs⁴⁸³. What Daphnis knows about the Helen myth may not be clear but the subversion of the pattern is indicative of the Longan narrative technique: pastoralising the epic and the tragic, while maintaining the narrative function of the individual motifs.

Lampis

The apple scene makes clear that Chloe is by now almost a woman⁴⁸⁴, and her beauty becomes a prize for her suitors.

(a) Daphnis is engaged to Chloe.

⁴⁸¹ 3.34.1-3.

⁴⁸² Lucian, *Judgement of the Goddesses*, 3, (Πάριν) νεανίας ἐστὶ καλὸς καὶ τὰλλα ἐρωτικὸς. Sappho, *F105a*. Morgan, (2004) p.223, argues that Paris' name is not mentioned in order to avoid 'negative connotations'. I personally see it as a passage inviting a two-layered reading, the Sapphic and the Helen one. The Theocritean intertexts, below, argues for a merge of the two.

⁴⁸³ Cf. Theocritus, *Idyll 27, Oaristes*, (Girl) τὰν πινυτὰν Ἑλέναν Πάρις ἤρπασε βουκόλος ἄλλος. (Daphnis) μᾶλλον ἐκοῖσ' Ἑλένα τὸν βουκόλον ἔσχε φιλεῦσα.

⁴⁸⁴ On apples and their sexual connotations, cf. Theocritus, *Oaristes*, 49-65, τί ῥέζεις, σατυρίζεις; τί δ' ἐνδοθεν ἄψαιο μαζῶν; μᾶλα τεὰ πρᾶτιστα τάδε χνοάοντα διδάξω ... παρθένος ἐνθα βέβηκα, γυνὴ δ' εἰς οἶκον ἀφέρπω.

(b) Lampis, one of the disappointed suitors, decides to take revenge by destroying Daphnis' garden⁴⁸⁵. Lampis' assault brings the master's son, Astylus, and Gnathon to the fields, which results in a double seduction motif: Lampis targets Chloe, Gnathon targets Daphnis. Daphnis resists Gnathon's assaults and has the tokens revealed. The celebrations for Daphnis' recovery, facilitate Lampis' plans to abduct Chloe *ὥς οὔτε Δάφνιδος ἔτι γαμήσοντος καὶ Δρύαντος ἐκεῖνον ἀγαπήσοντος*⁴⁸⁶.

(d) Once more Daphnis fails to protect his beloved and he needs the help of Gnathon⁴⁸⁷, who attacks Lampis's household and gets hold of Chloe; Gnathon's 'expedition' is described as a 'war' since he was planning to capture Lampis *ὥς αἰχμάλωτον ἐκ πολέμου τινός*⁴⁸⁸.

The incident is similar to Anthia's recovery by the homosexual Hippothous for the sake of his friend. This subversion may be an echo of the anti-heroism portrayed by Xenophon's and AT's novels, but it also has an intratextual explanation. As seen above, Gnathon is well educated in the 'sympotic mythology', and therefore able to act according to the requirements of the mythological patterns. Gnathon can take the initiative because he knows what is expected from him. With Chloe restored to Daphnis only the question regarding her chastity remains – the motif (c) of the pattern; but

⁴⁸⁵ For the association between the garden and the sexual transformation of Chloe see Zeitlin, (1993).

⁴⁸⁶ 4.28.1-2.

⁴⁸⁷ The interlude between Gnathon and Daphnis, which also echoes the abduction motif with a homosexual shades, is used as an accelerator for the recognition of Daphnis first and then of Chloe. The danger of moving Daphnis 'to the city' – 4.17.1, *κομίσειν εἰς τὴν πόλιν αὐτῷ μὲν δοῦλον, ἐκεῖνῳ δὲ ἐρώμενον* – reflects alludes to the motif (c) of the pattern. But the Gnathon-Daphnis interlude has one more function, this time as part of a playful Phaedra-motif: where the hero is a slave, hence sexual slave of a powerful mistress – cf. Xenophon.

⁴⁸⁸ 4.29.2-3.

Daphnis can reassure Dionysophanes in person that μηδὲν γεγονέναι φιλήματος καὶ ὄρκων πλέον⁴⁸⁹ and he is allotted Chloe for his wife. With the official betrothal to Daphnis, Chloe is transformed from a virgin into a beautiful, god-like young woman, since καὶ γυναῖκες πολλαὶ τῶν μέγα πλουσίων ἠράσαντο θεοῖς αὐταὶ πιστευθῆναι μητέρες θυγατρὸς οὕτω καλῆς⁴⁹⁰. Chloe's coming of age and her wedding to Daphnes close the cycle of the three consecutive patterns of love triangles. Chloe is restored permanently to Daphnis and they live happily ever after.

Discussion

Longus' novel shows thematic similarities with the other novels discussed above. From the three patterns above motif (b) is slightly altered: the action motif does not leave the seashore of Mytilene and no transportation is needed. On the other hand, Longus' abduction scenes are loosely connected to the tradition of the motif, because the pirates and/or the Methymnian youths have no sexual interest in Daphnis and/or Chloe. However, the result of these abductions is conformed to the relevant plot practices: abduction, chastity and recovery. Thus the Lesbian microcosm reflects the larger plot of the novelistic quests.

Motif (c) is absent because the pattern follows the Homeric version, and Chloe's virginity cannot be fully elaborated thematically since she is too young. It is the reader of novels that is able to trace the affinities between

⁴⁸⁹ 4.31.3.

⁴⁹⁰ 4.33.4.

abduction and loss of virginity and not the characters themselves. As Goldhill observes the 'desire' lies with the reader and his/her voyeuristic reading of the text⁴⁹¹.

Motif (d) receives the most playful treatment: Daphnis' big words and oaths are not enough to protect Chloe, but it is Pan and Gnathon who recover her from Daphnis' rivals. The motif of war on a small scale is developed in Dorcon's death, which takes place without a duel, and especially in Pan's and Gnathon's interventions.

However, what is important for the novel is the gradual development of the motif (a). In the first instance, Daphnis' kidnapping, they do not know they are in love; in the second attempt, Chloe's abduction, they are 'almost' a couple and during the Lampis incident they are officially engaged: in this last scenario Chloe is given to Daphnis, not by Aphrodite, but by the ἄλλος θεός to whom the Nymphs alluded to earlier, Eros and/or Dionysus. The last part of motif (a) is the banquet - not for choosing Chloe's husband, but her father. It appears then that Longus' novel is structured around the gradually conscious adaptation of the Helen pattern, which finds its peak at the end of Book 3 with 'Daphnis' Judgment' of beauty.

Achilles Tatius

AT's novel begins with two programmatic allusions to women's abductions; the patterns are in Table 4.

⁴⁹¹ Goldhill, (1995).

1. Intertexts

The first is the ἑκφρασις at the port of Sidon, Europa's abduction, which according to Herodotus, initiated the mythological causes of the wars between Greece and Asia, and which may be characteristic of AT's wish to insert the beautiful protagonist in the list of mythological women like Io, Europa, Medea, and Helen, who became famous because of their beauty and their elopement or kidnap. Leucippe's appearance is described as stunning and similar to that of Cleitophon's second partner, Melite, with one difference: whereas the virginal Leucippe is assimilated to Europa⁴⁹² (and/or Selene⁴⁹³), Melite's beauty is that of a mature woman and she is compared to Aphrodite⁴⁹⁴, but both have something in common with the famous mythological beauties. As is expected from the novelistic pattern, Leucippe's beauty is the object of male desire. Nevertheless, as the narrative continues, it is not Leucippe who is abducted, to the great surprise of the reader, but her cousin, Calligone. Moreover, the geographical orientation of the novel is not from the East to the West, but from the North (Byzantium) to the South (Alexandria).

The Helen intertexts are more developed in Cleinias' list of dangerous beauties, most of which figure in the *Iliad*. In the passage there is a direct mention of the Helen myth in its Homeric version by Cleinias:

⁴⁹² Helen in Herodotus, 1.3.7.

⁴⁹³ For the debate see Morales, (2004) and above note 101.

⁴⁹⁴ 1.4.3, (Leucippe), ὅμμα γοργόν ἐν ἡδονῇ, κόμην ξανθῇ; (Melite) 5.13.2, ἐμάρμαιρον αὐτῆς τὸ βλέμμα...κόμη πολλή καὶ βαθεία καὶ κατάχρυσος.

τὸ μὲν γὰρ Ἑλένης τῶν γάμων πῦρ ἀνῆψε κατὰ τῆς Τροίας ἄλλο πῦρ. ὁ δὲ Πηνελόπης γάμος τῆς σώφρονος πόσους νυμφίους ἀπώλεσεν⁴⁹⁵.

Cleinius' aphorism is interesting because, unlike the common moralistic oppositions between the lustful Helen and the faithful Penelope, he condemns both the *femme fatale* and the σώφρων.

Leucippe's beauty may not result in warfare between Europe and Asia, but it is the catalyst for a plot of elopements and abductions, of which the first recalls the Homeric treatment and takes place at Cleitophon's house and the second, which echoes the Euripidean treatment, is set in Egypt. The first corresponds to Cleitophon's first δράμα⁴⁹⁶, the one narrated to Cleinias, whereas the other is one of the Leucippe δράματα.

2. Patterns

The Homeric version of Leucippe's seduction

The first pattern of abduction has Cleitophon in the Paris role. Leucippe in the first two books is also portrayed as rather reluctant but does not oppose Cleitophon, who finds his way into her bedroom. The articulation of the motifs in this case is as follows: (a) Leucippe is Cleitophon's guest and therefore should be protected and respected. (b) Cleitophon desires what he should not; he flirts and finally elopes with Leucippe to Sidon, which figures as a Paris-Helen destination from the *Iliad*⁴⁹⁷; then they travel to Egypt, which is mentioned among Helen and Menelaus' post-Troy wanderings, or as

⁴⁹⁵ 1.8.6.

⁴⁹⁶ See Part I.

⁴⁹⁷ *Iliad*, 6.289-292.

Proteus' kingdom in the Stesichorean/Euripidean version. Cleitophon is depicted as a suitor in his effort to convince Leucippe to sleep with him and he also favours a close relationship to Aphrodite, as Cleinias observes⁴⁹⁸. Cleitophon is not expert in matters of love, but he is further supported by Aphrodite: the goddess, in exchange for his patience, promises him Leucippe, just as Aphrodite secured Helen for Paris; the one difference is that Cleitophon must be patient:

νῦν οὐκ ἔξεστί σοι παρελθεῖν ἔσω τοῦ ναοῦ. ἦν δὲ ὀλίγον ἀναμείνης χρόνον, οὐκ ἀνοίξω σοι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἱερέα σε ποιήσω τῆς θεοῦ⁴⁹⁹.

Motif (c) is not yet fully developed, since Leucippe is willing to invite Cleitophon into her bedroom. Nevertheless, the beauty of this novel is highly offended by her mother's rebuke that flight appears to her as the best option for supporting her chastity.

This Homeric version of Leucippe's seduction is underlined by the parallel event of Calligone's abduction. The two Helen patterns should be examined alongside, because they complement each other and they provide a double version of the myth: the Leucippe, where the protagonist opts for elopement, and the Calligone, where she is abducted by force.

The Homeric abduction of Calligone

The second pattern contains the abduction of the supposed Leucippe by Callisthenes. The sequence of the motifs is more typical in its structure despite

⁴⁹⁸ 2.38.1, μή πρωτόπειρος ἀλλὰ γέρον εἰς Ἀφροδίτην τυγχάνειν.

⁴⁹⁹ 4.3.7.

the superficial variations and runs as follows: (a) Callisthenes⁵⁰⁰ fails to marry Leucippe. Not having seen her, and already in love with her like Paris⁵⁰¹, he decides to abduct her. Callisthenes, although from Byzantium, is described with all the typical equipment of an oriental womaniser, ready to take by force even what does not belong to him⁵⁰²:

νεανίσκος ἦν Βυζάντιος, ὄνομα Καλλισθένης...ἀκούων τὴν Σωστράτου θυγατέρα εἶναι καλὴν... ἀναπλάττων γὰρ ἑαυτῷ τῆς παιδὸς τὸ κάλλος καὶ φανταζόμενος τὰ ἀόρατα ἔλαθε σφόδρα κακῶς διακεείμενος⁵⁰³.

Laplace has correctly observed that for Callisthenes, Leucippe, like Helen for Paris, is just an empty name not related to a body⁵⁰⁴. However, unlike the Paris of the standard myth, Callisthenes abducts the wrong girl⁵⁰⁵. Calligone's abduction is also patterned on the Helen myth: (a) Calligone is engaged to Cleitophon; (b) on the day of her pre-wedding celebrations Callisthenes abducts her using a boat and sails away; (c) Calligone remains a virgin⁵⁰⁶ because of Callisthenes' decision and (d) as expected, the un-heroic Cleitophon does not go after his bride-to be. Callisthenes participates bravely in the war in Byzantium, and gains a distinction and Calligone's hand. The motifs (c) and (d) are not narrated until the end of Book 8 and the pattern is interrupted by the Cleitophon-Leucippe motif (b).

⁵⁰⁰ 2.13.1ff. Callisthenes has never seen Leucippe before. Cf. Dio's 11th where Paris falls in love with Helen, without having seen her.

⁵⁰¹ The Homeric myth is criticised by Dio, 11.54, σκόπει δέ, ἔφη, τὴν εὐήθειαν τοῦ ἐναντίου λόγου. In Philostratus' *Heroicus*, Achilles and Helen fall in love without having seen each other.

⁵⁰² For despotism and lust in Greek tragedy see Liapis, (2006) p.12. For Paris and lust see Dio, 20.29, νῦν δὲ ἐπειδὴ τυραννὸς καὶ δυνάστεως ἦν ... τὰ λοιπὰ ἤδη ἔργῳ ἐξεργάσατο.

⁵⁰³ 2.13.1.

⁵⁰⁴ Calligone and Helen and the problems between the 'bruit du nom et réalité visible', see Laplace, (2007) p.575. For the main study of 'body' and 'name' in the *Helen* see Solmsen, (1934).

⁵⁰⁵ 8.17.3, διημαρτηθεὶς δὲ τὸ πᾶν ἔργον.

⁵⁰⁶ 8.17.1-4.

Leucippe in Egypt

The negotiable motif (c) of the Beauty pattern is explicitly present once Leucippe lands on Egyptian soil: the Artemis dream, in which the goddess advises her to remain a virgin until her marriage to Cleitophon⁵⁰⁷, marks a change of mood in the course of the novel. The transit to Egyptian ground is sprinkled with echoes of the Helen myth and Leucippe's resolution to remain a virgin until her wedding with her beloved fits the scenery well.

In Egypt the couple meets a certain Menelaus, a love-stricken Egyptian, who is wandering after the death of his boyfriend⁵⁰⁸. The irony regarding Menelaus finds its peak at the introductory phrase of Menelaus' narrative, namely in that his wanderings are due to an *ἔρως βάσκανος καὶ θήρα δυστυχής*⁵⁰⁹. The first part of this well-balanced sentence in association with the name of the speaker alludes to Helen's disastrous wedding, to which Cleinias has referred at the beginning. In this context it would not have been unlikely to find a deceived Menelaus wandering on Egyptians shores, with or without Helen. Nevertheless the first part can be also read as an allusion to the reinterpretation of the Helen myth by Chariton,⁵¹⁰ and therefore as raising expectations of another 'ideal-love' narrative. The second part of the sentence clarifies the context by echoing Cleinias' unlucky romance with Charicles. Hence Menelaus gives the homosexual, Adrastus-like, version of his life. That

⁵⁰⁷ 4.1.4.

⁵⁰⁸ 2.33.1.

⁵⁰⁹ 2.34.1.

⁵¹⁰ 1.1.16, 3.3.17.

Menelaus is homosexual classifies him immediately with the allies of Cleitophon and Leucippe. Despite his first name he is not a threat to the protagonist's virginity and he proves to be the right-hand man of Cleitophon in his Egyptian adventures⁵¹¹.

The first Egyptian chapter presents an almost fully developed Homeric transposition of the Helen myth with a Euripidean setting. Three men are after Leucippe: Charmides the general, Gorgias (a soldier), and Chaereas. Charmides is fearless at Cleitophon's presence and he is ready to discharge him⁵¹². He has not much in common with Paris, or Menelaus, and he seems to be rather the typical novelistic rival, rather than a mythological echo. Besides, he wants Leucippe not as a prize of war, but as a pre-war interlude. Menelaus tries to defend Leucippe's virginity by using her menstruation as an excuse. And this is when a further (b) motif steps in to replace the previous one. Gorgias tries to poison Leucippe; this time the transportation part of the motif risks being fatal, but another rival, Chaereas, interferes and saves Leucippe.

Chaereas, whose name may echo Chariton's protagonist, is presented in Paris' colours. He approaches the couple as a friend, but after he gains their confidence, he transgresses the rules of hospitality. He is reported to be τὸ μὲν γένος ἐκ τῆς νήσου τῆς Φάρου, τὴν δὲ τέχνην ἀλιεύς, ἐστρατεύετο δὲ

⁵¹¹ For Menelaus as the 'hand of providence' both in the *Iliad* and the *Helen* see Laplace, (2007) p.576.

⁵¹² 4.7.6, τὸν Κλειτοφῶντα ἀποφορτίσασθαι.

μισθῶ κατὰ τῶν βουκόλων τὴν ἐν ταῖς ναυσὶ στρατείαν⁵¹³. Chaereas is a fisherman from the island of Pharos, and is further described as a θαλάσσιος ἄνθρωπος⁵¹⁴. His native place, Pharos, suggests that he is probably an ally of the couple, just as Proteus had been of Helen, but things develop differently:

εἰδὼς οὖν ἀμήχανον τὸ τυχεῖν, συντίθησιν ἐπιβουλήν, ληστήριον ὁμοτέχνων συγκροτήσας, ἅτε θαλάσσιος ἄνθρωπος, καὶ συνθέμενος αὐτοῖς ἃ δεῖ ποιεῖν, ἐπὶ ξενίαν ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν Φάρον καλεῖ, σκηψάμενος γενεθλίων ἄγειν ἡμέραν⁵¹⁵.

Unlike Proteus, Chaereas not only proves to be a Theoclymenus, but on top of that a dangerous Paris – who instead of receiving gives hospitality. Pretending to be a friend of the couple, he fools them into a trap in which he does not participate personally. At Leucippe's abduction Cleitophon is once more unable to react vigorously; wounded with a knife in the leg he begs one of the warlords to help him recover Leucippe⁵¹⁶. The general pursues the pirate boat and the crew, fearing that they will be captured, decapitates the ἄθλον⁵¹⁷; the small-scale battle that follows is about recovering the prize of Leucippe. Chaereas' plot includes all the main motifs: (a) the engagement, (b) the abduction, that results in Leucippe's transportation in Miletus, (c) Leucippe appears defenceless but her life is spared, and (d) a war for Leucippe, which does not result in her recovery. From this point onwards the story seems to merge into the Euripidean version.

With Leucippe apparently dead, Cleitophon finds consolation in Melite

⁵¹³ 4.18.2.

⁵¹⁴ 5.3.2.

⁵¹⁵ 5.3.1.

⁵¹⁶ 5.7.3.

⁵¹⁷ 5.7.4.

but refuses to consume their engagement until their arrival at Miletus. Melite, frustrated, laments her 'καίνόν' suffering, not the usual κενοτάφιον, but an empty-sex marriage, a κενογάμιον⁵¹⁸. The word κενοτάφιον in association with the strange situation, καίνόν, is reminiscent of the *Helen* and to the fake funeral for Menelaus⁵¹⁹. Melite appears to know the meaning of the second word κενοτάφιον, because of her recent loss of her husband to the sea. One assumes that she had to offer the funerary rituals for Thersander on an empty tomb – yet Thersander, like Menelaus, is alive. In this sense the word is used to the letter.

On the other hand, this allusion to the *Helen* evokes the funerary ritual that the eponymous heroine offers in order to postpone her wedding to Theoclymenus and save the newly recovered Menelaus. Cleitophon too uses the excuse of Leucippe's seafaring ghost⁵²⁰ as an excuse for the postponement of his marital duties to Melite. The κενογάμιον in AT then has the same retarding function as the κενοτάφιον in the *Helen*.

But the narrative seems to subvert the epic tradition by a twist in the interpretation of κενογάμιον: in the final testing Melite appears to have been chaste during Thersander's absence⁵²¹, just as Helen has been patiently waiting for Menelaus's return in Egypt. Nevertheless, Melite, like Calligone, is the subordinate character that underlines the basic pattern of Leucippe.

⁵¹⁸ 5.14.4.

⁵¹⁹ *Helen*, 1564.

⁵²⁰ 5.16.1, λέγουσι δὲ τὰς ψυχὰς ἐν ὕδατι ἀνηρημένας μηδὲ εἰς Αἴδου καταβαίνειν ὅλως.

⁵²¹ 8.11.2.

Whereas Cleitophon thought of Leucippe as dead, and Menelaus thought of Helen as abducted, the protagonist's reality is a different one. To the surprise of Cleitophon, Leucippe is alive and sold into Melite's household⁵²² under Helen's ethnic name, Λάκαινα⁵²³, through the agency of a slave-dealer whose name is also Callisthenes.

This Callisthenes has nothing in common with Calligone's abductor, but the name alludes to the previous failed plan of the Byzantine youth. The name that the merchant gives Leucippe may be a result of her beauty: if Callisthenes saw Leucippe before she cut off her hair, then he gave her an appropriate nickname. Callisthenes' involvement results in the transportation of the protagonist to a foreign land, where she has to face more advances.

The peak of Leucippe's adventures are Sosthenes and Thersander, who are portrayed as the most dangerous rapists⁵²⁴. It is the Lacaena that Thersander plans to marry⁵²⁵, if not willingly, by force, thus recalling Theoklymenos' assault on Helen⁵²⁶. When Leucippe is on her own she laments over her fate that has 'stolen' even her name; yet in order to escape from the perilous situation she decides to re-perform the role of Helen: Φέρε πάλιν ἐνδύσωμαί μου τὸ δρᾶμα. Φέρε, περίθωμαι τὴν Λάκαιναν⁵²⁷. Leucippe seems conscious of acting in a play, until the solution comes.

⁵²² 5.17.9.

⁵²³ Laplace, (2007) p.579: 'c'est sous ce nom générique, usuel pour les esclaves, qu'elle (Hélène) est souvent désignée de façon péjorative'.

⁵²⁴ 6.13.2, ὅταν εἰς τὰς ἀλλοτριὰς μὴ ἐνυβρίζῃ γυναῖκας; 6.22.3, ἀληθινὸν τοῦτο πειρατήριον.

⁵²⁵ 6.11.3.

⁵²⁶ Laplace, (2007) p.580.

⁵²⁷ 6.16.5.

The escape motif in AT is interwoven with the Iphigenia myth, as I will discuss later and includes trickery performed by the 'other Helen', Melite: the Ephesian widow appears to be an example of marital devotion and Thersander is judged guilty.

Discussion

The novel plays with both versions of the Helen myth on different levels. First it maintains the main feature of the motif, which is the transporting of the heroine from place to place because of one of her suitors. In this respect the pattern is the one already encountered in the implicit version section of the 'Beauty' pattern; nevertheless, the text gives precise evidence for a conscious subversion of the Helen pattern. Europa's abduction, Calligone's abduction, Melite's apparent faithfulness, are all part of both the Trojan and the Egyptian versions of the myth. But the most intriguing factor is that every time an element from the Helen myth is introduced, e.g. a womaniser like Callisthenes, a character by the name of Menelaus, an inhabitant of Pharos by the Charitonian name of Chaereas, or words like κενοτάφιον and εἶδωλον, the narrative immediately changes direction and defeats the expectations raised: Callisthenes gets hold of the wrong woman, Menelaus is homosexual, Chaereas is not a Proteus-like supporter, and Melite's chastity is negotiable. But the most interesting variation is Leucippe's gradual transformation from a playful girl into the stereotypical chaste virgin, from Paris' Helen into the Egyptian Lacaena. This switch of roles, which

undermines the above described playful mythological interpretation, seems to be directed by the prerequisites of the pattern, and despite the narrator's flexibility with his mythological material, his manipulation of motif (c) does not diverge from the novel's plot rules.

Heliodorus

1. One allusion

Heliodorus does not mention Helen by name but direct knowledge of the *Helen* by Heliodorus seems indisputable⁵²⁸; there are similar motifs evocative of this text as will be shown below, and an echo of a Euripidean line in Book 8⁵²⁹.

Heliodorus, 8.7.4 : ὦ δαιμονία...τρύχουσα καὶ καταναλίσκουσα μάτην.

Helen, 1285 : σύ δ'ὦ τάλαινα...τρύχουσα σαυτήν.

However, Heliodorus uses the Helen pattern not only for two major episodes of his plot, Theagenes and Charicleia's meeting and eloping and her time in Egypt, but also to present Charicleia as the perfect image of beauty (see Table 5). Charicleia's other mythological model is Andromeda⁵³⁰, although as I will discuss, Charicleia does not look like Andromeda outside Ethiopia but only in the Meroe setting; in the Greek geographical space Charicleia's itinerary is constantly compared to that of Helen.

⁵²⁸ See Feuillâtre, (1966) p.12, and Fusillo (1991) p.32 etc. Although Feuillâtre and Fusillo have noticed the Euripidean intertext they have not followed its reworking by Heliodorus. Paulsen (1992) p.72, cites *Helen* mainly for its influence on the development of the plots of New Comedy.

⁵²⁹ Neimke, (1889).

⁵³⁰ Bartsch, (1989), Billault, (1990).

2. Many patterns

The prodigious childhood and teenagerhood of a god-like beauty

Divine or prodigious conception seems to be an indispensable element in a hero's/ heroine's life⁵³¹. Although Charicleia's⁵³² mother has not been unfaithful to her Ethiopian husband, as Leda had been to Tyndareus, yet the offspring of their union too seems illegitimate: the daughter of the royal pair of Ethiopia turns out to be white⁵³³, because her mother was looking at a painting of Andromeda⁵³⁴. Convinced that no one would ever believe her she gives the newborn baby to a priest Sisimithres, who, in turn, finds for her an adoptive father in the person of the Greek priest Charicles⁵³⁵, in the way that Tyndareus and, in one source Leda, were the adoptive parents of Helen⁵³⁶. By the time the girl is aged seven she is already a great beauty:

κόρην ἀμήχανόν τι καὶ δαιμόνιον κάλλος, ἦν αὐτὸς μὲν ἑπτὰ ἔτη γεγονέναι
ἔλεγεν ἐμοὶ δὲ καὶ ὥρα γάμου πλησιάζειν ἑώκει⁵³⁷.

As with Helen⁵³⁸, the age of seven is the time of first travel outside the homeland. It is a transitional age that corresponds with the end of childhood

⁵³¹ Raglan, (1996).

⁵³² Cf. Ion, exposed by Creusa at Delphi, has a prominent place in the *Aethiopica*, and the Oedipus myth. However, in these cases we have to do with male heroes. In the Ion myth, there is divine conception but no wandering. In the Oedipus there is wandering but no divine conception; yet one should not forget that 'incest' is what Oedipus was mainly known for. For the influence of the Ion on the *Aethiopica* see Clavo, (2003).

⁵³³ There is an interesting story in Plutarch 563a of how a Greek woman gave birth to a black baby and how she was tried for adultery until they discovered that she was Ethiopian.

⁵³⁴ 4.8.5. For the painting see Bartsch, (1989) and Billault, (1990).

⁵³⁵ 2.31.1ff.

⁵³⁶ Apollodorus, *Library*, 3.10.7 (LOEB); Nemesis and/or Leda as Helen's mothers.

⁵³⁷ 2.31.3.

⁵³⁸ Tzetzes on *Lycophron*, 513. The detail also in Hellanicus, *FGrH*, 323aF18 and F19, (Fowler 168b).

and the beginning of puberty⁵³⁹. The seven-year-old Charicleia is described no longer as παῖς but as κόρη and looks as if she is ripe for marriage⁵⁴⁰. At the same age Helen was not only stolen by Theseus because of her premature beauty, but also bore him a daughter, Iphigenia⁵⁴¹. Charicleia shares with Helen this premature femininity⁵⁴² and the god-like beauty that cannot be hidden⁵⁴³.

Being a great beauty and a virgin priestess of Artemis, ζάκορος⁵⁴⁴ in Charicleia's case is not contradictory⁵⁴⁵. Even Helen had been a priestess of Artemis, the Spartan Artemis Orthia, and it was from Artemis' temple that Theseus stole her⁵⁴⁶. Like other heroines of the novel, Charicleia is moulded from the divine matrix of both Artemis and Aphrodite⁵⁴⁷. Charicleia's godlike beauty makes her an almost twin *soeur*⁵⁴⁸ of the other stunning beauty, Callirhoe, but unlike the controversial virtue of her Syracusan predecessor, Charicleia's devotion to Artemis casts her as the most beautiful and chaste⁵⁴⁹.

Charicles' Homeric Charicleia

The first Helen pattern of the novel involves the coming of age of

⁵³⁹ See also Aristophanes, *Lysistrata*, 641, ἐπὶ τὰ ἔτη γεγῶς' εὐθὺς ἡρώηφόρου. See also Henderson (1989), p.159 and Burkert and Raffan, (1987) p.229.

⁵⁴⁰ Charicles, after having adopted the girl, refers to her as a child in 2.33.1-2 as a proof of his paternal feelings towards her. For the passage from παῖς to κόρη/παρθένος, γυνή and πρεσβύτις see Lalanne, (2006).

⁵⁴¹ Plutarch, *Theseus*, 31.2 presents Theseus putting the young Helen under the protection of Aethra until she was ripe for marriage. The story of Helen bearing Iphigenia is found in Hellanicus, Antoninus Liberalis' account of Iphigenia-Orsiloché (27) and Pausanias 2.26.2.

⁵⁴² An example for the opposite is Chloe, who is slowly turning into a Helen.

⁵⁴³ 2.31.3.

⁵⁴⁴ 2.33.4.

⁵⁴⁵ King (2002 (originally 1983)) p.92: the parthenos is not asexual.

⁵⁴⁶ Plutarch, *Theseus*, 31.2. καὶ τὴν κόρην ἐν ἱερῷ Ἀρτέμιδος Ὀρθίας χορεύουσιν ἀρπάσαντες ἔφυγον.

⁵⁴⁷ Frye, (1976) p.90ff.

⁵⁴⁸ Reardon, (2001).

⁵⁴⁹ Holmberg, (1995).

Charicleia and the preparations for her betrothal. The pattern resembles that of AT, with Theagenes in the role of both the beloved and the abductor of the virgin.

Obviously, choosing the groom for such a beauty is no easy task⁵⁵⁰. The girl must be given to one suitor and the others should accept the father's choice. In the *Aethiopica* Charicles has already chosen for Charicleia's husband his nephew, Alcamenes⁵⁵¹. This recalls Tyndareus' choice of Menelaus, a choice that would have endangered him, were Odysseus not there⁵⁵². Similarly Charicles' and Alcamenes' lives are in danger since Theagenes reacts violently to the news of the arranged marriage:

ἐγὼ μὲν, εἶπε, καὶ τελευτᾶν οὐ διαφέρομαι τυχὼν Χαρικλείας...οὐ γὰρ δὴ μὴ ἀνάξιοι γε ὄντες τῷ Χαρικλεῖ κηδεύσωμεν...οἰμῶξει, ἔφη Θεαγένης, ὅστις θαλαμεύσει Χαρίκλειαν⁵⁵³.

In the *Aethiopica* it is Calasiris who takes up Odysseus' role, calming Theagenes' anger, and who deters him from any thoughtless actions. Calasiris' advice functions in the same way as Odysseus' oath laid out the framework of the Trojan War, and prepares for the development of the novel⁵⁵⁴. The decision then to organise a kidnapping of Charikleia, seemingly involuntary, is all part of Calasiris' plan. Furthermore it is a plan which is based on a common mythical story⁵⁵⁵, that of the young girl, married or not,

⁵⁵⁰ In Dio, 11th, Paris as the legal husband for Helen causes the war.

⁵⁵¹ 4.7.9.

⁵⁵² In an interesting story reported by Plutarch, Phocos is killed by the suitors of his daughter, Callirhoe; Plutarch *Love stories*, 774d ff.

⁵⁵³ 4.6.6-7.

⁵⁵⁴ For Calasiris, as the intradiegetic narrator who 'organizes' the plot Winkler, (1982).

⁵⁵⁵ The word 'ἄρπαγή' is used mostly in the case of Helen, Persephone, Ariadne, Medea and Io.

who elopes or is abducted by a young suitor. Given that Helen is the best known mythical example of that tale, Calasiris stages his protégée's tale according to mythical 'common sense'.

Nonetheless in Heliodorus' chaste universe things are slightly different from the 'standard' version of the myth: Charicleia is not married but betrothed to Alcamenes and there is no risk of real adultery. The possible pattern that arises is the one in which (a) Charicleia is engaged to Alcamenes, and (b) Theagenes, as a rejected suitor, elopes with Charicleia. Of course Charicleia's famous denial of marriage and love exculpate her from any guilt. Theagenes too, although he is taking the place of Paris, is not altogether presented as a Paris-model. The reason is that for the authors of later antiquity Paris exemplified not only the handsome youth but, mainly the 'μοιχὸς'⁵⁵⁶ and the 'ξεναπάτης'⁵⁵⁷. On the other hand it would have been difficult to see in Theagenes a model of Menelaus, who, because of his meekness, enjoyed no better reputation than Paris. Theagenes, therefore, shares some of Paris' characteristics, but on the other hand he shows the influence of the tradition according to which Achilles and not Menelaus is the only appropriate husband of Helen; this last mythological alignment had already been treated in Chariton and subverted in AT's allusion to Achilles on Skyros. Unlike Chaereas who refuses to seduce Dionysius' wife, Theagenes,

⁵⁵⁶ Plutarch, *Sympotic questions*, 655a.

⁵⁵⁷ Euripides, *Trojan Women*, 866 and earlier Ibykos, F. S151 'ξεναπάταν Πάριον'.

despite his Achillean calibre⁵⁵⁸, acts as Paris when advised by Calasiris to carry Charicleia from the temple of Apollo. This is according to Charicles' version⁵⁵⁹. However, from Theagenes' and Charicleia's point of view he is the brave benefactor⁵⁶⁰ of Hydaspes and Persinna, the one who brought their daughter back, still a virgin, faithful to his oath⁵⁶¹. Therefore, Theagenes' mythical models, Paris and/or Achilles, vary according to the focalisation of the narration. The Paris-like behaviour of Theagenes is described in the Delphic chapters of the *Aethiopica*. Here, Theagenes is the 'seducer' of the chaste Charicleia: he carries her away, along with the help of some Thessalian youths, and, moreover, takes some movable possessions of value found in Charicles' house⁵⁶², thus recalling Paris stealing Helen along with Menelaus' treasures.

Motif (c) is not developed in this Homeric version but motif (d) is present: as is the case in the Helen story, the abduction of the beautiful priestess of Artemis is followed by a war; in Charicleia's case the general Hegesias commands the Delphians to attack the Thessalians⁵⁶³. The attack of the Delphians on their neighbours and co-amphictyons, the Thessalians and Ainianes, perhaps recalls the Sacred War against the Phocians, in the 6th c. B.C, but Charicleia is the only sacred reason⁵⁶⁴. In a mythical context however,

⁵⁵⁸ In an attempt to idealise Achilles, Philostratus, in the *Heroicus*, attributes his wrath to the wrong done to Palamedes and not because of Briseis.

⁵⁵⁹ 10.35.1.

⁵⁶⁰ 10.37.1.

⁵⁶¹ 4.18.6.

⁵⁶² 4.17.1ff.

⁵⁶³ 4.19f.1ff.

⁵⁶⁴ 10.36.3, ἐκ τῶν ἀδύτων αὐτῶν τὴν κόρην ἀποσυλήσας.

this internal strife might well recall the first Peloponnesian attack on Aphidna in Attica, by the Dioskouroi: in that case the mythical cause was the abduction of Helen by Theseus⁵⁶⁵. However, this is not the only war for the sake of the beautiful Charicleia. Two consecutive Homeric motifs arise before Charicleia's landing on Egyptian soil.

The Beauty and her lover sail away in a Phoenician boat apparently towards Tyre⁵⁶⁶. The Helen pattern is continued: (b) the Phoenician merchant desires Charicleia, and simultaneously, a pirate named Trachinus plans to abduct her. We should be reminded at this point that both the Phoenician and Trachinus are associated with Heracles: the former with Heracles of Tyre⁵⁶⁷ and the latter - by his name - with the Heracles of Sophocles' *Trachiniae*. Furthermore, Heracles was known for the first sack of Troy that happened for another beautiful woman, Hesione⁵⁶⁸, in a similar Helen-like mythological pattern. Indeed, Trachinus calls the beginning of the first battle between himself and the Phoenician a war, whose prize is Charicleia:

ὁ Τραχῖνος τῆς Χαρικλείας ἐπιλαβόμενος, 'οὐδὲν, ἔφη, πρὸς σέ ὁδε ὁ πόλεμος, ὦ φιλάττη, ἀλλὰ διὰ σέ γεγένηται⁵⁶⁹.

Charicleia therefore joins the group of beautiful women, whose abduction was responsible for greater or lesser wars⁵⁷⁰, next to Helen and Hesione. Trachinus takes the place of the malicious abductor, Paris, a role in

⁵⁶⁵ Plutarch, *Theseus*, 31.

⁵⁶⁶ 4.16ff; before arriving at Troy Helen and Paris visit Sidon, the major Phoenician city. cf. Homer *Iliad* 6.289-291. For Heliodorus' allusions to Phoenicia, his claimed homeland, see Bowie, (1998).

⁵⁶⁷ 4.16.6.

⁵⁶⁸ Apollodorus, *Library*, 2.5.9; the Hesione myth seems an echo of the more widespread Andromeda myth.

⁵⁶⁹ 5.26.1.

⁵⁷⁰ Cf. Herodotus, 1.3ff.

which Theagenes was only partially cast. However Trachinus' plans, like Paris' plans, fail when they reach Egypt. The land of Proteus provides protection to Helen and the land of Calasiris to Charicleia: in a last Homeric echo, another brigand, Pelorus, enamoured of Charicleia, is urged on by Calasiris, and attacks Trachinus. The pirates are divided into two parties⁵⁷¹, Charicleia, beautifully dressed⁵⁷², like Helen on the walls of Troy, is the prize⁵⁷³ who watches the fight. The result is settled by a duel, which recalls the fight between Menelaus and Paris; Pelorus wins and a battle follows, evoking *Iliad* 4. The novel uses a water acoustic image to describe the sound of the combat:

θαλάττη προσείκασας ἄν τοὺς ἄνδρας αἰφνιδίῳ σπιλάδι κατασεισθέντας, οὕτως ἀλόγιστος ὁρμή πρὸς ἄφραστον αὐτοὺς ἤγειρε τάραχον, ἅτε οἶνω καὶ θυμῷ κατόχους γεγεννημένους... καὶ ἦν οἰμωγὴ μία ξύλοις λίθοις κρατῆρσι δαλοῖς τραπέζαις βαλλόντων καὶ βαλλομένων.⁵⁷⁴

The *Iliad* as Rattenbury has observed⁵⁷⁵ gives a similar acoustic image of water, this time a torrent flowing on the mountains—a detail which reinforces the Homericity of the scene. It appears then that the duel between Pelorus and Trachinus is patterned on its Homeric prototype of the duel between Paris and Menelaus, with Pelorus and Trachinus cast alternately in the roles of Paris and Menelaus, since they both present themselves as the rightful

⁵⁷¹ 5.32.1; cf. *Iliad* 3.333.

⁵⁷² 5.31.2.

⁵⁷³ Helen as a prize in the scene of the *τειχοσκοπία*, *Iliad* 3.15ff.

⁵⁷⁴ 5.32.1.

⁵⁷⁵ On 'βαλλόντων καὶ βαλλομένων' cf. *Iliad* 4.450-453, ἔνθα δ' ἄμ' οἰμωγὴ τε καὶ εὐχολὴ πέλεν ἀνδρῶν / ὀλλόντων τε καὶ ὀλλυμένων, ῥέε δ' αἵματι γαῖα./ὥς δ' ὅτε χεῖμαρροι ποταμοὶ κατ' ὄρεσφι ῥέοντες/ἔς μισγ' ἀγκειαν συμβάλλετον ὄβριμον ὕδωρ. Cf. Rattenbury (1935) p.80 note 3. vol.2.

'owners' of Charicleia but are both her kidnappers. Moreover Theagenes, the only rightful consort of Charicleia, also shares some of Paris' characteristics. Therefore the staging of the Homeric Helen in the *Aethiopica* is arranged each time according to the focalisation of the narrative. Nevertheless this last staging results in an unexpected result: Theagenes, with Achillean bravery – equalled only by Chaereas in the surviving novels – participates in the battle and kills Peloros, his main rival; nevertheless, the beginning of the novel finds him half-dead in Charicleia's arms. The Homeric plot reaches a deadend when the Egyptian version of the plot arises.

Charicleia in the land of Proteus

In the narration of the Egyptian episodes of the *Aethiopica* the focalisation is no longer through Calasiris, but through the omniscient narrator, and this could be interpreted as a shift in the narratorial intentions: Calasiris constructed for Charicles a 'Homeric Charicleia' plot; the Heliodoran narrator will present an – even better? – Euripidean version of her adventures. The geographical background, Egypt, favours the choice: Egypt in Euripides' *Helen* is the land of Proteus and Charicleia's trip to Egypt also takes place under the protection of an Egyptian⁵⁷⁶, Calasiris, whom Cnemon compares to Proteus⁵⁷⁷. Nevertheless, the linguistic versatility of Calasiris is not the only reason for this characterisation.

⁵⁷⁶ Herodotus, 2.112ff.

⁵⁷⁷ Heliodorus 2.4.4, εὐρηκα γάρ σε κατὰ τὸν Πρωτέα τὸν Φάριον. Proteus appears as a simile for sophistic elusiveness in Plato, *Euthydemus*, 288b8.

Calasiris like king Proteus is an old man⁵⁷⁸, with prophetic powers⁵⁷⁹. Like the mythological king Proteus⁵⁸⁰, he has two sons, who fail to follow the example of their father's piety. After fighting each other for the priesthood, the elder son, Thyamis, ended up as a bandit killing people, and the second son, Petosiris, stole his post at the temple of Memphis⁵⁸¹. This attempted fratricide reshapes the Oedipus myth and not the myth of Proteus⁵⁸². However, Calasiris, like Proteus, knows beforehand the fate of his sons, which is one of the reasons for his wanderings. Proteus flees from Thrace to Egypt, whereas Calasiris flees from Egypt to Greece. The Thracian woman in the Proteus myth, Torone, is represented in Calasiris' case in the person of the beautiful courtesan Rhodopis⁵⁸³. Calasiris' *θεωρία* brings him to Thebes, Meroe and Delphi, where the Pythia foretells him his return to his homeland⁵⁸⁴. In Delphi, Calasiris is entrusted with the love and the welfare of Charicleia and Theagenes⁵⁸⁵ and he is finally able to return to his homeland⁵⁸⁶ and to prevent his sons' fratricide⁵⁸⁷. Having set the mythological biography of Calasiris the plot moves forward to the rest of the pattern.

⁵⁷⁸ There are different stories regarding Proteus all of which seem to reflect a side of Calasiris: Greek literature knows two figures called Proteus; the first is a son of Poseidon, *Odyssey*, 4.365, 4.385. In Herodotus, Proteus becomes a mortal king of Egypt, 2.112, and Pausanias, 3.18.16. A third Proteus is in Apollodorus 2.5.9; he is still a son of Poseidon, who among his many voyages went to Thrace. There he marries Torone and has two aggressive sons, Polygonos and Telegonos or Tmolos and Telegonos; cf. Tzetzes, on *Lycophron* 124. Because his sons deliberately killed every stranger who set foot in Thrace, Proteus prayed to his father Poseidon to re-establish him in Egypt; this last Proteus has more in common with Calasiris.

⁵⁷⁹ 3.11.2.

⁵⁸⁰ Cf. Herodotus, 2.112-2.118.

⁵⁸¹ 1.33.2, 7.4.4 etc.

⁵⁸² 2.25.5; Morgan, (1996a).

⁵⁸³ Rhodopis was originally from Thrace. For her mention in Herodotus and the *Aethiopica* see Bucher, (1989).

⁵⁸⁴ 2.26.5.

⁵⁸⁵ 2.23.2.

⁵⁸⁶ For the ambiguous presence of Calasiris at Delphi and his journey see Futre-Pinheiro, (1991).

⁵⁸⁷ 7.7.1. ff.

For Charicleia, Calasiris is her father and her protector. He is the one who helps her dead or alive⁵⁸⁸; just as Proteus' tomb, situated near the Nile⁵⁸⁹, protected Helen from Theoclymenus. The *Aethiopica* opens next to one of the mouths of the Nile, with the aftermath of the 'Iliadic' episodes of the novel: Trachinus and Pelorus are dead, along with the rest of the pirates; Theagenes is half dead. Trachinus' ship, which has been prepared to be Charicleia's bridal suite, figures in the background⁵⁹⁰. The setting – Nile, shore, ship, battle – recalls the ἔξοδος of the Helen with the single difference that instead of departing, Charicleia and Theagenes remain on Egyptian soil. It can be argued, therefore, that the Egyptian episodes of the *Aethiopica* reflect the structure of Euripides' *Helen* but in a more or less reverse sequence, from the end to the beginning. This partially inverted reflection is mainly based on the geographical setting: Helen and Menelaus leave Egypt for Greece, whereas Theagenes and Charicleia move deeper into Egyptian territory, in order to reach Ethiopia, Charicleia's native land.

Once the battle is over, Egyptian bandits under the command of Calasiris' son Thyamis appear and the motif (b) reappears: Thyamis is the new suitor of Charicleia, but having been a priest, does not force her to marry him immediately and awaits the time when they will reach Memphis for the marriage. Charicleia, without Calasiris at her side – just like Helen when left without Proteus' protection – must show all her rhetorical skills and all her

⁵⁸⁸ 8.11.2.

⁵⁸⁹ *Helen*, 1ff.

⁵⁹⁰ 1.1.2 and 5.29.3.

wit in order to postpone this wedding⁵⁹¹, according to motif (c). Being clever, she manages to convince him that she has feelings for him⁵⁹² and to hide her relationship with Theagenes, as is the case in the *Helen* too. Additionally, the *Aethiopica* provides a situation analogous to the exchange of oaths between Menelaus and Helen⁵⁹³: Theagenes, alarmed by Charicleia's acceptance of marriage, wants to be reassured of her love. Charicleia like Helen has to convince him of her love and her chastity and once more she underlines the real motivation of her decision to elope with him, unlike Helen she followed a husband:

οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἐραστῇ πειθομένη ἀλλ' ὡς ἀνδρὶ συνθεμένη τότε πρῶτον ἐμαυτὴν ἐπέδωκα... πῶς οὖν οὐκ ἂν εἴης ἄτοπος εἰ τὸν βάρβαρόν με τοῦ Ἑλλήνος, τὸν ληστὴν τοῦ ἐρωμένου πιστεύοις ἐπίπροσθεν ἄγειν⁵⁹⁴.

In the *Helen* there is a similar scene, where Menelaus unconvinced of Helen's chastity demands an oath from her:

Helen: θανῇ. γαμοῦμαι δ' ἢ τάλαιν' ἐγὼ βία./ Menelaus: προδοτίς ἂν εἴης. τὴν βίαν σκήψασ' ἔχεις./ Helen: ἀλλ' ἄγνόν ὄρκον σὸν κάρα κατώμοσα./ Menelaus: τί φῆς; θανεῖσθαι; κοῦποτ' ἀλλάξεις λέχη⁵⁹⁵.

However, *in* a coup de théâtre, a new battle is imminent⁵⁹⁶ and Thyamis hides his bride in a cave, where he returns to kill her soon after⁵⁹⁷. The plot is still following the *Helen*⁵⁹⁸, but in a sense backwards, since

⁵⁹¹ 1.22.7, Charicleia fakes accepting the wedding, but postpones the ceremony until Memphis. She is using the same 'plan' as Calasiris, when he was trying to protect her from Trachinus.

⁵⁹² 1.25.4ff.

⁵⁹³ *Helen*, 794ff.

⁵⁹⁴ 1.25.4.

⁵⁹⁵ *Helen*, 843-846.

⁵⁹⁶ 1.27.2ff.

⁵⁹⁷ 1.29.1ff.

⁵⁹⁸ *Helen*, 424.

Charicleia is not dead but miraculously replaced by another woman, Thisbe. At the sight of his 'dead' beloved Theagenes collapses and believes that all their misfortunes, all their endurance were in vain⁵⁹⁹. Menelaus too reacts similarly when he learns of the disappearance of his wife⁶⁰⁰. Theagenes is ready to end his life when he hears the voice of Charicleia's 'phantom' shouting 'Theagenes':

ἦξω φιλτάτη ψυχῇ, ἔλεγεν, εὐδηλος εἶ περὶ γῆν ἔτι φερομένη...τὸ δὲ διὰ το ἄταφον ἴσως ὑπὸ νερτερίων εἰδώλων εἰργομένη⁶⁰¹.

Yet, the dead body is not that of Charicleia and a εἶδωλον has been killed in her place. Thisbe then, the negative version of Charicleia⁶⁰², is the ghost, as the Cloud in Euripides is the faithless Helen, the opposite of the real, chaste one. The juxtaposition between body and name, famous from the *Helen*⁶⁰³, is once more repeated in Charicleia's case, whom Theagenes lamented ἐν ἀλλοτρίῳ σώματι⁶⁰⁴.

The association of the Egyptian chapters of the *Aethiopica* with dramatic poetry is further developed when Theagenes, teasing Cnemon, refers to Thisbe as a ghost and to Cnemon's story as a 'drama':

οὐ παύσῃ...ἄγαν ἀνδριζόμενος εἶδωλά τε καὶ σκιάς εὐλαβούμενος; οὐ γὰρ δὴ καμὲ τε καὶ τὴν ἐμήν ὄψιν εἴποις ἂν ὥς ἐγοήτευσεν, οὐδὲν κοινωνοῦντα τοῦ δράματος⁶⁰⁵.

⁵⁹⁹ 2.1.2, ἡνύσθω, λελύσθω τὰ πάντα.

⁶⁰⁰ *Helen*, 603, λέγω πόνους σε μυρίους τλῆναι μάτην.

⁶⁰¹ 2.5.2.

⁶⁰² Morgan, (1989a).

⁶⁰³ *Helen* 43, 66, 199, etc. See also Solmsen, (1934) on 66, ὡς, εἰ καθ' Ἑλλάδ' ὄνομα δυσκλεῆς φέρω, μή μοι τὸ σῶμά γ' ἐνθάδ' αἰσχύνῃν ὀφλη.

⁶⁰⁴ 2.7.2.

⁶⁰⁵ 2.11.3.

Thus, Thisbe is the lever that connects Cnemon's drama with Theagenes' and Charicleia's drama⁶⁰⁶. In Cnemon's drama Thisbe is a dead phantom of the past, but in Theagenes' drama she is a 'phantom' of the here and now, in whose body and name⁶⁰⁷ Charicleia finds shelter. It is because the novel's broad screen makes it easier for different 'dramas' to take place simultaneously and to interact, a possibility of which the dramatic stage was neither aware nor capable. Thus, Thisbe's complex role serves the purposes of the novelistic 'plot' just as effectively as the μηχανή⁶⁰⁸ of the dramatic stage.

Regarding finally the staging of the Heliodoran *Helen* one should keep in mind that it does not follow the Euripidean drama straightforwardly, but alters the order of the events, in a slightly reversed way: first, the battlefield near/on the shore and the encouraging cry of Charicleia to Theagenes⁶⁰⁹; then, the marriage proposal from the son of her protector which is to be postponed by Charicleia's wit; the hiding in the cave, which happens in line 424 of the *Helen*; finally the disappearance of the fake heroine and the appearance of the real heroine.

Discussion

With Heliodorus' adaptation of the Helen story not only on the level of pattern but also with explicit allusions to the eponymous Euripidean play, the re-adaptation of the myth finds its most idealised treatment. Heliodorus'

⁶⁰⁶ 1.1.3, τὸ καθ' ἑμῶν δῶμα.

⁶⁰⁷ Charicleia is sold as Thisbe in 5.2.10.

⁶⁰⁸ Thisbe as μηχανή in 2.8.3.

⁶⁰⁹ Heliodorus 5.32.5; cf. *Helen* 1603 παρακέλευσμα πρημνύθεν Ἑλένης.

novel follows in its broad lines both the Homeric and the Euripidean versions and it seems that there are also possible allusions to the first abduction of Helen by Theseus, her first departure from home and the war that followed it. Charicleia is virginal like Andromeda and the Helen of Spartan cult. She is also chaste and faithful like Penelope and the Euripidean Helen. However, because she is so beautiful and chaste she has to confront all the temptations Helen has encountered.

Provisional conclusions

Unlike then the orators and sophists, in whose work the image of the Helen-adulteress prevails, Heliodorus, as is the case in his possible model, Philostratus, creates an idealised image of Helen-Charicleia, reinforced by her union with a descendant of Achilles, handsome and chaste as well. The end of the novel recalls the happy and blessed union of Achilles and Helen on the island of Leuke, a place which is presented like a utopia and reserved only for the privileged. Likewise, Theagenes' and Charicleia's wedding takes place in a utopian Ethiopia, which has re-established the blessing of the gods with the abolition of human sacrifices.

The elevated tone of Heliodorus' ending⁶¹⁰ is not strange in the overall context of the Helen myth in later antiquity. Admittedly, in the orators and even in Lucian the Stesichorean version was used only on a few, more elevated, occasions, set against a strong moral background, influenced by the

⁶¹⁰ Morgan, (1989) p.319.

Platonic *Phaedrus*⁶¹¹ and *Republic*⁶¹². In a different context, Plutarch, who mainly adopts the Homeric version of Helen and often presents her as a negative example, still insists, even if she is the cause of the War, on presenting her as guiltless. It seems, therefore, that outside the sophistic milieu, there is a need for an innocent, if possible virginal, beauty, capable of exciting passion and desire, which, in their turn, are followed by wars and misfortunes. Moreover one may bear in mind that this is a characteristic not only of the pagan literature but of the non-pagan literature contemporary to the *Aethiopica* as well - and by this we mean the Christian novels and the lives of the martyrs. Consequently there was enough material, amongst both pagans and non-pagans, for the creation of the virginal but sexual beauty. Charicleia, the last novelistic heroine, fits this category perfectly, much more than Callirhoe and Anthia.

What is interesting in Heliodorus' case is that in following the less common version of the 'chaste Helen' he does it by taking up the pattern of the Euripidean *Helen*, whereas his contemporaries⁶¹³ almost unanimously cite Stesichoros and not Euripides as the 'inventor' of this version⁶¹⁴. Admittedly, the story of the blindness of Stesichoros and its moral and philosophical context, related to its Platonic treatment, might have excited more the mind and the pen of the sophists. However, this was not the case of the novelists,

⁶¹¹ Plato, *Phaedrus* 243a5.

⁶¹² Plato, *Republic*, 586c4.

⁶¹³ There is an exception: Plutarch, *On the Stoics' self-contradictions*, 1049b (about Chrysippus), καὶ τὸν Εὐριπίδην μάρτυρα καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους προσάγεται.

⁶¹⁴ The lack of more than fragments of the *Epic Cycle* and Stesichorus' other poems makes it difficult for us to understand the literary background that privileged Stesichorus' version.

notably Heliodorus and his precursor AT, who show that they found in the eponymous Euripidean drama fertile ground for further exploration⁶¹⁵. I would even go further and suggest that it was because of the increased interest in Platonism that there was a turn towards the Euripidean *Helen*, since this version of the myth does not appear either in Chariton or in Xenophon. After all, the *Phaedrus* is one of the key intertexts for the Ideal novel and it contains Socrates' own celebrated *Palinode* to love. As such, both the myth of the Stesichorean *Palinode* along with its dramatic, Euripidean representation should have been warmly welcomed among the novel's ideal plots.

⁶¹⁵ The preoccupation of AT and Heliodorus with 'drama' within the 'staging' of their novelistic plots is reflected clearly in their language by comparison with the other authors. There are 13 mentions to the word 'drama' (sing/plural) in Heliodorus and 18 in AT as against 3 in Chariton and none in Xenophon and Longus.

2.2 *The myth of the 'other woman': Phaedra*

2.2.1 The implicit version of the 'other woman' plot

The tale of the adulteress wife who desires her stepson (or a protégé of her husband, his brother, or even a slave), is denied (or not?) his attention and retaliates by accusing him to her husband is an ancient pattern⁶¹⁶. Hollis rightly sees, at least, a three-part motif, contrary to Stith Thompson's binary one⁶¹⁷. The Egyptian *Tale of Two Brothers* is probably one of the oldest of its kind, dated around 13th c. B.C.E⁶¹⁸. The tale is divided into two parts: the first part narrates the unsuccessful approaches of Anubis' wife to his younger brother, Bata, her accusation and his subsequent emasculation; the second part develops the plot of Bata's unfaithful wife, who tries twice to have him killed after eloping with the Pharaoh. The tale, apart from exaggerating Bata's bad luck with mischievous women, also exemplifies two narrative possibilities: a plot in which the woman is older than the hero or at least in a more powerful position, and a plot dealing with the unfaithful wife⁶¹⁹. This division between the two plots makes clear that unfaithfulness can be of two different kinds, incest or adultery. In other words the story offers two possibilities for the treatment of a love-triangle: husband-wife-stepson and/or husband-wife-lover. Further, the tale has a fourth part, probably owing to its folk-tale background, that of the punishment of the wives,

⁶¹⁶ For a general overview in ancient Greek, oriental and European literature see Yohannan, (1968).

⁶¹⁷ Hollis, (2008) p.105.

⁶¹⁸ First critical edition by Maspero, (1915). For its influence on Greek storytelling Trenkner, (1958) p.99-108; regarding the influence on the novels see Barns, (1956) p.35 for the influence of Egyptian narrative fiction on Greek fiction.

⁶¹⁹ For the connection between the two parts and the identification of Anubis' and Bata's wife with different aspects of Hathor see Hollis, (2008) p.192.

the exoneration of the hero and his ascent to the throne.

In Greek mythological terms this would mean that the Helen myth discussed previously is a model for the wife-lover triangle, while the wife-stepson motif immediately alludes to the *Phaedra*. Aristophanes makes an interesting comment on the intersection of these two possibilities by juxtaposing Penelope (normally opposed to Helen and/or Clytemnestra) with Phaedra⁶²⁰. Yet as becomes clear from the *Tale of the Two Brothers* it seems that the Phaedra pattern retained its autonomy vis-à-vis the Helen one, since it offered different possibilities of plot, one of which is its transformation of the stepmother into the type of the *saeua nouerca* in Latin declamations, which accordingly enriched the plots of the novels⁶²¹.

I shall now procede to a study of the treatment of the motif in Egyptian literature and then in the Greek novels, for which see Table 6 (Appendix).

2.2.1.1 *Joseph and Aseneth*

The tale of Joseph is well known ⁶²²: his sale as a slave to Potiphar by the Ishmaelite, the desire of his master's wife for him – she is not mentioned by her personal name but only by a toponym, either as Memphis or as the Egyptian⁶²³ – her unfounded accusation based on a piece of his garment, and his spending two

⁶²⁰ Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazousai*, 547, μίαν γὰρ οὐκ ἂν εἶποις τῶν νῦν γυναικῶν Πηνελόπην, Φαίδραν ἀπαξάπασας. The play performed in 411 B.C.E, a year after the chaste *Helen*; for the references to *Hippolytus* see Austin and Olson, (2004).

⁶²¹ Van Mal-Maeder, (2001).

⁶²² For questions related to its date see Wills, (1995); Wills also traces the tale back as the 6th c B.C.E. and discusses its emergence from a possible Persian source (p.160).

⁶²³ *Genesis*, 39.7.

years in prison until he explains the Pharaoh's dreams and ascends the Pharaoh's throne⁶²⁴. The tale presents all the main characteristics of what was going to be a typical pattern: (a) the chaste and beautiful hero – faithful to his God⁶²⁵, (b) the unsuccessful attempt at seduction by an older woman and her unfounded accusations to her husband (c) the youth's punishment and (d) the revelation of the truth and the youth's reward. In Joseph's case there is also one more motif, that of retardation of the action, because he is thrown in jail for two years⁶²⁶.

The tale of Joseph was known in the Greek-speaking world *via* the *Septuagint*, *Joseph's Testament*⁶²⁷, Flavius Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*⁶²⁸ and Philo. The *Septuagint* presents a slimmer version of the rather extended and voyeuristic version of the *Testament*⁶²⁹. As for *J&A*, its context suggests that the background of the story was well known⁶³⁰. It is uncertain, whether Greek readers were aware of the striking similarity between the names Petephres⁶³¹ and Pentephres⁶³², as the Judaeo-Egyptian community might have been, given the Midrash allusion. Indeed, as argued by Goldman, there is a version of the tale of Joseph in the Midrash that ties Aseneth directly to the Potiphar's Wife episode. According to one Midrash, Aseneth, still an infant, assured her foster-father

⁶²⁴ For a discussion of primary and secondary literature see Humphrey, (2000).

⁶²⁵ *J&A*, 4.19, καὶ ἔστιν Ἰωσήφ ἀνὴρ θεοσεβὴς καὶ σώφρων καὶ παρθένος ὡς σὺ σήμερον.

⁶²⁶ *Genesis*, 39. 19-20.

⁶²⁷ For intertextuality with the *Hippolytus*, (the motif of hanging herself) see Braun, (1938) p.46.

⁶²⁸ Flavius Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, 2.39-59.

⁶²⁹ The *Septuagint* gives only the request of the Egyptian woman 'κοιμήθητι μετ' ἐμοῦ', whereas the *Testament* gives a full account of her attempts. For the influence of the *Hippolytus* play on the later Joseph saga see Wills, (1995), who also discusses the elaborate, quasi-novelistic, description of Potiphar's wife's emotions (p.164-165).

⁶³⁰ *J&A*, 4.14.1, οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κοιμηθεὶς μετὰ τῆς κυρίας αὐτοῦ;

⁶³¹ See (Petephres, as Joseph's master) in Flavius, Philo Judaeus, *On dreams*, 1.78; *Genesis*, 37.36, *Genesis* 41.45; (as Aseneth's father) in Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, 2.39, *Genesis* 41.45.

⁶³² Philo Judaeus, *Sacred Laws*, 3.236.

under oath that the charge against Joseph was false⁶³³. This Jewish version, in which Aseneth is the adoptive daughter of Potiphar and biological daughter of Dinah, unifies the tale of Joseph into a three part romance in the best possible way: the first part has Joseph sold as a slave and the news of his 'apparent' death reaching Jacob; there follows the interlude with Potiphar's wife; and finally comes his ideal romance with Aseneth⁶³⁴.

Even without this detail – therefore even without the benefits of the novels' exploitation of the interaction and recycling of characters⁶³⁵ – Joseph's tale provides us with all the requisite ingredients for a novel plot: child exposure and recovery, adultery and/or incest, slavery and torture, and finally marriage.

2.2.1.2 *Metiochus and Parthenope*

What the exact relationship is of the Metiochus story to the pattern of Potiphar's wife is not easily inferred from the remaining text. *P.Berol* 7927 offers some hints of a plot by Miltiades' second wife, Hegesipyle, against her stepson Metiochus⁶³⁶. The comparison of the remaining evidence of *Metiochus and Parthenope* with its Persian reworking, *Vamiq and Adhra*, led Hägg to conclude that there was no romance between Hegesipyle and her stepson 'provided it is not the Persian poet who has purged the narrative⁶³⁷'. The missing link may be

⁶³³ Goldman, (1995) p.110.

⁶³⁴ It is common to have the daughter of the seductress as a wife for the hero: cf. Bellerophon.

⁶³⁵ A novel plot appears to be more coherent if its characters intersect and intermingle in a cohesive ensemble. Heliodorus is the master of this art, especially in his treatment of Sisimithres in the context of Charicleia's recognition at the very end.

⁶³⁶ *P.Berol*, 7927etc.lines 12-15, φ[ι]λότεκνος γὰρ ὥς []. πώτατον [εἰ]ς ἐπιβουλήν θη-[]. τα ἀποθρ[...].ς καὶ κατὰ προ-[] α Ἡγήσιπ[ύ]λη τῶν ἐαυτῆς [] π[ι]αίδων.

⁶³⁷ Hägg, (2003) p.221.

hiding in the following omission: the Greek fragment nevertheless suggests that Metiochus did not finish his tale to Polycrates – perhaps due to Parthenope's arrival? – since the king encourages him to join the banquet:

[...] τοῦ πατρὸς ὀλιγωρία [...]]μενα διορθώσομαι τὸ λοι[...]] κ]αταστήσας εἰς ὑψηλότερον[...]. μᾶλλον γένηται τῇ Παρθενό-[πη]⁶³⁸.

Half-told stories are not rare in Greek novels: Hippothous, recounting his adventures, remembers to mention Anthia only at the very end, and almost accidentally. Callirhoe's tale, narrating her past to Dionysius, is only half-revealed, since she does not mention her wedding to Chaereas; further, Cnemon's tale of Demaenete's plot against him is also presented in two parts. Besides it seems natural, despite Metiochus' quality of τὸ εὐθαρσές⁶³⁹, to avoid mentioning all the details in front of a large audience, or perhaps, precisely because of his straightforward approach, Polycrates felt like interrupting him before he revealed too much.

Metiochus' tale appears to have all the typical characteristics of the Phaedra pattern: (a) the chaste youth is Metiochus, whose very name means the one who has wisdom, μῆτις (+ ἔχω), or is driven by wisdom, (+ὀχοῦμαι). His candidness is such that he goes as far as Hippolytus in rejecting Eros' dominance over the human soul. His rejection of Eros sounds like an Hippolytean echo and could perhaps be read in the context of a previous Phaedra pattern:

⁶³⁸ P.Berol., 7927, lines 5-10.

⁶³⁹ P.Berol 7927, θαυ]μασάντων τὸ εὐθαρσές.

εἰη δ'] ἂν κάκεῖνο παντελῶς ἀπίθανο[ν, εἰ][βρέφ]ος ἐστὶν ὁ Ἑρως, περινοστεῖν αὐτ[ὸ]ν. ὅ[λ]η[ν] τή[ν][οἴκου]μένην... ἐγὼ [δέ γ' οὐ]πω—μηδὲ πειραθείην τὸ σύγολον.⁶⁴⁰

(b) The plot of the stepmother results in his (c) exile from his home country – cf. Bellerophon, Phoenix – and eventually (d?) the proof of his innocence and the marriage to Parthenope. Motif (c) in this case is not of retardation but of motion.

2.2.1.3 *Ninus and Semiramis*

How much of the Hippolytus tale is in the *Ninus* novel is hard to judge. Nevertheless Ninus' first words to his aunt and Semiramis' mother show that he has been, like Hippolytus, bound with an oath of chastity: ἀδιάφθορον καὶ ἀπείρατον Ἀφροδίτης φυλάξειν[±7 ὥμω]μόκει⁶⁴¹. Ninus' chastity, just like that of Metiochus, seems to be patterned on a Hippolytean model. Nevertheless both youths soon find their soulmates and the omnipotent Eros challenges and tests their bond over earth and sea.

2.2.1.4 *Rhodanes and Sinonis*

Iamblichus' *Babyloniaca* provides a rather complex vision of the topos of chastity. In this case the third woman is a farmer's daughter, καλὴ τὴν ὄψιν ἄρτι χηρωθεῖσα καὶ τῇ πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα εὐνοίᾳ τὰς τρίχας περικειραμένη⁶⁴². This characteristic assimilates her to Melite and other female rivals sympathetic to the

⁶⁴⁰ P.Berol. 7927-9588-21179, lines 54-60.

⁶⁴¹ P.Berol. 6926, lines 18-20.

⁶⁴² Photius, 94.76b.

reader. Being a widow⁶⁴³ also makes her a more threatening candidate than standard examples of the Phaedra pattern, since she is allowed to take the hero in marriage. Rhodanes, although committed to Sinonis, shows compassion for the unnamed woman's sufferings and the help she has offered him, and kisses her; Sinonis, bewildered after witnessing the scene, reacts like the vengeful 'other woman' we encounter in the Greek novels and tries to kill her rival. This variation should not be classified as conflicting with the remaining motifs; rather it provides an interesting variant on a positive version of the 'other woman', while it furnishes material for an elaborate description of Sinonis' jealousy.

Preliminary conclusions

The discussion above has demonstrated that the pattern of the 'other woman' is adapted in the novelistic narratives in many variations: the stepmother – stepson relationship is not a necessary element, although it seems to intensify the feelings of guilt of those involved –whether the relationship is perceived as incest or adultery. Equally common, however, seems to be the variant of the chaste guest, who like Bellerophon does not allow his eyes to rest upon the wife of his host. What is more, the punishment of the adulteress and the reward of the hero seem to have been a part of the fairytale tradition as well as the marriage of the hero with the 'kin' of the 'other woman', as is the case in some of the traditions regarding Joseph and Bellerophon.

⁶⁴³ A review of the motif in Huber, (1990), for the similarities of the Widow and the Phaedra tales in Petronius see Macglathery, (2001) p.124ff. and Harrison, (2006).

How much the Phaedra myth directly influenced the fragmentary novels and the novel of Joseph is impossible to determine, given the scarcity of allusions. It is only the *Metiochus* that shows precise Hippolytean characteristics, with the hero's absolute rejection of love, a theme that we do not encounter in the myth of Bellerophon and/or that of Phoenix. With regards to Joseph however, his vow of chastity can be interpreted without being related to the Hippolytus myth.

2.2.2 The explicit versions of the myth of Milady de Winter⁶⁴⁴

The popularity of the Phaedra myth

At this point I shall move on to examine the reception of the Phaedra pattern in later antiquity, which, according to Pausanias its Euripidean staging was probably one of the most popular tales even among the barbarians⁶⁴⁵. The reworkings of the Phaedra myth tried to investigate Phaedra's emotions and to exonerate her, by positive models of Phaedra and/or of Hippolytus.

2.2.2.1 *The Second Sophistic on Phaedra*⁶⁴⁶

Plutarch, Lucian, Philostratus

Plutarch, while denying the historicity of the tale⁶⁴⁷ and condemning the

⁶⁴⁴ Milady de Winter in the *Trois Mousquetaires* of Alexander Dumas, is accused, among other, of adultery, poisoning, and political conspiracy. She is executed by her ex-lover, Athos, and the reason she is cited here is because of her resemblance to Heliodorus' Arsace.

⁶⁴⁵ Pausanias, 1.22.1.

⁶⁴⁶ Table-6.

⁶⁴⁷ Plutarch, *Theseus*, 28.22, τὰς δὲ περὶ ταύτην καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ δυστυχίας, ἐπεὶ μηδὲν ἀντιπίπτει παρὰ τῶν ἱστορικῶν τοῖς τραγικοῖς, οὕτως ἔχειν θετέον ὥς ἐκεῖνοι πεποιήκασιν ἅπαντες.

moral message of such plays⁶⁴⁸, presents a positive Phaedra in the person of the chaste widow Ismenodora, who happily marries a boy much younger than herself⁶⁴⁹. Lucian, who also despises τῶν πάλαι τὰς μαχλοτάτας, Φαίδρας καὶ Παρθενόπας καὶ Ῥοδόπας τινάς⁶⁵⁰, reinterprets the Phaedra-like tale of Stratonice and Combabos, in which the queen did not accuse Combabos out of vengeance. Lucian comments with insight that true love cannot result in slander:

ἐγὼ μὲν νυν οὐδὲ Σθενεβοίην πείθομαι οὐδὲ Φαίδρην τοιάδε ἐπιτελέσαι, εἰ τὸν Ἰππόλυτον ἀτρεκέως ἐπόθεε Φαίδρη. ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ἐχέτω ὅπως καὶ ἐγένετο⁶⁵¹.

Next to these positive Phaedras, Ismenadora and Stratonice, stands Philostratus' positive Hippolytus, who finds his incarnation in Timasion's person⁶⁵². The youth although accused by his stepmother does not reject Aphrodite, and Apollonius, who himself had been often the victim of such slander because of his self-restraint⁶⁵³, proposes to ἐστεφανῶσθαι αὐτὸν (Timasion) ἐπὶ σωφροσύνῃ καὶ πρὸ Ἰππολύτου τοῦ Θησέως⁶⁵⁴. Like in the case of the Helen myth, Philostratus opts for a novel-influenced version of the Phaedra myth too. It is important to notice that although both the Helen and the Phaedra myth find a very harsh and conservative treatment when discussed in their original versions, Homer and Euripides, they are treated much more flexibly and positively in the fringe, pattern-derived, models.

⁶⁴⁸ Plutarch, *How should the young men listen to the poets*, 28a; the tale also figures in the *Minor Parallels* 314a, the comparison between Theseus and Comnenius.

⁶⁴⁹ Plutarch, *Amatorius*, 749d.

⁶⁵⁰ Lucian, *On dancing*, 2; And again in 46, with spectacles on 'Cretan themes'.

⁶⁵¹ Lucian, *On the Syrian Goddess*, 19ff. For the religious background of the etiological tale see Lightfoot, (2003).

⁶⁵² Discussion of the Euripidean quotations in Bowie, (2009). Also on Apollonius' beauty – compared to that of *Hippolytus* – as non-erotic see Billault, (2000) p.106.

⁶⁵³ Philostratus, *Apollonius*, 1.13, καίτοι ψευδῇ γράμματα κατ' αὐτοῦ ξυνθείς.

⁶⁵⁴ Philostratus, *Apollonius*, 6.3.

Structuring the Phaedra myth

The myth of Phaedra found in the Classical mythological curriculum⁶⁵⁵ was highly influenced by Euripides two *Hippolytoi*⁶⁵⁶ and ended up being synonymous with the play. Both tragedies seem to have a great impact on the Greek novel as has already been observed on many occasions⁶⁵⁷. Hutchinson suggests a plausible sequence of events for the first play in which Phaedra's testing by Theseus and her suicide follow, and do not precede, Hippolytus' death. In this case the plot conforms more to that of the *Tale of Two Brothers* discussed above. An older version of the Phaedra tale, which as we shall see is often cited by Lucian and the Greek novelists, is that of Bellerophon and Stheneboea⁶⁵⁸. The pattern in this tale has the following elements: (a) the chaste youth Bellerophon is (b) falsely accused by Stheneboea (or Ant(e)ia), the wife of his host, Proetus. (c) Proetus sends him off to his father-in-law, Iobates, who hesitates to kill a guest and sends him against the Chimaera; (d) not only is Bellerophon not killed but in the end, Iobates, convinced of his innocence marries him to his younger daughter⁶⁵⁹. Another tale figuring a stepmother was that of Phoenix, blinded by his father, after the unfounded accusation of his father's concubine⁶⁶⁰.

The remaining fragments show that, despite the predilection for Phaedra,

⁶⁵⁵ Kirk, (1970): 'Greek myths are quite heavily contaminated in the form in which we know them. This is all the more true for the Phaedra myth'.

⁶⁵⁶ For the two plays and a possible reconstruction of the first *Hippolytus* see Barret, (1964b) and Hutchinson, (2004); also Kovacs, (1995). About Potiphar's wife motif and Euripides' play see Halleran, (1995).

⁶⁵⁷ For a general approach see Fusillo, (1991(1989)), Billault, (1998b). Specialised references will be given with the treatment of each novel.

⁶⁵⁸ For the fragments and the background of the myth see Collard (1995).

⁶⁵⁹ *Iliad*, 6.155-197.

⁶⁶⁰ See Wehrli, (1969). On the tale of Argyranasius and the origins of Euripides' *Phoenix*.

the *Stheneboea* with its folktale ending continued to be popular, probably because it was closer to the ambience of New Comedy and that of the Greek novel. The ending of the Joseph tale might have enjoyed the same popularity; like that of Bata and Bellerophon, it ends with the marriage of the hero and his accession to the throne. The need for a happy end and the already available versions of the pattern suggest the development of the fourth motif of the pattern, that of the punishment of the villain and the reward of the hero.

This plot pattern resembles Helen's since it presents the hero's chastity threatened by a rival⁶⁶¹. It is motif (b) that makes the difference, because the rivals' motif in the Phaedra pattern does not affect the transition of the hero in the narrative. Only in some cases, like those of Bata and Bellerophon, does the hero leave the house of his father/master; in these cases exile replaces the hero's punishment,⁶⁶² and there is a strong motive, that of reward⁶⁶³. In Lucian's *ἑκφρασις* of Apelles' painting of *Slander*, found in his work *On Calumny*, *Slander* is depicted as followed by *Repentance*: in structural terms, motif (c) cannot appear without the subsequent motif (d)⁶⁶⁴.

Preliminary conclusions

The broad conclusion that can be extracted from this treatment of the

⁶⁶¹ The symmetry studied in Konstan, (1994).

⁶⁶² The two Euripidean *Hippolyti* play with this possibility of exile, of distance, but as soon as *Hippolytus* exits the city-limits he dies. The focus is on the house, *oikos*, and the impossibility of escape.

⁶⁶³ In the *Hippolytus* Artemis also promises the dying hero that a cult will commemorate his death as a reward for his chastity.

⁶⁶⁴ Lucian, *On Calumny*, 5, Μετάνοια, οἶμαι, αὕτη ἐλέγετο· ἐπεστρέφετο γοῦν εἰς τοῦπίσω δακρύουσα καὶ μετ' αἰδοῦς παννὴν τὴν Ἀλήθειαν προσιοῦσαν ὑπέβλεπεν. The passage is famous from Botticelli's *Calumny of Apelles* in Florence.

Phaedra myth in later antiquity is that the pattern continued to inspire writers, but that these are keen to opt for a less radical, less misogynistic version of the chaste youth, rather than a Hippolytean one. Moreover, there seems to be a preference for happy endings, just as with Ismenodora, and a tendency to investigate the emotional side of the tale rather than emphasizing the family drama: hence the emphasis on the means of attempted seduction (supplication, threats, a letter, the nurse) and/or on the carrying out of the accusation (letter, suicide, falsely reported rape). The Phaedra emotional portrait was replaced by, what we could nowadays call a psychological study of Phaedra's motivations but not of her passion. Lucian's Stratonice, being partly in the realm of myth and partly in that of the literary culture of the Second Sophistic, probably presents the only truly 'new' version of the pattern, introducing the detail of Combabos' emasculation. But even in this exotic, oriental setting, which might have allowed the narrator to experiment with a more ferocious oriental Phaedra, of the sort we shall see in the novels, Lucian interrupts his narrative to comment on his reader's expectations, thus making a seemingly realistic comment on female emotions.

2.2.2.2 The Greek novels on Phaedra

Given the different possibilities offered by re-interpretation of the Phaedra myth, the pattern became an almost compulsory ingredient of the novels' plots. The Phaedra pattern resembles that of Helen: in both, a rival threatens the hero's chastity, yet the Phaedra pattern seems more static, since the male hero is not

transported. Moreover, the Phaedra plots tend to take place indoors, as expected for an adultery plot, which emphasises the dramatic character of these episodes. Finally, unlike Helen, the Phaedra myth occupies fewer pages in the novels, so that the two patterns are not symmetrical⁶⁶⁵.

Chariton

1. Intertexts

I have already discussed the Hippolytean hunting scene from the *Callirhoe*, Book 6. 4.1. The king's hunting preparations are meant to distract him from thinking of Callirhoe⁶⁶⁶ but his plan has the opposite outcome, since συνεξήλθε γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν θήραν ὁ Ἑρως αὐτῷ⁶⁶⁷. The scene, given the King's attested σωφροσύνη⁶⁶⁸, echoes the introductory scene of the *Hippolytus* although in this case the hero, despite being chaste in deed is not so in his thoughts – and the heroine is not the predator, but the victim. The hunt ends abruptly with the king returning hastily to the palace⁶⁶⁹. It is impossible to determine the debt of this scene to Virgil's *Aeneid* 4, Dido's and Aeneas' hunt, and/or Seneca's description of Phaedra hunting alongside Hippolytus⁶⁷⁰.

To return to the Euripidean intertexts, the king's resistance, like Phaedra's, lessens with time. After Artaxates' second proposal, when he reminds him that Callirhoe has no official husband yet, the king consents to send him as the go-

⁶⁶⁵ Against Konstan, (1994).

⁶⁶⁶ 6.3.9.

⁶⁶⁷ 6.4.5.

⁶⁶⁸ 6.3.8, μηδεμίαν μου καταγνώς ἀκρασίαν.

⁶⁶⁹ 6.4.8, ὡς τὸ καλλιστον θήραμα θηράσας.

⁶⁷⁰ Seneca, *Phaedra*, 105ff. On possible allusions to the *Aeneid* see Tilg, (2010) p.261-297.

between. Callirhoe refuses tactfully⁶⁷¹ and the pattern is abandoned at this point. Nevertheless, with the sudden outbreak of the Egyptian revolt, Callirhoe's case is sunk in retardation as she is moved with Artaxerxes' possessions⁶⁷². This part corresponds with motif (b) from the Helen pattern, hence the related movement: Callirhoe leaves Babylon but remains in captivity until her reunion with Chaereas. In this case the Phaedra pattern is fused with the Helen one and the references to the *Hippolytus* could be read as using the play itself as an intertext on the pathology of love rather than echoing the pattern (Table 7).

Pattern avoided

What remains part of the Phaedra pattern is Callirhoe's fear that the King's love might be revealed to Stateira, and that she might react as a vengeful Phaedra, punishing and humiliating Callirhoe and/or selling her to get her away⁶⁷³. This possible outcome has already been alluded to in Theron's false tale about Callirhoe to Phocas: according to the pirate, Callirhoe is from Sybaris and was sold because of her mistress' jealousy⁶⁷⁴. Chariton-narrator here consciously omits a fallacious tale, which is anyway known to the reader from previous novels. He nevertheless provides the reader with enough hints to make it evident

⁶⁷¹ 6.10.6.

⁶⁷² 6.9.5-7, οὐ μὴν Καλλιρόης ἐπελέληστο βασιλεύς.

⁶⁷³ 6.6.5, φοβερωτέραν ἡγοῦμαι τὴν τῆς βασιλίδος ζηλοτυπίαν.

⁶⁷⁴ 1.12.5, γυνὴ δὲ Συβαρίτις, εὐδαιμονεστάτη τῶν ἐκεῖ, καλλίστην ἄβραν ἔχουσα διὰ ζηλοτυπίαν ἐπώλησεν, ἐγὼ δὲ αὐτὴν ἐπριάμην.

that this is not due to lack of skill, but rather is an artistic choice. Chariton does not include any Phaedra patterns, and Stateira, although a potential 'barbarian other woman' remains a positive character, a Hellenized oriental queen⁶⁷⁵, throughout the novel. As a result the King is forced, by the plot and by Stateira's tact, to display his fidelity and justice to their maximum.

Discussion

Chariton's novel does not make use of the Phaedra pattern explicitly – as a pattern – despite the close intertextual triggers that we have just observed. As for Chaereas, not only is he not tempted to possess his beautiful prize – before recognizing Callirhoe as his wife – but he also mentions ironically that he is ἐπαφρόδιτος καὶ ἐράσμιος, if the woman rejects him before seeing him, adding that he, above all, πρέπει γὰρ σωφροσύνην τιμᾶν⁶⁷⁶. Chaereas is sketched as the opposite of Dionysius and the Great King and as a true example of σωφροσύνη, respectful towards Artemis and Aphrodite alike. Lastly, the omission of the pattern by the narrator should not be conceived as inconsistent with the dating of the novel. *J&A* precedes the writer from Aphrodisias, and a version of the *Metiochus and Parthenope* may have been circulating around this time as well, i.e. there were novelistic treatments of the pattern. As for the emotional tact that the novel displays in its treatment, it anticipates, in my view, the Lucianic treatment, of the oriental but not vengeful Stratonice, in that Stateira is not

⁶⁷⁵ Haynes, (2003) p.103.

⁶⁷⁶ Heliodorus, 7.6.12.

jealous, as it would have been expected from an oriental queen.

Xenophon of Ephesus

Xenophon of Ephesus uses the Phaedra pattern as a means of forward movement, not retardation (Table 8). Moreover, unlike Helen, he makes precise allusions to the Euripidean treatment of the myth, and, although he is not consistent in his intertextual references, he structures the novel around the three Phaedra-like women that manipulate its plot, namely Manto, Cyno and a subsidiary case, Rhenaea⁶⁷⁷. The Manto episode occupies and influences the plot of books 2 and 3 and is the most elaborate. The Cyno episode is shorter and appears not to be fully developed, since it consists of a mere six sub-sections. The episode of Rhenaea is not fully developed either.

1. Intertextuality : the larger Hippolytean project

Eros' vengeful plot and Xenophon's novel

The main elements of the Hippolytus plot are adumbrated at the beginning of the novel: the background is Artemis' temple at Ephesus and Anthia is presented as a priestess and simulacrum of the goddess⁶⁷⁸. The novel's first tableau presents, a hunting scene, which is not a mere 'exotic touch' associated with the cult of Artemis Ephesia:

⁶⁷⁷ Haynes, (2003) p.102, classifies under the 'Phaedra' tag all the following: Stateira, Rhenaea, Manto, Cyno, Lycaenion, Melite and Arsace; she says that as 'female antagonists [they] can be grouped together according to a similarity in narrative function (rivals for the heroes' affection) but the diverse treatment they receive at the hands of the different authors is interesting both from a socio-historical and a literary perspective'. In particular for Rhenaea's case (p. 108): although Rhenaea's plot function differs from that of Manto and Cyno, they share a set of characteristics which are indicative of the author's strict stance towards female sexuality.

⁶⁷⁸ 1.2.7.

παρήεσαν δὲ κατὰ στίχον οἱ πομπεύοντες· πρῶτα μὲν τὰ ἱερὰ καὶ δᾶδες καὶ κανᾶ καὶ θυμιάματα, ἐπὶ τούτοις ἵπποι καὶ κύνες καὶ σκεύη κυνηγετικά ὧν τὰ μὲν πολεμικά, τὰ δὲ πλεῖστα εἰρηνικά⁶⁷⁹.

The opening scene in the *Hippolytus* also depicts a hunting scene⁶⁸⁰. In Xenophon, however, it is a religious procession - but this alludes to the ritual procession during which Phaedra first saw Hippolytus⁶⁸¹. Obviously in classical Athens women were not allowed to be seen in public and these cases of love at first sight at religious festivals are not a mere motif, but the only occasion on which the two sexes had the opportunity to meet each other. Nevertheless the emphasis on the procession in honour of Artemis points to a rather more nuanced intertextuality between the two texts. But there is more: Anthia is presented as the living image of the goddess in whose service she is. The comparison of Anthia to Artemis is a *lieu commun*⁶⁸² in the Greek novels; yet the hunting context reinforces the link between Habrocomes and Hippolytus, the lover of Artemis. That is the reason why, when she appears in front of the public in her heavenly beauty, the crowds, overjoyed, honour her as the real Goddess Artemis⁶⁸³:

πολλάκις αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ τεμένουσιν ἰδόντες Ἐφέσιοι προσεκύνησαν ὡς Ἄρτεμιν..., καὶ ἦσαν ποικίλαι παρὰ τῶν θεωμένων φωναί, τῶν μὲν ὑπ' ἐκπλήξεως τὴν θεὸν εἶναι λεγόντων, τῶν δὲ ἄλλην τινὰ ὑπὸ τῆς θεοῦ περιποιημένην⁶⁸⁴.

A close reading of the incident offers further support for reading

⁶⁷⁹ 1.2.4.

⁶⁸⁰ *Hippolytus*, 51-56, ἀλλ' εἰσὼρῶ γὰρ τόνδε παῖδα Θησέως/στείχοντα, θήρας μόχθον ἐκλελοιπότα, Ἴππόλυτον, ἔξω τῶνδε βήσομαι τόπων.

⁶⁸¹ *Hippolytus*, 24-27, πατὴρ εὐγενὴς δάμαρ/ἰδοῦσα Φαίδρα καρδίαν κατέσχετο ἔρωτι δεινῷ.

⁶⁸² Létoublon, (1993) p.189, the female protagonist as Artemis and Aphrodite.

⁶⁸³ Dalmeyda, (1926). p.5; also Steiner, (1969) and Griffiths, (1978). Griffiths pp. 411-412 argues that Artemis cannot be Anthia's model. For the Greek identity of Artemis at Ephesus see Yildirim, (2004).

⁶⁸⁴ 1.2.7.

Habrocomes as Hippolytus-like. The hero is depicted as a handsome youth who thinks highly of his beauty⁶⁸⁵ and is condescending regarding Love's power:!

Ἐρωτά γε μὴν οὐδὲ ἐνόμιζεν εἶναι θεόν, ἀλλὰ πάντα ἐξέβαλεν ὥς οὐδὲν ἡγούμενος, λέγων ὥς οὐκ ἂν ποτὲ οὐ τις ἐρασθεῖη οὐδὲ ὑποταγεῖη τῷ θεῷ μὴ θέλων. εἰ δέ που ἱερὸν ἢ ἄγαλμα Ἐρωτος εἶδε, κατεγέλα⁶⁸⁶.

This is Hippolytean behaviour⁶⁸⁷, since one remembers very well the last words of Hippolytus to his old slave, who was trying to convince him to honour Aphrodite⁶⁸⁸. Moreover, Habrocomes is not just handsome, like Hippolytus, but he appears to be the image of a god himself, in order to pair Anthia's exceptional beauty. This is why during the procession towards the temple of Artemis, they exclaim in amazement with a simile⁶⁸⁹:

πάντες ἰδόντες Ἀβροκόμην ἐκείνων ἐπελάθοντο, ἔτρεψαν δὲ τὰς ὄψεις ἐπ' αὐτὸν βοῶντες ὑπὸ τῆς θεᾶς ἐκπεπληγμένοι, 'καλὸς Ἀβροκόμης' λέγοντες, 'καὶ οἶος οὐδὲ εἰς καλοῦ μίμημα θεοῦ'.⁶⁹⁰

Habrocomes' arrogance⁶⁹¹ makes him a version of Hippolytus, who is described by Aphrodite as one of those who φρονοῦσιν εἰς ἡμᾶς μέγα⁶⁹². Anthia mentions that she is in love with Habrocomes καλῷ μὲν, ἀλλ' ὑπερηφάνῳ⁶⁹³. For this arrogance Habrocomes is going to be punished, not by Aphrodite, but by her son,

⁶⁸⁵ 1.1.4, ἐφρόνει δὲ τὸ μειράκιον ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ μέγала.

⁶⁸⁶ 1.1.5ff.

⁶⁸⁷ Dalmeyda, (1926) p. xviii: 'Éros joue dans le roman le rôle que sa mère tient dans l'Hippolyte d'Euripide. However Dalmeyda does not explain thing further. And I believe that the link he makes between Anthia and Phaedra is quite odd, if not wrong.

⁶⁸⁸ *Hippolytus*, 113, τὴν σὴν δὲ Κύπριν πόλλ' ἐγὼ χαίρειν λέγω.

⁶⁸⁹ *Hippolytus*, 88, ἀναξ, θεοὺς γὰρ δεσπότας καλεῖν χρεών. For a discussion of the meaning of those lines see Barrett, (1964): 'Lord – I address you thus because, it is the gods whom one should call master'. But West, (1965) and Kovacs, (1995): 'Lord, for it is as gods that one should address one's masters'.

⁶⁹⁰ 1.2.8 etc.

⁶⁹¹ 1.1.4.

⁶⁹² *Hippolytus*, 6.

⁶⁹³ 1.4.6.

Eros, whom he dared to challenge; the punishment is not to fall in love with Anthia as he had thought in the beginning⁶⁹⁴ but to be separated from her. Only when in the hands of the pirates does he understand that ἄρχεται τὰ μεμαντευμένα τιμωρίαν ἤδη με ὁ θεὸς τῆς ὑπερηφανίας εἰσπράττει⁶⁹⁵.

Xenophon incorporates a positive version of the Hippolytus myth in his main narrative. He may underline Anthia's silent erotic suffering, her physical weakening, her need for a faithful nurse ἵνα βοηθὸν λήψομαι; τίني πάντα κοινώσομαι⁶⁹⁶ in a Euripidean spirit, but the situation is not an impasse, as it is in the play. Anthia's status as a *parthenos* and that of Habrocomes as a youth obviously do not prevent their marriage, whether with or without the help of an intermediary, and despite Anthia's excuses, the situation is romantic rather than shameful⁶⁹⁷; nevertheless the large-scale Phaedra pattern applied here by Xenophon requires that an oracle approve of the marriage and foretell their future trials⁶⁹⁸. Clarian Apollo's intervention sanctions their union and their marriage ideal is summarized in the oaths of love:

ὁμόσωμεν ἑαυτοῖς, φιλτάτη, σὺ μὲν ὥς ἐμοὶ μενεῖς ἀγνή καὶ ἄλλον ἄνδρα οὐχ ὑπομενεῖς, ἐγὼ δὲ ὅτι οὐκ <ἄν> ἄλλη γυναικὶ συνοικήσαιμι⁶⁹⁹.

The oracle's prediction of the beginning and the ending⁷⁰⁰ of erotic suffering, νόσος, is the link between the previous echoes of the Phaedra pattern on the level

⁶⁹⁴ 1.4.4, Ἐρως, μέγα σοι τρόπαιον ἐγγίγερται κατὰ Ἀβροκόμου τοῦ σώφρονος...ἀπειρος ὢν, Ἐρως, ἔτι τῶν σῶν ὑπερηφάνουν· ἀλλὰ νῦν Ἀνθίαν ἡμῖν ἀπόδος.

⁶⁹⁵ 2.1.2

⁶⁹⁶ 1.4.7

⁶⁹⁷ For Phaedra's shame and guilt Gérard, (1993).

⁶⁹⁸ 1.6.1ff.

⁶⁹⁹ 1.11.4.

⁷⁰⁰ 1.6.1, τίπτε ποθεῖτε μαθεῖν νόσου τέλος ἡδὲ καὶ ἀρχήν; / ἀμφοτέρους μία νόσος ἔχει, λύσις ἔνθεν ἀνέστη./ δεινὰ δ' ὁρῶ τοῖσδεσι πάθη καὶ ἀνήνυτα ἐργα.

of myth^I and their transposition on the level of plot, myth^{II}. Note that this is the only occasion where the Phaedra pattern is openly applied as a model to a larger novelistic plot, and not just to specific episodes, myth^{III}. The mutual oaths of fidelity and chastity divert the Phaedra pattern to a different, novelistic direction, which still maintains the articulation of a possible Phaedra pattern, but not its content: (a) chaste youth Habrocomes neglects to pay his respects to Eros; (b) Anthia is in love with Habrocomes, who does not require a go-between to seduce him; (c) the youth will nevertheless be punished for his previous impiety, not by failing to attain the object of his love but by first getting and then losing it. Unfortunately, as in the case of Phaedra, his punishment entails the suffering of his beloved until (d) she is restored to him.

This initial pattern is a loose allusion to what follows and the Euripidean echoes could also be read at a level of mythological simile or model (myth^I). What is important for the novels is the way in which this broad preamble is translated into novelistic terms as follows: (a) chaste Habrocomes is in love only with Anthia-Artemis, (b) different women try to seduce him, (c) Habrocomes suffers their revenge, (d) Habrocomes is rewarded for his chastity and the seductresses punished. Hence the initial Phaedra background is used in a programmatic way to introduce a different type of Phaedra pattern, one in which the youth is faithful not to chastity, but to his beloved. The exposition of Xenophon's tale situates him in the heart of the Euripidean tradition of the *Hippolytoi* and it is used as an amplifier for the rest of the story. Once the setting is contextualised then the

different variations which structure the rest of the pattern can be introduced without intertextual references or even be concealed under non-Euripidean intertextuality.

2. Phaedra patterns and the structure of the novel

Manto

The Manto episode which occupies and initiates Books 2 and 3 has nothing in common with the Euripidean opening, but with the general Phaedra pattern. Manto, whose name indicates Apolline influence, and for that reason is presented as part of the divine plan foretold at Claros⁷⁰¹, is a virgin, beautiful and not married⁷⁰². In this she does not conform to the general Phaedra-pattern and she could have been a possible partner for Habrocomes. Yet, like the powerful females of the pattern, she is in a higher social position than Habrocomes and Anthia, whom her father Apsyrtos brings into their household as a slave. As the story goes, Manto falls in love with the handsome Habrocomes, who, faithful to Anthia, rejects her. Manto tries unsuccessfully to use Anthia's former servant, Rhode, as a go-between. In her encounter with her Manto makes clear that, if Habrocomes does not consent, they will have to suffer the wrath of an ἡδυκημένης καὶ βαρβάρου παρθένου which knows no limits⁷⁰³.

It is hard to tell exactly the debt of that articulation to the first *Hippolytus*,

⁷⁰¹ For Manto as the mythical founder of the oracle of Claros, Pausanias, 7.3.1-2; On the names in Xenophon see Hägg, (1971)

⁷⁰² 2.3.1.

⁷⁰³ 2.3.5.

in which Phaedra was presented more daring, and/or to the *Medea*, since barbarians, contrary to Greeks were typically presented as bad-tempered and pathologically jealous⁷⁰⁴. The only Euripidean echo in the episode is the letter sent to Habrocomes by Manto⁷⁰⁵. Letters⁷⁰⁶ are also a characteristic of the Phaedra myth⁷⁰⁷; however love letters are not in the *carte du jour*, save for letters of accusation. The reason for this is that *scripta manent* and love letters could result in true or false evidence of guilt. Despite Habrocomes' imprisonment, Manto's letter reveals the truth to her father, while she and Moeris move to Syria, dragging along Anthia, as part of her planned revenge.

This easy-going Phaedra-style plot presents some deviations from the pattern which should be attributed not exclusively to a particular Euripidean intertext, but rather to the programmatic way in which the Phaedra pattern is used. Manto is a virgin and her erotic suffering is reminiscent of that of Anthia. Just like Anthia she is unable to declare her love to Habrocomes in person, nor is she able to reveal it to anyone else of her household⁷⁰⁸. But Manto's obstacle is not just Habrocomes' arrogance, as it was for Anthia. Her object of desire is inaccessible since she knows that he has a γυναῖκα εἰδυῖαν καὶ πείσειν οὐδέποτε ἐλπίζουσα⁷⁰⁹. After her failure to convince Habrocomes with Rhode's help, she

⁷⁰⁴ On emotions see Konstan, (2006) p.231; jealousy was regarded as an emotion of the barbarians, where as the Greeks it was interpreted as a 'selfish spleen'. Also Bowie, (1991).

⁷⁰⁵ 2.5.1.

⁷⁰⁶ For the uses of letters in the novels in relation to the plot see Létoublon, (2003).

⁷⁰⁷ Probably there were love letters in Sophocles' *Phaedra*; see: Radt (1977)) p.475.

⁷⁰⁸ 2.3.2

⁷⁰⁹ 2.3.2.

sends him a letter *via* a barbarian servant⁷¹⁰. The detail is important because it accentuates the difference between the Greek and barbarian reaction, not only on the level of the two rivals, Anthia and Manto, but also on the level of servants, Rhode and the barbarian. Manto's love-letter has no effect and, driven by jealousy, she accuses him to her father of attempted rape. Apsyrtos, who was coming home bringing Manto a husband, punishes Habrocomes violently and imprisons him, bringing the sub-plot to a dead end. The real culprit, Manto, is not only not punished, but marries Moeris and departs for Syria, taking Anthia, Rhode and Leucon along with her.

The breaking of the pattern at such an important and unexpected moment of the narrative is not paralleled in the *Hippolytus* plot. Elements like Habrocomes' imprisonment echo the tale of Joseph, who was a slave and spent two years in captivity. The reaction towards the 'other woman' also seems to be analogous. The Flavius Josephus version, discussing the reaction of Potiphar, mentions that he was eager to punish Joseph, being in love with his wife:

δοὺς δὲ σωφρονεῖν τῇ γυναικὶ πονηρὸν δ' εἶναι κατακρίνας τὸν Ἰώσηπον τὸν μὲν εἰς τὴν τῶν κακούργων εἰρκτὴν ἐνέβαλεν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ γυναικὶ καὶ μᾶλλον ἐφρόνει κοσμιότητα καὶ σωφροσύνην αὐτῇ μαρτυρῶν⁷¹¹.

Apsyrtos' punishment of Habrocomes is inflicted in order to show τῷ νυμφίῳ τῆς θυγατρὸς ... ὅτι σώφρονα παρθένον ἄξεται⁷¹². Habrocomes' time in prison is associated with dreams too, although the dream he has of his father seems to

⁷¹⁰ 2.5.3.

⁷¹¹ Flavius Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, 2.59.

⁷¹² 2.6.5.

need no deep interpretation, since it predicts his manumission and his reunion with Anthia. Meanwhile Apsyrtos finds Manto's letter and realises the injustice that has been done. He frees Habrocomes, appoints him τῆς οἰκίας ἄρχειν, and promises to marry him to a citizen's daughter⁷¹³. Manto escapes the punishment like Potiphar's wife, – i.e. part one of motif (d) – and Habrocomes is converted from a slave into the major-domo. Yet this turn of events endangers the novelistic pattern: Habrocomes takes up the direction of Apsyrtos' house in order to collect information about Anthia⁷¹⁴, just as Joseph was appointed 'curator' of Egypt.

The pattern seems to have reached a stalemate until Manto's second letter informs her father regarding Anthia. We know from the Helen chapter that the Moeris episode results in the transportation of the heroine, because Manto's husband turns out to be one of Anthia's ardent suitors (motif b⁷¹⁵). But Manto's letter offers another reading of the Helen pattern, by introducing a groundless accusation. This time the target of the slander is Anthia and the episode is patterned as an equivalent of the previous Phaedra pattern. Manto, prone to baseless accusations, reverses the situation and makes of Anthia a potential Phaedra. In her reading she sees (a) Moeris, the loyal husband of Manto (b) and Anthia the 'other woman' who tries – unwillingly but successfully– to seduce him⁷¹⁶. Moeris does not appear to have strong will power, unlike Habrocomes; Manto takes the situation in her hands, and sends Anthia off to Cilicia as a slave.

⁷¹³ 2.10.2.

⁷¹⁴ 2.10.4.

⁷¹⁵ 2.11.1, ὁ Μοῖρις ...ἐρᾷ τῆς Ἀνθείας σφοδρὸν ἔρωτα.

⁷¹⁶ 2.12.1 Ἀνθειάν...πολλὰ διαπραξανένην κακὰ.

Therefore Manto's purposeful misreading of the Moeris episode bridges motifs (d-) and (d) of the Phaedra and the Helen patterns respectively – where (d1) is Habrocomes' innocence without Manto's punishment, and (d2) is Habrocomes' quest for Anthia⁷¹⁷.

Cyno

The Cyno episode is elaborated in a single paragraph⁷¹⁸. Here the basic elements of the plot are reduced to a minimum: Araxos is an old man and his wife is wicked; unlike Manto she is not in the least beautiful, and her name means 'bitch'. Moreover Cyno, the bitch, is a shameless woman; therefore killing her husband in order to satisfy her lust for Habrocomes is not altogether unexpected. Additionally she is not ashamed to express herself in words: προφέρειν λόγον περὶ συνουσίας καὶ δεῖται πείθεσθαι καὶ ἄνδρα ἔχειν ὑπισχνεῖτο καὶ Ἀραξὸν ἀποκτενεῖν⁷¹⁹. The moral distance between the silent suffering of Anthia at the novel's beginning, which echoes that of Phaedra, Manto's indirect love letter and Cyno's direct λόγος is great. Nevertheless, the episode's function is similar: (a) Habrocomes, the chaste lover of Anthia (b) becomes Cyno's object of desire; Cyno is married to Araxos, whom she kills in order to marry Habrocomes. (c) On this exaggerated version of the pattern, since the husband cannot avenge the insult, the unnamed ἄρχων of Egypt is charged with Habrocomes' trial. He is found

⁷¹⁷ Meaning thwhere the quest of Anthia not the very issue of the novel, the incident could have ended with Habrocomes imprisonment and exoneration; however Habrocomes has to look for Anthia, as expected by motif d of the Helen pattern.

⁷¹⁸ 3.12.1

⁷¹⁹ 3.12.4.

guilty but miraculously manages to escape both crucifixion and fire⁷²⁰. The murderous intent of the 'other woman' is also present in the tale of Bata and in the Testament of Joseph: in the first, Bata's wife tries to have him killed twice, and both times he escapes death; in the latter Potiphar's wife presents him with the following possibility: εἰ μοιχεῦσαι οὐ θέλεις, ἐγὼ ἀναιρῶ τὸν Αἰγύπτιον, καὶ οὕτως νόμῳ λήψομαί σε εἰς ἄνδρα⁷²¹.

Nevertheless, despite the obvious divine favour that attends Habrocomes, he is not judged innocent but returned to prison, according to the ἄρχων's words: ἕως μάθωμεν ὅστις ὁ ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν καὶ ὃ, τι οὕτως αὐτοῦ μέλει θεοῖς⁷²². The divine hand that extends over Habrocomes is expressed through an intermediary, Hippothous, who, arriving in Egypt, uses Psammis' gold to pay Habrocomes' ransom and secure his freedom. The culprit Cyno suffers the same punishment as that applied to Habrocomes: she is crucified⁷²³.

Once again, the Phaedra pattern in Xenophon is characteristic for its static quality. Motif (d), despite Habrocomes' salvation, is not one of action but one of retardation and it needs an external thrust in order to get things moving.

Rhenaëa

The Rhenaëa episode falls into neither a Phaedra nor a Helen pattern. However it is developed in a parallel tonality to that of Manto's second plot – i.e. her vengeance on Anthia. O' Sullivan has also noticed the similarities between the

⁷²⁰ 4.4.2.

⁷²¹ *Testament of Joseph*, 1.5.1.

⁷²² 4.2.10.

⁷²³ 4.3.4.

Rhenaëa and Manto incidents and noted that both share the same expressions and structure⁷²⁴. Rhenaëa's husband, Polyidus, captures Anthia, but appears to be an unusual suitor. Although Polyidus desires her, he takes an oath to Isis to keep her pure and brings her home. We do not learn whether Anthia gives him her real name or her new one, like in Hippothous' case, in which she is presented as a Μεμφίτις and, Αἰγυπτία⁷²⁵, a name which may echo that of Potiphar's wife in the *Testament of Joseph*. Even if that is not the case, Polyidus' wife, Rhenaëa, seeing Anthia as the 'other woman' who intends to destroy her marriage, tortures her and sells her to a brothel-keeper, while she tells Polyidus, who is eager to believe her, that Anthia has escaped:

ἡ δὲ Ῥηναία ἐλθόντι τῷ Πολυίδῳ λέγει ὅτι ἀπέδρα ἡ Ἀνθία, κακείνος ἐκ τῶν ἤδη πεπραγμένων ἐπίστευσεν αὐτῇ⁷²⁶.

How can Rhenaëa convince Polyidus about the departure of Anthia? The phrase ἐκ τῶν ἤδη πεπραγμένων seems to allude to a logical conclusion by which Polyidus agrees not to pursue Anthia. However, the main point is Rhenaëa's dissimulation of truth since she provides her husband with a groundless accusation, used to conceal a crime out of jealousy, as was true in Manto's case with both Habrocomes' torture and Anthia's despatch. In this plot (a) the chaste Anthia (b) who is falsely accused of seduction, as being the 'other woman', (c) is punished and sold. Reaching another point of retardation Anthia

⁷²⁴ O'sullivan, (1995) p.41.

⁷²⁵ 4.3.6, ἐφασκε δὲ Αἰγυπτία εἶναι ἐπιχώριος καὶ τὸ ὄνομα Μεμφίτις; cf. *Testament of Joseph*, 11.3.6, καὶ ὠρθηρίζον πρὸς Κύριον, καὶ ἐκλαίον περὶ Μεμφίας τῆς Αἰγυπτίας, ὅτι σφόδρα ἀδιαλείπτως ἐνόχλει μοι.

⁷²⁶ 5.5.7.

remains in the brothel until Hippothous' arrival.

Xenophon's small-scale treatment of the Phaedra myth does not rely on direct intertextuality with the Euripidean text, but echoes it: the detail of Manto's letter is the most important evidence of an at least second-hand knowledge of the Sophoclean *Phaedra* plot – although in a more bookish society, around 150 C.E., letters might well be a more common means of recognition than in classical antiquity. Only the large-scale, programmatic opening makes specific allusions to the setting of the *Hippolytus* play.

Therefore it could be inferred that the Phaedra pattern develops accordingly to the landscape in which it is set: in the Greek world Ephesus is closer to the Euripidean plays in both its structure and its analysis of emotions (i.e. Anthia's silent and noble endurance of love), whereas against the background of Tyre a virgin barbarian woman becomes more daring, until, on Egyptian ground, female cruelty reaches its peak with the raw brutality of Araxos' Egyptian wife – influenced probably by local traditions, such as Joseph's tale and/or Bata's. Is then *Anthia and Habrocomes* a study in the intercultural use of the myth? The four consecutive adaptations of the pattern show that, more than in the other novels, the Phaedra pattern had a pivotal role in the structuring of the novel, being the main motif of retardation and acting in counterpoise to the rapidly alternating and volatile Helen motifs. The diversity in its use bears witness to a conscious engagement of the narrative with the pattern, which might well argue for a culturally broader intertextual context.

Discussion

Xenophon's novel opens with numerous allusions to the *Hippolytus*, especially in Habrocomes' arrogance and punishment but also in the sketching of Anthia's emotions. The opening also alludes to a broader, looser pattern based on the *Hippolytus*, by presenting the adventures of the couple as part of Eros' revenge. Nonetheless on a smaller scale the novel is structured around the three Phaedra episodes, those of Manto, Cyno and Rhenaea, which do not use Euripidean material and which may be variations on other, especially Egyptian, material. Xenophon's novel is unique in its abundant variations of the Phaedra pattern, two major and one minor, plus its opening, programmatic version. It appears to me that just as the Chariton narrator tries to set out different studies of the Helen myth, Xenophon's text attempts to do the same with the Phaedra myth. Given the possible intertextual triggers between the two⁷²⁷, it seems not impossible that in a process of fruitful *aemulatio* Xenophon emphasised another side of the novelistic plot, that of the Phaedra pattern.

Longus

1. Hippolytean intertextuality in the proem

Longus' novel starts with making a firm connection between ἔρως and σωφροσύνη⁷²⁸, a combination, undoubtedly, cherished by Euripides⁷²⁹ and by

⁷²⁷ Especially the echo of Callirhoe's burial by Chaereas and its equivalent in that of Anthia by Perilaus; for the affinities between Xenophon and Chariton see p.79 , and p. 310 (current document).

⁷²⁸ For the analogy see also Bowie, (2007) p.344.

Plato⁷³⁰. The passage is intermingled with Theocritean allusions to the *Cyclops*, *Idyll 11*, and/or the *Hylas*, *Idyll 13*. The narrator ends his proem with the assertion that: οὐδείς ἔρωτα ἔφυγεν ἢ φεύξεται, μέχρις ἂν κάλλος ἦ καὶ ὀφθαλμοὶ βλέπωσιν. ἡμῖν δ' ὁ θεὸς παρὰσχοι σωφρονοῦσι τὰ τῶν ἄλλων γράφειν⁷³¹. Furthermore, the text provides us with another direct allusion, this time to Euripides' *Stheneboea*. Astylus, making fun of Gnathon's mythological encyclopaedism, teases him with the gnomic phrase: μεγάλους ὁ ἔρωτας ποιεῖ σοφιστάς⁷³². The gnome is also alluded to in Plato's *Symposium*, when Agathon praises the musicality of Eros in Euripidean words⁷³³. Other verbal allusions to Euripides can be found in Chloe's inability to eat⁷³⁴ and in the simile of love as a νόσος⁷³⁵ or φάρμακον⁷³⁶, though they may also be interpreted as literary commonplaces.

2. Phaedra patterns in a 'green shade'

Lycaenion

Lycaenion need not be introduced as a Phaedra-like character. By the time

⁷³⁰ Cf. *Hippolytus*, 528-529, μή μοί ποτε σὺν κακῷ φανείης; *Stheneboea* TrGFr, 661.24, (Kannicht), ὁ δὲ εἰς τὸ σώφρον ἐπ' ἀρετὴν τ' ἀγῶν ἔρωτος, ζηλωτὸς ἀνθρώποισι; *Theseus*, TrGFr, 388, (Kannicht), ἀλλ' ἔστι δὴ τις ἄλλος ἐν βροτοῖς ἔρωτος; Plato, *Phaedrus* 241a3: νοῦν καὶ σωφροσύνην ἀντ' ἔρωτος καὶ μανίης, in the first speech of Socrates; *Symposium* 188d5, 196c4, etc.

⁷³¹ For Platonic influence on Longus see: Hunter, (1983) notes on p.31-3 and Danek and Wallisch, (1993) p.46, p. 47, p.54 etc. For the familiarity with the Roman elegists Morgan, (2004) p.148: 'the prayer is a duplicitous indemnity clause, which well resists being read for prurience or titillation'.

⁷³² Pref. 4. For a distant echo see also the words of the chorus in *Hippolytus*, 525, etc ἔρωτος, ἔρωτος, ὁ κατ' ὀμμάτων στάζων πόθον ... μή μοι σὺν κακῷ φανέησις. Cf. *Antigone*, 787, καὶ σ' οὐτ' ἀθανάτων φύξιμος οὐδείς; for Eros in the novels as a positive emotion contrasted to its tragic interpretation see Morgan, (2004) p.150.

⁷³³ 4.18.1; cf. Euripides, *Stheneboea*, TrGFr 633 (Kannicht).

⁷³⁴ Plato, *Symposium*, 166b2, ποιητὴς ὁ θεὸς σοφὸς οὕτως ὥστε καὶ ἄλλον ποιῆσαι.

⁷³⁵ *Hippolytus*, 135-137; see the discussion in Bowie, (2007).

⁷³⁶ *Hippolytus*, 131-132.

⁷³⁷ For the dialogue between the Euripidean and the Theocritean intertexts see Bowie, (2007) p.345 and Morgan, (2004) p.183.

of the composition of Longus' novel the motif and its use seem to have been a standard requirement of novelistic plots (Table 9). Yet the *Daphnis and Chloe* present another, humorous version of it. Lycaenion is presented from the beginning in the colours of the 'other woman':

ἦν δέ τις αὐτῷ γείτων, γεωργὸς γῆς ἰδίας, Χρόμις τὸ ὄνομα, παρηβῶν ἤδη τὸ σῶμα.
 τούτῳ γύναιον ἦν ἐπακτὸν ἐξ ἄστεος, νέον καὶ ὠραῖον καὶ ἀγροικίας ἀβρότερον.
 τούτῳ Λυκαίνιον ὄνομα ἦν⁷³⁷.

Lycaenion has all the qualifications to fulfill this role: she is young and she has an old husband, a detail which may recall the Euripidean treatment of the *Phoenix* and/or Menander's *Samia*⁷³⁸: just like Gnathon, who is an expert in quoting mythological similes and acting according to mythological contexts (see my previous discussion of the Helen pattern in Longus), Lycaenion brings with her the *mœurs* of the city and of city women⁷³⁹.

The description of how Lycaenion first saw Daphnis and desired him is a highly humorous version of the procession described in the *Hippolytus*, as I noted when discussing Xenophon. Lycaenion sees Daphnis καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν παρελαύνοντα τὰς αἵγας ἔωθεν εἰς νόμην, νύκτωρ ἐκ νομῆς, ἐπεθύμησεν ἐραστὴν κτήσασθαι δώροις δελεάσασα⁷⁴⁰. The participle

⁷³⁷ 3.15.1.

⁷³⁸ Cf. Euripides, *Phoenix* and Menander, *Samia*, 498-500, τοῦτ' ἐτόλμησας σὺ πράξει, τοῦτ' ἔτλης; Ἀμύντορος νῦν ἐχρὴν ὀργὴν λαβεῖν σε, Δημέα, καὶ τουτονὶ ἐκτυφλῶσαι; Also Euripides, *Phoenix*, *TfrGr.*807 (Kannicht): πικρὸν νέαι γυναικὶ πρεσβύτης ἀνὴρ. Cf. Stobaeus 4.22.116, and *TrGF*, 804, δέσποινα γὰρ γέροντι νυμφίῳ γυνή in Stobaeus 4.22.109 and Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriasousae*, 411-412, and Menander, *Sententiae* - see Jaekel, (1964) line 191.

⁷³⁹ For a discussion of the New Comedy motifs in Longus see Hunter, (1983) p.68: 'the character of Lycaenion does seem to have links with the 'kind-hearted' courtesans familiar from the dramatic genre'. Hunter's comment refers more to characterisation rather than the pattern; besides courtesans like Samia do not sleep with the main hero, but help the couple.

⁷⁴⁰ 3.15.2.

παρελαύνοντα recalls military parades⁷⁴¹ and its adaptation in the bucolic context of the *Pastorals* may seem an ironic tint; yet a Theocritean intertext points to a bucolic reinterpretation of the episode. As Hunter has accurately observed, the Longus passages allude to Theocritus *Idyll* VIII in which Daphnis, walking his goats before the cave of a beautiful girl and being teased by her, turns his eyes to the ground out of embarrassment⁷⁴². The scene appears again in Theocritus V, 88-89 and seems to be typical of the pastoral genre⁷⁴³; Daphnis' embarrassment⁷⁴⁴ in combination with the well-known punishment of Daphnis' arrogance by Aphrodite in the *Thyrsis*, *Idyll* I⁷⁴⁵ may recall, among others, the *Hippolytus*⁷⁴⁶.

The link between the Daphnis myth and that of Hippolytus is all the more evident in the *Pastorals* in the description of Lycaenion's predatory sexuality. Lycaenion pursues her lover further, into the woods, fulfilling Phaedra's wish in the prologue of the *Hippolytus*⁷⁴⁷. There she has the opportunity to observe Chloe's and Daphnis' amorous παίγνια and συναλγήσασα δὲ τοῖς ἀθλίοις καὶ καιρὸν ἦκειν νομίσασα διττόν, τὸν μὲν εἰς τὴν ἐκείνων σωτηρίας, τὸν δὲ εἰς

⁷⁴¹ Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, 5.3.56, Plutarch, *Pelopidas*, 17.3ff.

⁷⁴² Theocritus, 8.71-74, κῆμ' ἐκ τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ σύνοφρος κόρα ἐχθρὴς ἰδοῖσα / τὰς δαμάλας παρελάντα καλὸν καλὸν ἦμεν ἔοασκεν/οὐ μὲν οὐδὲ λόγον ἐκρίθην ἀπο τὸν πικρὸν αὐτᾶ, ἀλλὰ κάτω βλέψας τὰν ἀμετέραν ὁδὸν εἶρπον. On the bucolic intertext see Hunter, (1983) p.69.

⁷⁴³ Theocritus, 5. 88-89, βάλλει καὶ μάλοισι τὸν αἰπόλον ἅ Κλεαρίστα/τὰς αἶγας παρελάντα καὶ ἀδύ τι ποππυλιάσδει. For the comparison see Legrand, (1925) p.10, v.1.

⁷⁴⁴ Against Legrand, (1925) p.10: 'Daphnis amoureux passionné ne ressemble guère au Daphnis de la 1^{re} Idylle, qui maudit Aphrodite et résiste Éros jusqu'à la mort'. However, the second part of Daphnis' song 8.76-80, praises the joys of pastoral life over the charms of the beautiful girl.

⁷⁴⁵ Theocritus, 1.97-98-104, Aphrodite, τί θην τὸν Ἐρωτα κατεύχεο, Δάφνι, λυγίξειν/ ἢ ὅ' οὐκ αὐτὸς Ἐρωτος ὑπ' ἀργαλέω ἐλιγχῆς; Δάφνης κῆν Αἴδα κακὸν ἔσσεται ἄλγος Ἐρωτι.

⁷⁴⁶ See Crane, (1987) role of Aphrodite in the cases of Daphnis, Hippolytus and Adonis. Also for intertextuality with Longus and Theocritus I, based on the ἀδύ γελάσας, see Crane, (1987) p.165 and Morgan, (2004), p.214, p.236. The allusion when describing Daphnis may point to the different, positive, treatment of Daphnis, who in 3.22.4 is already well versed by Lycaenion and also tells to his beloved Chloe a tale of Eros.

⁷⁴⁷ *Hippolytus*, 208ff.

τὴν ἑαυτῆς ἐπιθυμίαν, ἐπιτεχνᾷται τι τοιόνδε⁷⁴⁸. Lycaenion's plot does not oppose Daphnis' wishes but in a humorous twist her object of desire not only does not oppose her desire but also is also highly keen to lie with her. Her plea to him can be interpreted in a double way. The first is the meaning that Daphnis understands and rushes to save her goose: σῶσόν μοι τὸν χῆνα, μηδὲ περιίδης ἀτελῇ μοι τὸν ἀριθμὸν γενόμενον⁷⁴⁹. The adjective ἀτελῇ⁷⁵⁰, however, in the phrase μηδὲ περιίδης ἀτελῇ, may also sound like 'save me ...do not neglect my desire unconsumed'. Yet the hero understands the words literally and acts accordingly. Once away from Chloe, Lycaenion reveals to him what his sexual education lacks; at this moment Daphnis' reaction contrasts with the Hippolytus pattern:

οὐκ ἐκαρτέρησεν ὁ Δάφνις ὑφ' ἡδονῆς, ἀλλ' ἅτε ἄγροικος καὶ αἰπόλος καὶ ἐρῶν καὶ νέος, πρὸ τῶν ποδῶν καταπεσὼν τὴν Λυκαίνιον ἰκέτευεν ὅτι τάχιστα διδάξαι τὴν τέχνην, δι' ἧς ὁ βούλεται δράσει Χλόην⁷⁵¹.

Daphnis' eagerness to learn the secrets of love, being a country-boy and a goatherd and a lover and young (the paratactic accumulation of these qualities emphasise Daphnis' non-Hippolytean reaction), reverses the scene; so, where on other occasions the woman would be the suppliant of an unwilling beloved male, here it is Daphnis who falls on his knees, in the scene recalling the amorous

⁷⁴⁸ 3.16.1.

⁷⁴⁹ 3.16.3.

⁷⁵⁰ Cf. Lucian, *On the Syrian Goddess*, 27, ξείνη γυνὴ ἐς πανήγυριν ἀπικομένη...ἔχοντα, ἐρωτι μεγάλῳ ἔσχετο, μετὰ δὲ μαθοῦσα ἀτελέα ἑόντα ἑωυτὴν διεργάσατο.

⁷⁵¹ 3.18.1.

ἰκεσία that follows Lycaenion's first contrived plea to Daphnis⁷⁵². After love-making, Lycaenion warns Daphnis that if he does the same to Chloe the girl will bleed; Daphnis appears quite scared of the blood, and therefore he does not show the same eagerness to apply Lycaenion's instructions to Chloe before their wedding⁷⁵³. Lycaenion, like Gnathon versed in the city's patterns, guides also the pattern of the novel of these naïve lovers.

This unusual Phaedra pattern is structured around the following motifs: (a) Daphnis is faithful to his Chloe – and only because he is eager to please Chloe does he surrenders to Lycaenion; (b) Lycaenion is a city woman, who is older, married and beautiful, and desires Daphnis; (c) Daphnis is not accused but even gets presents and fruitful feedback from Lycaenion; (d) Daphnis is married to Chloe and Lycaenion is at their wedding.

It is questionable whether Phaedra was right to hang herself after all, given that things on other occasions work perfectly fine. But Longus here is not only questioning here his tragic intertexts by opposing his handling to theirs⁷⁵⁴. The narrative pattern also questions the adaptations and reworkings of the pattern within the novel genre. Lycaenion, unlike the other 'other women' of the novel, is not jealous of Daphnis' love for Chloe, as long as she can make some profit out of it, and in that she succeeds. Longus' bucolic relationships are not necessarily possessive and demanding. As in the description of the villagers' collective

⁷⁵² 3.16.1, ἀκριβῶς μιμησαμένη τὴν τετραγαμένην, ὥσόν με, εἶπε, Δάφνι, τὴν ἀθλίαν'. The phrasing appears much as a lover's plea, as if Lycaenion is trying to convince Daphnis to save her from her suffering. But Lycaenion comes up with another excuse, the missing goose.

⁷⁵³ 3.24.3.

⁷⁵⁴ Bowie, (2007) p.349.

measures for killing the wolves or for confronting the Methymnians, who, like Daphnis do not have personal property, Eros is also communal. At least this is the impression that the text gives until the recognition of Daphnis and Chloe by their rich parents.

Discussion

Longus' treatment of the Phaedra pattern is not based only on the Euripidean *Hippolytus* or the *Stheneboea* as these intertexts may suggest. Rather the novel hints at a reception of the Phaedra pattern via the Theocritean pastoral tradition, since Theocritus' Daphnis, and Hippolytus, are both the subjects of Aphrodite's wrath. The introductory scene of the Lycaenion episode may well imply this connection. Nevertheless the interpretation of both myths is, as Morgan has already observed, positive: unlike Daphnis and/or Hippolytus, Longus' Daphnis appears an ardent student of Lycaenion's erotic course, which constitutes the only Phaedra-related pattern in the novel⁷⁵⁵.

Achilles Tatius

1. Hippolytean echoes

Charicles

AT's treatment of the Phaedra pattern is elaborated in two stages: the first three books introduce the pattern within a homoerotic context, then the appearance of Artemis in the beginning of Book 4 signals the introduction of a

⁷⁵⁵ See Lalanne, (2006); for the sentimental education of the couple see Morgan, (1996) and Hunter's reply.

Phaedra-pattern 'proper' (Table 10). The first miniature sketch of the myth appears in the interlude between Cleinias and Charicles. We learn from Cleitophon that

ἦν δέ μοι Κλεινίας ἀνεψιός, ὀρφανός καὶ νέος, δύο ἀναβεβηκώς ἔτη τῆς ἡλικίας τῆς ἐμῆς, ἔρωτι τετελεσμένος· μειρακίου δὲ ὁ ἔρως ἦν⁷⁵⁶.

Cleinias has some Hippolytean characteristics, he is young and an orphan, but, contrary to his cousin he is initiated in the matters of love - of boys. This last detail portrays Cleinias' and Charicles' arrogance towards heterosexual Eros. Charicles condemns marriage and claims that πονηρὸν μὲν γὰρ γυνή, κἂν εὖμορφος ἦ⁷⁵⁷. Cleinias on the other hand reacts to Cleitophon's news with a couplet from Hesiod about the disasters brought by Pandora⁷⁵⁸ and then he provides a catalogue of similes: this includes disastrous women, among others, Phaedra, who ἀπέκτεινεν Ἰππόλυτον φιλοῦσα (in contrast to the murderous but μὴ φιλοῦσα Clytemnestra). Cleinias ends his account with a generalising gnome: κἂν φιλῶσι, φονεύουσι· κἂν μὴ φιλῶσι, φονεύουσιν⁷⁵⁹. This last remark is echoed ironically and reversed a few chapters later; Charicles' death is not caused by his approaching marriage⁷⁶⁰, but by Cleinias', a lover's, gift, as indicated by the narrator's prolepsis: ὁ μὲν οὖν ἀπῆει τὴν τελευταίαν ὁδὸν, ὕστατα καὶ πρῶτα

⁷⁵⁶ 1.7.1.

⁷⁵⁷ 1.7.4.

⁷⁵⁸ AT 1.8.2, Hesiod, *Works and days*, 57-58, τοῖς δ' ἐγὼ ἀντὶ πυρὸς δώσω κακόν, ᾧ κεν ἅπαντες τέρπωνται κατὰ θυμόν, ἔον κακὸν ἀμφαγαπῶντες. Cf. *Hippolytus*, 616-617, ὦ Ζεῦ, τί δὴ κίβδηλον ἀνθρώποις κακόν/ γυναῖκας ἐς φῶς ἡλίου κατώκισας; and from the first *Hippolytus*, *TrGF*, 429, (Kannicht) ἀντὶ πυρὸς γὰρ ἄλλο πῦρ/ μείζον ἐβλάστομεν γυναῖκες πολὺ δυσμαχώτερον.

⁷⁵⁹ 1.8.7.

⁷⁶⁰ 1.7.3, οἰχομαί σοι, λέγων, Κλεινία.

μελλήσων ἱππάζεσθαι⁷⁶¹.

The unusual Phaedra pattern introduced by Cleinias and Charicles may be articulated as follows: (a) Charicles is in love with Cleinias – a relationship which may recall that of the mutual fidelity of heterosexual couples in the novels; (b) a woman, ugly but rich and of a high social status is presented as Charicles' future wife⁷⁶²; (c) Charicles rejects marriage and women altogether; (d) the death of Charicles, caused by his boyfriend's horse. Charicles' death alludes to the *Hippolytus* by being announced, just as in the play, by a witness, in a detailed, voyeuristic description of the accident⁷⁶³. Garnaud⁷⁶⁴ is right to see in this incident and in the father's lament over the body of his son a direct allusion to Theseus' lament for Hippolytus⁷⁶⁵. The theatricality of the incident, which happens over a single day⁷⁶⁶, and its markedly Euripidean context are emphasized by the messenger speech⁷⁶⁷. The whole passage functions in a programmatic way for the events to come, not only in respect to its content – homosexual versus heterosexual love⁷⁶⁸ – but also with respect to the genre – i.e. tragic treatment versus novelistic treatment of a love story.

⁷⁶¹ 1.8.11.

⁷⁶² Here is an amusing variant of a 'real life' situation: the young man who marries an ugly woman for her riches. Here Charicles, using the verb ἐκδίδομαι, in very girlish distress presents himself as being 'sold' to his bride.

⁷⁶³ 1.12-13

⁷⁶⁴ Garnaud, 'Achilles Tatius D' Alexandrie: *Le Roman De Leucippé Et Clitophon*', (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1991). p. 22.

⁷⁶⁵ *Hippolytus*, 1245-1248.

⁷⁶⁶ The unity of place and time alluded to in Charicles' words, 1.8.10, πολλὰ δ' ἂν γένοιτο καὶ ἐν νυκτὶ μιᾷ.)

⁷⁶⁷ The detail of riding in a storm is similar in both: 1.12.4, ὁ δὲ τοῦ κλύδωνος ἐπὶ ἐξεν αὐτὸν χειμών; and *Hippolytus*, 1213, αὐτῷ δὲ σὺν κλύδωνι καὶ τρικυμῇ κύμ' ἐξέθηκε ταῦρον, ἄγριον τέρας cf. 1.12.5-6, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν τοῦ δένδρου κλάδων τὸ πρόσωπον αἰσχύνηται ... ὁ δὲ ἵππος ... τῷ σώματι κατεπάτει τὸν ἄθλιον, 1.13.2, οὐδὲ εὐσχήμων φαίνει νεκρός and *Hippolytus*, 1238, σποδοῦμενος μὲν πρὸς πέτραις φίλον κάρα/ θραύων τὲ σάρκα; 1343-1344, ὁ τάλας ὅδε δη στείχει/ σάρκα νεαράς ξανθὸν τὲ κάρα διαλυμανθείς.

⁷⁶⁸ For the moral message of the incident see Morales, (2004) p.152: 'a cautionary tale against Cleinias' mode of loving'.

Hippolytean aetiology

The Melite episode, which is the main Phaedra pattern in the novel, closes with an aetiology, like the *Hippolytus* and other Euripidean plays⁷⁶⁹, e.g. the *IT*, although Melite, unlike Charicleia, is not responsible for the inauguration of the ritual. Melite, in order to be exonerated, has to step into the waters of Styx, a spring near Ephesus. The tale, and the rite performed in order to exonerate falsely accused wives, resembles in its function the ritual held for Hippolytus, in which the virgin consort of Artemis became the object of a pre-marital cult as Artemis had predicted⁷⁷⁰; similarly, the metamorphosis of the virgin Rhodopis gives the aetiological background for the rite performed by married women (and in some cases unchaste wives) in Ephesus. Rhodopis may not be a virgin male, like Hippolytus, but her lover Euthynikos is; so their common rejection of Aphrodite and their punishment allude heavily to Euripides' play⁷⁷¹.

As expected, Aphrodite, Artemis' rival, makes the two young hunters fall in love with each other. As in the myths of Callisto and Actaeon, Artemis, enraged, punishes her unfaithful devotee. But what especially echoes the Hippolytean intertexts is Aphrodite's laugh; as in the *Hippolytus*, and in the Theocritean version of Daphnis⁷⁷², Aphrodite is presented as the arch-enemy of Artemis, and a goddess whose power rules over men and gods, just as the ego-narrator observes

⁷⁶⁹ For Euripidean closure see Dunn, (1996).

⁷⁷⁰ Dunn, (1996) p.95ff.

⁷⁷¹ 8.12.1-12, καὶ ἤκουσεν ἡ Ἀφροδίτη καὶ ὀργίζεται καὶ ἀμύνασθαι θέλει τὴν κόρην τῆς ὑπεροψίας.

⁷⁷² Theocritus, I, 95, ἦνθέ γε μὰν ἀδεία καὶ ἅ Κύπρις γελάοισα. For the connection to the *Hippolytus* see Crane, (1987).

at the beginning of the novel.⁷⁷³

2. Patterns: the Melite variations

Leucippe's misreading: Cleitophon as Hippolytus

The conversation between Cleitophon and Cleinias reveals another side of our hero. We learn that he was teasing his cousin for being a slave of desire⁷⁷⁴. A little later Cleitophon appears to be himself a slave of his desire for Leucippe⁷⁷⁵. Books 1 to 3, however, show the transformation of Cleitophon's desire into something more 'ideally' appropriate to a novel plot. The parallel dreams of Artemis and Aphrodite at the beginning of Book 4, in which both goddesses assure their respective protégés of the happy outcome of their adventures, point towards a different treatment of the Phaedra pattern – one in which both Artemis and Aphrodite bless their marriage. This is the setting for the novel's main Phaedra pattern that is introduced in Book 5, but influences its plot until Book 7.

The pattern of the Melite incident is as follows: (a) chaste and faithful to his deceased beloved, Cleitophon meets (b) the widowed Melite who desires him; but, although he agrees to marry her, he refuses to consummate their marriage until they reach Ephesus; (c) with the return of Melite's husband Cleitophon is thrown in prison –while Melite, not only does not bring a public charge against him but (d) helps him out, on the condition that he sleeps with her, something he

⁷⁷³ 1.2.1.

⁷⁷⁴ 1.7.1, ἐσκώπτων οὖν αὐτὸν ἀεὶ τῆς ἀμερμινίας.

⁷⁷⁵ 1.9.1-2, πάντοτε Λευκίππην φαντάζομαι. οὐ γέγονεν ἄλλω τινὶ τοιοῦτον ἀτύχημα. τὸ γὰρ κακὸν μοι καὶ συνοικεῖ. Cleitophon's inexperience and chastity are negotiable: he has had already some sexual experience (2.37.5) and his knowledge surprises Menelaus who, amazed, tells him that 'σοὶ μοι δοκεῖς μὴ πρωτόπειρος ἀλλὰ γέρων τῆς Ἀφροδίτης τυγχάνεις (2.38.1)'.

does happily.

Cleitophon's resistance to Melite's advances has some similarities to the Charicles episode. Just like Charicles' future bride, Melite is wealthy, of high social status and is head over heels in love with him. Melite's obsession for Cleitophon is described by Satyrus as follows:

ἡ Ἀφροδίτη μέγα τοῦτον παρέσχευεν ἀγαθόν, ὃ δὲ οὐκ ἐθέλει λαβεῖν. γυναῖκα ἐξέμηνεν ἐπ' αὐτῷ πάνυ καλήν, ὥστε ἂν ἰδὼν αὐτὴν εἴποις ἄγαλμα, Ἐφεσίαν τὸ γένος, ὄνομα Μελίτην...ὃ δὲ οὐκ οἶδα τί παθὼν ὑπερηφανεῖ, νομίζων αὐτῷ Λευκίπτην ἀναβιώσεσθαι⁷⁷⁶.

The plot that Satyrus describes in this case intersects with that of the *Hippolytus*; with the difference that Melite's passion here is presented as something ἀγαθόν, something positive. Aphrodite is the plot maker, who has generated Melite's desire and madness, just as with Phaedra. Moreover, contrary to Charicles' appointed fiancée, Melite is beautiful, young and widowed – which allows the two to enter a legal marriage.⁷⁷⁷ This non-incestuous and quite feasible plot, devised by Aphrodite, is described as a present which Cleitophon refuses out of arrogance. The verb ὑπερηφανεῖ belongs to a group of terms used to describe Hippolytus' arrogance⁷⁷⁸: here it picks out that of Cleitophon. The mention of arrogance, then, suggests a reading of Cleitophon as belonging to the pattern of traditional novel heroes, like Chaereas or Habrocomes. Unexpectedly, Cleitophon agrees to marry Melite – despite imposing a condition of sexual

⁷⁷⁶ 5.11.6.

⁷⁷⁷ This is also the case of Ismenodora in Plutarch's *Amatorius*.

⁷⁷⁸ *Hippolytus*, 6, σφάλλω δ' ὅσοι φρονούσιν εἰς ἡμᾶς μέγα. Cf. Antonius, resisting Cleopatra's love in Plutarch, *Antonius*, 61a, οἱ φίλοι τῆς Αἰγυπτίας ἐρῶντα καὶ καόμενον ἀνέπειθον ὡς ὑπ' ἐκείνης ἐρῶτο, καὶ λοιδοροῦντες ἐκαλοῦν ἀπαθὴ καὶ ὑπερήφανον; and 1.2.1.

abstinence during their trip.

The version that AT's novel presents seem to be one of the more unpredictable in the genre. The Ephesian destination of the couple, along with the promise of Cleitophon that he will fulfill his marital duties⁷⁷⁹ once in Ephesus, hints at a different twist in the plot⁷⁸⁰, which is realised in two stages: the plot resurrects and recalls on stage first Leucippe and, second, Melite's husband, Thersander.

The resurrection of Leucippe while introducing a possible version of the 'motif' of escape⁷⁸¹ (cf. the Helen pattern), also carries further the Phaedra pattern. After Leucippe has made her presence clear to Cleitophon by a letter in which she wishes him all the best for his καινούς γάμους⁷⁸², Melite asks him to fulfil her desire. As expected from the already adumbrated Hippolytean plot Cleitophon refuses. Once more, by pretending illness, he postpones the marriage⁷⁸³. But this time he is not successful because Melite, in despair, looks for help to seduce Cleitophon by means of magic and spells. Since the women of Thessaly were widely known for their links with magic⁷⁸⁴ it is not surprising that Melite asks for help from Leucippe, who in this context is acting as the supportive go-between, like Phaedra's nurse. The motif of love-drugs is alluded to in the *Hippolytus* too, and in Melite's reading of the mythical pattern there is no reason why the

⁷⁷⁹ The oaths to Isis in 5.14.2.

⁷⁸⁰ On Ephesus as 'a place rich in novelistic connotations' see Whitmarsh and Morales, (2001a), p. 158.

⁷⁸¹ 5.19.3-4, ἀλλ' ἐντός κάτεσχε, μὴ πάντας ἀπολέσῃς...γυναῖκα ὁραῖς πρώτην Ἐφεσίων μαινομένην ἐπὶ σοί.

⁷⁸² 5.18.6.

⁷⁸³ 5.21.7.

⁷⁸⁴ 5.22.2.

Thessalian slave-girl would refuse the favour. Leucippe, encouraged by Melite's confession that Cleitophon is faithful to his deceased beloved, goes happily to the fields to collect her magical herbs⁷⁸⁵. Up to this point, despite some deviations, the basic format of the Phaedra motif is unchanged.

Thersander's misreading : Melite as Phaedra

It is Thersander's unexpected return that 'accélère en explicite-versions le rythme des péripéties plus que jamais sous le signe de l'échec et de l'erreur'⁷⁸⁶. For an avid reader of fiction Thersander's return points towards motif (b) of the pattern: in other words the reader expects Melite to defend herself while accusing Cleitophon for taking advantage of her. But this is not the case. At the crucial moment of Thersander's attack on Cleitophon the latter drops Leucippe's letter, and Melite, who is left speechless, picks it up. The detailed description of Melite's emotional suffering is the best explanation for the omission of the 'false accusation' motif:

πᾶσαν μαθοῦσα τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐμεμέριστο πολλοῖς ἅμα τὴν ψυχὴν, αἰδοῖ καὶ ὀργῇ καὶ ἔρωτι καὶ ζηλοτυπία. σχύνεται τὸν ἄνδρα, ὠργίζετο τοῖς γράμμασιν, ὁ ἔρως ἐμάραινε τὴν ὀργήν, ἐξῆπτε τὸν ἔρωτα ἢ ζηλοτυπία, καὶ τέλος ἐκράτησεν ὁ ἔρως⁷⁸⁷.

Melite questions the reaction she is expected to have. The reference to 'shame' - αἰδοῖ, ἡσχύνεται –suggests a possible reading of Melite as Phaedra⁷⁸⁸; the references to anger and jealousy - ὀργῇ, ζηλοτυπία- suggest a novelistic

⁷⁸⁵ 5.22.7.

⁷⁸⁶ Billault, (1998a) p.150.

⁷⁸⁷ 5.24.3.

⁷⁸⁸ *Hippolytus*, 385.

reading of Phaedra, which presents the revenge of the unlucky lover on the hero and his beloved. But the narrator here opts for another version, one that appears similar to Lucian's comment regarding Stratonice, as discussed above. Melite cannot accuse Cleitophon herself. Her self-defence in front of her husband is constructed around the themes of 'rumour' and 'slander', which, as in Lucian, are responsible for the king's reaction⁷⁸⁹. Thersander too relies on slander, but this time there is no empty accusation from the wife's side. The victory of Eros is the new variation on the pattern that the novel brings in. It is impossible to state with certainty whether there is direct intertextuality between AT and Lucian, both writing around 150 C.E., although they might have been using an earlier source, or it could be a coincidence⁷⁹⁰.

Cleitophon's reading: the Melite variations

The reading that Cleitophon-narrator and Lucian here suggest is that the Phaedra pattern does not need the 'false accusation' motif in order to be exploited. Thersander is easily convinced by the not altogether false accusation regarding his wife's lover and imprisons Cleitophon, as part of the motif (c). Melite comes to his call not to accuse him but to help him, begging him as follows: μήν ἀτιμάσης τὸν ἔρωτα τὸν ἐμόν δι' ὃν τὰ μέγιστα εὐτυχεῖς...σύ δε παρ' ἐμοῖ θησαυρὸν ἔρωτος εὐρῶν ἀτιμάζεις τὰ εὐεργετήματα⁷⁹¹.

Melite's plea is heartbreaking and Cleitophon cannot remain untouched,

⁷⁸⁹ 6.10.4, Φήμη δὲ καὶ Διαβολὴ δύο συγγενὴ κακά. θυγάτηρ ἡ Φήμη τῆς Διαβολῆς.

⁷⁹⁰ Although Melite accuses him of being an eunuch, like Combabos; AT 5.25.8, εὐνοῦχε καὶ ἀνδρόγυνε.

⁷⁹¹ 5.25.8-10.

since Melite talks as a spokesman of Eros, or as Eros in person. He therefore consents to her demands by saying that: ἔπαθόν τι ἀνθρώπινον καὶ ἀληθῶς ἐφοβήθην τὸν Ἑρωτα, μή μοι γένηται μήνιμα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ⁷⁹². Cleitophon here acts as a good reader of the pattern. Knowing that a further refusal would only bring more perils upon him– and this is also his first-hand experience with Charicles' wedding – he consents and has sex with Melite, although he still argues in front of Leucippe's father that he has kept his virginity, 'if such a thing exists among men'⁷⁹³.

Cleitophon's comment also makes a statement regarding the plot of the novel. The Phaedra pattern which could be interpreted as symmetrical⁷⁹⁴ to that of Helen, is not: this is because, although male heroes are also exposed to female temptresses, just as females are to male rivals, since there is nothing controversial regarding male virginity and there is no way to test it. Therefore, the Phaedra pattern can be reworked with or without compulsory chastity on the part of the male hero. What is more, Melite's chastity trial is the very confirmation of her 'innocence', and a narratorial comment on the cunningly conceived plot, suggesting that the pattern can be used with or without female chastity being involved. Consequently, Thersander, the only incomprehending reader of the Phaedra-Melite pattern, is the only one deceived. The comment of Cleitophon-narrator on the realization of motif (d) at 8.20.5 is then ironically intertextual and

⁷⁹² 5.27.2.

⁷⁹³ 5.20.5.

⁷⁹⁴ Konstan, (1994).

intratextual, referring both to the programmatic Phaedra motifs at the beginning of the novel and their treatment in the previous novelistic tradition.

Discussion

AT's novel presents four different readings of the Phaedra pattern. The first is a homosexual reworking of the Hippolytus myth and it is there that we find most of the intertextual references to the eponymous play. The reading of Cleitophon as Hippolytus is the one proposed by Leucippe, who, acting as the go-between for her mistress, has realised that her lover is chaste. Thersander reads a doubly wrong version of the pattern: like Theseus, he sees in Cleitophon the youth who has been seduced by his wife. Melite's silence encourages this reading since she does not try to protect herself by accusing her beloved. Nevertheless, a fourth version is given to the audience, Cleitophon's interlocutor. This is the 'true' version that Leucippe and her father never learn, in which Cleitophon appears as an excellent reader of the previous literary tradition. Cleitophon's consent to Melite's supplication comes out of the pretended fear that, should he resist, Eros will then try to avenge his ὕβρις. The suspense of this reading is kept up to Melite's trial and the ironical decision of the Styx spring: Melite is innocent because she did not commit adultery while her husband was abroad – but, as the voyeuristic audience knows, after her husband's return. So just as Cleitophon can defend himself by having suffered τι ἀνθρώπινον, thus the readers of this Phaedra plot can identify the narrator in this positive human,

all too human, description of desire.

Heliodorus

Patterns only

Demaenete

Just like AT, Heliodorus presents two binary Phaedra patterns on two levels of intertextuality⁷⁹⁵ (Table 11). The first⁷⁹⁶ near the beginning of the novel has a programmatic character and is the subject of Cnemon's narrative⁷⁹⁷. The second occupies the Memphis chapters of the novel with the Persian Queen Arsace and Theagenes in the main roles. The pattern is important since it links the narrative to the main action, providing a unified narrative⁷⁹⁸; therefore not only is the narrative of 'the Athenian love'⁷⁹⁹ presented as the reverse of the ideal novelistic love of Theagenes and Charicleia, but the narrative's structure is also opposed to that of Book 7 and 8 and functions as an intertextual comment on how such plots can be exploited.

The Phaedra story in the first part of Cnemon's narrative (1.9.1 – 1.11.2)

⁷⁹⁵ Paulsen (1992) pp.67-68. For a more recent article treating the Phaedra story in both Heliodorus and Apuleius see Smith, (2007a).

⁷⁹⁶ For Phaedra in Heliodorus see Feuillâtre, (1966), Sandy, (1982), Rocca, (1976); Also, Colonna, (1987), Morgan, (1989a); Rattenbury (1935). p. 15, oddly argues that the incident is not inspired directly by Euripides' Phaedra but 'il semble avoir été très familier avec les oeuvres d'Euripide'.

⁷⁹⁷ For the term see Morgan, (1989a) arguing against Winkler, (1982), that the narrative is a straightforward narrative opposite to the Heliodoran, complicated one.

⁷⁹⁸ Morgan, (1989a) p.107: 'the narrative provides a prolonged portrait of perverted, immoral, simply bad love'.

⁷⁹⁹ The term used by Morgan, (1989a).

unusually for Heliodorus' allusive style, names Hippolytus⁸⁰⁰: Demaenete calls Cnemon 'ὁ νέος Ἰππόλυτος⁸⁰¹'. This is not just an intertextual allusion to the Euripidean *Hippolytus* but also a reference to the Aristophanic mention of the 'καινήν Ἑλένην⁸⁰²'. This comment suggests in a programmatic way that Heliodorus' version of the original text is going to be a combination of tragic and comic elements. (a) Cnemon need not be chaste, yet he is the stepson of Demaenete, the young wife of his father and a woman with a dubious past⁸⁰³; (b) Demaenete sees – not for the first time – Cnemon returning from the Panathenaea and is consumed by desire for him; the setting strongly recalls the *Hippolytus*, although Demaenete had other chances to see Cnemon at home. Probably it is here used to recall the Euripidean intertextual framework. Demaenete approaches Cnemon during Aristippus' absence at night and 'ἐπειρᾶτό τινας τῶν ἀθεμίτων τυγχάνειν⁸⁰⁴'.

Demaenete plans her revenge overnight and accuses Cnemon to Aristippus of having kicked her while pregnant. (c1) Aristippus believes his wife and has Cnemon punished: πύξ τε ἔπαιε καὶ παιῆδας προσκαλεσάμενος μάστιξιν ἠκίζετο⁸⁰⁵. Thus Cnemon receives the punishment of a slave, like Habrocomes, whereas exile, would have been closer to the play. (c2) The punishment that

⁸⁰⁰ For the naming of the characters see Bowie, (1995).

⁸⁰¹ 1.10.2.

⁸⁰² Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazousae*, 850, Ἐγῶδα τὴν καινὴν Ἑλένην μιμήσομαι.

⁸⁰³ For the association of Demaenete with Lais, the prostitute concubine of the hedonist philosopher Aristippus, see Jones, (2006) p.558; Hieronymus of Rhodes, *On poetry* ἐπεὶ τὸν παροικούντα πρεσβύτερον καὶ ἐκτέμνοντα τὸ ἄλσος ἐτιμωρήσατο Ἀνάργυρος ἥρως...ὁ δὲ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ ἐπέμνηνε τὴν παλλακὴν...ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἑαυτὸν ἀνήρτησεν, ἡ δὲ παλλακὴ εἰς φρέαρ ἑαυτὴν ἔρριψεν...ἵστορεῖ δὲ ὁ Τερώνυμος ἐν τῷ περὶ τραγωδωποίων ἀπεικάζων τούτοις τὸν Εὐριπίδου Φοῖνικα. Wehrli, (1969) p.38.

⁸⁰⁴ 1.10.2.

⁸⁰⁵ 1.11.1.

Cnemon receives is not enough for Demaenete's wrath and she plans a 'δευτέραν ἐπιβουλήν⁸⁰⁶', which occupies chapters 1.11.2 to 1.14.1. Thisbe is encouraged by her mistress to maintain a relationship with Cnemon; during one of their meetings Thisbe strategically 'reveals' to Cnemon that Demaenete has a lover, something which would not be surprising for a woman who had already made advances to her stepson; Cnemon, reading accordingly, is easily convinced and rushes into her bedroom to kill her, where he finds her with his father. Immediately he is accused of attempted parricide and he is exiled. Aristippus' choice not to kill Cnemon on the spot but to bring his son in front of the court is a comment on Theseus' behaviour⁸⁰⁷. Whereas Theseus murdered his own son, Aristippus uses the law. In vain Cnemon, not being bound by any oath, cries to his judges that his stepmother has accused him⁸⁰⁸. Soon after we find him exiled on Aegina.

I would like parenthetically to note here that the detail of the kick which forms the kernel of Demaenete's false accusation, points to Chariton's treatment of a parallel episode: Cnemon kicking his 'pregnant' stepmother may easily recall Chaereas⁸⁰⁹. Moreover the false accusation of having an 'affair', against Callirhoe and against Demaenete, which results in a kick, appears to be an anti-ideal manipulation of this Charitonian mini-plot, since in Cnemon's case it is well premeditated in order to put the blame on Cnemon. This feature argues for a

⁸⁰⁶ 1.11.2.

⁸⁰⁷ 1.13.2.

⁸⁰⁸ 1.13.4, ὡ μητρυνιά, διὰ μητρυνιά ἀναιροῦμαι, μητρυνιά ἄκριτον ἀπόλλυσι.

⁸⁰⁹ 1.12.3, τὸν πατέρα μὲν εἰς ἀγρὸν αἰφνιδίου τινὸς χρείας καλούσης; Cf. 1.4.8, προσποιήσαι, ὡς εἰς ἀγρὸν ἀπιέναι, βαθείας δὲ ἐσπέρας παραφύλαττε τὴν οἰκίαν.

different kind of generic merging: that of the novelistic motif into the tragic-one, whereas the more common movement appears to work the other way round – from tragedy into the novel.

The emphasis on the stepmother's plot⁸¹⁰ can be read throughout the narrative as a metatextual reading of such parallel plots. In the beginning it is Demaenete who is trying to present motherly feelings towards Cnemon; then, when she accuses him to Aristippus mentioning – falsely – the kick and Cnemon's carefree lifestyle, she confesses to her husband that she had not revealed anything in order not to be treated as a stepmother⁸¹¹. On the other hand she interprets Cnemon's unwillingness to succumb to her approaches as a result of his refusal to commit not adultery but incest⁸¹². Moreover the thousand votes for Cnemon's exile took into consideration καὶ τῇ ὑπονοίᾳ τῇ κατὰ τῆς μητρειᾶς⁸¹³. It is clear, then, that in Cnemon's narrative everyone, except Aristippus, is reading a stepmother plot. His proleptic closure to his inset audience– οὐ μὴν ἀτιμώρητός γε θεοῖς ἐχθρὰ Δημαινέτη περιλείφθῃ –is not enough to fulfil their expectations and makes them ask for the end:

καὶ μὴν προσεπιτρέψῃς γε ἡμᾶς, ἔφη ὁ Θεαγένης, εἰ τὴν κακίστην ἀτιμώρητον ἔασῃς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ Δημαινέτην. οὐκοῦν ἀκούοιτ' ἂν, ἔφη ὁ Κνήμων, ἐπειδὴ περ ὑμῖν οὕτω φίλον⁸¹⁴.

Theagenes' words suggest that the right ending for this tale is the

⁸¹⁰ Hunter, (1998) p.45, on Heliodorus and Lysias' *Eratosthenes*.

⁸¹¹ 1.10.4, μή τινα λάβοιμι μητρειᾶς ὑπόνοιαν.

⁸¹² 1.15.1, ἀλλοτριάν μὲν ἀλλ' οὖν γε πατρῶϊαν εὐνήν ἡσχύνετο.

⁸¹³ 1.14.1.

⁸¹⁴ 1.14.2.

punishment of the stepmother. This comment illuminates the variations on the ending of the different Phaedra patterns that we have discussed so far and the limits of deviation in the manipulation of the different narratives. Heliodorus' narrative conforms to the original version, the one that has Phaedra punished, but the way he develops motif (d) is his main innovation. Just as Cnemon has anticipated his audience in the beginning his story is developed in a long tragic pattern⁸¹⁵:

παῦε, ἔφη, τί ταῦτα κινεῖς κἀναμοχλεύεις; τοῦτο δὴ τῶν τραγωδῶν. οὐκ ἐν καιρῷ γένοιτ' ἂν ἐπεισόδιον ὑμῖν τῶν ὑμετέρων τὰ μὰ ἐπείσφerein κακὰ ⁸¹⁶.

Hunter notes the links between Thisbe's and Demaenete's stories and has argued that 'the general similarities between the details of Demaenete's plot against Cnemon and that of Thisbe's subsequent revenge upon her (1.14.2 – 1.17.6), openly display how such narrative material is 'held in common' for almost infinite reuse⁸¹⁷. The recapitulation of the same pattern does not consist only in the similarities between Cnemon's and Demaenete's ἐξάπατησις and their punishments, by Demaenete and Thisbe respectively. Rather, Thisbe appears to be a skilful plot-writer who manipulates her audience's reactions and expectations – here Demaenete's – precisely because this is the plot her mistress/audience desires. Demaenete's meeting Cnemon can be read as an allusion to the *Hippolytus*, illustrating of the shamelessness of the woman in

⁸¹⁵ Paulsen (1992) p. 84-85: 'Knemon als Mensch gezeichnet werden soll', in tragischen Termini denkt und fühlt', wirt unmittelbar im nächsten Satz weiter gefestigt... Knemons Erzählung betrachten soll', al seine Tragödie...etc'. For Knemon's story as a 'tragedy in prose', p.101.

⁸¹⁶ 1.8.7.

⁸¹⁷ Hunter, (1998) p.46.

love. In the second part, Thisbe invents a milder plot. Demaenete's monologue suggests that besides the pattern already developed there are multiple ways to carry out a Phaedra plot:

τί γὰρ οὐ περιεῖπον ἀλλ' ἐπεβούλευον; τί οὐχ' ἰκέτευον ἀλλ' ἐδίωκων;...ἀλλ' ἡ θηριώδης ἐγὼ καὶ ἀνήμερος ὥσπερ οὐκ ἐρῶσά τινος ἀλλ' ἄρχουσα δεινὸν⁸¹⁸.

Demaenete realizes that she has been acting not as a lover – οὐκ ἐρῶσά τινος ἀλλ' ἄρχουσα – but as a vengeful mistress, just like Manto and Cyno, a comment that echoes Lucian's comment about Stratonice and her Greek mythological models.

Thisbe

The second plot is proposed and carried out by Thisbe⁸¹⁹. In it, she takes up the role of the go-between willingly, although her main role is not that of the nurse, but that of Phaedra. Thisbe's decision is not directed by faithfulness to her mistress, but by personal benefit, since Demaenete blamed her for Cnemon's exile:

εἰ δέ ποτε γένοιτο καθ' ἑαυτήν, πολλὰ τὴν Θίσβην ἐμέμφετο ὡς οὐ προσηκόντως ὑπηρετησαμένην, ἥ σπουδαία περὶ τὰ δεινὰ, λέγουσα, ἢ πρὸς μὲν τὸν ἔρωτα μὴ συμπράξασα⁸²⁰.

Like the nurse in the *Hippolytus*, Thisbe attributes her first failure to luck and promises a second, more successful, attempt⁸²¹. This new seduction plot designed by Thisbe has the handmaiden partly in the role of Phaedra and

⁸¹⁸ 1.15.5.

⁸¹⁹ For the parallels between Demaenete and Thisbe see Morgan, (1989a) p.111.

⁸²⁰ 1.15.1; cf. *Hippolytus*, 682, ὃ παγκρακίστη καὶ φύλων διαφθορεῦ.

⁸²¹ *Hippolytus*, 701ff.

Demaenete while it maintains Demaenete in the stepmother role:

ἐρᾶν μὲν ἐγὼ προσποιήσομαι τοῦ Κνήμωνος...παρακαλέσω δὲ τὴν Ἀρσινόην...
εἰσαγαγεῖν με ὡς αὐτὸν νύκτωρ ἀνθ' αὐτῆς⁸²².

Thisbe then proposes to treat Demaenete's madness and love sickness by providing her with the object of her love⁸²³. Meanwhile, as a *deus ex machina*, she reveals to the naïve Aristippus her 'truth' regarding Cnemon's conduct and Demaenete's unfaithfulness. This time the Charitonian plot is used more to the letter: the husband following the (not altogether) false accusation enters the room and catches her in the act– or at least this is what he believes, since Thisbe reassures him that the 'lover' escaped. The law-abiding Aristippus takes Demaenete to the assembly, συλλαβόμενος ἡγὼν ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν, in order to have her tried:

ἡ δὲ πάντα ἅμα τὰ περιεστῶτα...ἀνιωμένη μὲν ἐφ' οἷς ἡλίσκετο χαλεπαίνουσα δὲ ἐφ' οἷς ἠπάτητο, ἐπειδὴ κατὰ τὸν βόθρον ἐγένετο τὸν ἐν Ἀκαδημίᾳ ἐνταῦθα ἀθρόον τοῦ πρεσβύτου σπαράξασα τὰς χεῖρας ὥσεν ἑαυτὴν ἐπὶ κεφαλὴν⁸²⁴.

Demaenete's suicide in the βόθρος has something both comic and tragic. Demaenete opts for suicide like Phaedra, and a heroic one, in the pit for Harmodius and Aristogeiton, despite being wicked. This elaborate punishment of the stepmother is Thisbe's addition to the Phaedra pattern and the first of Heliodorus' Phaedra sub-plots; or, in Charicleia's words, τὴν Ἀθηναίαν ἐκείνην τὴν ψάλτριν τὴν τῶν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐπιβουλῶν καὶ Δημαινέτην ποιήτριν⁸²⁵,

⁸²² 1.15.7.

⁸²³ *Hippolytus*, 490, οὐ λόγων εὐσχημόνων δεῖ σ' ἀλλὰ τάνδρως.

⁸²⁴ 1.17.5-6.

⁸²⁵ 2.8.2; Thisbe as engineering Demaenete's death 2.10.1, τὴν Δημαινέτης τελευτὴν δι' ἐμοῦ μὲν ὑπὲρ σοῦ γενομένην.

Thisbe is the dramaturge (ποιητής) of this play.

Thisbe's plot can be summarised in the following motifs: (a) Demaenete is not innocent or faithful, but still she is tricked by her handmaiden, who uses the previous Phaedra pattern to convince her; (b) Thisbe (not altogether) falsely accuses Demaenete of faithlessness – or this is what her relatives believe⁸²⁶; (c) Aristippus is convinced by Thisbe and tries to bring Thisbe to the court. (d1) Demaenete commits suicide – as a result of her previous stepmother plot and as part of motif (c) of the current pattern – she dies before Aristippus learns the truth (as part of her own plotted Phaedra pattern), while Thisbe dies, after she is incorporated (via Nausicles) into the main plot of the novel.

The punishment of the stepmother and Aristippus remorse with respect to his treatment of Cnemon provides a more than satisfactory end to the first two Phaedra patterns. When Cnemon is near the ending of his tale he hints at a sequel to the story⁸²⁷. The reaction of his audience to his tale is that of tears, as if during a tragic play⁸²⁸, although the narrator ironically comments that their tears were due to their own sufferings. Just as for the spectators of a tragic play, or for the listeners/readers of a novel, the tale is the pretext for their tears. Cnemon's tale of misfortunes is an emotional mirror in which Theagenes and Charicleia read their own sufferings, without fully identifying themselves with the inset narrator; in Hunter's words, Cnemon's tragically presented 'narrative is a self-contained

↗ 2.19.2, οἱ κατὰ γένος τῇ Δημινέτῃ προσήκοντες...ἐβόων καὶ τὴν μοιχεία προκάλυμμα τοῦ φόνου...καὶ τέλος τὴν Θίσβην εἰς βασάνους ἐξήτουν.

↗ 1.18.1.

↗ 1.18.1, καὶ ἅμα ἐδάκρυεν· ἐδάκρυον δὲ καὶ οἱ ξένοι.

exhibit...neither touching nor touched by those at its heart⁸²⁹.

Arsinoe

While Cnemon's first Phaedra narrative becomes a bedtime story for the couple, with the good rewarded and the bad punished, the third part of his adventures is presented as a spooky ghost tale. The motifs are as follows: (a) Thisbe is more skilful than Arsinoe in flute playing and Nausicles prefers her over Arsinoe – in this context Thisbe is innocent; (b) Arsinoe accuses Thisbe of Demaenete's murder; as a result Thisbe's master, Aristippus, is ruined and accused as a murderer; Cnemon's father is charged with the outcome of the two previous Phaedra patterns, the one that led to Cnemon's exile and the one which resulted in Demaenete's death⁸³⁰; (c?) Thisbe escapes punishment, fleeing with Nausicles to Naucratis – while Cnemon tries to find her to bring her to Athens; Thisbe is found dead in Egypt being herself a dead text with a letter narrating her fate, as motif (d) of the previous Thisbe pattern. Cnemon's words over her body summarise what could have been a rewarding ending for his tale, with the guilty punished, which echoes the words with which the first Demaenete pattern finished. Cnemon here presents himself as the protagonist and the audience in the phrase ἡδίκημένος θεατῆς:

⁸²⁹ 1.18.1. Hunter, (1998) p.42.

⁸³⁰ 2.9.3.

οὕτως ἄρα τιμωρὸς Ἑρινὺς γῆν ἐπὶ πᾶσαν, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐλαύνουσά σε οὐ πρότερον
ἔστησε τὴν ἔνδικον μάστιγα πρὶν καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ με τυγχάνοντα τὸν ἡδικοημένον
θεατὴν ἐπιστῆσαι τῆς κατὰ σοῦ ποινῆς⁸³¹.

The retribution for Thisbe's plot, in which she has both the role of Phaedra and of the handmaiden and, accordingly the fate of Phaedra too, is death; this time it is Cnemon in Theseus' position⁸³². Nevertheless what makes it more satisfactory is that Cnemon, who so far has been both actor in the first Demaenete plot and audience in the second Thisbe plot, which is narrated by a certain Anticles to Cnemon⁸³³, can now experience the ending with his own eyes, being the spectator of Thisbe's death. There is a missing motif from this series of Phaedra tales, motif (d), about Arsinoe's punishment and Aristippus' exoneration. There are reasons to believe that this part might have been available to Nausicles, although he never has the opportunity to narrate his tale about Thisbe⁸³⁴; besides one can read Cnemon's marriage with the rich Nausicleia as a means to reimburse Aristippus' debts. Whether this is what the reader is supposed to infer, being in so far well versed in Phaedra patterns, or whether is omitted *brevitatis gratia*, is impossible to tell.

Cnemon's narrative is narrated in three stages: Cnemon's proper tale, Charias' report of Thisbe's machination, and Anticles' report of Arsinoe's plot, centered like Russian dolls around a main kernel: the punishment of the culprit,

⁸³¹ Cf. 2.11.1, τιμωρὸς Ἑρινὺς... ἐλαύνουσά; cf. 1.14.6, τὴν δὲ εὐθύς Ἑρινύες ἤλαυνον.

⁸³² Hardie, (1989) p. 43, observes that Cnemon's reading of the deltos reminds Theseus reading Phaedra's note; cf. *Hippolytus* 856-7 and *Aethiopica* 2.10.1.

⁸³³ 2.9.4.

⁸³⁴ Cnemon's recapitulation precedes, 6.3.1: ἐφ' οἷς ὁ Ναυσικελῆς μυρίας ἔστρεφε βουλὰς...καὶ τέλος μόγις ἐπέσχε.

that takes place some time – in the next plot – after the punishment of the innocent hero (c), thus prolonging the suspense. Contrary to the other novels that focus on the sufferings of the falsely accused (c), the patterns of Cnemon's narrative seem to postpone this motif by introducing the beginning of another pattern (a) and (b) when the motif (c) of the previous sequence appears to come to a dead end. More precisely, Cnemon is exiled but Demaenete is not immediately punished; instead of a fast-forward revelation of the stepmother's machinations, another Phaedra pattern is set up, this time by Thisbe, who is using the previous plot as a guide. Thisbe too escapes punishment in the crucial motif (d) of her own pattern and another plot by Arsinoe, (a) and (b), is required to have her accused; as for her final punishment, τὸ δὲ ὅπως ἡ Θίσβη κατὰ τὸ ἄντρον καὶ πρὸς τίνων ἀνήρηται, θεοῦ τινος ἂν ἴσως δεήσει φράζοντος⁸³⁵. In other words, Heliodorus' narrator's tale is the one that provides the ultimate astonishing denouement of Thisbe's plot.

Arsace's plot – against Charicleia's reading

If Demaenete's subplot gives the narrator the licence to play with the constraints of the pattern, the Arsace episodes bear witness to the most difficult explicit version Euripidean rewriting of the Phaedra myth⁸³⁶. This time the pattern is not a bedtime story distanced from the characters but one that should be taken seriously⁸³⁷. Thus Arsace is a serious threat to the couple's happiness.

⁸³⁵ 2.9.5.

⁸³⁶ For Demaenete and Arsace see Paulsen (1992) p. 91-2, Pletcher, (1998), Hunter, (1998), Rocca, (1976) and Morgan, (1989).

⁸³⁷ Pletcher, (1998) p.19.

The similarities between the couples Demaenete-Cnemon and Theagenes-Arsace are well known. Both have been read as reworkings of the Phaedra myth. However, it is not clear whether the Heliodoran intertexts rely more on the first *Hippolytus* rather than the extant one, and arguments can be made for the predominance of both tragic plots. Arsace's cruelty and emotional savagery has been argued as deriving from an imitation of the first *Hippolytus*⁸³⁸, although the play need not be the only intertext, especially given that other versions, some of them non-Greek in origin, were available. This is all the more true for the Arsace episodes, which were not staged in Egypt but actually in Memphis, just as in the Joseph tale. The pattern is as follows:

(a) Theagenes, like Habrocomes, is faithful to his Artemis-like Charicleia⁸³⁹, whom he has sworn not to touch before their wedding; (b) the Persian Arsace, wife of Oroondates, desires her young slave, Theagenes – just as with Thyamis before⁸⁴⁰ – but he rejects her. Arsace seeks, not for the first time, the help of her nurse, a Lemnian woman with a barbarian name, Cybele⁸⁴¹. This detail points to several mythological traditions: to that of the Argonauts, and the reputation of Lemnian women⁸⁴², then to the Euripidean tradition, since she is the Queen's wet-

⁸³⁸ Rocca, (1976).

⁸³⁹ For Charicleia as Artemis, 2.33.4-5; also 1.2.6-7, when lamenting over Theagenes. The scene with Charicleia mourning Theagenes body recalls too the scene at the end of the extant *Hippolytus*, when Artemis on person appears to lament over *Hippolytus* death. But, depending on the point of view it also echoes Isis' mourning over Osiris' body. For the reading of the scene see Morgan, (1989a) p.103.

⁸⁴⁰ 7.2.4 etc. Arsace had also tried to seduce Thyamis (another Hippolytean figure in his youth) when he was priest at Memphis. Thyamis rejected her love, thus made it possible to Petosires, his brother, to take Arsace's part and withdraw Thyamis from the priesthood. Calasiris also shares, in his youth, Hippolytean characteristics in his affair with Rhodopis (2.25.1) and his (self)-exile after the incident. On this see also Paulsen (1992) p. 155.

⁸⁴¹ Burkert and Raffan, (1987) p.178-179.

⁸⁴² Herodotus, 6.138, τὰ σχέτλια ἔργα πάντα Λήμνια καλέεσθαι. A murderous Lemnian woman well versed in poisons and Aristogeiton's servant appears also in Demosthenes, *Against Aristogeiton*, 79, ἡν μιὰρὰν Θεωρίδα, τὴν Λημνίαν, τὴν

nurse, and to the non-Greek tradition of Cybele as the Magna Mater, whom her devotees worship with castration⁸⁴³. These different cultural backgrounds suggest a cross-cultural rewriting of the pattern.

(c) The chaste Theagenes does not reciprocate her feelings and the queen decides to punish him herself. For Arsace is from the beginning presented as an ἀνδρόβουλος γυνή⁸⁴⁴. Consequently she is portrayed as a potential Clytemnestra and replaces both Phaedra and Theseus, in both loving and punishing in person the chaste youth. Cybele's cautionary tale to Theagenes describes her mistress as a vengeful barbarian:

αἱ χρησταὶ καὶ φιλόνεοι γυναῖκες ἀμείλικτοι γίνονται καὶ βαρυμήνιδες⁸⁴⁵ ἀποτυγχάνουσai καὶ τοὺς ὑπερόπτας ὡς ὕβριστὰς εἰκότως ἀμύνονται. ταύτην δὲ ὅτι καὶ Περσὶς τὸ γένος ἐννόει καὶ ὡς βασιλείον αἷμα... καὶ ὡς πολλὴν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν περιβέβληται....εὐλαβήθητι καὶ μὴνιν ἐρωτικὴν φύλαξαι καὶ τὸ ἐκ τῆς ὑπεροψίας νεμεσσητόν⁸⁴⁶.

Arsace then is as dangerous as the barbarian Manto and threatens the couple's happiness.

Cybele's plot

The dramatic shift in Heliodorus' plot is made by Achaemenes' distress at not having Charicleia⁸⁴⁷. In the first part of Arsace's plan Theagenes, like

Θαρμακίδα, καὶ αὐτὴν καὶ τὸ γένος ἅπαν ἀπεκτείνετε. If really our text takes into account the Demosthenes speech, then one can argue for two levels of intertextuality in the novel: one easily understood, via mythological models and parallels from a wide range of readers, and another, more narrow audience, which would understand these subtle allusions. Also for proverbs regarding Lemnian women see Zenobius, 91, Λήμνιον κακόν, Λημνία χειρὶ.

⁸⁴³ Burkert and Raffan, (1987) p.179: 'the Attis myth is known only from the Hellenistic age'.

⁸⁴⁴ 7.1.4. Cf. Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, 268-269.

⁸⁴⁵ The adjective is found in Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, 1482, (see also Colonna, (1987) p.408.

⁸⁴⁶ 7.20.4.

⁸⁴⁷ 7.22.3.

Hippolytus, is a free man, being Thyamis' protégé. When Cybele's first plan fails, Achaemenes' information makes a slave of Theagenes⁸⁴⁸; this allows him to ask for Charicleia as a reward for his services to Arsace. The motif of marrying, or of threatening to marry the heroine to a slave is also present in Xenophon, when Anthia is given to Lampon, as part of Manto's revenge against her or sent to a brothel as part of Rhenaea's revenge. Yet, in Heliodorus, who has carefully staged the relationship of Theagenes and Charicleia as a brother-sister one⁸⁴⁹, Achaemenes reveals the couple's true relationship. Unavoidably this intensifies Arsace's jealousy and she acts like the barbarian 'other women' that the reader has met in his previous readings of Greek novels. Nevertheless, there is another interesting twist, one opposite to the expected novelistic plot: not only does Theagenes not resist Arsace's passion, but he seems to encourage it, and indeed with Charicleia's compliments too:

τί δὲ χρὴ πράττειν ἢ τίνα μηχανὴν ἐπινοεῖν ὥστε διακρούσασθαι τήν τε ἐμὴν πρὸς Ἀρσάκην καὶ τὴν σὴν πρὸς Ἀχαιμένην ἀπενκτὴν σύνοδον; 'μίαν, ἔφη, πρὸς αὐτὸν ἢ Χαρίκλεια, κατανέυσας τὴν ἑτέραν τὴν κατ' ἐμὲ διακωλύσεις⁸⁵⁰'.

Theagenes' apparent concession to Arsace's desire is made on the condition that she will revoke her promise to Achaemenes, regarding his sister, who is now confirmed as his fiancée too⁸⁵¹. Charicleia is successful in pre-reading Cybele's plan. Even after the revelation of her relationship to Theagenes, Arsace consents to let them marry, provided that Theagenes keeps his promise to her. This last

⁸⁴⁸ 7.24-1-2.

⁸⁴⁹ 7.12.7.

⁸⁵⁰ 7.23.6.

⁸⁵¹ 7.26.4, ἢ γαμετὴν οὐτε θελήσεις, εὐ οἶδα, οὐτε θέλουσα ἐκδώσεις.

unexpected twist increases Achaemenes' jealousy and the narrator describes him acting as a slave, ὡς σφόδρα χρῆ προσδοκᾶν⁸⁵². This comment raises the reader's expectations of a new ἐπιβουλή⁸⁵³. Charicleia's masterful reading of female emotions might have actually worked out if it were not for Achaemenes. Blinded by his passion for revenge he betrays Arsace's indecent lifestyle to Oroondates. Meanwhile Cybele, fearing for her life and afraid of Achaemenes' unexpected reactions, suggests to her mistress another way of approach; ἐπειδὴ δὲ κατεξανίσταται ὡς ἐρωμένης, λαμβανέτω πείραν ὡς δεσποίνης καὶ μαστιγούμενος καὶ στρεβλούμενος ὑποπιπτέτω τοῖς σοῖς βουλευμάσι⁸⁵⁴.

Cybele's suggestion is the exact opposite of what Demaenete has proposed in her second plot: instead of counselling Arsace to show patience she encourages her to behave as the mistress and torture the youth. The reader knows that the result of such a treatment would not threaten the youth's chastity – while the previous approach was more fruitful since Arsace kissed Theagenes, increasing Charicleia's jealousy⁸⁵⁵. Cybele's suggestion therefore redirects the pattern to a more traditional form, despite Arsace's hesitations about seeing Theagenes' bodily suffering⁸⁵⁶, and the youth is sent to the torturer⁸⁵⁷.

Arsace's wrath and revenge has enough novelistic precursors to

⁸⁵² 6.26.7.

⁸⁵³ 7.29.1, ὑπ' ὀργῆς ἅμα καὶ ζηλοτυπίας καὶ ἔρωτος καὶ ἀποτυχίας οἰσטרηθείς.

⁸⁵⁴ 8.5.10.

⁸⁵⁵ 7.26.7, τὸ στόμα ἀντὶ τῶν χειρῶν προβαλοῦσα ἐφίλησε.

⁸⁵⁶ 8.5.11, ὡς δ' ἂν ἐνέγκαιμι, ὦ θεοί, τοῖς ἐμοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἢ ξαινόμενον ὀρώσα τὸ σῶμα ἐκεῖνο ἢ καὶ ἄλλως κολαζόμενον;

⁸⁵⁷ 8.6.1.

contextualise her emotions⁸⁵⁸. As expected, torturing Theagenes does not bring about any positive result. Cybele proceeds to the next step: the elimination of Charicleia, for which she appeals to slander. (b) Cybele's baseless accusation is not entirely successful either: instead of poisoning Charicleia Cybele is poisoned herself⁸⁵⁹, but with her last breath accuses Charicleia of being the murderer. As a result Charicleia joins Theagenes in prison waiting for her death sentence. The pair has therefore reached motif (c) of the pattern, despite the fact that their innocence (d) has been proved on the pyre. Charicleia's death sentence is a variation on the punishment motif of the hero (c). Like Habrocomes, Charicleia is judged to die on the pyre⁸⁶⁰. In the Heliodoran pattern, Arsace does not have only her unwilling chaste lover to punish but also to punish him alongside with his fiancée.

This is a unique *tour de lecture* – according Morgan – in the novelistic plot, since the second part of Manto's plot (Anthia given to Lampis) is only resumed after the separation of the lovers. Hence Achaemenes plays both roles, that of the rival who helps to transport the heroine to Oroondates and in combination with Cybele the accuser of the innocent Theagenes⁸⁶¹, while his mother takes up the same role vis-à-vis Charicleia. This latter contributes to the retardation motif (c), since even after Charicleia's miracle on the pyre, the couple is still imprisoned. This variation (Charicleia being punished as well as Theagenes in the Phaedra

⁸⁵⁸ For jealousy in the *Medea* and the *Phaedra* see Boedeker, (1997).

⁸⁵⁹ 8.7.2, φαρμάκῳ τὴν ἐπιβουλήν δακονήσασαι.

⁸⁶⁰ 8.8.5.

⁸⁶¹ Achaemenes denotes Theagenes for being a slave, thus Arsace can treat him as such; Cybele accuses Charicleia for her murder.

motif) allows the couple not to be separated. What is more, contrary to the Manto episodes, Charicleia is not the spectator of Theagenes' torture, but with the double false accusation she ends up as the protagonist of the Phaedra plot, resisting the constraints of the pattern.

The fire writes the epilogue of the Memphis chapters, which brings face to face the two opposite female characters, Charicleia and the lustful Arsace, and not the male ones, as in Euripides *Hippolytus*. The opposition is even more stressed by meticulous planned allusions and not just direct opposition. The most characteristic is the comparison of Charicleia's passion for Theagenes to Arsace's⁸⁶²; in Book 1 her willingness to hang herself in order to avoid the bandit's violence and σωφροσύνη echoes Phaedra's words at the beginning of Euripides' play⁸⁶³ and indicates the moral distance between her wish to die unshamed and Arsace's shameful suicide.

Charicleia steps into the fire willingly⁸⁶⁴, dressed in her Delphic chiton, and she addresses a prayer to the Sun, the Earth and the daemons of the Underworld, whom she calls upon to be witnesses of her innocence:

Ἥλιε ανεβόησε, καὶ Γῇ καὶ δαίμονες ἐπὶ γῆς τε καὶ ὑπὸ γῆν ἀνθρώπων ἀθεμίτων
ἐφοροὶ τε καὶ τιμωροί, καθαρὰν μὲν εἶναι με τῶν ἐπιφερομένων...τὴν δὲ ἀλάστορα
καὶ ἀθεμιτουργὸν καὶ μοιχαλίδαν...Ἀρσάκην ὥς ὅτι τάχιστα τιμωρήσεσθαι⁸⁶⁵.

⁸⁶² 6.8.2 βάκχιόν τι οἰστροθεῖσα (Charicleia) and 7.7.5 ὥσπερ οἰστροθεῖσα ὑπὸ ὀψεως ἐμμανῆς (Arsace).

⁸⁶³ 1.8.3 ἐγὼ μὲν ἀγχόνῃ προλήψομαι τὴν ὕβριν...καλὸν ἐντάφιον τὴν σωφροσύνην ἀπενεγκαμένη; cf. *Hippolytus* (The Chorus to Phaedra's wish to die), 432-433, τὸ σῶφρον ὡς ἀπανταχοῦ καλὸν καὶ δόξαν ἐσθλὴν ἐν βροτοῖς καρπίζεται.

⁸⁶⁴ 8.9.4.

⁸⁶⁵ Heliodorus, 8.9.11.

Charicleia's words are a distant echo of these of Habrocomes on the cross⁸⁶⁶; and the expected miracle occurs as Bagoas leads them to Elephantine. Upon their departure Arsace dies, like Phaedra, βρόχον ἀγχόνης ἀψαμένη⁸⁶⁷, a decision, which, as in Demaenete's case, is not prescribed by shame or desire for vengeance, but by fear of punishment.

Discussion

Far from being a simple essay in narrative virtuosity, as Winkler wished to show, or in exploiting the moral message, as argued by Morgan, the Phaedra pattern in Heliodorus functions on many different levels. The first version draws upon a novelistic, Charitonian background; the second seems to be closely related to the 'new Hippolytus' pattern that Cnemon's tale has already introduced; the third is a reworking of Thisbe by Demaenete's initial conspiracy, which ends with the death of the Phaedra-model; only Arsinoe's plot remains without conclusion, and we never learned what happened to Thisbe's rival. These alternating sequels of the same pattern, rather than being an example of the straightforwardness of Cnemon's narrative, are a proof of his narratorial virtuosity in telling the same tale four times without boring his audience – which is precisely what the Heliodoran narrative is doing in its reworking of the previous tradition.

But Cnemon's variations have also another use: they hint to his audience how to read these plots. Charicleia's reading of Arsace's and Cybele's plot is

⁸⁶⁶ 4.2.4, ὁ δὲ ἀποβλέψας εἰς τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὸ ρεύμα ἰδὼν τοῦ Νείλου ὥς θεῶν ... μήτε τὸ Νείλου ρεύμα μιανθεῖν ποτε ἀδικῶς ἀπολομένου σώματι, μήτε σὺ τοιοῦτον ἰδοῖς θέαμα, ἀνθρωπον οὐδὲν ἀδικήσαντα ἀπολλύμενον ἐπὶ τῆς σῆς ἐνταῦθα'.

⁸⁶⁷ 8.15.2; cf. *Hippolytus*, 802 βρόχον κρεμαστὸν ἀγχόνης ἀνήψατο.

evidence that she has been a good listener to the first tale. The reuse of the term ἐπιβουλή⁸⁶⁸ to designate Hippolytean episodes in the novel, as well as to emphasise their best possible λύσις⁸⁶⁹, especially in the mouth of Charicleia, acts as metanovelistic evidence pointing towards a structural study of the motif: 'how/by whom is the plot set up', 'how is it developed', 'what is the best ending', these are the questions that the reader is invited to answer. Nevertheless the Heliodorus-narrator is supposed to surpass every expectation: in another virtuoso rehearsal, the double role assigned to Achaemenes and Cybele's second plot that will make Charicleia the protagonist of the Hippolytean Memphitic plot, is the new element with which Heliodorus is trying to overturn the previous possible readings of the motif by introducing one that is unexpected. Thus Charicleia's apotheosis on the pyre, echoing famous tragic ἔξοδοι, like the *Medea* and the *Trachiniae*, seems to be the right spectacular ending for this Memphitic Phaedra pattern.

Provisional conclusions

To sum up: unlike sophistic literary treatments of the Phaedra pattern, the novels and the fragments bring out both the plot- structuring of the myth as well as the moral and/or emotional side of the story. More precisely: Xenophon's and Heliodorus' elaborate variations on the motif are the evidence that the Phaedra

⁸⁶⁸ The term is linked to the Phaedra pattern: (Demaenete) 1.112, (Thisbe) 1.15.2, 2.9.1, etc (Cybele) 8.7.2.

⁸⁶⁹ 1.15.6, (Demaenete), ἀλλ' ὡ γλυκεῖα Θίσβη τίνα λύσιν ὠνόμαζες; 7.14.7 (Charicleia referring to the absence of Calasiris, the provider of novelistic solutions to their problems) ἡ εὐπορία καὶ λύσις τῶν ἀμυχάνων. 7.21.4 (Charicleia advises Theagenes), εἰκός τίνα καὶ λύσιν θεῶν βουλήσει τὸν μεταξὺ χρόνον ἀποτεκεῖν. This latter is an excellent metanovelistic comment and a prolepsis of Achaemenes' future plan. It also points to the characterising retardation of the Phaedra pattern. Harrison, (2002) 8.5.6 (Arsace), ὦ Κυβέλη; τίς λύσις ἔσται μοι τῶν περιεστηκότων;

pattern and its models were an important ingredient of a good and exciting novelistic plot that could not be omitted - not even in Chariton, whose narrative hints at a possible Phaedra-Stateira plot. AT's and Longus' more sensual adaptations are intended to shock the reader by defeating his expectations, indicating the persistence of the pattern. The novels, using Euripidean material from the *Hippolytus* and/or *Stheneboea*, promoted a plot whose main engine is not just the frustrated desire, but, also, the vengeance of the Phaedra model, which is developed in lengthy variations of the motif. Therefore, the revenge of the often barbarian 'other woman' becomes a subsidiary plot of the Phaedra pattern, which illustrates the reworking of the pattern in a world no longer uniformly Greek. Exceptions like Stateira, the Persian queen, and Melite, Greek but from sensual Ephesus, alongside Lucian's Stratonice and the negative Attic Phaedras, Demaenete and Thisbe, show that, despite a slight predominance of the revenge motif, there was no novelistic rule which made moral distinctions between Greek and barbarian Phaedra-like heroines⁸⁷⁰.

This observation has some cultural implications, since it suggests the circulation of the motif in a larger cultural environment that did not distinguish as sharply as the Classical world, or even the Second Sophistic's authors, between Greek and non-Greek material. What is more, the polarity between female sensuality (non Greek, morally incorrect) and male self-restraint (Greek, morally correct), seems to be translated in the divergence between appropriate

⁸⁷⁰ Cf. *Phaedra, Medea*; see Harrison, (2002).

and inappropriate ways to love. This is clear from the emphasis given to the juxtaposition of the heroine and the seductress rather than the sensual female and the chaste youth, and it is developed fully in the four novels, and as a sub-plot in Chariton. This positive Phaedra pattern finds its echoes in Philostratean reworkings of the motif in the *Apollonius*, as discussed above, and suggests a new insight into the female and male sexuality, which cannot be discussed here.

The eclipse, then, of sharp dichotomies between Greek-barbarian and male-female allows further development of the motif with an emphasis on its function in the spatiotemporal axis of the novel. The pattern is used to counterbalance the Helen one and to help the structure of the novel's chapters. There is an emphasis on the retardation, which results from the Phaedra sub-plot and postpones the action, although in some cases the Phaedra revenge encourages the hero's departure and his meeting with the beloved, e.g. Metiochus, and Cnemon. In the other cases, the extant variations of the motif, in which the heroine is also involved, may, in combination with the Helen pattern, result in the transportation of the female heroine from one place to another, where a new plot is introduced: i.e. Anthia, and Charicleia; yet, in most cases, i.e. Habrocomes, Cleitophon and Theagenes, the pattern drives the plot towards a problematic retardation that requires a solution. The reason is that the novelistic predecessors of the pattern did not need to elaborate further, because of the concision of the dramatic genre.

By contrast, in its novelistic adaptation the pattern is presented as an enigma whose solution makes evident the narrator's mastery in manipulating the

plot: the ironic and controversial solutions proposed by Longus and AT, and also partially by Heliodorus, are a manifestation of this reversal of approach. In Charicleia's words, the best handling is the postponement of the pattern until it comes to a solution, since in the novelistic universe it is εἰκός τινα καὶ λύσιν θεῶν βουλήσει τὸν μεταξὺ χρόνον ἀποτεκεῖν. The metanovelistic approach with respect to the λύσις is the novels' contribution to the development of the Phaedra pattern, showing that what contributes to novelistic excellence is the ability to (re)-invent and solve structural enigmas within the limits of a well known plot, to reach a narrative dead end and navigate around it, or simply to manipulate and merge the reader's realistic timeline into the fictional acceleration and deceleration formulas of the novelistic universe.

2.3 The myth of Death's maiden: Iphigenia

In a tale of love and adventure there are two things that endanger the 'happy ever after' ending. The first is adultery, the betrayal of oaths of fidelity; the second is death. The Helen and the Phaedra patterns discussed above deal with threats to fidelity and/or virginity. As observed, death threats, mainly of execution, may be the result of a Phaedra-plot threat against the life either of the hero or the heroine. In this chapter I would like to discuss two more near-death situations, which are both centred around the 'Bride of Hades⁸⁷¹' subject, i.e. the link between marriage and death for the bride, pre/post nuptial suicide, and the motif of sacrifice and/or (ritual) execution⁸⁷². Since a principal obsession of the novels is virginity, the sacrifice of virgins forms another voyeuristic treatment of the threat of male violence on the female body.

In his excellent review of sacrifice in culture and literature Hughes defines human sacrifice as 'the ritual, religious, sacrifice of a human' which is 'used as a powerful symbol' to delineate the distance between culture and civilization; in his words 'execution is rarely approximate to human sacrifice but it is perfectly possible for a writer to use the idea of human sacrifice powerfully to interpret the social or psychological dynamics of an execution⁸⁷³'. In classics the subject continues to excite scholars⁸⁷⁴ and Attic drama is a fecund ground for such analyses: from Trenkner and Lattimore who broadly explore the patterns of

⁸⁷¹ Rose, (1925).

⁸⁷² Thoroughly discussed in Dowden, (1989). The title of this section is inspired by Rehm, (1994).

⁸⁷³ Hughes, (2007) p.2.

⁸⁷⁴ On human sacrifice Bremmer, (2007); for Greece, Burkert and Bing, (1983) and Hughes, (1991); for the archaeological evidence Dennis, (1991).

human sacrifice⁸⁷⁵, to the more feminist approaches of Burnett, Loraux and Foley⁸⁷⁶ and the psychoanalytical approach of Seaford⁸⁷⁷, most of the aspects of sacrifice in Greek drama have been meticulously examined.

Structuring the *Iphigenia*

The two chief examples are the two Euripidean *Iphigenias*⁸⁷⁸. I will hereafter treat the two *Iphigenias* as a structural unity because they share the same basic themes – sacrifice of a kinsman, recognition, rescue-flight. The difference is that in the *IA* the sacrifice of Iphigenia takes place in Aulis, on Greek ground, whereas in the *IT* the sacrifice of Orestes takes place in a remote land, which is closer to what we have in the novels. However, the overall resemblance of the two plots was not unperceived in antiquity either: it has been rightly argued that the tripartite mythic pattern described above forms the kernel of the Euripidean plays and that Euripides consciously patterned the *IT* on the myth of Iphigenia's sacrifice⁸⁷⁹. Aristotle too points out the similarities in the two myths; when discussing Polyidus' *IT*⁸⁸⁰; the same pattern is used in Sophocle's *Chryses*⁸⁸¹ and in the *Aletes*⁸⁸². Except in the Euripidean *IT*, which is structured on the pattern of

⁸⁷⁵ Trenkner, (1958) the sacrifice of the princess for her country also in Aarne-Thompson, (1928): A831.3 (Earth by sacrifice of son and daughter of first couple), A1545.2 (animal substituted for human sacrifice), H335.1 (princess to be sacrificed to a dragon/monster) etc; briefly in Lattimore, (1964).

⁸⁷⁶ The major work for Greek tragedy is Rehm, (1994). Also see Burnett, (1971) p.22ff. on Alcestis' sacrifice; Rosenmeyer, (1963) p.199ff. On the solitude of Euripidean characters vis-à-vis death; Loraux, (1987), distinguishes between dying mothers and wives and tragic virgins; Foley, (2001) p.172ff., on sacrificial virgins as daughters and stateman; sacrifice in Euripides in O'Connor-Visser, (1987) and Aretz, (1999); for *IT* Kyriakou, (2006).

⁸⁷⁷ Seaford, (1987).

⁸⁷⁸ For the *IT* as Euripides' innovation see Wright, (2005) p.119.

⁸⁷⁹ For the similar plots of the *IT* and the *IA* see O'Brien, (1988) p.98ff.: 'both tragedies are structured on a tripartite sequence of motifs: (a) the murder of a kinsman narrowly averted by a recognition; (b) a reunion is followed by an intrigue; (c) a maiden is rescued'.

⁸⁸⁰ *TrFG*, v.1 (Snell), p.248.

⁸⁸¹ See *TrFG*, v.4 (Radt) 494-496, also for Pacuvius' *Chryses*.

⁸⁸² Hyginus 122; Stobaeus (Nauck).

Iphigenia's sacrifices, males, and especially virgin males, do not tend to be the object of human sacrifice, but rather of slander⁸⁸³, like in the two Euripidean *Phrixos*⁸⁸⁴ and Meneoceus in Euripides' *Phoenician Women*. These cases are part of the Phaedra pattern and not of the Iphigenia one.

The female sacrifice can be of two types, 'raw' and 'averted' in respect to its respective dramatic impact. In the first case the emotional commitment relies on the fear and pity aroused for the victim; it is an exploration of near-death emotions, of despair, of courage on the part of the victim, and of guilt on the part of the culprit. 'Raw' sacrifice is a study in death⁸⁸⁵. On the other hand, the 'escape' tragedies display the previous features, but they do so as a meta-tragic commentary on the first type, because the main impact is focused around the recognition-escape motif, enhancing the 'suspense'. This is the reason why the victim meets the death threat early in the plot, and the audience/reader knows that the following hour/pages is/are to be filled in with 'something', the rescue motif. This is the case for the *IT*, the *Alcestis*, and the *Andromeda*.

The pattern of human sacrifice in the theatre includes, in its most 'novel-like' treatments, a quadripartite sequence of motifs, as observed in the case of the two *Iphigenias*, the *Helen*, the *Andromeda* and the *Alcestis* - see Table 11: (a) a god or a king requires the immolation of a (virgin) victim – either abroad or at home; (b) the sacrifice is often carried out (and in the more dramatic versions) by

⁸⁸³ Reineke, (1997) p.85, discusses Kristeva's and Girard's thesis on male and female sacrifice and opts for a view of sacrifice as 'a form of matricide'; hence the emphasis on the female victims.

⁸⁸⁴ Watson, (1995) p.35, discusses Creusa as a 'non totally unsympathetic stepmother'. For Heliodorus and the *Ion* see Clavo, (2003); but because it is a stepmother plot and not a sacrifice, I do not think it is reflecting the plot of the *Aethiopica*.

⁸⁸⁵ The *IA* describes a 'raw' sacrifice; it is centred on the themes of death and marriage and the impact of the play focuses upon the heroine's pre-sacrifice emotions.

a relative of the victim, or a relative is close enough to observe the sacrifice; (c) there is a recognition scene, in which the victim and the θύτης recognise each other, or recognize each other's intentions; (d) the sacrifice is averted by human or divine intervention; in some cases the victim is carried away to another land. There is not much mobility in the pattern, with the exception of the last motif (d) that can take the victim to another country: e.g. Iphigenia in Scythia, Menelaus and Andromeda in Greece.

This pattern, which conforms more to the requirements of a novel-style plot, is popular on the fringe of novelistic production. The practice of human sacrifice was known in the times of the Roman Empire and later. The Greeks knew, or thought they knew as part of an ethnophobic fantasy, that the Scythians did it, or used to do it, that the Carthaginians sacrificed children to Cronos and that in distant India women committed suicide on their husbands' funeral pyres: ritual ξενοκτονία⁸⁸⁶, τεκνοκτονία⁸⁸⁷ and αὐτοκτονία⁸⁸⁸, echoing the *IT*, the *IA* and the *Alcestis*, respectively, were not alien to the cultural/ literary context of the novels⁸⁸⁹.

⁸⁸⁶ Herodotus, 4.103 (on the sacrifices of shipwrecks in Scythia); also Lucian, *Toxaris*, (as a practice of old); Hecataeus, Fragment 118a (Jacoby), regarding human sacrifices in Lemnos.

⁸⁸⁷ For child sacrifice in Phoenicia as a source for Euripides see Diodorus Siculus, 20.14.5-7.

⁸⁸⁸ For the ritual burning of widows: Philo, *Abraham*, 182 and Plutarch, *On misfortune*, 499c, Ἰνδῶν δὲ φίλωνδ' αὖ καὶ σφύροντες γυναῖκες ὑπὲρ τοῦ πυρὸς ἐρίζουσι.

⁸⁸⁹ For the archaeological evidence of infanticide in Tunisia, see: Brown, (1991), discussing the iconography of votive stelae used in the sacrificial rites. Also see Smith, (1992) about sacrifices during Late Antiquity; and Smith, (2005).

2.3.1 The implicit versions of the 'Death's maiden' plot

2.3.1.1 Charition in the land of the Indians

The Charition mime tells the story of a Greek priestess of Selene (?) and her escape from India along with her brother and her slave. The main plot of the passage that has come down to us, which may or may not be the full script⁸⁹⁰, includes a chorus of Indians and the Indian king, who are deceived by Greeks, after drinking wine. Santelia has pointed out the resemblances of the Charition's plot to the *IT*⁸⁹¹, whereas the differences - e.g. the wine trick, which recalls the Cyclops episode – do not affect the structure of the plot⁸⁹². Hall points out that, for an audience which would have attended both the restaging of the Euripidean play in Oxyrhynchus and its burlesque reworking, the detail of the letter that allows the recognition between brother and sister, if kept intact in the mime, would have 'struck chords with the many Greek-speakers in his audience'⁸⁹³. In this case the structure of the *Charition* would conform to the (a), (b), (c) and (d) motifs above and bear witness to the audience's predilection for such plots – of near death and recognition⁸⁹⁴.

⁸⁹⁰ Discussion for the *Charition* as the scenario of a larger play in Hall, (2009).

⁸⁹¹ Santelia, (1991).

⁸⁹² Hall, (2009) p.397; see p.398ff. for a discussion of the escape motif (d) in Homer, Euripides and the Aristophanic parody of it in the *Thesmophoriazousae*. In Apuleius' version too (a) Charite and the ss are to be sacrificed to Mars; (b) the sacrifice is prepared, but Thrasyleon, dressed up as Haemon, beguiles the bandits with wine (d) Charite and the ass are saved.

⁸⁹³ Hall, (2009) p.405; in the later reception of the myth the letter is predominant, see Lucian, *Toxaris*, 6; ps-Lucianic, *Amores*, 47 (praising the homosexual relationship and friendship between Pylades and Orestes); Ovid, *Tristia*, 4.4.63-88 (with emphasis on the remoteness of the Taurian land, Artemis' xoanon, Iphigenia's duties at the temple and the arrival of Orestes and Pylades). Cf. Ovid *Letters from Pontus* 3.2.83-92 (emphasis on the letter and the friendship).

⁸⁹⁴ Hall, (2009) p.403, argues that there is evidence for performances of the *Cresphontes* and the *Alcestis* and possibly of the *IT* in Oxyrhynchus.

2.3.1.2 *Xenophon*

Anthia's triple death, a study in horror

In Xenophon's novel, Anthia endures but survives a sacrifice, a suicide and an execution; Anthia's narrow escape from Lampon is a result of Manto's plot, so it is discussed along with the Phaedra pattern⁸⁹⁵. The first and the third attempts are carried out by the same person, Hippothous, who, in a third attempt, tries to rape her, before recognizing her as his best friend's bride. This striking coincidence does not seem to have its parallel anywhere else in the novels, besides that of AT. It appears that, like that of the Phaedra, the execution/sacrifice motif was one of the narrator's favourites, hence the reason for its many variations.

A sacrifice

The first near-death situation that Anthia encounters is ritual sacrifice: captured by Hippothous in a forest in Cilicia⁸⁹⁶, a place outside civilised society, the bandit sacrifices Anthia to Ares⁸⁹⁷. The sacrifice, just like the planned sacrifice of Charite in Apuleius, is for the success of their bandit expedition, although the relevant passage seems to report the sacrifice ritual:

⁸⁹⁵ 2.11.3; equally for Habrocomes' double execution.

⁸⁹⁶ 2.11.10.

⁸⁹⁷ There might be a connection between the love of 'Ares and Aphrodite' of Anthia's bridal bed and Anthia's sacrifice to Ares, although it is not surprising that a bandit captain would sacrifice a virgin to Ares.

ἔδει δὲ τὴν θυσίαν γενέσθαι τρόπῳ τῷ συνήθει. τὸ μέλλον ἱερεῖον θύεσθαι, εἴτε ἄνθρωπος εἴτε βόσκημα εἴη, κρεμάσαντες ἐκ δένδρου καὶ διαστάντες ἡκόντιζον. καὶ ὅποσοι μὲν ἐπέτυχον, τούτων ὁ θεὸς ἐδόκει δέχεσθαι τὴν θυσίαν ὅποσοι δὲ ἀπέτυχον, αὐθις ἐξιλάσκοντο. ἔδει δὲ τὴν Ἀνθίαν οὕτως ἱερουργηθῆναι⁸⁹⁸.

In this case Anthia is the victim and Hippothous is her husband's future best friend, although not kin, and a key person for their reunion. The speed with which the narrative presents Hippothous' and Habrocomes' meeting, only a few paragraphs after Anthia's averted sacrifice and recapture by Perilaus⁸⁹⁹, can be attributed either to the narrative's inherently fast tempo or to its eagerness to hint at what is later going to be the kernel of the recognition plot, namely Hippothous' and Habrocomes' friendship. The first sacrifice pattern then involves (a) Mars' request for a victim, (b) Anthia offered as a sacrifice by Hippothous, (c) recognition postponed until Hippothous meets Habrocomes – the pair's recognition is delayed until the end; (d) Perilaus saves Anthia.

A suicide

Anthia's second narrow escape from death recalls vividly Callirhoe's *Scheintod* described above. The relation, though, who is held responsible for the sacrifice is not Perilaus, to whom in another possible plot-motif she could have been married and with whom she could have lived happily ever after⁹⁰⁰. The narrative takes care to introduce another character, Eudoxus. Eudoxus is a Greek in a foreign land, a doctor, and from Ephesus, just as Anthia is. Perilaus

⁸⁹⁸ 2.13.2.

⁸⁹⁹ 2.13.5 Perilaus saves Anthia. In 2.14.1 Habrocomes meets accidentally Hippothous.

⁹⁰⁰ Cf. the folk tale pattern, discussed above: prince saves princess from perilous situation and marries the princess (e.g. Andromeda); the same is the case for Mesopotamia and Zobaras in Iamblichus.

encourages the relationship between the two, in hope that his wife will not feel lonely abroad. But Eudoxus is also trying to return to his homeland. Anthia, knowing his need for cash in order to travel back, begs him to free her from her misery; but Eudoxus plays a trick on Anthia: afraid that he will be accused if she dies, he brings her a sleeping drug⁹⁰¹, leaving the rest to luck⁹⁰².

Anthia's lamentations about marrying Death could be a distant echo of the *Antigone*, but secure intertextuality cannot be established⁹⁰³. The plot then is articulated according to the Iphigenia pattern, where motif (a) is that Anthia's matrimonial oaths require that she does not survive Habrocomes' death, (b) Eudoxus, a compatriot, is responsible for her death, (c?) Tyche decides the outcome – and recognition with Habrocomes is postponed, (d) Anthia is saved, albeit sold as a slave, by the τυμβωρύχοι.

The dogs' den

The third attempt against Anthia's life is again made by Hippothous, who fails to recognize in her the girl from Cilicia, who was revealed to be Habrocomes' wife. The situation becomes more complex since Anthia does not reveal her identity and pretends to be Egyptian, Μεμφίτις⁹⁰⁴. Anthia's second near-death escape is not a ritual sacrifice, but an execution ordered by Hippothous. This time she is accused of having murdered the rapist Anchialus in

⁹⁰¹ 3.5.5-11.

⁹⁰² Anthia has reassured him that he will have the time to escape, 3.5.8, δυνήσῃ δὲ πρὸ τοῦ πυθέσθαι τινὰ ἐπιβὰς νεῶς τὴν ἐπ' Ἐφέσου πλεῖν.

⁹⁰³ There is a tragic 'echo' in 3.6.3 οὐχ οὕτως ἄνανδρος ἐγὼ οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς κακοῖς δειλή; cf. Sophocles, *Antigone*, 37-38, οὕτως ἔχει σοὶ ταῦτα, καὶ δείξεις τάχα/ εἴτ' εὐγενὴς πέφυκας εἴτ' ἐσθλῶν κακὴ.

⁹⁰⁴ 4.3.6.

self-defence, probably recalling practices of torture on Christians⁹⁰⁵. In an interesting exposition of ways to kill a woman the bandits agree to the following:

καὶ ἐβουλευόντο κατὰ Ἀνθίας ποικίλα, ὁ μὲν τις ἀποκτεῖναι κελεύων καὶ συνθάψαι τῷ Ἀγχιάλου σώματι, ἄλλος δὲ ἀνασταυρῶσαι. ὁ δὲ Ἱππόθοος...ἐβουλεύετο δὲ κατὰ Ἀνθίας μείζονα κόλασιν. καὶ δὴ κελεύει τάφρον ὀρύξαντας μεγάλην καὶ βαθεῖαν ἐμβάλλειν τὴν Ἀνθίαν καὶ κύνας μετ' αὐτῆς δύο, ἵνα ἐν τούτῳ μεγάλην δίκην ὑπόσχη τῶν τετολμημένων⁹⁰⁶.

Hippothous' more elaborate and cruel solution could be read as a study in horror. Anthia has already been buried alive and survived, while crucifixion has been used for Habrocomes a few chapters before. Since these means have been already exhausted in literary terms, Hippothous' μείζονα κόλασιν is intended to draw the reader's attention to the carefully chosen new death sentence. In this case (a) Anthia is executed (b) Hippothous and her potential suitor, Amphinomus, carry out the punishment; (c) Anthia is left unrecognised again by Hippothous; (d) finally, Amphinomus saves Anthia. Just as the Phaedra pattern is a study in slander, the Iphigenia pattern seems to present a variety of means of 'almost' executing the protagonist. Yet, unlike in the *Iphigenia* plays, the recognition motif (c) is not immediate.

⁹⁰⁵ Perkins, (1994) p.61.

⁹⁰⁶ 4.6.3.

2.3.1.3 Iamblichus

The complex plot of the *Rhodanes and Sinonis* has space for a double execution scene, which approximates to that of the Iphigenia pattern discussed above. From Photius' summary we learn that the doubles of Rhodanes and Sinonis, namely Euphrates and Mesopotamia, are arrested and are about to be sacrificed, Mesopotamia by Zobaras and Euphrates by his own father, but ἀναγνωσθεὶς σφύζεται⁹⁰⁷. The interlocking of this double plot shows that what is at stake here is not the ritual context but the novelistic context: (a) king Garmus executes his enemies; (b1) Mesopotamia is to be executed as not-Sinonis; (b2) Euphrates is to be executed by his father; (c1) Mesopotamia is saved by a suitor, echoing the same folk patterns, as Anthia, as I will discuss later; (c2) Euphrates is recognised by his father as not-Rhodanes; (d1) Mesopotamia is carried to Egypt, and (d2) Euphrates, after taking up his father's role as an executioner, finds a way to escape.

2.3.1.4 Lollianus

Winkler has discussed Lollianus in relation to ritual sacrifice. He has pointed out that the sacrifice scenes in the novels (he lists eight of them) do not emphasize the ritual context of the sacrifice but underline the barbarism⁹⁰⁸ of the far-away countries in which these practices are performed⁹⁰⁹. The scene in

⁹⁰⁷ Photius, 96.76a-77b.

⁹⁰⁸ For the reception of the motif of cannibalism see Winkler, (1980).

⁹⁰⁹ Winkler, (1980): (1) Leucippe's first sacrifice by Menelaus and Satyrus in 3.15.1ff; (2) Anthia's sacrifice by Hippothous in 2.13.1ff; (3) Anthia being eaten by dogs in 4.5.1ff; (4) Charite's and the ass' sacrifice to Mars in 7.10.1ff; (5) Leucippe's

Lollianus⁹¹⁰ includes both sacrifice and cannibalism and, besides conforming to the prejudices regarding Phoenician practices, gives no information about the child in question, his/her status in the narrative, and/or his/her possible *Scheintod*⁹¹¹. However it bears witness to the secularisation of the 'sacrifice' pattern, a movement from ritual to cannibalism.

Preliminary conclusions

From the above it can be deduced that in the broader plot lines the Iphigenia myth remained unchanged. But the cultural context of the sacrifice seems to have shifted from Aulis to the margins of the empire, where human sacrifices were still thought to be performed. On the other hand, the *IT*, by contrast with the *IA*, because of its 'sacrifice' and 'escape from a barbaric land' motif, seemed to be a more open cultural context, which gave opportunities for different literary adaptations, just as in the works of prose fiction of Philostratus and Lucian that I will study next. The main conclusion to be extracted is that in the majority of literary treatments the Iphigenia myth takes place outside the Greek mainland.

2.3.2 The explicit versions of Lady Jane Grey⁹¹²

The Iphigenia myth not only seems to have been put together by

decapitation at Pharos in 5.7.1ff; (6) Charicleia-Thisbe's murder by Thyamis in 1.30.1; (7) Chariclea's sacrifice by her father in 10.7.1ff and (8) the sacrifice scene in Lollianus (*P.Oxy.*1368 B.1Recto 11ff).

⁹¹⁰ Lollianus, fr. b1r.

⁹¹¹ For a discussion of the gender of the *παῖς* see Winkler, (1980) p.174: S.Stephens, whom he quotes, proposed that the *παῖς* is a girl, disguised as a boy. In AT the father of Charicles laments him as if he were a woman.

⁹¹² Lady Jane Grey (1536/1537 – 12 February 1554), or the 'Nine Days' Queen', was executed in the Tower of London with her fiancé Lord Guildford Dudley, accused for treason against Queen Mary. The execution of the young and innocent Jane is painted in very eloquent and moving colours by Paul Delaroche (1833); the painting is in the National Gallery, London.

Euripides⁹¹³, but also remained unchanged throughout later antiquity. Apollodorus' and Pausanias'⁹¹⁴ accounts of the myth are based mainly on the Euripidean plays.

2.3.2.1 The Second Sophistic on Iphigenia

Antoninus Liberalis

What could be seen as an interesting variation on the Iphigenia myth is Antoninus Liberalis' account of her metamorphosis. According to him Iphigenia was the daughter of Helen by Theseus, but brought up as the adoptive daughter of Agamemnon and Clytemnestra. The narrative continues with her sacrifice at Aulis, her replacement by a calf, instead of a deer, and her transportation to the land of the Borysthenites, where, unlike in the myth, she does not become priestess of Artemis, but is changed into an immortal spirit, called Orsilochia, and becomes Achilles' bride at Leuke. The narrative seems to lack any Euripidean intertext except for the scene in which the Achaeans look away from the altar⁹¹⁵.

Lucian

Lucian treats the Iphigenia myth in the *Toxaris*: according to Toxaris, the abduction of Iphigenia resulted in a ritual among the Taurians⁹¹⁶. The Greek myth on this occasion is presented as an aetiological explanation for the banishment of

⁹¹³ The previous mentions are in Hesiodus' *Catalogue of women*, and in Herodotus' discussion of Scythia. See the discussion in Kyriakou (2006). I am indebted to Ewen Bowie for drawing my attention to the Suda entry on Σιμωνίδης, Καρύστιος ἢ Ερετριεύς, ἐποποιός. τὴν εἰς Αὐλίδαν σύνοδον τῶν Ἀχαιῶν, Τριμέτρων βιβλία β', Περὶ Ἰφιγενείας α'.

⁹¹⁴ Pausanias, 1.33, (Brauron).

⁹¹⁵ For a discussion of the authenticity of the line 1757 see Diggle, (1981).

⁹¹⁶ *Toxaris*, 1, 6.

human sacrifice, but, above all, it praises solidarity and friendship. Mnesippus' Greek version of the text describes the killing of the temple's guardians⁹¹⁷. The same detail is found in the ἔκφρασις of the Iphigenia myth found in the Scythian Oresteion⁹¹⁸. The detail appears as a realistic variation on the Euripidean tale, in which no one is hurt. Moreover, the murder of Thoas is interpreted as punishment τῆς ὕβρεως⁹¹⁹, because he was performing human sacrifices.

In *On Sacrifices* Lucian treats the different sacrificial customs among Greeks, barbarians, Phrygians, Scythians, and especially those invoking the theriomorphic gods of the Egyptian pantheon. The essay also explores Homeric allusions to sacrifice. Lucian, perceptively and ironically, describes the blind devotion to the practice, concluding that:

ταῦτα οὕτω γιγνόμενα καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν πιστευόμενα δεῖσθαι μοι δοκεῖ τοῦ μὲν ἐπιτιμήσοντος οὐδενός, Ἡρακλείτου δέ τινος ἢ Δημοκρίτου, τοῦ μὲν γελασμένου τὴν ἄγνοιαν αὐτῶν, τοῦ δὲ τὴν ἄνοιαν ὀδυρουμένου⁹²⁰.

This is a sophistic critique of the religious practices of Lucian's contemporaries, well placed within a more modern sense of 'enlightenment'.

Philostratus

The critique of religious and sacrificial rituals continues in Philostratus' *Apollonius*⁹²¹. The sage is a Pythagorean and an ardent enemy of bloodshed in sacrifices. The narrative starts with Pythagoras' advice: μὴ γὰρ αἱμάττειν τοὺς

⁹¹⁷ *Toxaris*, 2.

⁹¹⁸ *Toxaris*, 6.

⁹¹⁹ *Toxaris*, 3.

⁹²⁰ Lucian, *On sacrifices*, 15.

⁹²¹ The revival of Protesilaus cult in Philostratus' *Heroicus*, should be treated differently, as a revision of the classical ritual performances and not as a critique of current ritual practices. For Protesilaus' cult see Bradshaw and Mclean, (2004); *Heroicus* and Christianity in Betz, (2004).

βωμούς, ἀλλὰ ἡ μελιπτοῦτα καὶ ὁ λιβανωτὸς καὶ τὸ ἐφθυμῆσαι⁹²². Thus Apollonius persuades an Indian king not to offer a horse sacrifice but incense instead⁹²³. Philostratus' Apollonius, like Charicleia⁹²⁴, appears as the Greek influence that is reshaping barbarian customs, although in other instances the Indians are presented as a source of wisdom. Further on in the narrative Apollonius is presented as having written four books περὶ θυσιῶν καὶ ὡς ἂν τις ἐκάστῳ θεῷ προσφόρως τε καὶ κεχαρισμένως θύοι⁹²⁵.

Plutarch

Another critique of the practice of human sacrifice and of its literary representation is found in Plutarch's *Pelopidas*. The general, before the battle at Leuctra, is reported to have a dream, which was admonishing him to sacrifice a blonde virgin; when he asks the advice of the seers, οἱ μὲν οὐκ εἶων παραμελεῖν οὐδ' ἀπειθεῖν, τῶν μὲν παλαιῶν προφέροντες Μενουκέα τὸν Κρέοντος καὶ Μακαρίαν τὴν Ἡρακλέους⁹²⁶; in the examples Agesilaus is added, for not having sacrificed his daughter when in Aulis according to Artemis' request, and thus doomed his expedition⁹²⁷. Pelopidas objects and finally sacrifices a female horse with a blond mane, instead of a blonde virgin.

⁹²² Philostratus, *Apollonius*, 1.1.

⁹²³ Philostratus, *Apollonius*, 1.31.

⁹²⁴ Morgan, (2009), with a full list of the possible intertexts.

⁹²⁵ Philostratus, *Apollonius*, 3.41.

⁹²⁶ Plutarch, *Pelopidas*, 21.1-4.

⁹²⁷ Plutarch, *Pelopidas*, 21.5-6.

2.3.2.2 *The novels on Iphigenia*

Chariton

A latent pattern

Polycharmus in the land of the Taurians

The Iphigenia myth *per se* is not found in *Callirhoe*. Unlike with the Phaedra pattern, for which there were specific allusions pointing to a Hippolytean context, the sacrifice motif is not present. Nevertheless there are possible echoes of it, especially in the death-marriage motif: problems arise with the binary study of the two burial scenes, that of Callirhoe and that of Chaereas, made explicit at the beginning of Book 4⁹²⁸. The echoes of the Iphigenia pattern are linked to the leading Helen pattern, and especially Euripides' version, which resembles the plot of the *IT*.

While the slander against Callirhoe's chastity has its model in the Helen myth, her apparent death presents, mythologically- and intertextually- a mystery. The key element of the novel's plot as observed above is how to remove the couple from the retardation/stability of their mutual love and launch them on their sea of adventures, literally how to make them embark on a ship⁹²⁹. In Chariton, Aphrodite, enraged with Chaereas, conceives a plot that will make him, in person, the murderer of his wife. The bandits who retrieve Callirhoe point out that they should not have mercy on her τὴν οὐκ ἐλεηθεῖσαν ὑπὸ ἀνδρὸς οὐδὲ

⁹²⁸ 4.1.11, σὺ μὲν ἔθαψας ἐμέ πρῶτος ἐν Συρακούσαις, ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν Μιλήτῳ πάλιν σέ.

⁹²⁹ Hence, no elopement motif could follow.

γονέων⁹³⁰. On the other hand Chaereas presents himself as having committed a crime worse than parricide and begs to throw his ἀσεβὲς σῶμα into the sea⁹³¹.

Chaereas here does not refer to matricide, but his request to be treated as a μιάσμα, and hence to be buried outside the city, may echo the myth of Orestes, before his exoneration by the Ἀρεῖος Πάγος. Forgiven by Hermocrates, Chaereas and Polycharmus, whose friendship has already been compared to that of Achilles and Patroclus⁹³², leave in a quest for Chaereas' wife. On their way to Miletus the expected motif of shipwreck occurs, just as in the *Helen* and the *IT*; upon their arrival on the shore they encounter Aphrodite's ζάκορος and Callirhoe's golden image, which vividly recalls the setting of the *IT*, although the reader knows beforehand that she is not Callirhoe. What is important, though, is that there is a recognition motif that is realised via the golden image of Callirhoe. Additionally, the second recognition of Chaereas, when on the cross, is also realised via Callirhoe's name, just as the revelation of Iphigenia's name to Orestes prompts him to reveal his identity. These similarities – image, name, and recognition – are also present in the *Helen* pattern, which has stronger intertextual bonds with the *Callirhoe* narrative. Indeed, Chaereas has set out, like Menelaus, in search of his wife, and like the King of Sparta he faced shipwreck and (non-ritual) execution. It is also important that the order to sink the Syracusan trireme was given consciously by Dionysius' steward, Phocas, and that

⁹³⁰ 1.9.5, and 1.10.4, ἐλέησομεν ἦν οὐκ ἠλέησεν ἴδιος ἀνὴρ ἀλλὰ ἀπέκτεινεν;

⁹³¹ 1.5.5.

⁹³² 1.5.2, τοιοῦτος οἶον Ὅμηρος ἐποίησε Πάτροκλον Ἀχιλλέως. For Achilles and Patroclus, along with Orestes and Pylades as exemplary friendship models see Fitzgerald, (1997).

Dionysius, like Thoas and/or Theoclymenus, approved⁹³³. However, the closer relationship to the *IT* is grounded on the basis of closer intertextual parallels, and above all Polycharmus's role as the 'best friend' of Chaereas⁹³⁴.

Polycharmus⁹³⁵ is acting like Pylades even in the final recognition scene: being the only sober person he advises them, like Pylades, that they are οὐκ ἐν πατρίδι, ἀλλ' ἐν πολεμίᾳ γῇ, καὶ δεῖ ταῦτα πρότερον οἰκονομῆσαι καλῶς, ἵνα μηδεὶς ἔτι ὑμᾶς διαχωρίσῃ⁹³⁶. Polycharmus is the one who tries to arrange the development of the plot to achieve the best possible outcome and is the one to whom Chaereas gives his sister in marriage in the end, just as Orestes had given Electra to Pylades⁹³⁷.

The intertextual relationship of Chariton's novel to the Euripidean play is realised throughout Polycharmus' role as Chaereas' best friend, and, just as Polycharmus is a δευτεράγωνιστής, the Iphigenia pattern is subordinate to the larger Helen one. A possible analysis of the main motifs of the loose Iphigenia plot would consist of (a?) Aphrodite's request for Callirhoe's *Scheintod*, for which (b?) Chaereas is the main culprit. Motifs (c) and (d) come in a different sequence, since the recognition scene in the novel is much more elaborate and page-consuming than that of the play.

⁹³³ 3.9.11.

⁹³⁴ 3.6.5, where Polycharmus remains σῶφρον, at the news of Callirhoe's marriage.

⁹³⁵ Hock, (1997), for a comparison between the ideal of friendship as presented in Chariton and in Lucian's *Toxaris*, p.155: Polycharmus and Chaereas could easily be added as a sixth pair of Greek friends to the five presented in Lucian's *Toxaris*.

⁹³⁶ 8.1.9; Cf. *IT*, 901-906, τὸ μὲν φίλους ἐλθόντας εἰς ὅσιν φίλων, / Ὅρεστα, χειρῶν περιβολὰς εἰκὸς λαβεῖν / λήξαντα δ' οἰκτὰν κάπ' ἐκεῖν' ἐλθεῖν χρεῶν, / ὅπως τὸ κλεινὸν ὄμμα τῆς σωτηρίας / λαβόντες ἐκ γῆς βησόμεσθα βαρβάρου.

⁹³⁷ 8.8.12.

Discussion

The similarities observed in the two patterns, the Helen and the Iphigenia, far from making the Iphigenia pattern a major one for the novel, vary the Helen one, and might indicate that both plays were received as a structural unity, displaying the same plot, and were used as a structural unity for the shaping of the novel.

Achilles Tatius

1. Intertexts

An allusion to the Iphigenia myth is found in the proverb that Cleitophon quotes when he escapes from prison with Melite's help. He mentions that when the guard saw him coming out in female clothing, κακεῖνος ὡς τὸ εἶκός, θέαμα ἰδὼν παραδοξότατον τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἔλαφον ἀντὶ παρθένου παροιμίας, ἐξεπλάγη καὶ ἔστη σιωπῇ⁹³⁸. The proverb need not be an allusion to the Euripidean play, but later, in the last chapters, Cleitophon explicitly compares Ephesus with Scythia, as I will discuss below⁹³⁹.

⁹³⁸ 6.2.3.

⁹³⁹ 8.2.3.

2. Patterns

Leucippe's triple near-death escapes appear to be a reading of Xenophon and a proof that novel-like 'ways of killing a woman' were not, by the time of *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, exhausted. On the other hand, AT's connection with mime may be the reason for his different setting of the scene⁹⁴⁰. Whichever the main intertexts might be, it is a fact that Leucippe is reported dead three times.

Leucippe's sacrifice and resurrection

The first time, just as in one case of Anthia, the reader and the narrator, Cleitophon, witness the sacrifice of Leucippe by the Βουκόλοι as a *ιερεῖον*, which would guarantee the success of their warfare against Charmides⁹⁴¹. It appears to be a ritual Egyptian sacrifice:

ἄγουσι δὴ τινες δύο τὴν κόρην ὀπίσω τῷ χεῖρε δεδεμένην...εἶτα κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς σπονδὴν περιχέαντες περιάγουσι τὸν βωμὸν κύκλῳ, καὶ ἐπηύλει τις αὐτῇ, καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς ἤδεν, ὡς εἰκός, ὥδην Αἰγυπτίαν. τὸ γὰρ σχῆμα τοῦ στόματος καὶ τῶν προσώπων τὸ διελκυσμένον ὑπέφαιεν ὥδην⁹⁴².

Cleitophon then describes the rest of the ritual at the end of which he remains speechless and motionless like Niobe. In his lament we can discern a comment on this innovative sacrifice motif, which he refers to as *καινὰ μυστήρια*⁹⁴³. It is over Leucippe's body that he meets his friends Satyrus and Menelaus, who, after a ritual to Hecate, revive Leucippe and restore her to her lover. The incident in

⁹⁴⁰ AT and the *Charition* as possible intertexts are discussed by Mignogna, (1997); yet the novelists, demonstrate first-hand knowledge of the tragedians and even of texts which were not in the cannon, Liapis, (2006). I believe that there is no need to separate between AT's sources, mime and tragedy, could be used as possible cultural and literary intertexts. For mime as a genre in which the osmosis: 'high' and 'low' literature is manifested see Andreassi, (2002) p.30-46.

⁹⁴¹ 4.14.4-6, a ναυμαχοπεζομαχία follows in which Charmides dies.

⁹⁴² 3.15.1-6.

⁹⁴³ 3.16.4, ὡ τροφῶν καινὰ μυστήρια.

itself appears to be one of the stereotypical motifs of the novel as genre, but the two interpretations of it allow us to inscribe it in the Iphigenia pattern.

Leucippe, revived by Menelaus and Satyrus, informs Cleitophon that the day before her expected sacrifice Artemis, who guarantees the happy end,⁹⁴⁴ appeared to her. Like Iphigenia, Anthia and Charicleia, Leucippe is one of Artemis' protégées, whom the goddess saves miraculously. Artemis foretells Leucippe her escape and also her marriage. This detail is a difference from the Euripidean Iphigenia myth, in which the protagonist does not marry Achilles at all. However, the most striking interpretation is the way in which Leucippe's sacrifice is not averted, but faked. Therefore it is clear that this is an 'averted sacrifice' pattern.

Satyrus gets hold of an actor's sword⁹⁴⁵, used πρὸς τὰς κιβδήλους σφαγὰς⁹⁴⁶. This allows the narrator to hold back the narrative's tempo and move into a large digression, describing how the poor actor entered a real battle when the ship was captured, with a fake sword. When transposed to the novelistic world –from the mime's stage– this sword, which appears to be the *machina* that save Leucippe's life⁹⁴⁷, ends up serving its purpose in a 'real' situation, this time effectively. As for the replacement animal, this is a lamb's belly which is cut wide open instead of that of Leucippe; the lamb is associated with Menelaus' praise of friendship which loosely echoes Euripides' *Orestes* but may also to allude to

⁹⁴⁴ 4.1.4.

⁹⁴⁵ The actor was one performing Homeric mimes; for a discussion of the scene with respect to mime see Mignogna, (1997).

⁹⁴⁶ 3.20.7.

⁹⁴⁷ 3.21.3, τὸ ξίφος ὡς ἔχει μηχανῆς.

John's Gospel⁹⁴⁸, shapes the background of motif (b), namely the execution of Leucippe by a kinsman. As for the recognition motif, this comes almost immediately after the sacrifice and Cleitophon assists in the resurrection of his beloved, a detail that points to the treatment of the sacrifice motif as a *Scheintod* motif, since Leucippe's body, according to Cleitophon's own testimony, appears to be dead.

Leucippe's decapitation

The second death of Leucippe is neither a sacrifice nor an execution, but is also identified as a σφαγή⁹⁴⁹, a term that refers to dramatic sacrifices and suicides⁹⁵⁰. She is murdered so that Chaereas' pirates can escape from Cleitophon who is pursuing them along with the Egyptian general. The decapitation of Leucippe recalls her previous death in the phrasing τὴν κόρην ὀπίσω τῷ χεῖρε δεδεμένην⁹⁵¹. Again, as on the first occasion, Cleitophon, the general Charmides and the Egyptian soldiers passively witness Leucippe's drama. When the curtain of the stage falls, Cleinias has recovered the headless body of Leucippe and laments her double death:

νῦν μοι, Λευκίππη, τέθνηκας ἀληθῶς θάνατον διπλοῦν, γῆ καὶ θαλάττῃ διαιρούμενον. τὸ μὲν γὰρ λείψανον ἔχω σου τοῦ σώματος, ἀπολώλεκα δὲ σέ⁹⁵².

This second lamentation of Cleitophon is compressed by comparison with the

⁹⁴⁸ 3.22.1, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ φίλου, κὰν ἀποθανεῖν δεήσῃ, καλὸς ὁ κίνδυνος, γλυκὺς ὁ θάνατος. Cf. Euripides, *Orestes*, 1155-1158, οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν κρείσσον ἢ φίλος σαφής...σὺ γὰρ τὰ τ' εἰς Αἰγισθον ἐξηῦρες κακὰ/ καὶ πλησίον παρῆσθα κινδύνων ἐμοί; Cf. *St. John*, 15.13, μείζονα ταύτης ἀγάπην οὐδεὶς ἔχει, ἵνα τις τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ θῇ ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ.

⁹⁴⁹ 5.7.9.

⁹⁵⁰ Loraux, (1987).

⁹⁵¹ Only in 3.15.2 (the first sacrifice) and in 5.7.4 (the decapitation).

⁹⁵² 5.7.8.

more elaborate first one⁹⁵³: the rest of the action is summarized quickly, and soon after Leucippe's burial Cleitophon meets Melite. The audience is undoubtedly at a loss, since the sequence is not summarized now but only much later, and an explanation of Leucippe's paradoxical new salvation is given only by Leucippe herself and only in the last recapitulation of the adventures. The theatrical impact that this second sequence has, with (a) Leucippe's execution by decapitation, (b) carried out by Charmides' men, her suitor, leaves out both motif (c) and motif (d), which are not explained yet but much later. Just as in the *IA*, the audience, along with Cleitophon, has every reason to believe she is dead, an assumption which is endorsed by the brevity of the conclusion that leaves the sequence ending with a big question-mark, while a new motif, the Phaedra pattern, is introduced.

Cleitophon in the land of the Taurians

Leucippe's resurrection on Melite's estate is performed in two stages: first Cleitophon thinks, or retrospectively thinks that he had associated the slave's physical appearance with Leucippe⁹⁵⁴. Soon afterwards he gets a letter from Leucippe in which, he recognizes first the handwriting, and then the content, as coming from Leucippe⁹⁵⁵. Cleitophon's inability to recognise persons and faces⁹⁵⁶, despite his virtuosity in interpreting living letters⁹⁵⁷, may be associated with his passion for texts and the narrator's for intertexts, and will be further analysed in

⁹⁵³ 135 words in 3.16.3ff. and only 65 words in 5.7.9.

⁹⁵⁴ 5.17.1, καὶ γὰρ τι ἐδόκει Λευκίπτης ἔχειν.

⁹⁵⁵ 5.18.2.

⁹⁵⁶ He fails to recognize Satyrus and Menelaus at the first sacrifice of Leucippe; then he fails to recognize Leucippe on board and also Leucippe at Melite's.

⁹⁵⁷ 5.19.6, οὕτως ἡσυχνόμην καὶ τὰ γράμματα.

Part III. This time there is an allusion to the recognition scene in the *IT*, the letter. As in the play the letter is handed to the friend, Satyrus, to be delivered to the hero Cleitophon. Leucippe, unlike Iphigenia, recognizes Cleitophon first. The latter, amazed, asks Satyrus πότερον ἐξ Αἰδου ἤκεις φέρων τὴν ἐπιστολήν, ἢ τί ταῦτα θέλει; Λευκίππη πάλιν ἀνεβίω;⁹⁵⁸. The repetition, πάλιν, brings the reader's attention to the reworking of the motif, which makes easier the transition to the third sequence.

Cleitophon murders Leucippe

Leucippe is reported dead at the hands of Melite, by a stranger who has been accused of being an accomplice of the murder; this is an outcome which would have been expected in a novelistic Phaedra-revenge plot⁹⁵⁹. Cleitophon realises the size of the καὶνὴν ὑπόθεσιν συμφορῶν⁹⁶⁰ and he bursts into another lengthy lamentation, which is a intratextual commentary on the previous employed and varied motifs:

οἶμοι, Λευκίππη, ποσάκις μοι τέθνηκας· μὴ γὰρ θρηνῶν ἀνεπαυσάμην; ἀεὶ σε πενθῶ, τῶν θανάτων διωκόντων ἀλλήλους;...νῦν δὲ τέθνηκας θάνατον διπλοῦν, ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος. δύο ἐξέφυγες ληστήρια, τὸ δὲ τῆς Μελίτης πεφόνευκέ σε πειρατήριον⁹⁶¹.

This lamentation, which vividly echoes the previous one in its description of Leucippe's death as a διπλοῦς θάνατος, is a summary of the earlier ways in which the narrative has killed Leucippe. Opposed to Cleitophon's despair,

⁹⁵⁸ 5.19.1. Cf. *IT*, 772, ποῦ δ' ἐστ' ἐκείνη; κατθανοῦς ἤκει πάλιν;

⁹⁵⁹ 7.3.7.

⁹⁶⁰ 7.5.1.

⁹⁶¹ 7.5.2-3.

Cleinius' comment – τίς γὰρ οἶδεν, εἰ ζῇ πάλιν; μὴ γὰρ οὐ πολλάκις τέθνηκε; μὴ γὰρ οὐ πολλάκις ἀνεβίω;⁹⁶² – presents him, unlike Cleitophon, as a careful reader of the *Leucippe* and able to conjecture the following events from previous ones. But Cleitophon is not convinced and decides to punish Melite by taking the blame for Leucippe's death and appearing to be her murderer⁹⁶³. It is only at the very last moment that, with Sostratus' arrival, Artemis saves Cleitophon and the future recovery of Leucippe is foreshadowed⁹⁶⁴.

Leucippe is not dead, but, having escaped from Sosthenes, she has sought refuge in Artemis' temple⁹⁶⁵, echoing the Iphigenia myth. Again, we do not learn Leucippe's identity immediately but we learn about a beautiful maiden who resembles Artemis⁹⁶⁶, and thus cannot be anyone other than her protégée, Leucippe. Leucippe's third resurrection results in a tragic monologue by Cleitophon in which he associates their current adventures at Ephesus, a Greek territory, with Scythia:

τραγωδῶν ἐνέπλησα βοῆς τὸ ἱερόν,...'μεμΐανται τὸ ἔδαφος ἀνθρωπίνῳ αἵματι. τοιαῦτα σπένδει τίς τῇ θεῷ; οὐ βάρβαροι τοῦτο καὶ Ταῦροι καὶ ἡ Ἀρτεμις ἡ Σκυθῶν; ὁ παρ' ἐκείνοις μόνος ναὸς οὕτως αἱμάσσεται. τὴν Ἰωνίαν Σκυθίαν πεποίηκας, καὶ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ῥεῖ τὰ ἐν Ταύροις αἶμα⁹⁶⁷.

In a twist of reading, Cleitophon's identity slips and from the murderer he himself becomes the victim and a suppliant of Artemis. Like Orestes, he has had

⁹⁶² 7.6.2.

⁹⁶³ 7.6.3, ὡς ἀλλήλων ἐρώντες ἐγώ τε καὶ Μελίτη κοινῇ τὴν Λευκίππην ἀνηγόκαμεν.

⁹⁶⁴ 7.14.6, ἡ Ἀρτεμις οὐ ψεύδεται. ζῇ σοι ἡ Λευκίππη. οὐχ ὁρᾷς καὶ τοῦτον ὡς ἐκ τῶν βασάνων νῦν κρεμáμενον ἐξηρπάσεν; Also Sostratus' dream regarding the recovery of Leucippe and Cleitophon, in 7.12.4.

⁹⁶⁵ 7.13.2.

⁹⁶⁶ 7.15.2.

⁹⁶⁷ 8.2.1.

his good friend Cleinias by his side since the beginning of their adventures and it is with a quotation associated with Orestes that his friend tries to defend him in front of the Ephesian court, claiming that this is an ἀγὼν περὶ ψυχῆς ἀνδρός⁹⁶⁸. In this new staging of the Iphigenia on Ephesian soil (a1) Leucippe is thought to have been murdered by Cleitophon and/or Melite; (a2) Cleitophon is about to be tortured; (b) we do not learn anything about the means of her execution, despite Cleitophon's repeated efforts to extract information from the messenger⁹⁶⁹. This could be interpreted either as the narrator's inadequacy to produce another variation of the motif, or as an invitation for the reader to make up, from the previous patterns, a motif of his own; (c) there is a double recognition of both Leucippe and Cleitophon, by Sostratus, and a miraculous intervention by the helpful priest, who, unlike Calchas, (d) provides asylum to the two suppliants and stage-manages the plot to its solution.

Discussion

Thus, AT's novel inventively rewrites not only the Iphigenia pattern but also its variations used by his predecessors, and especially by Xenophon. Both narratives display the motif on three occasions, starting with the ritual sacrifice and continuing with its variations and in both intratextual comments can be found, revealing their narrators' eagerness for readerly appreciation of their skills. The most interesting reinvention of AT's novel is in my opinion the

⁹⁶⁸ 7.9.1. Cf. Sophocles, *Electra*, 1492, νῦν ἐστὶν ἀγὼν, ἀλλὰ σῆς ψυχῆς πέρι; Orestes to Aegisthus in the exodos. The phrase is common in tragedy and especially Euripides *Phoenissae* 1330 and *Orestes* 847, ψυχῆς ἀγῶνα δώσω, regarding the trial. The allusion is not cited in Liapis, (2006).

⁹⁶⁹ 7.4.2, τίνα τρόπον τὴν κόρην ἀπέκτεινεν, ἔφην, ὁ μισθωτός, καὶ τί πεποίηκε τὸ σῶμα;

relocation of the sacrifice, not abroad, but on Greek soil, as in the *Iphigenia in Aulis*, that could be interpreted as a comment on Greek barbarism opposed to that of foreigners.

Heliodorus

Novelistic sacrifice in the land of bandits - Thisbe

Charicleia faces three near-death situations: at the hands of Thyamis, of Arsace, and of Hydaspes. From these, her attempted execution by Arsace is treated alongside the Phaedra pattern as an expansion of motif (c) and although it is also a near-death situation it cannot be interpreted as belonging to the Iphigenia pattern.

A latent Iphigenia in a Helen motif

A latent Iphigenia case is the slaying of Charicleia – Thisbe at the very beginning of the novel, which introduces Thermouthis for the first time. Thyamis orders his minion to bring a *ἱερεῖον*, *ὡς ἂν θεοῖς ἐγχωρίοις ἐναγίσαντες οὕτω τῆς μάχης ἄρχοιεν*⁹⁷⁰. But the battle starts before Thermouthis makes it and when he finally brings the animal, Thyamis, who believes Charicleia dead, laughs at him, for having already *τὸ κάλλιστον θυμάτων ἱερουργήσας*⁹⁷¹. The sequence of capture by bandits followed by sacrifice-replacement, echoes its previous variations in the novels, e.g. Anthia and Leucippe, but the contextualising pattern is that of the Helen. Nevertheless there are clear traces of the sequence of the

⁹⁷⁰ 1.28.1.

⁹⁷¹ 1.31.1.

motifs for both parallel narratives, that of Charicleia and that of Thisbe.

For Charicleia: (a) Charicleia is captured by Thyamis and (b) is offered as sacrifice before the battle; (c) Thisbe is mistaken for Charicleia and (d) Charicleia is alive, with sacrifice averted.

For Thisbe: (a) Thisbe is captured by Thermouthis (b) and executed as a *ἱερεῖον*, by Thermouthis' superior; (c) misrecognition motif; the sacrifice is completed.

As discussed above the slaying of Charicleia is implemented within the wider Helen pattern and the 'sacrifice' of Thisbe is the result of her previous Phaedra-machinations. The link with the Iphigenia latent sequence is realised through the Thermouthis detail, a touch of dramatic irony: it is Thermouthis who is ordered to bring the *ἱερεῖον* and he happens to be the lover of the human victim, Thisbe. This small detail interconnects the subordinate plot, which is more appropriate to the novel-genre, to the main story and illustrates the narrative choice of leaving aside a possible 'sacrifice in the pirate's land' sequence and opt for a more tragic and spectacular one, that of Charicleia at Meroe.

Charicleia in the land of the Ethiopians

Συήνης πέποις

The main element of the Iphigenia motif is undoubtedly child sacrifice. Nevertheless in the Heliodoran context the emphasis is not only on the tragic daughter but also on the tragic father. Book 9 contributes towards a positive portrayal of Hydaspes before he resumes his role as his daughter's executioner in

front of the altar at Meroe. The characterisation of Hydaspes in Book 9 is presented so as to be set against that of Agamemnon, but the narrative insists on pointing out differences rather than similarities. Besides, Agamemnon was a favourite example of 'kingship', along with Achilles and Alexander, in the prose literature of later antiquity. In the *Iliad* and the *IA*, Agamemnon is presented as a man driven by a thirst for power⁹⁷²; according to Clytemnestra the whole heroic expedition was based on a crime that served the individualistic ambitions of the Greek generals⁹⁷³. In contrast, Hydaspes is always presented as the 'enlightened' king⁹⁷⁴, and the Syenian chapters engage in portraying him as such⁹⁷⁵. The long account of the siege is used not just as a digression⁹⁷⁶ but as a key element for tying together the plot.

Syene's siege occupies Book 9⁹⁷⁷ and alludes heavily to the *Iliad*, without this meaning that the Herodotean allusions as observed by Morgan (1982) and Elmer (2009) should be neglected. The Iliadic war was the 'archetypical' war for all the others that followed and which set Greece against the Persians, either in reality, or historiography, or fiction. Besides, the Homeric colouring of the battle scenes has been observed in the duel between Peloros and Trachinus, echoing that of

⁹⁷² *IA*, 1195, ἡ σκῆπτρα μόνον διαφέρειν καὶ στρατηλατεῖν μέλλει;

⁹⁷³ *IA*, 1194.

⁹⁷⁴ Cf. *Cyropaedeia*, 8.4.7; for the clemency and piety of other Ethiopian rulers, like Sobacos (Herodotus 2.139), and Actisanes (Diodorus 1.60); Morgan, (2005) p.309-318.

⁹⁷⁵ For the Herodotean elements of these chapters see recently Elmer, (2008) who argues that 'the capture of Charicleia match the abduction that open Herodotus' *Histories*', p.423; and that Heliodorus is narrating his own version of 'Persian Wars', in portraying Hydaspes in his war against Persia.

⁹⁷⁶ For this big digression as 'tiring' see Rattenbury (1935). Also see Morgan (1989) p.299-230; Morgan argues that Book 9, with a possible defeat of the Ethiopians, plays with the possibility of not concluding with a happy ending, since the *πρωτολεῖα* may not be offered.

⁹⁷⁷ Morgan, (1982), for the historical context, especially the Herodotean elements; the historical background in Lightfoot, (1988) p.119, arguing that Julian borrowed some fictive elements from Heliodorus' description. Recently, in Elmer, (2008) p.423. The coexistence of epic, dramatic and historiographical intertexts and allusions does not necessarily contradict my argument, since it is based on similarity of patterns and not just on intertextuality. It is perfectly fine for an episode, although treated here with a primary Euripidean intertext, to bring in allusions from other texts.

Paris and Menelaus, and the duel of Petosiris⁹⁷⁸ and Thyamis echoes that of Hector and Achilles⁹⁷⁹. At the border of Egypt and Ethiopia the battle continues around a city, which is presented as a potential Troy; surrounded by a big force, the native Syenians and the occupying Persians are doomed. The detail that the Syenians are not fighting for their location, but are the victims of the two powerful generals who want to take over this strategic city, is a detail that possibly gives a colour of imperialist political realism to the scene, rather than painting the picture of an idealised fight for the motherland. This detail is followed by another: unlike the siege of Troy that lasted ten years, Hydaspes, in order to make his attack fast and successful, conceives a brilliant, 'Odyssean', plan: to drown the city⁹⁸⁰. Hydaspes (his name's components are ὑδωρ+ἄσπις but it is also the name of the river by which Alexander fought Porus⁹⁸¹) chooses to attack the city with water, whilst Troy was famously burned down. Hydaspes' plan is based not on attacking from the inside but from the outside; the Syenians, because they are not fighting for their homeland but are pawns in the hands of their sovereigns, upon seeing the disaster approaching beg Hydaspes for clemency, which he happily displays⁹⁸².

But the *Aethiopica* offers another way of attacking Syene, performed by Oroondates, the negative counterpart of Hydaspes: when the city celebrates the

⁹⁷⁸ Cf. footnote 575.

⁹⁷⁹ Sandy, (1982) p.88.

⁹⁸⁰ 9.3.1.

⁹⁸¹ The battle of the Hydaspes, 326 B.C.E; Plutarch, *Alexander*, 62.1; Arrian, 5.18; note by that Alexander, having won, showed clemency and allowed Porus to rule in his name.

⁹⁸² 9.5.1.

Neiloa with sacrifices and banquets⁹⁸³, Oroondates frees his men who were imprisoned in Syene. The setting is similar to that at Troy: feasts and banquets result in a deep sleep and the eventual surprise of the Syenians upon discovering the escape of the Persians; this recalls the Trojans' naïve reaction and celebrations, with which they welcomed Odysseus' Wooden Horse. Both Odysseus' and Oroondates' plans are alike in that they are based on the false assumption, on the opponent's part, that the enemy has retreated⁹⁸⁴. The escape of the Persians causes the Syenians to be suspected of treason, since, despite Hydaspes' clemency, they appear to have co-operated with the enemy. It is here that the king's clemency is tested, risking his presenting a negative example. Nevertheless he appears to show mercy for a second time, despite Oroondates' double treason⁹⁸⁵.

When Oroondates is captured alive and brought in front of the Ethiopian king, Hydaspes displays all his φιλάνθρωπία, an element that distinguishes the *Aethiopica* from the world of the epic⁹⁸⁶. Hydaspes' φιλάνθρωπία seems to be inspired by Alexander's moral superiority⁹⁸⁷. The dialogue between the victor Hydaspes, and the defeated Oroondates recalls the encounter between Alexander and Porus⁹⁸⁸ in that Hydaspes approaches his opponent with admiration⁹⁸⁹; moreover Hydaspes proves himself magnanimous and clement towards the besieged Syenians for a second time, trying to exempt the many from one

⁹⁸³ 9.10.1-3.

⁹⁸⁴ 9.6.5 ἀλλ' εἰ βούλοιο Ὑδάσπης... ἀποχωρεῖν εἰς τὴν Ἐλεφαντίνην.

⁹⁸⁵ First in 9.6.2 and 9.6.5; now, in 9.8.1.

⁹⁸⁶ Although Alexander himself seems to have had Achilles as a model and allegedly carried the *Iliad* everywhere with him; this 'intertextual' dialogue is frequently reported by Alexander's biographers.

⁹⁸⁷ An 'idealized' version of Alexander in Dio, *On Kingship*, 1-4, and in Plutarch's *Alexander*.

⁹⁸⁸ 9.21.1ff. Plutarch, *Alexander* 60.14.

⁹⁸⁹ In the *Iliad* too we find words of admiration for the enemy; eg. Diomedes to Glaucus 6.123, Achilles to Priam 24.248; yet wrath makes warriors unmerciful, Achilles to Lycaon 21.34ff.

person's blame, arguing that it is εὖηθες, τὴν τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄνοιαν τοσοῦτοις ἐπαγαγεῖν ἀπώλειαν⁹⁹⁰. This attitude differentiates the siege of Syene from that of Troy, where many perished because of one person, Paris. This approach seems to echo contemporary Second Sophistic political ideologies of enlightened kingship. Hence, unlike Agamemnon's, Hydaspes' victory will be fair from start to finish and nothing will stain his homecoming. That is why his *nostos*, unlike Agamemnon's⁹⁹¹, will result in happy days with his wife.

This mythological approach to Book 9 as an 'alternative' *Iliad* is inseparable from the following Iphigenia sequence of motifs and reveals why the 'war episodes' come before the sacrifice in the *Aethiopica*. The narrator, starting Book 10, reminds the reader that:

τὰ μὲν δὴ κατὰ Σὺνῃν ἐπὶ τοσόνδε πραχθέντα εἰρήσθω, παρὰ τοσοῦτον μὲν ἔλθοῦσαν κινδύνου πρὸς τοσαύτην δὲ εὐπάθειαν ἀθρόον δὲ ἑνὸς εὐνομίαν ἀνδρὸς μεταβαλοῦσαν⁹⁹².

This as an intratextual comment-preface to Book 10 summarises the argument that the previous book was an elaborate narration of how Syene did not become another Troy, because of Hydaspes. I would even go further and suggest that were Hydaspes not clement and wise, his homecoming might well have resulted in a family tragedy instead of a 'happy ending.'

Iphigenia in Meroe

Having presented a positive version of Agamemnon, Book 10 continues the

⁹⁹⁰ 9.7.2.

⁹⁹¹ *IA*, 1186-7, τί σοι κατεύξη τὰγαθὸν σφάζων τέκνον; νόστον πονηρόν, οἰκοθεν γ' αἰσχρῶς ἰών;

⁹⁹² 1.10.1.

story of the sacrifice⁹⁹³. It is in this context that Hydaspes, although different in character and thoughts from his mythological model, shares with Agamemnon the same fate of the 'tragic father' who is to sacrifice his child for the benefit of his people. What is important to know, however, is that while Charicleia knows that Hydaspes is her father, Hydaspes thinks of Charicleia as a *πρωτόλειον*. Yet in order to re-stage a version of the family tragedy they both have to be aware of each other's identities; hence 'recognition' is necessary. I here treat the recognition scene alone, whereas the recognition patterns of Heliodorus are explicitly discussed in Part III.

The first encounter between daughter and father in both Charicleia's and Iphigenia's cases has one common element, the contradictory emotions on the daughter's and on the father's faces⁹⁹⁴; in the *IA* it is Iphigenia who cheerfully greets a wary-looking father⁹⁹⁵, while in the *Aethiopica*, it is Hydaspes who sadly notices the cheerful face of Charicleia as she faces sacrifice⁹⁹⁶. However, the real 'spectacle' begins after the virginity trial of the burning pyre when Charicleia is dressed in her Delphic chiton⁹⁹⁷. It is the third time⁹⁹⁸ Charicleia has consciously dressed herself for a 'performance' in which she is the protagonist. Charicleia reveals her identity in a dramatic way, *ὥσπερ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς ἐξ' ἀπόρων...καὶ οἶον*

⁹⁹³ Paulsen (1992).

⁹⁹⁴ 10.7.3, *φαιδρῶ τῷ προσώπῳ καὶ μειδiónτι συνεχῆς*. Cf. *IA* 640ff., *πάτερ σ' εἶδον ἀσμένῃ*.

⁹⁹⁵ *IA*, 650ff.

⁹⁹⁶ 10.7.6.

⁹⁹⁷ 10.9.3.

⁹⁹⁸ The other two in Delphi, when she meets with Theagenes, 3.4.2, and before her marriage to Trachinus, 5.31.2. Charicleia more or less 'consciously' performs her life: her love, her Helen-adventures and now her Iphigenia-adventures.

ἐκ μηχανῆς⁹⁹⁹.

Charicleia's defence is based on her knowledge, that she is the Ethiopian princess, and Hydaspes' ignorance. Her argument is based on the distinction between ξενοκτονεῖν and τεκνοκτονεῖν¹⁰⁰⁰. Thus, the first part of the sacrifice brings infanticide, and the *IA*, into play. The recognition scene follows all the steps of the 'ideal recognition', since Hydaspes is unaware of the identity of his victim, since, in Aristotelian terms it is βέλτιον δὲ τὸ ἀγνοοῦντα μὲν πρᾶξαι, πρᾶξαντα δὲ ἀναγνώρισαι¹⁰⁰¹.

The recognition in the *Aethiopica* follows all the possible options of the Aristotelian recognition-typology: (a) it is ἀτεχνοτάτη, διὰ σημείων σύμφυτων/ἐπικτήτων¹⁰⁰², given the band, the jewels and the ebony scar on her arm; (b) it is based on memory, since the sight of the young girl reminds Persinna of the daughter that she should have had, and Hydaspes of the dream in which he was the father to a daughter; (c) it is also an artificial recognition, πεποιημένη, in that Charicleia accidentally embraces the feet of Sisimithres, whom she recognises only later as her saviour, and who is now her public defender; (d) it is a recognition ἐκ συλλογισμοῦ, as a natural conclusion, in Sisimithres's case: such a beautiful virgin, whose skin colour and age correspond to that of the exposed infant, could not be anyone other than Charicleia. (e) Finally, in order to crown all these simultaneous modes of recognition, the narrative presents another option in

⁹⁹⁹ 10.12.2.

¹⁰⁰⁰ 10.12.3.

¹⁰⁰¹ Aristoteles, *Poetics*, 1454a, 1-5.

¹⁰⁰² Aristoteles, *Poetics* 1451b 22ff.

the Aristotelian typology, the famous Andromeda painting that explains Charicleia's skin-colour.

After all the proofs of Charicleia's identity are assembled, the sacrifice is called off and the general grief, felt from the beginning of the ritual – so hard was it to accept the sacrifice of such a beauty – gives place to jubilation¹⁰⁰³. However, a second surprise soon follows, unpleasant this time. Hydaspes decides, nevertheless, to sacrifice his daughter, since it is the traditional custom and the people have decided so¹⁰⁰⁴. It is at this point that Hydaspes embodies the character of Agamemnon and Persinna that of Clytaemnestra, the tragic mother. The theatricality of the next scene is highly accentuated: Hydaspes is now consciously staging his own drama, against the expectations of the other plot-maker, Charicleia. Hence, whereas the daughter expected the recognition to be the ending of her plot, the father conceives a new one, and addresses her with the following words:

σὺ δὲ ὦ θύγατερ ...τὸ ἀνδρεῖον ἐκεῖνό σου φρόνημα καὶ βασιλείον νῦν
...ἐπιδείκνυται...ὁ τέκνον ὁμοῦ καλεσάμενος καὶ τεκνοκτόνος γινόμενος¹⁰⁰⁵.

The comparison between sacrifice and marriage is common throughout Greek literature and it does not need to be related to the Iphigenia myth exclusively¹⁰⁰⁶. Nevertheless the sacrifice of a king's daughter for the commonwealth is a major characteristic of the Iphigenia myth¹⁰⁰⁷. Like

¹⁰⁰³ 10.16.1.

¹⁰⁰⁴ 10.16.6.

¹⁰⁰⁵ 10.16.8-10.

¹⁰⁰⁶ *IA*, 460-491, τὴν δ' αὖ τάλαιναν παρθένον... Αἰδὴς νιν, ὡς ἔοικε, νυμφεύσει τάχα.

¹⁰⁰⁷ *IA* 514ff. A major difference between the *IA* and the *Aethiopica* is the position of the priests. Whereas Calchas is presented negatively in the play (520), in the novel the Gymnosophists explicitly argue against human sacrifices, 10.9.6.

Agamemnon in the *IA* who first gave his consent and then tried to warn his daughter secretly, Hydaspes seems to accept the sacrifice, although τὴν ἐπιτυχίαν τῶν ἐνηδρευμένων τῇ δημηγορίᾳ λόγων ἀπευχόμενος¹⁰⁰⁸.

The staging is highlighted by allusions to the setting and to the ὑποκρισις, the acting of the Ethiopian king. Like a good plot-maker and actor, Hydaspes takes his time to observe his audience's reaction, before moving on with the play:

ἀλλ' ὀλίγον ἐπιστὰς τόν τε δῆμον κατοπτεύσας ἀπὸ τῶν ἴσων παθῶν κεκινημένον καὶ πρὸς τὴν σκηνοποιῖαν τῆς τύχης ὑφ' ἡδονῆς τε ἅμα καὶ ἐλέου δακρύνοντας...τὴν χεῖρα προτείνας καὶ κατασείων πρὸς ἡσυχίαν τὸ κλυδώνιον τοῦ δήμου κατέστελλε¹⁰⁰⁹.

The adjective κλυδώνιον is frequent in tragedy and in oratory, when the orator compares the current situation to a 'dramatic' one¹⁰¹⁰. Further on, Hydaspes presents himself as a man subjected to the divine powers; the god gives and takes, εἰ μὲν γὰρ τοῖς θεοῖς οὕτω φίλον ὥστε παρέχεσθαι τε ἅμα καὶ ἀφαιρεῖσθαι¹⁰¹¹. Moreover he addresses both his citizens and his daughter in a vocabulary drawn either from tragedy or from epic:

παύσασθε μὲν δακρύνοντες καὶ ἡμᾶς κατοικτιζόμενοι μάτην, τῆς δὲ ἱερουργίας ἐχώμεθα...σύ δε, ὦ θύγατερ μὴ μοι σύγχει τὸν θυμὸν ὀδυρομένη¹⁰¹².

Hydaspes then seems to heighten the drama that was staged by Charicleia in the beginning. Fearing the reaction of the crowd, he takes the initiative and

¹⁰⁰⁸ 10.17.1.

¹⁰⁰⁹ 10.16.3.

¹⁰¹⁰ Aeschylus, *Choephoroi*, 183, καρδία κλυδώνιον χολῆς Sophocles, *Oedipus King*, 1527, κλυδῶνα συμφορᾶς also Demosthenes, *On the false legation*, 314, τοῦ δήμου κλυδῶνα καὶ μανίαν. For Demosthenes' use of tragedy see Wilston, (1996).

¹⁰¹¹ 10.16.6; cf. *Odyssey*, 1.82, εἰ μὲν δὴ νῦν τοῦτο φίλον μακάρεσσι θεοῖσι, νοστήσαι Ὀδυσῆα; Plato, *Crito* 43d, ἀλλ', ὦ Κρίτων, τύχη ἀγαθὴ, εἰ ταύτῃ τοῖς θεοῖς φίλον, ταύτῃ ἔστω.

¹⁰¹² 10.16.8-9; Cf. *Prometheus*, 36, τί μέλλεις καὶ κατοικτιζεις μάτην; Euripides, *Andromeda*, TrGF 119-120, 1 (Kannicht, 5.1) συναλγήσον; cf. Aristophanes, *Thesmophoriazousae*, 1058, σὺ δ' εἰ τίς ἦτις τοῦμόν ὥκτιρας πάθος; and *Iliad*, 9.612, μὴ μοι σύγχει θυμὸν (Achilles).

prepares to sacrifice his daughter, asking her to be brave, like Iphigenia¹⁰¹³. Yet this is an action that is supported not only by his high sense of duty but also by self-motivation: playing the role of the tragic father in front of an audience of onlookers, he stages another drama, the play of his life and his kingship. In this drama, as opposed to the *IA*, the leading characters rely mainly on their audience's emotions and expectations. In *IA*, the Greeks, with the exception perhaps of Achilles, did not oppose the sacrifice but remained spectators. Hydaspes' expectations seem to come true when the crowd releases him from his duties by ordering him to save his daughter, arguing that they have recognised him *ὡς βασιλέα*, and it is his turn to be recognise himself *ὡς πατέρα*¹⁰¹⁴.

Therefore, Charicleia, like Iphigenia, narrowly escapes death, but not by substitution; she does so with the help of the inset audience, the crowd. What is more, this reaction of the Ethiopians marks Charicleia's final 'recognition' by her people as their princess. This is not an unexpected recognition since it is already grounded in Book 9 in which, as we have seen, Hydaspes is represented in all the glory of an enlightened king. It is expected, then, that his people would love him; therefore this type of recognition can be classified in Aristotle's terms as *ἀναγνώρισις ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων*¹⁰¹⁵, the logical conclusion of the events.

Last but not least, this reaction of the crowd is presented as in direct dialogue with Heliodorus' previous dramatic models (Iphigenia, Polyxena, etc.); why did the Greeks tolerate human sacrifice, when the Ethiopians did not? But

¹⁰¹³ Iphigenias' bravery praised by Achilles, *IA*, 1411, *ἐς τὴν φύσιν ...γενναία γὰρ εἶ*.

¹⁰¹⁴ 10.17.1.

¹⁰¹⁵ Aristoteles, *Poetics* 1455a15.

the narrator is also in dialogue with the external audience's expectations too: the expected ending, 'sacrifice' or 'substitution', is fundamentally re-examined: the tragic does not need to appeal in violence and/or unhappy endings to be tragic, in our modern sense of the term. Rather, the novels' tragic-like episodes could be sketched and perceived as tragic regardless of the final outcome and according to the suspense and fear what they created when unfolding; the happy ending could be as *καθάρσιον* as the unhappy one, and Chariton's witness is the most explicit comment on this attitude.

Theagenes in the land of the Taurians

Before moving to the adaptation of the *IT*, where a brother-sister relationship is presented, I would like to examine that between Theagenes and Charicleia. It seems that Heliodorus, the narrator, emphatically presents the relationship between Charicleia and Theagenes as a virtual brother-sister relationship as well as an erotic relationship. Firstly, Charicleia has tried to present Theagenes as her brother in front of Thyamis where they figured as priests of Artemis and Apollo respectively¹⁰¹⁶. Again in Book 6 Charicleia is compared to Isis in her search for Theagenes-Osiris¹⁰¹⁷ in Chemmis, a sacred city in the cult of Osiris¹⁰¹⁸, and afterwards in Bessa¹⁰¹⁹. In front of Arsace too

¹⁰¹⁶ 1.22.2.

¹⁰¹⁷ Charicleia's Isis-like quest in 6.15.4, γύναιον ὑπ' ἔρωτος σεσοβημένον καὶ πᾶσαν ὡς εἰπεῖν ἐπὶ γῆν ἐρωμένου τινὸς ἐνεκεν ἀλώμενον.

¹⁰¹⁸ There are two Chemmis: (a) a big city see Herodotus, 2.91; (b) a floating island, Herodotus, 2.156. On Chemmis as the first city that learned about Osiris' death see Plutarch, *Isis* 356d. For Chemmis as the birthplace of Horus see Behaeghel, (1995).

¹⁰¹⁹ Before leaving to Bessa, Charicleia is dressed as a beggar. Cf. Plutarch *Isis* 356d, where Isis is presented with her hair cut, dressed in rags and mourning, when in search for Osiris. Another parallel with the Isiac myth is the resurrection site that Charicleia attends (but does not perform herself) at 6.15.1ff. Isis attempted to revive Osiris, but in Plutarch's version she does not, see Sirinelli, (2000).

Charicleia again presents Theagenes as her brother¹⁰²⁰. This choice is not only required because of the subtle and discreet handling of erotic rivals but has a deeper model in the Isis-Osiris myth. Like Isis and Osiris, who fall in love in their mother's womb, Theagenes and Charicleia too, are sister-souls, who seek each other's love¹⁰²¹. The brother-sister relationship is not only a trick to deceive their suitors but also suggests a deeper relationship that the two characters share, that of Platonic love.

The shift from the *IA* plot to the *IT* plot is also founded on the dichotomy between ξενοκτονία and τεκνοκτονία. This time the interplay between these terms refers to Theagenes' relationship to Charicleia: Hydaspes decides to proceed with the rites when Charicleia, from being inventive and brave, becomes speechless and powerless. She then proposes that she sacrifice him herself. Hydaspes believes she is παράφρων:

ἀδελφὸν ὠνόμαζε τὸν μὴ ὄντα. τὸν ὄντα (Θεάγενην) ὅστις ἐστὶν ὁ ξένος ἐρωτωμένη, ἄγνοεῖν ἔλεγεν. αὐτίς ἐζήτη περισώζεσθαι ὡς φίλον τὸν ἀγνοούμενον, ἀδύνατον εἶναι μαθοῦσα τὴν αἴτησιν αὐτὴ καταθύειν ὥσανεὶ πολεμιώτατον ἰκέτευε¹⁰²².

The fast and unexplained change of emotions is the introductory element to another drama staged at Meroe, the adaptation of the *IT*. Interestingly Charicleia points out that the Ethiopians will admire her courage¹⁰²³. With Charicleia offering to perform Theagenes' sacrifice in person the shift from the *IA* to the *IT* is completed.

¹⁰²⁰ 10.18.2.

¹⁰²¹ 3.5.4.

¹⁰²² 10.22.2.

¹⁰²³ 10.20.2, αὐτὴν με κέλευσον αὐτουργήσαι τὸ θῦμα.

The setting of Theagenes' sacrifice recalls the *IT*: in a foreign land, the Taurian land in Iphigenia's case and Meroe in Charicleia's, 'foreigners' perform human sacrifices by killing strangers; the victims are devoted to Artemis and Seleniaia, Artemis' equivalent. The sacrificial victims are foreigners and have a close relationship with the priestess who performs the sacrifice. This latter is in both cases a priestess of a goddess of Moonlight, Artemis and Seleniaia respectively. Nevertheless, in the Taurian land a virgin priestess performs the rites, whereas in Ethiopia only a married woman can participate; but Charicleia has a liminal position between a virgin and a woman, being both virgin and Theagenes' fiancée¹⁰²⁴.

The mythical parallelism between the sacrifice of Theagenes and that of Orestes is based on two things: the virtual brother-sister relationship and the following recognition, required for the happy end and the ritual aetiology. On the one hand Charicleia, unlike Iphigenia, is fully aware of Theagenes' identity. Yet this is not enough. Theagenes needs not only his bravery to be recognised, but his identity too. It is Charicles' job to recognise him as the abductor of his daughter and only then is Theagenes fully legitimised as husband of Charicleia. The recognition of the hero, as is the case in the Iphigenia myth too, leads to the abolition of the sacrifice. Yet in the *Aethiopica* there follows no escape but marriage. Unlike Tauris for Orestes, Meroe is, finally, a friendly place for the two young wanderers, since it not only offers them shelter but also makes them queen

¹⁰²⁴ 10.22.3.

and king of the Ethiopians.

On the other hand, and most importantly, both the *IT* and the *Aethiopica* end with an aetiology of the abolition of human sacrifice. In the *Aethiopica* Sisimithres, aware of divine intervention in events, closes the scene as follows:

νῦν μὲν τὴν πανόλβιον Χαρίκλειαν ἐξ αὐτῶν σοι τῶν βωμῶν θυγατέρα ἀναδείξαντες καὶ τὸν ταύτης τροφέα...ἐνταῦθα ἀναπέμψαντες...νῦν...τὸν νυμφίον τῆς κόρης τουτονὶ τὸν ξένον νεανίαν ἀναφήναντες¹⁰²⁵.

This is the first conclusion of the novel, since the main ending consists of the coronation of Theagenes and Charicleia as priest and priestess of the Sun and the Moon respectively.

Discussion

Heliodorus then made a conscious effort not just to embed the Iphigenia pattern in his novel, but also to interlock it fully into his larger plot. Not only is the novel the only one to rework the pattern as a ritual sacrifice of a daughter by her father, followed by a sacrifice of a 'brother' by his 'sister', but it also places the pattern carefully at the very end of its narrative, with emphasis on the double recognition. The sequence of the motifs is as follows:

For Charicleia (a) the girl in a foreign land, but in reality, her homeland, (b) is to be sacrificed according to the Ethiopian rituals regarding the *πρωτόλεια* of a war. (c) The virgin recognizes the king as her father, and vice versa, while the sacrifice is still going on until (d) the audience calls the ritual off. For Theagenes motif (a) involves a young man in a foreign land (b) about to be sacrificed

¹⁰²⁵ 10.39.2-10.39.3.

according to its customs, by his own fiancée, priestess of Selene; (c) it is followed by his recognition by Charicles as the priestess' suitor and beloved hence, (d) the audience through Sisimithres' intervention call the sacrifice off and, they abolish the ritual for ever.

Provisional conclusions

The Iphigenia pattern functions on two different levels. On the first hand, on the level of episodic composition, AT's and Heliodorus' narratives re-insert motif (c) in its initial, dramatic, place before (d), maintaining the dramatic force of the Euripidean plays, especially the *IT*. Even more effectively, they strategically place it at the very end, instead of the very beginning, unlike Chariton and Xenophon, to endorse the sense of closure, by juxtaposing the near death situation with the subsequent happy ending.

Indeed, even in Chariton's and Xenophon's novels, in which motif (c) is postponed until the final recognition, this delay increases the readers' suspense as to the narrative method by which the solution will be carried out: e.g. in Xenophon's and AT's patterns each of Anthia's and Leucippe's near death situations comments intratextually on the previously developed one and attempts to supplement it in horror or opaqueness, namely that the narrative does not give enough information to answers the questions that it raises.

On a second level, sacrifice patterns have been examined as a response to the cultural context of the texts in which they are found. Although it is easy to say that sacrifice as a practice is a barbarian act and makes clear the divide between

the Greek and non-Greek world, since Greeks tend to be sacrificed by barbarians, in the novels this is not always the case. AT's and Heliodorus' novels seem to comment on this 'desperadoes' motif, as discussed by Winkler, by placing the sacrifice on Greek soil, like Ephesus, or in ambivalent locations, like Meroe¹⁰²⁶, and therefore narrowing down the distance between Greece and their neighbours. This latter point opens up the question already posed by Euripidean drama, regarding the limits between what is and/ or is not proper Greek identity and what is and/or is not proper barbarian identity. This last question seems to be interwoven with a more general disapproval of sacrifice in the Second Sophistic, and for a preference for immaculate rituals, as observed in Lucian and Philostratus. Finally, with respect to motif (c), the reason for its postponement will be made clear in the next chapter that deals with the larger novelistic plot as a recognition pattern.

Partial conclusions

In Part II I examined how the myths of Helen, Phaedra, and Iphigenia influenced the 'dramatic episodes' of the novels, as these were classified in Part I. I hope to have shown that the novels can be segmented into individual dramatic sections, each of which makes explicit use of a particular sequence of motifs, which is accentuated by the myths of the three dramatic heroines. Of course, not all novels make use of these patterns and intertexts to the same degree, and some, e.g. Xenophon's, rarely even allude to a specific text. However, this does not mean

¹⁰²⁶ Four Charicleia as both black and white Harris, (2001); also for the mixed paternity of the novel see Whitmarsh, (1998), and Elmer, (2008), who argues against any effort of inquiring into the genetics of the text.

that they do not make use of any such motif, and I have treated such cases separately in the section devoted to the 'implicit' versions of the pattern. Therefore the titles of my tripartite categorisation of the dramatic motifs should be taken in a broad sense: e.g. the myth of Helen is one of the myths of the Beauty, and it is enough for this study to prove the relation of a novel's pattern to that of the Beauty/Helen and not precisely to a specific Homeric or Euripidean version of the Helen myth.

Hence the three women, Helen, Phaedra, and Iphigenia, epitomise the three basic plots that can be found in almost every novel: the Beauty, whose chastity and/or marriage is threatened by her suitors' assaults; the chaste hero, whose chastity/and or marriage is endangered by the advances of the 'other woman'; and finally the perennially attractive pattern of the sacrifice/execution of a virgin and/or young bride, her marriage to death, and her subsequent escape.

These 'dramatic episodes', are, as I have noted, self-contained. There may be variations of a Helen pattern that unfold throughout the narrative, but each of them comes to a more or less concrete conclusion either at the end of motif (d) (which is common for all the patterns studied here) or in the beginning of the next sequence, just as the Phaedra patterns do in Heliodorus. This unity of action is enabled by a unity of space, since each of them takes place in a well known location: e.g. Callirhoe in Babylon is the Homeric Helen, and/or Charicleia by the Nile is an model of the Euripidean Helen; note that the Phaedra pattern is probably the most static and the one that always takes place indoors, with the

exception of Longus. The unity of action and place in connection with their static treatment enhances the 'dramatic' colour of these episodes, which are treated ὥσπερ in the theatre. Their theatrical handling is highlighted by the slower pace of the narrative, which takes its time to describe the setting, the emotions of the main actors and those of the inset audience, the former often presented in tragic monologues and lamentations, e.g. Heliodorus' opening scene; Chariton's first recognition scene, and/or Melite's reaction to Leucippe's letter are also good instances of this dramatic conception of the plot.

All these patterns emphasise virginity and chastity, and the Iphigenia pattern, is, fundamentally, not far from that of Helen; indeed, in Xenophon, Hippothous not only 'executes' Anthia twice but attempts to rape her, which is part of a Helen-sequence. This is to be expected from a genre whose main concern was to secure the heroine's chastity/virginity and life. There is an undeniable voyeurism and sexism in such organisation of the material (but this discussion is beyond the scope of this thesis).

I would like to point out that the quadripartite distinction of each pattern in motifs, although, as I am aware, a subjective organisation of the material, leads nevertheless to an objective conclusion. Unlike the Phaedra myth (that tends to be very static), the Helen and the Iphigenia myths, especially in their Euripidean treatment, enable the narrative to move from stagnant situations into action; e.g. the different suitors are the tools that promote the transportation of the heroine from hand to hand, and therefore the movement of the narrative itself, and/or the

bandits, who save Callirhoe and Anthia from their tomb, carry them off towards new adventures.

This escape-transportation motif is a characteristic not of dramatic poetry, which is delimited in time, location, action and narrative space, but of epic, whose material stretches over very many words and/or pages and/or landmarks, and whose initial concern is 'how to move forward' the thread of the action. The Helen pattern, which seems to be the prototype of the novel's treatment of the Beauty theme, is indeed a pattern on the cusp between epic and drama: hence the Euripidean adaptations of the motif result in dramatic episodes, but the more general Homeric treatments contribute to the mobility of the narrative.

Nevertheless, even the more flexible Helen-patterns - by this meaning those that do not always conclude immediately in motif (d) - are incapable of giving a direction to the narrative, since they tend to result in other variations of the Beauty pattern, with the risk of leaving the narrative open, without conclusion, ἐπεισοδιάζον in Aristotelian terms, like Scheherazade's perpetual storytelling, moving from one pattern to another. What is then the linking thread of the novel's narrative? How does the narrative move to its conclusion? What guidelines are given to the reader so that he will not get lost in a continuous narration? What is the novel's sign-posting system that enables its coherent reading of it from beginning to end? These questions will be answered in the following Part III that deals with the adaptation of the *Odyssey* as the *exemplary* 'recognitive' pattern.

PART III: ΜΥΘΟΣ AS NARRATIVE

Fiction is a form of language use that exemplifies the need to seek the relationship between language and language users in order to derive an interpretation. Jon-K. Adams, *Pragmatics and Fiction*, p.1.

In fiction, there is always a speaker; the speaker is always fictional. *Ibid.* p.17.

All lies have in common the condition that the speaker says or does something with words that is not the case and the hearer is not made aware of it. But if the reader *is* made aware of it, then the text is fiction. *Ibid.* p.15

3.1 *The novels as a διὰ ὅλου ἀναγνώρισις*

Years of scholarship and Bakhtin in his influential work¹⁰²⁷ have alike accepted the *Odyssey* to be the second key-intertext of the novels¹⁰²⁸, either before or after Euripidean drama: the argument is based on the fact that the *Odyssey* is a (fictive) narrative of adventures and of marital devotion-fidelity, which culminates in a happy-ending recognition scene and reunion. The novel's plot appears to echo this pattern, especially given the emphasis on the recognition scene, which happens to take place at the end and is the culmination of the narrative. Nevertheless, whereas scholarship emphasises the similarities of the two genres it seldom points out the differences, which I believe are more important.

Hence, it is not difficult to argue that the concept of adventure time and

¹⁰²⁷ Bakhtin, (2006 (1941)), on the difference of the epic and the novel; for Homeric influence in the novel see Fusillo, (1991 (1989)) and Lowe, (2000), for the novel adapting the 'major key' of the *Odyssey*; also Lalanne, (2008) for Chariton Biraud, (1985), and Hirschberger, (2001); for AT see Most, (1989); for Heliodorus: Keyes, (1922), Winkler, (1982), Whitmarsh, (1998) and Elmer, (2008).

¹⁰²⁸ Stanford, (1968).

marital devotion is one-sided in the *Odyssey*, belonging to Penelope, whereas in the ideal novel both characters suffer the same misfortunes, often together, and both remain stereotypically faithful to the other. Secondly, I believe that scholarship has overstressed the importance of 'shipwrecks' and 'bandits' found in the novels, when these occupy but a small fraction of its narrative, since as I argued in Part II, the episodes of the novel tend to be of dramatic, static, character and, therefore, the bandits/pirates are the narrative tool that promotes the hero/ine's transportation, a role which in the epic was reserved for divine powers, Athena and Poseidon.

There are of course novels like Antonius Diogenes and the Latin novels¹⁰²⁹ that portray a more *Odyssey*-like journey, which occurs in remote lands and in which romance is subordinate to the adventure time. By contrast, the ideal novels have love as their narrative kernel, which is the reason for the hero's travels and which results in a mutual and simultaneous recognition scene, unlike Odysseus' long, cautious, and meticulous revelation of his identity.

Thus viewed, the motifs of νόστος and of ἀναγνώρισις are not sufficient evidence for a precise, Homer-articulated, plot-structure. What I want to argue here is that, the novels while making use of the *Odyssey*, they

¹⁰²⁹ In the Latin novels there is more emphasis on the 'adventure' part of the story; cf. Winkler, (1985) p.165, discusses the 'episodic' form of Apuleius *Metamorphoses* and proposes Odysseus' Apologoi. Courtney, (2001) p.155, also proposes the Odyssean first-person narrative as a model for Encolpius' wanderings and Priapus as the Poseidon equivalent (139.2, *gravis ira Priapi*); Courtney, (2001) p.156, emphasises the similar adventures that Odysseus and Encolpius have to survive, mentioning that 'most of these allusions occur in the same sequence as the events in the *Odyssey*'. On the narrator see Conte, (1996) p.73ff.; the same could be argued for Antonius Diogenes' novel, full of imaginative adventures structured as a compilation of episodes.

do so, not by following a specific plot pattern, as with the plays I examined before, but by exploiting and adapting a narrative tool of the epic, the recognition scene, and with it the concept of the extended narrative as a recognition process.

In my Iphigenia chapter, I studied the recognition-scene proper, in Cave's definition, as an instance within a plot meant to shock and to reverse the flow of events¹⁰³⁰. When treated like this, already since Aristotle¹⁰³¹, epic and tragic recognition scenes are not different, but they are both 'narrative landmarks' of a reversal of good/bad fortune, of *περιπέτεια*¹⁰³². This is the kind of recognition scene that abounds in classical drama and in New Comedy¹⁰³³, and is manifest in the different recognition scenes of the *Odyssey*¹⁰³⁴. The emphasis on the *περιπέτεια* as a key element of a good dramatic plot is recommended in particular in drama because of its concise size and its compacted form: if everything has to happen in one day and in one place and in approximately 1643 lines at most (the *Agamemnon*) then of course the recognition scene is needed in order to emphasise the emotional impact of the play and to focus its dramatic effect. By contrast the 12,110 lines of the *Odyssey* allow a more elaborate handling of the recognition scene, one expanded in narrative time. Hence the *Odyssey* sets out, alongside the

¹⁰³⁰ Cave, (1988) p.1.

¹⁰³¹ Aristotle, *Poetics*, 1459b; for the *Odyssey* and Aristotle's 'typology of recognition' see Lowe, (2000).

¹⁰³² Cave, (1988) p.40.

¹⁰³³ Cave, (1988) p.50ff. On Menander and Aristotle see Cusset, (2003) p.24ff.

¹⁰³⁴ For ancient criticism Richardson, (1983); the typology of recognition scene in Gainsford, (2003).

recognition scene which was heavily adapted in the relevant dramas¹⁰³⁵, another approach to it, which, although it does not change the character of the recognition scene proper, influences the way this is constructed and brought out by the main narrative. Recognition in the *Odyssey* is not just a 'scene' but it is, as I will try to show here, a recognising process, and it is this particular feature that the novel shares with the epic.

Odysseus' repeated dissimulation of his true identity is interpreted as the best possible recognition strategy and is connected with the careful release and withholding of information throughout the epic narrative¹⁰³⁶. Unlike dramatic recognition, which is a moment of truth, epic recognition is a process of lying. Cave argues that, for Aristotle and Eustathius, 'epic anagnorisis sanctions false logic...paralogism, is the supreme confidence trick. It allows 'the charade of 'consequential action', of narrative motivation, to culminate in an astonishing reversal which the audience accepts as logical although it is based on fallacy¹⁰³⁷'. Epic recognition is, according to Cave, 'the art of telling lies'¹⁰³⁸.

This desire for lies, which is connected to the novel's large(r than drama) narrative space, has also been studied as a main feature of the Greek novel

¹⁰³⁵ E.g. The *Penelope*, by a certain Philocles (*TrFrG*, Snell, v. 1, F.8, p.161), a play, *Mnesteres*, by a Timseitheus, and an *Odysseus*, figures in the *Adespota* (*TrFrG*, v.2, F a and b, Kannicht-Snell) to which the reference of Aristotle's *Poetics* (16.1455a12) on 'absurd' recognition probably alludes. Moreover, there seems to be a trilogy/ tetralogy by Aeschylus: *Ostologoi*, *Psuchagogoi*, *Penelope*, *Circe* (*TrFrG*, v.3, Ulixes, Snell) Finally there is a *Nausicaa/ Plyntriae*, by Sophocles, but the content is obscure.

¹⁰³⁶ This male-centred recognition process is questioned by Winkler, (1990a), who shifts the 'cunning' from Odysseus' side to Penelope, so that it is her who tricks her husband before the final recognition.

¹⁰³⁷ Cave, (1988) p.43.

¹⁰³⁸ For recognition in the *Odyssey* see also Austin, (1975), Richardson, (1983); for a formal analysis of the Homeric recognition scenes see Gainsford, (2003); for the manipulation of information around recognition scenes and the narrator's voice see Goldhill, (1991); for fidelity and recognition see Winkler, (1990a) and Zeitlin, (1995).

and of fiction¹⁰³⁹, and is in concordance with Adams' programmatic epigraph to this chapter: the *Odyssey* and the Greek novel are categories of fiction, because they try to make the reader aware of the use of language as it is manipulated by the characters, e.g. Odysseus' fallacious truth-like narratives and his 'real' identity, in order to understand the interplay between the novelistic fallacious and truth-like narrative and its 'true' nature, namely that it is fiction. Only if the reader understands the narrative mechanism of Odysseus' speech, is s/he able to enjoy the novelistic narrative as truth-like fiction, as μῦθος, οὐ λόγος.

Modern scholarship treats epic recognition accordingly: Goldhill, playing with the notion of ἀναγνώρισις and ἀνάγνωσις, connects Odysseus' voice with 'the voice of the bard¹⁰⁴⁰'; Maronitis shows that the *Odyssey* is a large and gradual recognition project, at each stage of which the audience is challenged to 'locate' and 'identify' the hero¹⁰⁴¹; and Lowe argues that 'the organisation of its whole narrative *around and towards* the (final) resolution¹⁰⁴²' is purely *Odyssean*. Similarly, Morgan reads the Heliodorean plot as a 'riddle' with a strong sense of 'ending¹⁰⁴³'. As Lowe argues, when reading a plot, we read it for its *holographic* development, from its 'initial blur to increasing focus and clarity¹⁰⁴⁴'; the recognition scene of the novels is

¹⁰³⁹ Morgan, (1993), analyses the relationship of novels and fiction to 'lies'. Here I am doing something different: I am not studying the external readings of the novels as 'lies-fictions' but the intratextual references to lying.

¹⁰⁴⁰ Goldhill, (1991) p.56ff.

¹⁰⁴¹ Maronitis, (1991).

¹⁰⁴² Lowe, (2000) p.151.

¹⁰⁴³ Morgan, (1989) and Morgan, (1994). For a discussion of the endness and the open-endness closures of the Greek novels see Whitmarsh, (2009), between Morgan's and Nimis, (1999).

¹⁰⁴⁴ Lowe, (2000) p.25.

precisely a metaphor for such a reading, in which the truth is revealed only at the very end. But whereas the scene itself is the culmination, the process by which recognition is woven in the narrative is a process that starts with the first line of a novel. Hence, what I will try to study here is not the recognition scene as such, but the recognising process that leads towards the novel's final recognition scene.

The way to approach the narrative strategy of the novels is by studying the implication given by the major term which is used to describe the novel's narrative, *διήγημα*, alongside markers that characterise it as more or less truth-like, i.e. *ficiton*. The term *διήγημα* as discussed in Part I has been used to illustrate the novel's recapitulatory units as well as the novel as continuous and extended narrative, and it has also been used to illustrate the difference between *μῦθος* as fictive/fallacious mythological tale and novelistic *διήγησις* as myth-like tale. As such *μῦθος* qua *διήγημα*/ *διήγησις* is the closest term in the novels that describes prose narrative fiction. The fictionality of the novelistic narrative is further illustrated by the use of the recognition scene as the culmination of the emancipation of the recognition material of the novel, which is the aim of this chapter.

The following discussion is structured as follows: first I examine the Odyssean allusions in the novels in question, and secondly I proceed to an examination of the recognition scene as part of the narrative wider recognising process.

3.1.1 Fragmentary recognition scenes

Joseph and Aseneth

Joseph and Aseneth presents a recognition scene combined with the protagonist's conversion. This is not a recognition scene proper as we have it in the novels - it does not come at the end - but the interplay of words suggests a novelistic background.

Aseneth rejects Joseph ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ, believing that he is the son of a shepherd; the angel reveals to her that Joseph is more than this¹⁰⁴⁵; Aseneth does not only 'recognise' Joseph as the son of God and not the shepherd from Canaan, but also 'recognises' that she wants to be his wife. Aseneth's ἀγνοία is based on 'false' (εἰπὸν μοι οἱ ἄνθρωποι) information about Joseph and now she is discovering a new identity for him. The recognition of Joseph as the Son of God is the key element that enables the marriage of the two chaste young people. But Joseph too has to recognise Aseneth as his bride: that is why an angel visits Joseph and informs him about Aseneth's conversion. Their meeting is close to those of the novels; Joseph informs her that:

διότι ἐγὼ εὐηγγελίσθην περὶ σοῦ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ὅστις εἶπέ μοι πάντα τὰ περὶ σοῦ.
καὶ ἐξέτεινε τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἐνηγκαλίσατο τὴν Ἀσενέθ¹⁰⁴⁶.

Joseph has learned also πάντα περὶ Aseneth: the formulation is indeed one that recalls the Greek novel, as I will discuss later. In other words, the angel

¹⁰⁴⁵ J&A, 13.9, οὐκ ᾔδειν ἐγὼ ἢ ἀθλία ὅτι υἱὸς σοῦ ἐστι; 13.10, μὴ εἰδνῖα ὅτι υἱὸς σοῦ ἐστι.

¹⁰⁴⁶ J&A, 19.2.

has recounted to the youth Aseneth's conversion, the first part of the novel. The only difference is that a divine authority informs the narrative and there is no withholding or manipulation of information of importance to the narrative.

Ninus, Sesonchosis *and the* *Babyloniaca*

Ninus and *Sesonchosis*¹⁰⁴⁷ both imply they presented a separation and reunion scene, although we cannot be sure whether they included a recognition scene; as Winkler and Stephens argue '(the Daphne mosaic) suggests to us a separation, whether or not Semiramis followed Ninus in his campaigns¹⁰⁴⁸. *Sesonchosis* too provides us with a controversial recognition scene, between the hero and his fiancée¹⁰⁴⁹. Finally, the *Babyloniaca* too stages a dynamic plot, full of doublets and recognition, plus a lot of false recognition scenes, which I studied in the Iphigenia section¹⁰⁵⁰, although we don't know whether a final recognition scene was used as a closure - although a fidelity test for Sinonis is not implausible as a closure, before her wedding with Rhodanes.

Antonius Diogenes

According to Photius, Antonius Diogenes' prose narrative extended to the epic length of twenty-four books, mainly describing adventures in

¹⁰⁴⁷ Winkler, (1995) p.248; 'both (*Ninus* and *Sesonchosis*) include (1) events at the time of the young prince's coming of age; (2) a first military adventure; (3) an engagement to a girl...that is interrupted by military adventures and (4) a reversal of fortune'.

¹⁰⁴⁸ Winkler (1995) p.24.

¹⁰⁴⁹ See the discussion in footnote 332.

¹⁰⁵⁰ Cf. Iamblichus, above, p. 243.

faraway lands¹⁰⁵¹. Antonius Diogenes, to quote Stephens-Winkler, engages in 'downplaying of the erotic¹⁰⁵²', and, thus focuses more on the adventure-time¹⁰⁵³, unlike the ideal novels; this characteristic emphasises its Odyssean background.

The fictionality of Diogenes' narrative is praised by Photius as *πιθανωτάτη πλάσις*¹⁰⁵⁴. Antonius' account of *ἄπιστα* in combination with his efforts to endow his narrative with the greatest degree of plausibility make it a unique testimony to the nature of fiction according to Adams' epigraph: fiction needs a fictional speaker¹⁰⁵⁵; abundant fictional speakers only underline the fictionality of the narrative. We are unable to know whether, despite the Odyssean architext, there was a recognition scene between Deinias and Derkyllis. Nevertheless, it seems that the main thing for the reader to consider and recognise will have been the adventures of the 'text', its transmission, and its 'authenticity'. If this is so, then the novel may be classified alongside the *διηγήματα* of the ideal novels that I am studying here, as a master authorial manipulation of fictional credentials.

¹⁰⁵¹ Photius, 166, pp.109a6-112a12 (Bekker); also the discussion in Winkler, (1995) p.103.

¹⁰⁵² Winkler (1995) p.101.

¹⁰⁵³ Although Huet, Gégou, and Chapelain, (1971) p.36, considers it as 'un véritable roman des voyages et des amours'.

¹⁰⁵⁴ Photius, 166, 109a (Bekker), ἄτε μύθων ἐγγύς καὶ ἀπίστων ἐν πιθανωτάτῃ πλάσει καὶ διασκευῇ ὕλην ἑαυτῇ διηγημάτων ποιοῦμένη.

¹⁰⁵⁵ Adams, (1985) p.17.

3.1.2 Epic echoes and recognition patterns in the novels

3.1.2.1 *Chariton*

1. Echoes of epic νόστοι

The following four return tales, of Chaereas, of Callirhoe, of Theron and of Chaereas' son, are returns with recognition narratives. Chaereas' will also be treated separately later.

Departure and return of Chaereas-Telemachus

Callirhoe, I stated earlier, attracts a great number of suitors, like Helen and like Helen's literary cousin, Penelope. Because Callirhoe's suitors, unlike Helen's, did not support her choice, Chaereas becomes the victim of their conspiracies, like Penelope's son, Telemachus. For Callirhoe's μνηστήρες¹⁰⁵⁶ Chaereas is not worthy to be her husband, and he is described as ὁ δὲ πόρνος καὶ πένης καὶ μηδενὸς κρείττων βασιλέων ἀγωνισαμένων¹⁰⁵⁷. This formulation in combination with the unanimously accepted chastity of Callirhoe, who, like Penelope, is εὐσταθὴς καὶ ἄπειρος κακοηθούς ὑποψίας¹⁰⁵⁸, places Chaereas in Odysseus' position of the legal husband who has to fight his rivals to win his wife. After Chaereas' supposed murder of his wife and his discovery of the empty tomb, he sails out on his first quest¹⁰⁵⁹. Like Telemachus, his aim is to find some clues about Callirhoe's

¹⁰⁵⁶ 1.2.1; the μνηστήρες a key-intertextual term for both the Penelope and the Helen myths.

¹⁰⁵⁷ 1.2.1ff.

¹⁰⁵⁸ 1.2.6.

¹⁰⁵⁹ 3.3.4, ζητήσω σε διὰ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης.

disappearance. This first sailing is the preparation for the bigger expedition that he prepares after Theron's confession.

Callirhoe and Theron at Alcinous' palace

Callirhoe's gradual revelation of her true identity and her plea to Dionysius to help her return to her homeland is structured around an Odyssean parallel: like Eumaeus and Odysseus she claims that she has not been always a slave¹⁰⁶⁰, and supplicates him to show Alcinous' magnanimity and hospitality¹⁰⁶¹. However it has been argued that, outside the homeland, the leading characters of the epic poem and the novels do not have an identity¹⁰⁶², or, even if their identity is revealed, this does not mean that they are treated accordingly. The reason is that it is easy to craft a fake story like the one that Theron presents. Theron gives two versions of his tale, one to Chaereas, in which, being a πανούργος ἄνθρωπος¹⁰⁶³, he claims to have travelled from Cephallenia in quest of his brother. In the second, in front of the assembly, he repeats his Cretan tale:

Δημήτριος.. Κρης...πρὸς ἀδελφὸν ἑμαυτοῦ πλέων εἰς Ἰωνίαν ἀπελείφθην
νεῶς...μὴ οὖν ὑμεῖς, ὦ Συρακόσιοι, δῆμος ἐπὶ φιλανθρωπία περιβόητος, γένησθέ
μοι καὶ δίψους καὶ θαλάσσης ἀγριώτεροι¹⁰⁶⁴.

Theron's false narrative, which presents him as another Cretan Odysseus, appeals to the Syracusans' generosity, just as Callirhoe's plea had targeted

¹⁰⁶⁰ *Odyssey*, 15.427 (Eumaeus' tale of the Phoenician woman who carried him away); 14.340 (Odysseus the Cretan, almost sold as a slave).

¹⁰⁶¹ 2.5.11.

¹⁰⁶² Haynes, (2003) p.55.

¹⁰⁶³ Kasprzyk, (2001); Chariton, 3.3.18, cf. *Odyssey*, 13.256ff; 14.199ff; 19.172ff.

¹⁰⁶⁴ 3.4.9.

Dionysius' φιλανθρωπία¹⁰⁶⁵. Unlike Dionysius, the Syracusans are eager to accept Theron's tale¹⁰⁶⁶ and to provide him with a shelter, like Alcinous, whereas the 'first man of Miletus' does not fulfil his duties of hospitality. The parallel scene supports the image of Syracusan moral superiority over the Milesians: Theron is only treated as he deserves – like a criminal – once his true identity is, accidentally, revealed¹⁰⁶⁷.

Departure of Chaereas Menelaus-Odysseus-Jason

I argued above how Chaereas' departure in search of Callirhoe is part of the Helen pattern. Yet the phrasing alludes to Odysseus' departure by raft from Calypso's island, being ready διὰ τὸν ἔρωτα ζεύξας σχεδίαν εἰς τὸ πέλαγος ἑαυτὸν ἀφείναι τοῖς ἀνέμοις φέρεσθαι¹⁰⁶⁸. Of course Hermocrates is arranging for a proper ship for his son-in-law. Chaereas' departure, after the preparations are done, may recall the departure scene from Apollonius' *Argonautica*¹⁰⁶⁹, since there is no other heartbreaking departure scene in epic, where the hero's old parents bid such an emotional farewell to the hero¹⁰⁷⁰. The parallel is important because there are no allusions in the novels to Apollonius, although Hunter has proposed –not fully convincingly – the love and adventures of Jason and Medea as a model for the novels¹⁰⁷¹.

¹⁰⁶⁵ 2.2.1; 2.6.3.

¹⁰⁶⁶ 3.4.1, καὶ τάχα ἂν ἐπεισεν, ὥστε κἂν ἐφοδίων τυχεῖν.

¹⁰⁶⁷ 3.4.11, τις ἄλιεύς ἐγνώρισεν αὐτόν.

¹⁰⁶⁸ 3.5.1. Cf. 162-163, εὐρείαν σχεδίνην.../ ὑψοῦ, ὥς σε φέρησιν εὐ ἡεροειδέα πόντον.

¹⁰⁶⁹ 3.5.4-5, Ἀρίστων δέ, ὁ Χαιρέου πατήρ, ἐσχάτῳ γῆρα καὶ νόσῳ φερόμενος,...κλαίων ...ἡ δὲ μήτηρ, τῶν γονάτων αὐτοῦ λαβομένη; cf. Apollonius, *Argonautica*, 1.261-264, μήτηρ τ' ἄμφ' αὐτὸν βεβολημένη, ὅξυ δ' ἐκάστην/δύνεν αἶχος. σὺν δὲ σφί πατὴρ ὁλοῶ ὑπὸ γῆρα/ἐντυπὰς ἐν λεχέεσσι καλυψάμενος γοάσκειν.

¹⁰⁷⁰ In 1.12.3, parents bid farewell to Anthia and Habrocomes but there is no emotion in the description of the scene.

¹⁰⁷¹ See the Introduction in Hunter, (1989). But it may also echo a scene from the *Cypria*, e.g. Paris' farewell, that has not survived.

The foretold return of Chaereas' son – Telegonus or Telemachus?

A latent, but much foreshadowed recognition scene is one that happens outside the narrative. This is the sequel of the *Callirhoe* tale, and its subject is the return of Chaereas' son to Syracuse:

ἀνὴρ δὲ γενόμενος γνωρισθήσῃ ῥαδίως ὑπὸ τῶν συγγενῶν· πέπεισμαι γὰρ ὅτι ὅμοιόν σε τέξομαι τῷ πατρί¹⁰⁷².

Callirhoe is visualising her son's homecoming. Like Odysseus' son by Circe, Telegonus¹⁰⁷³, he is expected to sail in quest of his mother; like Telemachus he is to be recognized because he looks like his father¹⁰⁷⁴. These narratives are echoes of the *Odyssey* and other departure-return-recognition narratives. However, such Odyssean intertexts do not shape the plot of the novel but are the topoi of Greek thought regarding seafaring and homecoming¹⁰⁷⁵. I will now continue with the main recognition narrative.

2. Recognising (the) *Callirhoe*

Callirhoe's recognition is a process that involves not only the heroine, but also the recognition of the narratorial manipulation of information that leads to Callirhoe's recognition. The main questions asked by the narrative concern the following: (a) whether Callirhoe is alive or not; (b) whether Callirhoe is faithful or not; (b) who will be Callirhoe's husband. The rhetoric of Callirhoe's gradual recognition is structured around two thematic kernels:

¹⁰⁷² 2.11.2.

¹⁰⁷³ The story was popular and it is treated in the drama *Ὀδυσσεύς τραυματίας*, Aristotle, *Poetics*, 1453b33; also in Lucian, *On dancing*, 46; and Dictys F 1z, 49, Frag.10.

¹⁰⁷⁴ *Odyssey*, 4.143, ὡς ὅδ' Ὀδυσσεὺς μεγάλῃ τορὸς νῆϊ ἔεικε.

¹⁰⁷⁵ Lalanne, (2006), p.523 on Odysseus, Jason, Telemachus and Theseus as representative of this idea.

the verb (ἀνα)-γνωρίζω and its synonyms and the recurrent formula that, as I will show here, is present in all these partial recognition stages, πάντα...μόνον/ πλήν.

Is Callirhoe dead or alive?

Book 1 begins with Callirhoe's marriage and ends with her funeral. The sudden death of the god-like protagonist poses the obvious question, namely, whether Callirhoe is *really*, ἀληθῶς, dead or not; since for the reader, who is initiated into the novel's *true* narrative space, the protagonist cannot die in the first chapter. The description of the θησαυρὸς that was buried with Callirhoe gives way to a foreshadowing of the next step of the plot. Soon after the burial we learn that the funerary riches μειζόνων πραγμάτων ἐκίνησεν ἀρχήν¹⁰⁷⁶. The reader is soothed, and Theron's plan is introduced, which is followed by the next chapter, introduced in the same way with the title: τὰ δὲ περὶ Καλλιρρόην δευτέραν ἄλλην ἐλάβανε παλιγγενεσίαν. Thus, by the end of Book 1, the reader knows what 'really' happened to Callirhoe¹⁰⁷⁷.

Unlike the reader, who seems to share as much information as the narrator, the characters do not know the truth, but have to follow fragmentary clues: in front of the unexpectedly found treasure Chaereas and Callirhoe's mother lament the fate of Callirhoe:

¹⁰⁷⁶ 1.6.5.

¹⁰⁷⁷ cf. 1.8.4, Καλλιρρόην οὐδ' ἀληθῶς ἀποθανοῦσαν. Callirhoe's certainty about her fate confirmed again in 1.14.9, ἀληθῶς ἀπόλωλά σοι, Χαίρεα.

γνωρίσας δὲ τὰ ἐντάφια περιερρήξατο καὶ μέγα καὶ διωλύγιον ἀνεβόησεν ‘οἶμι
Καλλιρροή, ταῦτά ἐστι τὰ σά... μόνη τοῖς ἐνταφίοις ἢ νεκρὰ λείπει’¹⁰⁷⁸.

ἰδοῦσα δὲ ἡ μήτηρ τὰ ἐντάφια τῆς θυγατρὸς ἀνεκώκυσεν, ‘ἐπιγινώσκω πάντα.
σὺ, τέκνον, μόνη λείπεις’¹⁰⁷⁹.

Chaereas and Callirhoe’s mother recognize the ἐντάφια, making clear that they have all the clues but one, the body. In Chaereas’ recapitulation of the events in front of the assembly he mentions that he found Theron’s boat *πάντα* ἔχοντα τὰ ἐκείνης, *πλὴν* ἐκείνης¹⁰⁸⁰. The revelation of the ‘real’ truth, that Callirhoe is alive, comes after Tyche sheds light upon the truth¹⁰⁸¹, that is after Theron’s confession. The help of Tyche in discovering the truth about Callirhoe, although she is described as the one that makes every ἔργον τέλειον, is half-finished, and there seems to be an oscillation between the all-knowing narrator and Tyche with respect to the amount of information available: here the deed is unaccomplished since the bandit confesses *πάντα* εἰπὼν, *μόνον* τοῦνομα οὐκ ἐμνημόνευσε τοῦ πριαμένου¹⁰⁸². Once again the internal readers/audience, Chaereas and the Syracusans, are left a step behind the external reader/audience. Chaereas, arriving in Miletus, has reason to doubt Theron’s words:

φοβοῦμαι μὴ Θήρων ἡμᾶς διεψεύσατο καὶ τέθνηκεν ἢ δυστυχῆς. εἰ δ’ ἄρα καὶ ἀληθῶς πέπραται, τίς οἶδεν ὅπου¹⁰⁸³.

But a couple of lines later, Chaereas arrives at the shrine of Aphrodite, only

¹⁰⁷⁸ 3.3.15.

¹⁰⁷⁹ 3.4.2.

¹⁰⁸⁰ 3.4.6.

¹⁰⁸¹ 3.3.8, ἡ Τύχη δὲ ἐφώτισε τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

¹⁰⁸² 3.4.14.

¹⁰⁸³ 3.4.3-4; at this stage it is Chareas that conceals his identity, Πολύχαρμος, οὐδὲν εἶασε ἔτι τὸν Χαιρέαν εἰπεῖν...οὐ βουλόμενος ἐκπύστους γενέσθαι τίνες εἰσί.

to learn from the priestess that Callirhoe is alive and is also δέσποινα τῶν χωρίων τούτων, Διονυσίου γυνή, τοῦ πρώτου τῶν Ἰώνων¹⁰⁸⁴. With Chaereas' arrival at the shrine, the first inset riddle of the narrative is solved, Callirhoe is alive indeed, but is she faithful?

Is Callirhoe faithful or not?

Chaereas' arrival and recognition of Callirhoe at Miletus takes place early in Book 3. Yet the previous Book 2 has already initiated the external reader to the next riddle, Callirhoe's chastity. Dionysius asks Callirhoe to tell him her tale, τὴν ἀληθείαν¹⁰⁸⁵, and the beautiful woman πάντα εἰποῦσα μόνον Χαιρέαν ἐσίγησεν¹⁰⁸⁶. Why? An expert reader would have realised that dissimulation of private information is a trick often used by the novels' heroines in front of a potential suitor; it is also a piece of information that belongs to typical female cunning strategies like that of Penelope's shroud, a means to gain time and preserve women's chastity. On the other hand, Callirhoe's silence regarding Chaereas raises doubts about her faithfulness, although, despite Dionysius' and Plangon's pressure, Callirhoe remains ἀήττητος καὶ Χαιρέα μόνῳ πιστή, but her faithfulness κατεστρατηγήθη δ' ὑπὸ τῆς τύχης¹⁰⁸⁷. In a couple of lines, the situation changes, Callirhoe discovers her pregnancy and marries Dionysius, so that Chaereas' son may be born free. The evidence for Callirhoe's devotion in this case is removed

¹⁰⁸⁴ 3.5.5.

¹⁰⁸⁵ 2.5.2, μηδὲν ἀποκρύψης τῶν ἀληθῶν; 2.5.3.

¹⁰⁸⁶ 2.5.11.

¹⁰⁸⁷ 2.8.4.

outside the context of the novel and is linked to the recognition of her son as resembling Chaereas.

The second test of Callirhoe's fidelity has to do with her knowing or not whether Chaereas is alive or dead: if she knows that he is alive and looking for her how can she remain with Dionysius? The reader knows already¹⁰⁸⁸ that Chaereas and Polycharmus are among the captives sold as slaves in Caria, but what the inset audience knows is much less concrete: Callirhoe has a dream, which she falsely interprets as a sign of Chaereas' death; Dionysius learns about Chaereas' existence only at this very moment, which is the best point, plot-wise, for such a revelation to take place¹⁰⁸⁹. Indeed even with the dream alone Dionysius is already jealous; when the news about Hermocrates' trireme arrivea Callirhoe does not need to make an effort to make him investigate, and again Callirhoe tells him *μόνον* one piece of information¹⁰⁹⁰.

But the power game regarding the information about Chaereas changes hands: in Phocas' διήγησις of the arrival of the Syracusan trireme, the faithful steward asks Dionysius to be patient – *ἕως οὗ πάντα ἀκούσης. χρηστὸν γὰρ ἔχει σοι τὸ τέλος*¹⁰⁹¹. Phocas, who knows the full truth¹⁰⁹², besides this analepsis, tells the events in the order they occur until the 'happy end', Chaereas' presumed death. It is at this moment that Dionysius points out the only insufficient evidence in the overall convincing narrative of Phocas –

¹⁰⁸⁸ 3.6.3.

¹⁰⁸⁹ 3.7.4.

¹⁰⁹⁰ 3.9.4, ἀφικομένη τοίνυν πρὸς Διονύσιον τοῦτο μόνον εἶπεν, ὅπερ ἤκουσε παρὰ τῆς ἱερείας.

¹⁰⁹¹ 3.9.8; again 3.9.11, (Dionysius) ἐπυνθάνετο πάντα.

¹⁰⁹² 3.7.1, ναύτην δέ τινα ὑποκορισάμενος μανθάνει παρ' αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

τοῦτο μόνον ἀμελῶς ἐποίησας¹⁰⁹³ –that he did not find Chaereas’ body.

Callirhoe, according to Dionysius’ plan, learns an even more censored version; because of Phocas, the farmers διηγοῦντο πάνθ’ ἃ ἤδεσαν¹⁰⁹⁴, except two things: the attack of the trireme and the fact that there are survivors. Even the chief characters in the attack, Chaereas and Polycharmus, the latter of whom is narrating this recapitulation to Mithridates, know only half the truth: that there were survivors¹⁰⁹⁵. Thus, even after Chaereas’ recognition by Mithridates¹⁰⁹⁶, Phocas’ initiative never comes to light, and the novel continues with just half the truth, which is shared between the Chariton-narrator and the readers.

Chaereas too is left to believe a partial truth. He has learned from Mithridates that Callirhoe is legally married to Dionysius and that they have a child together¹⁰⁹⁷. This is the reason that in his letter he mentions that τοῦτό ἀντὶ πάντων saddened him, to learn about her marriage. Mithridates leaves Chaereas to believe that Callirhoe is πασῶν ἀσεβεστάτη¹⁰⁹⁸. Only after Mithridates’ plan to retrieve Callirhoe for himself fails, does the satrap reveal to Chaereas the full truth, that Callirhoe thought Chaereas to be dead,¹⁰⁹⁹ and only then is Chaereas convinced about his wife’s innocence :

¹⁰⁹³ 3.19.12.

¹⁰⁹⁴ 3.10.2; 3.10.1, τὰ μὲν ἄλλα τῶν γεγονότων φανερώς διηγείσθαι, δύο δὲ ταῦτα σιγᾶν, τὸ ἴδιον στρατήγημα καὶ ὅτι ἐκ τῆς τριήρους τινὲς ἐτι ζῶσι.

¹⁰⁹⁵ 4.2.12, λέγει πάντα θαρρῶν καὶ μηδὲν παραλίπης.

¹⁰⁹⁶ 5.1.1, ὡς Μιθριδάτης ἐγνώρισεν Χαιρέαν.

¹⁰⁹⁷ 4.3.8.

¹⁰⁹⁸ 4.3.11; in his letter he begs her to change her mind, μετανόησον, 4.4.8.

¹⁰⁹⁹ 5.2.4.

σὺ μὲν οὖν οὐδὲν ἀδικεῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἶδας ὅτι Χαιρέας ζῇ· πάντων δὲ ἀσεβέστατος ἐγώ, μὴ βλέπειν σε κεκελευσμένος...σοὶ δὲ εἴ τις τοῦτο προσέταξεν, οὐκ ἂν ἔζησας¹¹⁰⁰.

The repetition of 'πασῶν ἀσεβέστατη' and of 'πάντων δὲ ἀσεβέστατος ἐγώ' shows that the main issue for Chaereas was to recognise his wife's innocence. With the exculpation of Callirhoe in Chaereas' eyes the ground is set for the first recognition of the couple, in Babylon. Indeed the first words that Callirhoe says when she meets her husband for the first time are: Χαιρέα, ζῆς; However, because the recognition was half fulfilled and the lovers were not allowed to touch each other, Callirhoe thinks it is illusory¹¹⁰¹, and Chaereas believes that Callirhoe is not committed to him and attempts, without success, to commit suicide¹¹⁰².

This is the second cluster of consecutive recognitions which are centred around Callirhoe's fidelity: Callirhoe believes Chaereas to be dead ; Chaereas recognises Callirhoe's image as Dionysius' wife ; Chaereas is recognised by Mithridates, Chaereas learns about Callirhoe's child ; Chaereas learns that Callirhoe has buried him in Miletus ; Chaereas recognises Callirhoe as being innocent ; the first half-recognition in the court. All of them are characterised by a careful manipulation and withholding of information : Dionysius tells Callirhoe a partial truth, Mithridates one to Chaereas as well, Chaereas, according to Mithridates, stages their recognition so that Callirhoe does not

¹¹⁰⁰ 5.2.5.

¹¹⁰¹ 5.9.4, Χαιρέαν ὑμεῖς ἀληθῶς;

¹¹⁰² 5.10.7, γυναῖκα γὰρ σε καλῶ, κἂν ἕτερον φιλήσ... ἀλλὰ νῦν ἀληθῶς ἀποθανόντος Χαιρέου.

know in advance. A last twist on Callirhoe's innocence is her letter to Dionysius, exculpated in Chaereas' eyes, which is also one of the keystones of the Helen-pattern. This is a secret that the reader shares with Callirhoe and Stateira, since it is not part of Chaereas' *récapitulation* in Book 8.

Yet the reader knows beforehand all the background, and the pleasure of the narrative does not emerge because s/he is worried about whether or not Chaereas and Callirhoe will recognise each other; indeed, because the reader is at the level of the narrator and 'knows' what has happened before the characters s/he is in a privileged position, there is no doubt that the recognition will happen. Therefore, the pleasure of reading results from of the narrator's and the reader's confidence that s/he recognises the plot, whereas the inset audience of the various *διηγήσεις* and *récapitulations* is only allowed a partial truth. This attitude, to take a particular narrative plot for granted, results from the narrator's skilful plot planning and the recognition, on the reader's part, of this plan and of the conventions of the novel as a genre. Indeed, even if the reader is not trained in reading ideal novels, s/he is never led to believe that Callirhoe is not alive and/or that Chaereas is dead and/or that they will never meet. All the more, there is a permanent sense of direction, an impression that the action is well organised.

The word used by Chariton to describe the manipulation and the careful intentional orientation of the plot is 'στρατήγημα' which indicates a polemically conceived impression of creative plot. On most occasions on

which an important piece of information is not delivered the action is described as a στρατήγημα, e.g. Theron's lies regarding Callirhoe's identity and his revelation of her staged in Dionysius' household¹¹⁰³; Plangon's help for Dionysius' love-affairs is described as a στρατήγημα, as is her help in concealing Callirhoe's pregnancy; therefore Plangon knows all the information but Dionysius and Callirhoe know only the part they 'should' know. Phocas' purposeful attack on the boat and Dionysius' concealing of the event as well is one more στρατήγημα, which is based on Callirhoe's half-knowledge; the same term is used for Mithridates' withholding of information¹¹⁰⁴. An alternative term, ἐπινοῶ and the noun ἐπίνοια, is used when Artaxerxes secretly brings Callirhoe with him to the battlefield¹¹⁰⁵.

The same term is used by the *alter ego* of the narrator, Tyche, who plans Callirhoe's pregnancy¹¹⁰⁶ and all the important four 'twists' in the novel: Chaereas' discovery of Theron's ship; the detail that Mithridates' letter is not delivered to the right person; Artaxerxes' dislocation of Callirhoe from Babylon; and the almost failed final reunion of the couple¹¹⁰⁷. The reader is

¹¹⁰³ 1.14.1, ὁ Θήρων ἐστρατήγησέ τι τοιοῦτον. There is a game between the concealing of Callirhoe's identity and her revelation-epiphany in front of Leonas.

¹¹⁰⁴ (Plangon) 2.7.6, 2.8.1, καλῶς ἐστρατήγεται, καὶ χάριν ἔχω τοῦ φιλήματος; (Phocas) 3.9.11, ὁ στρατήγημα τὸ ἴδιον ἐπὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους, 3.10.1; 4.5.1 (Mithridates), ὑπισχνούμενος αὐτὸς στρατηγήσειν ὅπως ἀλλήλους ἀπολάβωσιν; 7.1.3 (Dionysius) θέλων γὰρ ὁ Διονύσιος ἀπελπίσαι Χαιρέαν τὸν Καλλιρόης γάμον καὶ μηκέτι μένειν τὴν δίκην, ἐπενόησε τι στρατήγημα τοιοῦτον.

¹¹⁰⁵ 6.9.5, ἐπενόησε δὲ τι τοιοῦτον; cf. similarity with 7.1.3 (above); also the term ἐπίνοια as a mischievous plan in 1.2.6 (the Acragas suitor's plan) ὡς ἀνδρὶ πᾶν ἱκανῶ μηχανήσασθαι. τοιαύτης οὖν ἐπινοίας ἐκείνος ἤρξατο; 1.11.1 (Theron), ἤρων, ποικίλαις ἐπινοίαις πειρώμενος ἀπατᾶν; 2.10.2 (Plangon to Callirhoe, about concealing the pregnancy), τὰ μεγάλα, φησί, τῶν πραγμάτων, ὧ γύναι, μέγαλαις ἐπινοίαις κατορθοῦται.

¹¹⁰⁶ 2.8.3, κατεστρατηγήθη <δ'> ὑπὸ τῆς Τύχης.

¹¹⁰⁷ 3.3.8, Chaereas finds Theron, ἡ Τύχη δὲ ἐφώτισε τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἥς χωρὶς ἔργον οὐδὲν τέλειον; 4.5.3, Mithridates' plan fails, ἡ Τύχη δὲ οὐχ ὅμοιον τῇ γνώμῃ τὸ τέλος ἐβράβευσεν, ἀλλὰ μειζόνων πραγμάτων ἐκίνησεν ἀρχήν; 6.8.1, Artaxerxes' plan fails, πᾶσαν δὲ σκέψιν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐρωτικὴν ὁμιλίαν ταχέως μετέβαλεν ἡ Τύχη, καινότερων εὐρούσα πραγμάτων ὑπόθεσιν; 8.1.2, ἐμελλε δὲ ἔργον ἡ Τύχη πράττειν οὐ μόνον παραδόξον, ἀλλὰ καὶ σκυθρωπόν.

then expected to guess that a kick in the stomach in pregnancy might result in death; to believe that good winds bring Theron into Chaereas' hands; to view it as plausible that Mithridates' men did not do their duty, as a result of their greedy barbarian behaviour; and to accept that the final meeting is because the narrator and not Tyche has decided to bring about closure. In the narrator's conscious game between coincidence and plan, strategy prevails. The static prolepses are part of this narrative plot and underline the authorial choice of composition in a tale, which, because of the absence of a traditional myth, was open to many twists and endings. As in Greek drama, the inventiveness of the staging of the recognition scene is to be appreciated not because of its content, nor 'for the plot', but because of the masterful *mise-en-scène*¹¹⁰⁸.

Who will be Callirrhoe's husband?

The third question looks to the final recognition of Callirrhoe, as Chaereas' wife. The theme is programmatically set in Stateira's comforting words promising Callirrhoe that Artaxerxes will marry her to the man of her choice¹¹⁰⁹. The threatening third Helen-pattern, with Artaxerxes as Paris, which questions once again the truth about Callirrhoe's fidelity¹¹¹⁰, ends without result when Τύχη reshapes the pattern *καινοτέρων εύροῦσα πραγμάτων υπόθεσιν*¹¹¹¹.

¹¹⁰⁸ This is why there can be three different tragedies centered on the recognition of Electra and Orestes.

¹¹⁰⁹ 5.9.3, ἔξεις ἄνδρα ὃν θέλεις.

¹¹¹⁰ Cf. 6.6.3, after Artaxerxes' advances Callirrhoe confirms, νῦν ὡς ἀληθῶς Καλλιρρόη τέθνηκεν.

¹¹¹¹ 6.8.1.

The new plot is introduced not as a partial withholding of information but as a deliberate lie, which is also described as a *στρατήγημα*¹¹¹²: Dionysius lets Chaereas believe that because of the help he is giving to Artaxerxes during the war he has already received Callirhoe as a prize. This time the text does not use the *πάντα...μόνον/πλήν* formulation but represents this as a conscious deception, since the reader knows already that Callirhoe is among Artaxerxes' women¹¹¹³ and that, in Dionysius' words, this is but revenge and deceit. Dionysius' threat endangers Callirhoe's and the reader's positive expectations for the upcoming happy ending¹¹¹⁴. This time no clues are given for what the reader should expect and Book 7 launches a highly exciting narrative, during which the reader is reading for the plot. The end of Book 7 closes with Chaereas' refusal to see the beautiful captive, who rejects every suggestion from the general's subordinates and thinks this is the most real imprisonment that she has suffered so far¹¹¹⁵. It is only in Book 8 the third-person narrator is unmasked as the plot-maker of *Τύχη*:

ἔμελλε δὲ ἔργον ἢ Τύχῃ πράττειν οὐ μόνον παρὰδοξον, ἀλλὰ καὶ σκυθρωπόν, ἵνα ἔχων Καλλιρόην Χαιρέας ἀγνοήσῃ καὶ τὰς ἀλλοτρίας γυναῖκας ἀναλαβὼν ταῖς τριήρεσιν ἀπαγάγῃ, μόνην δὲ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐκεῖ καταλίπῃ¹¹¹⁶.

Again, of all the captives, Chaereas is about to leave behind only one without recognising her (*ἀγνοήσῃ*), (*μόνην*) Callirhoe, the protagonist, and therefore avoid the conclusion of the narrative about Callirhoe. But, *ἔδοξε*

¹¹¹² 7.1.3.

¹¹¹³ 6.9.8.

¹¹¹⁴ 6.9.8, πολλὰ μὲν οὖν φέρειν καὶ πόλεμον ἄδηλα, καὶ μεταβολὰς τοῖς δυστυχοῦσι βελτίονας.

¹¹¹⁵ 7.6.7, νῦν ἀληθῶς αἰχμάλωτός εἰμι.

¹¹¹⁶ 8.1.2.

τόδε δεινὸν Ἀφροδίτῃ, who decided to arrange for the couple's final recognition. The authorial digression, which foretells the happy ending of the couple and mentions that the last σύγγραμμα will be a happy one, supports the metaphorical transposition of recognition from the character Callirhoe to the work *Callirhoe*. Chaereas, encouraged by Polycharmus, visits the beautiful captive and his opening speech, echoes the programmatic words with which Stateira used:

θάρρει, φησὶν, ὦ γύναι, ἥτις ἂν ἦς, οὐ γάρ σε βιασόμεθα· ἔξεις δὲ ἄνδρα, ὃν θέλεις. ἔτι λέγοντος ἡ Καλλιρόη γνωρίσασα τὴν φωνὴν ἀπεκαλύψατο καὶ ἀμφοτέρωι συνεβόησαν 'Χαιρέα', 'Καλλιρόη'. περιχυθέντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις, λιποψυχήσαντες ἔπεσον...ἔχω σε, εἰ ἀληθῶς εἶ Καλλιρόη· εἰ ἀληθῶς εἶ Χαιρέας¹¹⁷.

The irony behind the 'ἥτις ἂν ἦς' is an indicator for the reader of the large-scale recognition plan: Callirhoe recognises Chaereas' voice and for the first time they are in each other's arms. This time the adjective ἀληθῶς is used positively: instead of describing a step into uncertainty, as in the previous cases of fallacious certainty introduced with the νῦν ἀληθῶς, here it identifies the final and ultimate revelation of the narrative's truth. As expected, the recognition scene is followed by an exchange of narratives, a merging of the different, so far, points of view, on the story: Callirhoe, despite her hesitations about the Miletus adventure, narrates everything to Chaereas and Chaereas πάντα to Callirhoe¹¹⁸, and only after they have revealed the

¹¹⁷ 8.1.8-10.

¹¹⁸ 8.1.14-17.

full truth to each other do they go to bed: ἀσπάσιοι λέκτροιο παλαιοῦ
θεσμὸν ἴκοντο¹¹¹⁹. The closing line from the reunion of Penelope and
Odysseus underlines the importance of the *Odyssey* as a large-scale plot-
model for the *Callirhoe*.

However, the recognition is not fulfilled until the very end, the couple's
return to Syracuse. The focalisation this time is through the inset audience's
eyes; the zooming is gradual; seeing the trireme approaching, they could
guess everything but the truth:

βλέποντες δὲ εἰς τὴν σκηνὴν ἔνδον ἐνόμιζον οὐκ ἀνθρώπους ἀλλὰ φόρτον εἶναι
πολυτελεῖ, καὶ ἄλλος ἄλλο τι ἐμαντεύετο, πάντα δὲ μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ ἀληθὲς εἵκαζον.
καὶ γὰρ ἦν ἄπιστον ὡς ἀληθῶς¹¹²⁰.

The by now formulaic *πάντα* is followed by *τὸ ἀληθές*, which indicates the
absence of any manipulation of information in this endgame of the
recognition plot. The painful (τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐκτετακότων) slow zooming
on the tent continues until the curtains open:

πάντων δὲ ἀπορούντων καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐκτετακότων αἰφνίδιον εἰλκύσθη τὰ
παραπετάσματα, καὶ ὤφθη Καλλιρόη...Χαιρέας δὲ αὐτῇ παρακαθήμενος... οὔτε
βροντὴ ποτε οὕτως ἐξέπληξε τὰς ἀκοὰς οὔτε ἀστραπὴ τὰς ὄψεις τῶν ἰδόντων.¹¹²¹

This recognition scene is followed by recapitulatory *διηγήσεις*, in which
Chaereas reports *πάντα*¹¹²², the sorrowful stories and the happy ones, the full
truth. It is as if the whole narrative is structured around this one, final
recognition scene. But, as in the previous instances, where the narrator shows

¹¹¹⁹ 8.1.17; cf. *Odyssey*, 23.296.

¹¹²⁰ 8.6.6.

¹¹²¹ 8.6.7-8.

¹¹²² 8.7.3, *πάντα τὰ τῆς ἀποδημίας διηγήματα*.

πάντα, the narrative focuses on Callirhoe alone, who prays to Aphrodite for the happy ending¹¹²³. Thus, by a final narrative coup, the narrator allows the reader to have a unique insight into the story, the most private moment of the protagonist; then in the papyri follows the narrator's sphragis who claims to be one who wrote τοσάδε περὶ Καλλιρόης.

3.1.2.2 *Xenophon*

Non-Homeric couple-recognition pattern

Is Anthia dead or alive?

As suggested above, in the Iphigenia pattern, the recognition catalyst in Xenophon's novel is Hippothous. But the recognition scene proper is a result of many parameters. As in Chariton the main questions that connect the thread of the plot are whether Anthia is alive, and if yes, where. After the couple are separated in Tyre because of Manto the narrative is centered on mapping Anthia's location. Habrocomes' only concern then becomes to find his wife, ζῶσαν ἢ τεθνεῶσαν¹¹²⁴, recalling the novels' stereotypical quest, part of the Helen pattern. When Habrocomes finds Lampon he attempts to extract from him εἴ τι οἶδε περὶ κόρης ἐκ Τύρου¹¹²⁵. The question is interesting because Anthia is supposed to have presented herself as ἐκ Τύρου and not 'from Ephesus'. Lampon gives an analeptic summary of what has happened – τὸν γάμον καὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν τὴν περὶ αὐτήν – and with this information

¹¹²³ For the prayer as a one of the first descriptions of private moments see Biraud, (1996).

¹¹²⁴ 2.10.3.

¹¹²⁵ 2.11.3.

Habrocomes leaves Cilicia.

The second piece of information is the one provided by Hippothous: after the long digression about Hyperanthes, the bandit accidentally ‘remembers’ that he had sacrificed a virgin to Ares¹¹²⁶. Hippothous’ omission is not deliberate, as is the case in Chariton, but it has the same function : after having told all his διήγηματα, he adds the detail of the διήγημα about Anthia. What Hippothous knows is not much, only her looks, her age, and her homeland¹¹²⁷, which is enough for Habrocomes to recognise her as his wife. Indeed this time Anthia has presented herself not as ‘from Tyre’, but as ‘from Ephesus’ and this is what allows the plot to move on to the next recognition step.

Anthia is dead, but...

Habrocomes is again a step behind Anthia when he learns from Chryson’s διήγημα that Anthia died on the day of her wedding εἴτε μανεῖσα εἴτε ἄλλου τινὸς ἐρῶσα¹¹²⁸. Chryson gives a hypothetical reason, but the reader and the co-conspirator in Anthia’s supposed suicide, Eudoxus, knows that only the second part of her hypothesis is real, since Anthia has revealed to her compatriot the whole truth about the wedding and the chastity oaths¹¹²⁹. With Eudoxus’ departure, Chryson’s tale becomes the official version of Anthia’s tale. Her recapitulation is divided, like Hippothous’, in

¹¹²⁶ 3.3.5, ἄλλο σοὶ διήγημα παρήλθον οὐκ εἰπών.

¹¹²⁷ 3.3.4, πλεόν γάρ οὐδέν ἔμαθον.

¹¹²⁸ 3.9.5.

¹¹²⁹ 3.5.6.

two parts: after a description of Habrocomes' reaction - note the typical expression to indicate fallacious certainty, νῦν μὲν σαφῶς τέθνηκεν Ἀνθία¹¹³⁰ - and of his request to see the tomb, Chrysion decides to tell only the second part, the most interesting - τοῦτο γὰρ...τὸ δυστυχέστατον - her body is missing¹¹³¹. Once more Habrocomes and Chrysion lack the main clue, Anthia's *Scheintod*. Nevertheless, like Lampon, Chrysion's tale bears witness to Anthia's chastity¹¹³².

Habrocomes loses track of Anthia, but Hippothous captures her again; this time the reader expects that he will recall the piece of information that he gave to Habrocomes, about the beautiful girl from Ephesus, but, suprisingly, neither of them recognise each other - note that the verb used is γνωρίζω; Anthia makes recognition all the more impossible by dissimulating her true identity, pretending to be an Egyptian, from Memphis¹¹³³. In an ironical twist, now that Hippothous knows her name, she gives a false one, postponing her recognition. With Habrocomes in Sicily at Aegialus' house, the recognition thread seems broken. It is after the tale of the old fisherman that Habrocomes prays for τὰ τέλη τῶν μεμαντευμένων¹¹³⁴. His wish, programmatically placed at the beginning of the last book, is also that of the reader/audience, who, now that the hero has lost his clues, desires to reach an ending.

The recognition in Book 5 starts with the characters close geographically

¹¹³⁰ 3.9.7. The expression is formulaic.

¹¹³¹ 3.10.3.

¹¹³² 3.10.1, (Habrocomes) καλῶς μὲν καὶ σωφρόνως ἀποθανοῦσαν Ἀνθίαν.

¹¹³³ 4.3.6, οὐκ ἐγνώριζε δὲ Ἰππόθοον, οὐδὲ Ἰππόθοος τὴν Ἀνθίαν. ὅποτε δὲ αὐτῆς πύθοιτο ἦτις τε εἶη καὶ πόθεν, το μὲν ἀληθὲς οὐκ ἔλεγεν. Cf. Anthia does not tell her truth name to Polyidus too, 5.4.4.

¹¹³⁴ 5.1.13.

but disconnected plot-wise: Habrocomes is in Sicily, but at Syracuse and then in Italy at Nuceria where he exhausts himself physically breaking stones; Hippothous is also in Sicily but in Tauromenium; Anthia is in Taras in a brothel thinking of committing suicide¹¹³⁵. The reader learns at this stage the content of Habrocomes' life, and of the novel :

ἀπορία τῶν ἐπιτηδείων ἀμηχανῶν ὅ τι ποιήσει, τὰ μὲν πρῶτα τὰ μὲν πρῶτα περιηγεῖ τὴν Ἀνθίαν ζητῶν· αὕτη γὰρ ἦν αὐτῷ τοῦ βίου παντὸς καὶ τῆς πλάνης ἡ ὑπόθεσις¹¹³⁶.

The passage is interesting because Habrocomes knows from Chrysiôn that Anthia is presumably dead ; yet he is still searching for her urged by an ἐλπίδος δυστυχίης¹¹³⁷. Habrocomes' desperate search continues in Italy and on his way to Rhodes¹¹³⁸. This could be interpreted as a hint that despite the clues, he - and the reader- did not altogether believe that Anthia was lost for ever. This detail fades out when he arrives in Italy, so the suspense increases : although so close to Anthia Habrocomes leaves for Rhodes, desperate, driven by ἀθυμία καὶ ἀπορία δεινή; for Habrocomes the quest-plot has reached a dead-end and he gives up, despite his hopes of finding something out about Anthia. At the same point we learn what happened to Leucon and Rhode, who at that very moment decide to sail to Rhodes too¹¹³⁹. The re-appearance of the hero's two companions hints that the end of their adventure is close and that the young couple will contribute somehow to the reunion of the main

¹¹³⁵ 5.6.1.

¹¹³⁶ 5.8.2.

¹¹³⁷ 3.10.4.

¹¹³⁸ 5.1.2, περὶ Ἀνθίας εἴ τι πύθοιτο; 5.10.2, περὶ Ἀνθίας τι πυθέσθαι.

¹¹³⁹ 5.6.4.

couple, since they too are waiting until *τι περὶ τῶν δεσποτῶν πύθωνται*¹¹⁴⁰.

The accumulation of the similar formulas (εἰ) *τι περὶ τινος - πύθεσθαι*, used for Anthia, Habrocomes and the couple, is an indication that the desired information is soon to come, but some narrative steps still remain.

Anthia is found

With Habrocomes' departure for Rhodes and then Ephesus, the hero is a step ahead for the first time. Hippothous and Anthia remain in Sicily and the plot is easy to guess: Hippothous meets Anthia at the slave market and *καὶ ὁρᾷ τὴν Ἀνθίαν καὶ γνωρίζει καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ συμβάντι καταπλήσσεται*¹¹⁴¹. Hippothous is amazed at the coincidence, and the reader is left stunned at the fact that Hippothous recognises her as the Memphian woman but not as the Ephesian woman, which lays the groundwork for a new plot – Anthia's seduction by Hippothous. The concealed information now, at the end of the story, is ironically fatal.

Hippothous and Anthia exchange their respective *διηγήματα*, as is typical for recognition scenes; but Anthia relates only her Egyptian adventures¹¹⁴². It is after Hippothous' advances that Anthia decides to reveal the whole truth: *κάλλιον εἶναι νομίζουσα εἰπεῖν πάντα αὐτῷ τὰ ἀπόρρητα ἢ παραβῆναι τὰς πρὸς Ἀβροκόμην συνθήκας, λέγει τὸν Ἀβροκόμην, τὴν Ἑφέσον, τὸν ἔρωτα, τοὺς ὄρκους, τὰς συμφοράς, τὰ ληστήρια καὶ συνεχές*

¹¹⁴⁰ 5.6.4.

¹¹⁴¹ 5.9.5.

¹¹⁴² 5.9.11, καὶ ἥτις μὲν ἦν ἐπέπυστο οὐδέπω.

Ἀβροκόμην ἀνωδύρετο¹¹⁴³. Anthia's last recognition narrative mentions the ἀπόρητα; this is the second time Anthia reveals her identity abroad, and this time to a complete stranger, not a citizen. And finally she is recognised ὅτι τε Ἀνθία εἶη καὶ ὅτι γυνὴ τοῦ πάντων αὐτῷ φιλάτου¹¹⁴⁴. Anthia is recognised as a name and as the wife of Habrocomes, which means that the only ἀπόρητον that complicated an earlier recognition is precisely her relationship to Habrocomes. Anthia's recognition accelerates the recognition process.

The first recognition is a result of a reading process¹¹⁴⁵: Leucon and Rhode offer to Helios a golden stele inscribed with their names; Habrocomes sees the votive offering; Leucon and Rhode happen to be at the temple at this very moment, but they do not recognise the man lamenting in front of their offering; the text emphasises this impossible recognition-γνωρίζουσι μὲν οὐχί. They need to engage him in small talk, in which he introduces himself as Habrocomes and ends his words with his only wish: τὰ ἀναθήματα Λεύκωνος καὶ Ρόδης, οὓς ἰδεῖν εὐχομαι μετὰ Ἀνθίαν Ἀβροκόμης ὁ δυστυχής¹¹⁴⁶. It is only after the revelation of his name that Leucon and Rhode recognise him: ἀνενεγκόντες δὲ κατὰ μικρὸν ἐγνώριζον ἐκ τοῦ σχήματος. ἐκ τῆς φωνῆς, ἐξ ὧν ἔλεγεν, ἐξ ὧν Ἀνθίας ἐμέμνητο.¹¹⁴⁷

The inability of Leucon and Rhode to recognise Habrocomes is repeated

¹¹⁴³ 5.9.11.

¹¹⁴⁴ 5.9.13.

¹¹⁴⁵ 5.10.7, ἀναγνούς οὖν καὶ γνωρίσας τοὺς ἀναθέντας.

¹¹⁴⁶ 5.10.10.

¹¹⁴⁷ 5.10.11.

in the parallel scene with Anthia:

ἐλθόντες δὲ ὁρῶσι τὴν Ἀνθίαν καὶ ἦν μὲν ἔτι ἄγνωστος αὐτοῖς, συμβάλλουσι δὲ πάντα, τὸν ἔρωτα, τὰ δάκρυα, τὰ ἀναθήματα, τὰ ὀνόματα, τὸ εἶδος. οὕτως κατὰ βραχὺ ἐγνώριζον αὐτήν... ἡ δὲ ἐτεθαυμάκει τίνες τε εἶσαν καὶ τί βούλοιντο· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ποτε Λεύκωνα καὶ Ῥόδην ἰδεῖν ἤλπισεν... μόγισ δὲ ἀνενεγκοῦσα καὶ γνωρίσασα περιβάλλει τε αὐτοὺς καὶ ἀσπάζεται καὶ σαφέστατα τὰ κατὰ Ἀβροκόμην μανθάνει.

The repeated pattern οὐκ ἐγνώριζεν / μόγισ ἀνενεγκών... ἐγνώρισεν is the vital dramatic key of Xenophon's recognition scenes. Not only is Hippothous unable to recognise Anthia, whom he does not know, but even people who know each other well are unable to recognise their companions, until they introduce themselves by name and by relationship to Anthia/Habrocomes: in other words, Leucon and Rhode recognise Habrocomes because he laments over Anthia and Anthia because she laments over Habrocomes.

The Anthia-Leucon/Rhode recognition scene is introduced with the final conjecture, which recalls Chariton: συμβάλλουσι δὲ πάντα; the clues come ordered from the most important to the least important: first the love, which is proved because of the lamentations; then the *Realia*, the votives; then the names and finally the appearance. This is very strange especially for two superhumanly beautiful young people, who should have been easily recognisable by their looks. The change might echo Odysseus's disguise as a beggar in that, after all these travails, Habrocomes and Anthia might have changed. However, the narrative focus lies on the near-averted/finally-successful recognition scene as such, given their number in the novel; these

near-recognitions are indeed an accumulation of clues, and the final recognition-scene involves the collective interpretation of all clues, unlike the previous scenes, in which one or more clues were dissimulated or concealed.

The only non-ambivalent recognition scene is the one between Habrocomes and Anthia: ὥς δὲ εἶδον ἀλλήλους, εὐθὺς ἀνεγνώρισαν· τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐβούλοντο αἱ ψυχαί¹¹⁴⁸. The major recognition is mutual and unimpeded, unlike the Odyssean one. As in Chariton, we are allowed to peek into the couple's bedroom during their most intimate recognition, the confirmation of the ἀπόρρητα and the ὅρκοι. The couple are eager to believe each other, καὶ ῥαδίως ἔπειθον ἀλλήλους ἐπεὶ τοῦτο ἤθελον¹¹⁴⁹. Therefore recognition in Xenophon is an act performed perfectly only between lovers and the object of recognition is their mutual faithfulness and chastity; like Chariton's, Xenophon's novel can be read as a detective story of marital devotion or a mapping thriller, which investigates the identity, the location and the chastity of the characters.

3.1.2.3 Longus

1. Homeric echoes and similes

Lycaenion as Penelope

How much Homer is there in Longus' *Pastorals*? The answer is not easy.

¹¹⁴⁸ 5.13.3.

¹¹⁴⁹ 5.15.1.

Vieillefond¹¹⁵⁰, based on Scarcella's article¹¹⁵¹, has counted twenty-two references from the *Iliad* and twenty-five from the *Odyssey* but his list falls short when he has to point out that there is no overt mention of Homer in person throughout the *Pastorals*¹¹⁵². Morgan in his commentary attributes more accurately all pastoral elements to Hellenistic poetry, and especially Theocritus; Morgan also studies with great insight the most important Homeric scene of the work, Lycaenion's supplication to save one of her geese¹¹⁵³:

σῶσόν με Δάφνι, τὴν ἀθλίαν· ἐκ γὰρ μοι τῶν χηνῶν τῶν εἴκοσιν ἓνα, τὸν κάλλιστον αἰετὸς ἤρπασε καὶ οἷα μέγα φορτίον ἀράμενος οὐκ ἤδυνήθη μετέωρος ἐπὶ τὴν συνήθη τὴν ὑψηλὴν ἐκείνην κομίσαι πέτραν ἀλλ' εἰς τῆνδε τὴν ὕλην τὴν ταπεινὴν ἔχων κατέπεσε ¹¹⁵⁴:

Morgan justly notes that 'ironically a dream of the archetypal chaste wife (Penelope) is transposed into an instrument of seduction by a promiscuous and predatory female¹¹⁵⁵'. However, the theme of geese does not occur only in Penelope's dream; an omen of geese appears to Telemachus before leaving Menelaus, which is explained by Helen, the 'not-so-chaste wife'¹¹⁵⁶. Helen, like Lycaenion, mentions a single goose, when Penelope counts twenty. That the same omen about Odysseus' homecoming is revealed

¹¹⁵⁰ Vieillefond, (1987).

¹¹⁵¹ Scarcella, (1971).

¹¹⁵² Vieillefond, (1987).

¹¹⁵³ For Lycaenion as Phaedra, see p.318 (current document).

¹¹⁵⁴ Longus 3.16.1; cf. *Odyssey*, 19.536, χῆνές μοι κατὰ οἶκον εἴκοσι πυρὸν ἔδουσιν/ἐξ ὕδατος, καὶ τέ σφιν ιαίνομαι εἰσορόωσα· ἐλθὼν δ' ἐξ ὄρεος μέγας αἰετὸς ἀγκυλοχῆλης/πᾶσι κατ' αὐχένας ἤξε καὶ ἔκτανεν.

¹¹⁵⁵ Morgan, (2004) p.211.

¹¹⁵⁶ *Odyssey*, 15.171-178, ὥς ἄρα οἱ εἰπόντι ἐπέπατο δεξιὸς ὄρνις, /αἰετὸς ἀργὴν χῆνα φέρων ὀνύχεσσι πελαγον./ἡμερον ἐξ αὐλῆς. Discussed in Pattoni, (2005) pp.90ff., comparison of Lycaenion to Penelope and Nausicaa.

both to Penelope and Helen, suggests an interesting interpretation of its parallel version in Longus. It is not simply ironic because of the alteration between the predator and its victim. It is appealing because of the ambivalence of Lycaenion's characterisation as both Helen and Penelope.

The irony then becomes more biting when Lycaenion, who is to play the role of the third woman, that of Phaedra, suddenly acquires characteristics proper to the novelistic heroine. As we have earlier pointed out, the typical novelistic heroine blends the chaste Penelope with the beautiful Helen. Longus' sophisticated manipulation of the situation suggests that only Chariton or a similar text might have been his literary predecessor. What has then become of the generic 'third woman' novelistic episode in the *Pastorals* seems to be the following. The third woman is a negative counterpart of the heroine; Helen is also the negative counterpart of Penelope in the *Odyssey*. But Helen is seldom presented as the 'other woman', a role normally reserved for Phaedra-heroines in the novels. Since Chloe is not yet Helen-like¹¹⁵⁷, then, the Charitonian novel-plot *tel quel* is impossible. This subtle element in Lycaenion's role as Phaedra and an ambivalent Penelope shows once more that Longus' narrative choices are the exception that confirms the rule.

Intertextuality: Theocritean Homer in pastoral prose

This playful twist of the generic characterisation and themes has further generic implications. Longus is working with three literary traditions: the

¹¹⁵⁷ For Chloe's comparison to Helen see p. 135 (current document).

classic, Homer and the tragedians; the Hellenistic bucolic, Theocritus; and the earlier novels. The above merging of Lycaenion in the triple role of Helen/Penelope-Phaedra as well as that of the generic temptress of the novels is the best example of this strange hybridity¹¹⁵⁸. The Lycaenion passage itself gives the answer. Lycaenion gives an explanation of why she needs Daphnis' help: the goose was too heavy for the eagle, which οὐκ ἐδυνήθη μετέωρος ἐπὶ τὴν συνήθη τὴν ὑψηλὴν ἐκείνην κομίσαι πέτραν ἀλλ' εἰς τὴνδε τὴν ὕλην τὴν τάπεινήν ἔχων κατέπεσε¹¹⁵⁹. Which is the *usual high* stone and which the *humble* forest? Pattoni argues that they echo the two references in the *Odyssey*, Helen's interpretation of the omen, and Odysseus' interpretation of the dream¹¹⁶⁰. However there is a phrase, which alludes precisely to Theocritus: in one of the main intertexts of Longus' novel, the *Cyclops, Idyll 11*, Polyphemus finds the remedy for his love in music¹¹⁶¹. So he sits on a 'high stone' contemplating the sea and singing for Galatea¹¹⁶². The allusion to the Theocritean *Cyclops* in Lycaenion-Penelope's words shows the path of the *Odyssey's* reception, a reception via Hellenistic poetry. Lycaenion's words may indicate the path of the reception: the usual high stone, as I read it, stands here for the literary superiority of Longus' examples, Homer and Theocritus, which were usually appreciated and thought to be of poetic

¹¹⁵⁸ For the contamination of genres in Longus see Pattoni, (2005).

¹¹⁵⁹ 3.16.2.

¹¹⁶⁰ Pattoni, (2005) p.93, the allusion from the *Odyssey*, 15.175 and 19.538, ἐλθὼν δ' ἐξ' ὄρεος.

¹¹⁶¹ Longus and Theocritus in Morgan, (2004) p.5ff.

¹¹⁶² Theocritus, 11.17, καθεζόμενος δ' ἐπὶ πέτρας ὑψηλᾶς.

excellence, with Homer always a step above, as observed by Longinus¹¹⁶³. However, the Longan narrative, because of the weight, and as I read here, because of the weight of the Theocritean reworking of Homer, did not manage to reach the same literary heights (neither those attained by the *Odyssey*, nor of the *Idylls*), but fell down into 'τήνδε τὴν ὕλην τὴν τάπεινήν', the minimal and seemingly naïve pastoral (literary) matrix, ὕλη¹¹⁶⁴, prose-narrative.

2. Recognition patterns

The two recognition scenes between Daphnis, Chloe, and their parents are well prepared from the very beginning, in the description of the valuable tokens that accompany the two babies: Lamon θαυμάζει τὰ τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἔκθεσιν τύχης; but in an effort to dissimulate his identity, ὥς δ' ἂν καὶ τοῦνομα τοῦ παιδίου ποιμενικὸν δοκοί, calls him Daphnis¹¹⁶⁵. The same happens with the recovered baby girl, to which καὶ τίθεται καὶ αὐτὴ ποιμενικὸν ὄνομα πρὸς πίστιν αὐτῷ, Χλόην¹¹⁶⁶. The precision 'ὥς ἂν δοκοίη' and the 'πρὸς πίστιν' indicate that this is a willing camouflage of the truth. This in combination with the proleptic dream of Eros that appears to both Lamon and Dryas urges them to treat the children differently, but without revealing the truth to each other:

¹¹⁶³ Longinus mentions Homer, Thocritus, and Apollonius, as chief representatives of the hexameter genre, (homeric epic, bucolic, and hellenistic epic respectively), but gives the title of 'excellency' to Homer, 33.4-5, ἀπτωτος ὁ Απολλώνιος ἐν τοῖς Ἀργοναύταις ποιητής, κὰν τοῖς βουκολικοῖς πλήν ὀλίγων τῶν ἔξωθεν ὁ Θεόκριτος επιτυχέστατος· ἀρ' οὖν Ὅμηρος ἂν μᾶλλον ἢ Απολλώνιος ἐθέλοις γενέσθαι;

¹¹⁶⁴ Note the metaphor: ὕλη, for wood and poetic matrix, cf. Longinus, 13.4, ποιητικὴ ὕλη; 43.1.

¹¹⁶⁵ 1.3.1.

¹¹⁶⁶ 1.6.3.

τοῦτο τὸ ὄναρ ἰδόντες ἤχθοντο μὲν εἰ ποιμένες ἔσονται καὶ αἰπόλοι οἱ τύχην ἐκ σπαργάνων ἐπαγγελλόμενοι κρεῖττονα...ἐδόκει δὲ πείθεσθαι θεοῖς περὶ τῶν σωθέντων προνοία θεῶν. Καὶ κοινώσαντες ἀλλήλοις τὸ ὄναρ...ὥς ποιμένας ἐκπέμπουσιν αὐτοὺς ἅμα ταῖς ἀγέλαις¹¹⁶⁷.

Both Lamon and Dryas are afraid that the hidden truth will be revealed and they try to nurture the children better and educate them as well as possible, in case this happens¹¹⁶⁸. One of the most characteristic passages is when Dryas postpones Chloe's wedding in the hope that she will recover her parents, and that they will be awarded their freedom¹¹⁶⁹. This prolepsis preshadows the course of the plot: the revelation of Chloe's identity as a requirement for her marriage to Daphnis, making her recognition the central one for the ending of the plot. That is why Lamon overhears, *παρέργως ἀκούσας*¹¹⁷⁰, Dryas' words when Lamon tells him that he is aiming for a superior son-in-law, *περὶ μειράκιον κρεῖττον ἡμῶν*¹¹⁷¹; nevertheless Dryas ponders upon Daphnis' origins, as if he knew:

ἄρα καὶ τοῦτον ἐξέθηκέ τις ὡς Χλόην· ἄρα καὶ τοῦτον εὔρε Λάμων ὡς ἐκείνην ἐγώ; Ἄρα καὶ γνωρίσματα ὅμοια παρέκειτο τοῖς εὐρεθεῖσιν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ; ἐὰν ταῦτα οὕτως, ὦ δέσποτα Πὰν καὶ Νύμφαι φίλαι, τάχα οὗτος τοὺς ἰδίους εὐρῶν εὐρήσει τι καὶ τῶν Χλόης ἀπορρήτων.

Lamon's private reasoning reshapes the plot set by Dryas and makes Daphnis' recognition a prerequisite for the recognition of Chloe. Therefore the preparations for marriage that conclude Book 3 set out all the narrative lines

¹¹⁶⁷ 1.8.1.

¹¹⁶⁸ 1.8.2.

¹¹⁶⁹ 3.25.3, εἰ ποτε τοὺς ἀληθινούς γονέας εὔροι.

¹¹⁷⁰ 3.32.1.

¹¹⁷¹ 3.31.4.

regarding what will follow in the last and final book. The recognition is already prepared and announced and the only remaining thing is to find out how the plot will execute it.

And a last point: because Longus consciously adopts a story-line with rustic teenager characters, who know neither the name of love nor the name of unfaithfulness, the recognition concerns not only the identity of the characters but also their sexual relationship (to be).

The recognition of Daphnis

Here, I shall present the twofold recognition of Chloe: first, her recognition as a woman, which is linked to her recognition as not being Dryas' daughter, and secondly, her recognition as a virgin, and therefore a proper wife for Daphnis.

Daphnis 'recognises' Chloe

Daphnis' recognition by Dionysophanes is Lamon's last resort in order to frustrate Gnathon's sexual plans. The recognition of the male protagonist is strategically placed first, so that the finale deals only with Chloe's recognition. Revelation of Daphnis' identity by Lamon is referred to as ἐκκαλύπτειν τὰ κρυπτά¹¹⁷², but the verb (ἀνα)γνωρίζω is not used on this occasion. However the truth-like narrative is alluded to in Lamon's description of his recognition narrative as a ἀληθῆς λόγος¹¹⁷³ and not μύθοις ὅμοια¹¹⁷⁴. As a result of the

¹¹⁷² 4.18.2.

¹¹⁷³ 4.19.3.

¹¹⁷⁴ 4.20.1, τὰληθῆ λέγειν μηδὲ ὅμοια πλάττειν μύθοις ἐπὶ τῷ κατέχειν τὸν υἱόν.

celebrations for Daphnis, the young shepherd ἐξελάθετο καὶ Χλόης πρὸς ὀλίγον¹¹⁷⁵. When Daphnis recovers Chloe from Lampis' hands the quest of the narrative shifts immediately towards the recognition of Chloe. The couple, like Callirhoe and Chaereas and even more Anthia and Habrocomes, decide to keep their love secret, but Dryas has the proofs¹¹⁷⁶ and reveals τὰ ἄρρητα¹¹⁷⁷. Chloe is not fully recognised yet, but only as still virgin¹¹⁷⁸ and as not being Dryas' daughter.

An evocation of the novels' recognition scenes of couples is implied in Daphnis's astonishment at the well-dressed Chloe:

εὐμορφοτέρα τοσοῦτον ἐφάνη πᾶσιν ὥστε καὶ Δάφνις αὐτὴν μόλις ἐγνώρισεν. ὥμοσεν ἂν τις καὶ ἄνευ γνωρισμάτων ὅτι τοιαύτης κόρης Δρύας οὐκ ἦν πατήρ¹¹⁷⁹.

Chloe's change is so great that even Daphnis has to perform an act of recognition. The formulation μόλις ἐγνώρισεν alludes to the similar formulas in Xenophon. The connection of the passage with the recognition scene is confirmed by the detail that Chloe's beauty did not need any tokens, γνωρίσματα. But the staging of Chloe's *retrouvailles* needs a more solid plot strategy, which calls for Eros' help. Indeed, the Nymphs and Eros appear in Dionysophanes' dream and indicate how to investigate Chloe's lineage. The Odyssean allusion to the bow contest is here inverted, since Eros unstrings his bow; the banquet motif is of course present also in the *Odyssey*, but it has a

¹¹⁷⁵ 4.23.2.

¹¹⁷⁶ 4.30.1, αὐτοῖς ἐδόκει τὸν γάμον κρύπτειν, ἔχειν δὲ κρύφα τὴν Χλόην...ἀλλ' οὐ συνεχώρει Δρύας.

¹¹⁷⁷ 4.30.3, ὁμοία με ἀνάγκη Λάμωνι τὰ μέχρι νῦν ἄρρητα ἐκέλευσε λέγειν.

¹¹⁷⁸ 4.32.1.

¹¹⁷⁹ 4.32.2.

folk-tale origin, and either or both could influence Longus. What is important however is the great diligence with which Chloe's recognition is staged: the dream, the banquet, and the tokens. The culmination of the recognition scene is Dionysophanes' words to Megacles, which summarise the plot of the novel:

λαβὲ τὰ γνωρίσματα καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα, λαβὼν δὲ ἀπόδος Δάφνιδι νύμφην. ἀμφοτέρους ἐξεθήκαμεν, ἀμφοτέρους εὗρήκαμεν, ἀμφοτέρων ἐμέλησε Πανὶ καὶ Νύμφαις καὶ Ἔρωτι¹¹⁸⁰.

With Chloe's recognition as Daphnis' bride the novel has reached its end as well as Eros' *Myth of Chloe*.

Recognising Eros

During the course of the narrative of recognition the main New Comedy question regarding the families of the two young children is left aside, since a more important topic emerges. The focus of the narrative shifts from the 'identity' of the children to the 'identification' of their relationship; in other words, the question is not whether Chloe is alive or dead, but how Daphnis and Chloe will learn the name and the deeds of love. The shift is from the (ἀνα) γνωρίζω towards μανθάνω. The sentimental education of Daphnis and Chloe has been discussed by Morgan: according to him Longus' heroes show no signs of emotional maturation¹¹⁸¹. I will here argue that the process of recognition is a process of learning: Philetas' tale teaches them both the name

¹¹⁸⁰ 4.36.2.

¹¹⁸¹ On the sexual education Wouters, (1987) and Winkler, (1990); on the sentimental education Morgan, (1996), on the opposite, with arguments from Petronius and Apuleius see Hunter (1996), in the same volume.

of Eros but the deeds of love are only known to Daphnis and Lycaenion¹¹⁸².

The Lycaenion episode is full of allusions to learning: Daphnis is a μαθητής of Lycaenion, an ἀρτιμαθής in sexual intercourse in sexual intercourse¹¹⁸³.

Chloe too is educated by Daphnis' tales¹¹⁸⁴.

The verb, with its sexual connotations, is repeated in the two recognition scenes discussed above: first, Lamon wants Gnathon to learn the identity of Daphnis¹¹⁸⁵; secondly, the sexual appeal of Chloe in the miniature recognition scene between the lovers, is described as a process of learning: ἦν οὖν μαθεῖν οἷόν ἐστι τὸ κάλλος ὅταν κόσμον προσλάβηται¹¹⁸⁶. Recognition has to do with sexuality in Longus, as it has to do with chastity and virginity in Chariton and in Xenophon; this is the reason why the recognition process starts when Daphnis' (male) integrity is threatened. After Daphnis' initiation into the mysteries of sex, the question shifts to whether Chloe will reach her wedding-day a virgin or not¹¹⁸⁷: unlike the unhappy girls of the inset tales, Chloe succeeds in remain alive, a virgin and happily married 'ever after'¹¹⁸⁸ and it is on the night of her wedding that τότε Χλόη πρῶτον ἔμαθεν ὅτι τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς ὕλης γινόμενα ἦν ποιμένων παίγνια¹¹⁸⁹. With Chloe's sexual initiation the sexual recognition is completed.

¹¹⁸² Goldhill, (1995) p.22: 'the combination of innocence and a literal understanding of the veiled language of sexuality constructs a misrecognition for the amusement of the (sophisticated) reader'.

¹¹⁸³ 3.14.5, ἀμαθέστερος εἰς τὰ ἔρωτος ἔργα; 3.17.3, ἀραδίδου μοι τερπνόν σαυτὸν μαθητήν; 3.20.2, ἀρτιμαθῆς γὰρ ὧν ἐδεδοίκει τὸ αἶμα.

¹¹⁸⁴ 1.27.1, διδάσκει (Phatta); 3.22.4, εἰ διδάξειε (Echo); 2.35.3 (Syrinx), Daphnis learns how to play the syrinx, μαθῶν.

¹¹⁸⁵ 4.18.3, μαθέτω Γνάθων ὁ μαρὸς οἶος ὧν οἶων ἐρᾷ.

¹¹⁸⁶ 4.32.1.

¹¹⁸⁷ On Daphnis' sexual knowledge as power see Morgan, (2004) p.210.

¹¹⁸⁸ This insistence on preserving Chloe's virginity is the main difference between Longus and New Comedy. The parent-children recognition theme is subordinated to the main search for Chloe's innocence.

¹¹⁸⁹ 4.40.3.

Just as Chariton-narrator gives readers access to information otherwise unknown to the characters, so the same manipulation of material is observable in Longus. The process of recognising the deeds of love is programmatically presented in the beginning of the novel: τοῦτο μόνον ἤδεσαν ὅτι τὸν μὲν φίλημα, τὴν δὲ λουτρον ἀπώλεσεν¹¹⁹⁰. The formulation is repeated when Chloe decides not to reveal the kiss to Dorcon.

ἡ δὲ αὐτῷ διηγεῖται πάντα...καὶ ὅτι τέθηκε Δόρκων. μόνον αἰδεσθεῖσα τὸ φίλημα οὐκ εἶπεν¹¹⁹¹.

Chloe, like Chariton's narrators, recapitulates the main events, and omits one, the most crucial for the action. The next important step is revealed to characters and reader alike: Philetas ἀληθῆ πάντα εἶπεν¹¹⁹². This gives them the required instructions to start embracing, which, as the narrator says parenthetically, ὁ μήπω πρότερον ἐποίησαν¹¹⁹³; but immediately after we learn that they did not proceed to τὸ οὖν συγκατακλιθῆναι, which they knew was the μόνον φάρμακον ἔρωτος¹¹⁹⁴. It is here that the sequence of common education breaks down.

Chloe has hidden a kiss, but Daphnis conceals Lycaenion. At the end of the novel the only question that remains unresolved is Lycaenion's role in Daphnis' education, which is not described in the opening, programmatic, painting and, as expected, Daphnis never confesses to Chloe: was Lycaenion

¹¹⁹⁰ 1.22.4.

¹¹⁹¹ 1.31.2.

¹¹⁹² 2.8.3.

¹¹⁹³ 2.9.1.

¹¹⁹⁴ 2.9.2.

too depicted in the painting? How did the narrator retrieve such precious personal information? Is Lycaenion the narrator's playful twist of the tale? The only thing that remains for sure is that Lycaenion's intervention is probably the novelistic personification of the *μόνον φάρμακον* that cures love, and the only way - known to everyone and suspected by Chloe too - to redirect the narrative from its naive impasse to its knowing τέλος .

Achilles Tatius

1. Homeric echoes

Ο Ομηριστής

Satyrus and Menelaus are at a loss since they cannot save Leucippe who is about to be sacrificed. When looking at the sea they witness what could have been a novelistic and/or an Odyssean scene as well: a ship is attacked and a mime-actor specialising in the representation of the *Iliad*, τῶν τὰ Ὀμήρου τῷ στόματι δεικνύντων ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις¹¹⁹⁵, fights against the pirates with all his theatrical equipment and dies...gloriously. The fake knife that the mime-actor uses is the one that saves Leucippe from being sacrificed.

If this is now transposed into narrative terms, it could indicate that, for AT, epic poetry, in both its Iliadic¹¹⁹⁶ and in its Odyssean context, is a tool, a fanciful one, but of no use in the novelistic context, that can be imitated (by a mime-actor), but not reproduced, that can be of crucial help in the course of

¹¹⁹⁵ 3.20.4.

¹¹⁹⁶ Morales, (2004) p.65, the *Iliad*, the epic about *Achilles*.

the narrative, without being the narrative : the knife is then a metaphor for the Odyssean intertexts. AT 's interlocked reception of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* can be observed in the following example as well.

The Cyclops' and Melantho

Morales argues that Melite's 'subversive appeal'¹¹⁹⁷ recalls, verbally, Cleitophon's earlier courting of Leucippe¹¹⁹⁸. Hence, *sexual symmetry* does not involve Cleitophon and his beloved according to Konstan¹¹⁹⁹, but Cleitophon and Melite. I here want to examine the two occasions on which a Homeric echo, the first Odyssean, the second Iliadic, operates in order to camouflage a sexual seduction.

The first is Cleitophon's intrusion into Leucippe's room, when Satyrus encourages him to enter after giving Conops a sleeping drug. Morales argues that the Cyclops/Conops rhyme activates a reading of Conops as the man who sees everything in Pantheia's household¹²⁰⁰. Satyrus encourages Cleitophon to enter Leucippe's room, just as Odysseus entered the Cyclops' cave¹²⁰¹. The *Odyssey* is also used in the parallel penetration scene, that of Melite into Cleitophon's cell. This time the gate-keeper is Melite's faithful servant, τῶν πιστῶν¹²⁰², Melantho. The strategic naming of Melite's most faithful servant as Penelope's unfaithful maiden, the lover of Eurymachus,

¹¹⁹⁷ Morales, (2004) p.230.

¹¹⁹⁸ Morales, (2004) p.231.

¹¹⁹⁹ Konstan, (1994) p.61ff.

¹²⁰⁰ Morales, (2004) p.86.

¹²⁰¹ 2.23.1-3, σὺ δὲ ὅπως Ὀδυσσεὺς.

¹²⁰² 6.1.4. cf. Melantho, chastises to Odysseus, 18.321-326, and 19.65.

suggests a reading of Melite as an unfaithful Penelope. If this is so, the previous passage, read retrospectively, implies a reading of Cleitophon as an unfaithful Odysseus. The two illicit lovers have many characteristics in common.

Melite, we learn, is, unlike Penelope with her twenty-year-long wait, freshly widowed, τέθνηκε δὲ αὐτῆς προσφάτως ὁ ἀνὴρ κατὰ θάλασσαν¹²⁰³, and she (already) wants to remarry. Thersander, like Odysseus, is falsely reported dead (ὃν ἐνόμιζε τεθνηκέναι κατὰ θάλασσαν) since his companions σωθέντες καὶ νομίσαντες ἀπολωλέναι, τοῦτο ἀπαγγείλαντες ἔτυχον¹²⁰⁴. Thersander's companions, unlike Odysseus', not only survive, but also hastily, and conveniently, announce his death¹²⁰⁵. Therefore on his return he is surprised to find his wife courted by a young lover¹²⁰⁶. Thersander's comic entrance, shouting all the way from the harbour¹²⁰⁷, is a hint that indicates that Melite's husband, although he studied Homer in his youth¹²⁰⁸, did not learn much about concealed returns of long-absent husbands. Cleitophon too has a touch of Penelope, since has recently lost his beloved on the sea¹²⁰⁹. Cleitophon's refusal to sleep with Melite until Ephesus reminds the reader of Penelope's shroud, promising, postponing, but not fulfilling sexual expectations. However, Cleitophon's Cyclopean past suggests a different

¹²⁰³ 5.11.6.

¹²⁰⁴ 5.23.4.

¹²⁰⁵ Odysseus is presented as caring for his companions, although none of them survives.

¹²⁰⁶ 6.5.1, ἰδοῦ, φησὶν, οὗτος ὁ μοιχὸς βακχεύων ἡμῖν ἐπεισι καὶ τῆς σῆς γυναικὸς ἔχων λάφυρα. Cleitophon is described not only as Melite's suitor, but also as the one that stole Melite's wealth, ironically, her garment. Cf. Penelope's suitors who are living on Odysseus' property.

¹²⁰⁷ 5.23.4, ὁ Θέρσανδρος κατὰ πόδας εἰστρέχει. If staged Thersander would have entered from the right parodos.

¹²⁰⁸ 8.9.3, ὁμηρίζων μὲν τὰ πολλά.

¹²⁰⁹ 5.16.7.

development once Melantho appears alongside Melite in the parallel intrusion scene.

The epic theme is here doubly subverted and can be identified either as simple allusion or as a potential, but undeveloped, pattern: Cleitophon, the Achilles-like male hero, is in Penelope's role, and Melite in that of the suitors; further, the Penelope-figures, in other words, both Melite and Cleitophon, fail to maintain the epic level of morality and they surrender to desire; moreover, the reader is reminded that Cleitophon, now disguised like Achilles, now cunning like Odysseus, failed in his intrusion into Cyclops' cave, whereas Melite succeeded. In fact, the episode with Cleitophon as Achilles in Scyros, far from making the *Iliad* the only '*textual hieroglyph*' of the novel¹²¹⁰, suggests the merging of the two epics into one: an Achilles-like hero, in Penelope's role, is courted by the Odysseus-like Melite.

As Morales observes, the abuse of the chastity test¹²¹¹ in Melite's case shows the extent of the subversion of the traditional, ideal, fidelity theme as well as, I argue here, of the *Odyssey*. This intertext does not ultimately influence the plot of the novel, which is still woven around the recognition of Leucippe, but emphasizes, by contrast, the difference between the 'ideal', epic and novelistic, female characterisation and that of AT's novel. Just as Odysseus hid the epic equipment, the sword, under the female hair-pins meant for Lycomedes' daughters, AT hid his sensual material, the intercourse

¹²¹⁰ Morales, (2004) p.65ff.

¹²¹¹ Morales, (2004) p.231.

of Cleitophon and Melite, in the centre of an epic, Penelopean-seeming, context. The Homeric model is similar in nature to the skilful handling of the Homeric mime-actor on board ship. These subversions of the traditional epic and novelistic material underline the idealism of the female protagonist, who, from Book 4 onwards conforms progressively to the requirements of the novel's virginity plot. The Cleitophon-Melite side plot is not one of τῶν περὶ Λευκίππης διηγημάτων.

2. Recognising the narrative strategy

The Achilles Tatius-narrator

The Ego-narrative of AT's novel and its relationship to the *Odyssey* has been often observed¹²¹². What has escaped scholars is partly the distinction between the AT-narrator and Cleitophon¹²¹³, which is mirrored in the description of the double port at Sidon:

δίδυμος λιμὴν ἐν κόλπῳ πλατύς, ἡρέμα κλείων τὸ πέλαγος· ἥ γὰρ ὁ κόλπος κατὰ πλευρὰν ἐπὶ δεξιὰ κοιλαίνεται, στόμα δεύτερον ὀρώρεται¹²¹⁴.

The double harbour of the port of Sidon stands, as I see it, for the narrative itself. The unnamed Ego-narrator sacrifices to Astarte after a storm; the second, deeper harbour, is a harbour to host the ships in the winter. Accordingly the outside-adventure-narrative question is formed around the reasons of the narrator's arrival at Sidon and the reader expects an Odyssean

¹²¹² Most, (1989), Fusillo, (1991 (1989)) p.166, 'la situation épique', and Reardon, (1994b).

¹²¹³ Only a footnote in Reardon, (1994b) p.93.

¹²¹⁴ 1.1.1-2.

narrative of sea-storms and shipwrecks. The description of the painting, when we move from the harbour to the city, brings the narrator to the inner *locus amoenus*¹²¹⁵ where Cleitophon begins his narrative of the ὕβρεις ἐξ ἔρωτος¹²¹⁶. In a narrative coup then, the 'adventure' *Odyssey*-like storm-narrative is transposed into a 'love' narrative. The duplicity of Cleitophon's love-tale is echoed in the parallel scene, in which Leucippe is the audience of erotic myths: this second ἄλσος is presented as double, the real one and its reflection, and underlines AT's preference for double constructions¹²¹⁷ as his narrative choice.

The Cleitophon-narrator

Cleitophon narrator presents himself immediately, name, father, country of origin, and a brief summary of his first nineteen years. His narrative loses its 'account' form and becomes more detailed once he meets with Leucippe; the arrival of the beautiful cousin from Byzantium is prepared for by a dream, after which Cleitophon decides to keep silent, but he already knows that something is about to happen¹²¹⁸; Leucippe appears to him as a revelation or as the rising sun, παρθένος ἐκφαίνεται μοι¹²¹⁹; from this point onwards the narrative is woven around a series of progressive mis-recognitions of Leucippe, which underline Cleitophon's weaving of the plot. Cleitophon's

¹²¹⁵ 1.2.3. Note the similarity of this *locus amoenus*, described as a place for 'amorous speeches' and the one at 1.15.1-8, ὡς δοκεῖν τὸ ἄλσος εἶναι διπλοῦν, τὸ μὲν τῆς ἀληθείας, τὸ δὲ τῆς σκιᾶς, in which Cleitophon invites Leucippe to prepare her for the ἐρωτικὴν ἀκρόασιν (1.14.1). Duplicity in AT is a Platonic echo.

¹²¹⁶ 1.2.2.

¹²¹⁷ Repath, (2006) about the two Callisthenes.

¹²¹⁸ 1.3.5, κατ'ἐμαυτὸν δὲ πονηρὰ ἐσκεπτόμεν.

¹²¹⁹ 1.4.2.

woes appear to be the result of his ignorance, οὐκ οἶδα, in love matters¹²²⁰, since despite his sexual training with prostitutes he appears to be a πρωτόπειρος¹²²¹. The narrative is structured as a 'sentimental education', not a sexual one, which is centred around the gradual recognitions of Leucippe.

Recognising Leucippe

With Cleitophon's philosophical digressions on the nature and texture of love, Leucippe is left aside, fulfilling only her role as the object of desire. While Cleitophon is unable to recognise his fortune, his double, Callisthenes, falls in love with Leucippe's beauty and decides to seize her¹²²². Having never seen her he mis-recognises Calligone as Leucippe, τὴν δὲ Καλλιγόνην ἰδὼν τὴν ἀδελφὴν τὴν ἐμήν¹²²³. But Callisthenes recognises the wrong woman, although he recognises Leucippe's mother¹²²⁴, and the misrecognition is underlined by Cleitophon's need for precision: note the τὴν ἀδελφὴν τὴν ἐμήν, which indicates that the name Calligone alone is not enough. The emphasis should be read in combination with the previously released information that Leucippe, on the day of Calligone's pre-nuptial rituals, pretended to be ill¹²²⁵. Therefore Cleitophon's specification 'my own sister' is a reminder of the reason for Leucippe's absence: they were planning to meet secretly. However, even Cleitophon is not always able to recognise

¹²²⁰ 1.9.4, 1.9.7, οὐκ οἶδα γὰρ ἐγὼ τὰς ὁδοὺς.

¹²²¹ 2.37.5 ἐγὼ μὲν πρωτόπειρος ὢν εἰς γυναῖκας, ὅσον ὁμῆσαι ταῖς εἰς Ἀφροδίτην πωλουμέναις; 2.38.1, μὴ πρωτόπειρος ἀλλὰ γέρων εἰς Ἀφροδίτην.

¹²²² The recognition scenes that I am treating here have been described as narratorial incompetence by Reardon, (1994b)p.246.

¹²²³ 2.16.2, ἐγνώρισε γὰρ τοῦ Σωστράτου τὴν γυναῖκα.

¹²²⁴ 2.16.2.

¹²²⁵ 2.16.1.

who/where Leucippe is, which results in the three consequential apparent deaths and resurrections of the heroine. Thus the narrative is woven around the narrator's failed efforts to recognise the object of his desire.

Is Leucippe dead or alive?

In the first description of Leucippe' narrow escape from being sacrificed the main accent is upon Cleitophon's (in)ability to recognise with precision his beloved:

καὶ αὐτοὺς μὲν οἵτινες ἦσαν οὐκ εἶδον, ἦσαν γὰρ ὥπλισμένοι, τὴν δὲ κόρην Λευκίππην οὖσαν ἐγνώρισα¹²²⁶.

The vague description of the victim as first the girl, as τὴν κόρην, and then as Leucippe, is characteristic of Cleitophon's imprecise reading of the scene¹²²⁷. His remark that he did not recognise the two men is a piece of information that will only be explained later. At this stage, the mention of 'two men' would be enough, but the insistence on Cleitophon's inability to recognise Leucippe's guards, who will then be revealed as Satyrus and Menelaus, gives a clue towards the upcoming revelation of the truth¹²²⁸. The revelation/recognition of Leucippe's adventures, which is tactfully described as τὰ περὶ Λευκίππης¹²²⁹, comes with a recognition narrative of the previous adventures of Menelaus and Satyrus, which the first person narrative of

¹²²⁶ 3.15.2.

¹²²⁷ Reardon, (1994b) p.246: 'the readers are deliberately prevented from knowing what has really happened'. What Reardon treats as inconsistencies regarding the ego-narrative I study them here as intentionally released informations.

¹²²⁸ 3.18.2, ἀλλ' ἰδοὺ καὶ φίλημα ἀληθινόν; 3.18.3, ἀποκάλυψαι!

¹²²⁹ 3.20.1, τὰ περὶ τῆς Λευκίππης πυθόμενος.

Cleitophon could not have covered in advance¹²³⁰, despite the hint that Cleitophon did not recognise Leucippe's guards.

The same motif, as argued above in the Iphigenia section, has been manipulated for Leucippe's near-decapitation; again the heroine is referred to generally as ἡ κόρη, but this time there is no precision that she is Leucippe¹²³¹. Cleitophon memory recovers only when Leucippe only he holds her headless body:

νῦν μοι, Λευκίππη, τέθνηκας ἀληθῶς θάνατον διπλοῦν...μικρόν μοί σου μέρος καταλέλειπται ἐν ὅψει τοῦ μείζονος· αὕτη δὲ ἐν ὀλίγῳ τὸ πᾶν σου κρατεῖ¹²³².

Leucippe's death this time is presented as truer, νῦν ἀληθῶς, than the previous time. Cleitophon's and the reader's partial knowledge - τὸ μέρος, τὸ πᾶν - is echoed in the segmented grasp of Leucippe's body and is parallel to Chariton's distinction between πᾶν and μόνον: hence Cleitophon διηγεῖται to Cleinias ἅπαντα περὶ Λευκίππης¹²³³. Nevertheless, despite Cleitophon's seemingly obscure narrative, the narrator has taken care to provide the reader with the required tools to decipher the scene, or to recognise a dead body¹²³⁴. In the programmatic sub-plot of Charicles death, Cleinias laments the disfiguration of the boy's face.

¹²³⁰ Since Cleitophon's narrative follows, not the order of the events but the order of how these events became known to the narrator. On Cleitophon's incapability to follow his program see Reardon, (1994b).

¹²³¹ 5.7.4.

¹²³² 5.7.8.

¹²³³ 5.8.3, ἐγὼ δὲ τὰ περὶ τῆς Λευκίππης ἅπαντα.

¹²³⁴ Again Reardon, (1994b) p.247, interprets the scene as a trick of the 'strict ego-narrative device', while varying the 'recipe'.

τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοις τῶν ἀποθανόντων κἄν ἵχνος τῶν γνωρισμάτων διασώζεται
...σοῦ δὲ ὁμοῦ καὶ ταῦτα διέφθειρεν ἡ τύχη, καὶ μοι τέθνηκας θάνατον διπλοῦν,
ψυχῇ καὶ σώματι¹²³⁵.

I would here¹²³⁶ like to draw attention to the importance of the face, *πρόσωπον*, in the recognition process. Cleitophon has not yet slept with Leucippe, hence he cannot recognise her body. Not only this, but the Charicles case mentions one's incapacity to recognise a person if the face of the dead body is disfigured, but if it is missing the recognition is impossible. Therefore the narrator, like the reader, knows that Leucippe is not dead, since she is not fully recognised because of her missing head.

The second recognition of Leucippe is realised through a medium other than an eyewitness, her letter to Cleitophon:

λαβὼν δέ, πρὶν ἀναγνῶναί με, κατεπλάγην εὐθύς· ἐγνώρισα γὰρ Λευκίππης τὰ γράμματα. ἐγγέγραπτο δὲ τάδε· Λευκίππη Κλειτοφῶντι τῷ δεσπότῃ μου¹²³⁷.

Cleitophon, who was unable to recognise Leucippe dressed in rags¹²³⁸, is fully competent to recognise her handwriting. Leucippe's letter is the first recapitulation of the events that followed Leucippe's death which was supposedly unknown to the narrator and the reader, a cluster of verbs (*τέθνηκα, πέπραμαι, ἐδέθην*), although the αἴτιον of her miraculous salvation is not yet disclosed. Cleitophon cannot believe his eyes when

¹²³⁵ 1.13.3-4.

¹²³⁶ The similarities of the two passages are presented in the current document, p.254ff. RIGHT REFERENCE ?

¹²³⁷ 5.18.2.

¹²³⁸ 5.19.2, οὐδ' ἂν ἄλλος αὐτὴν ἰδὼν γνωρίσειεν, ἔφηβον οὕτω γενομένην. Note that Leucippe's transformation into a young boy is parallel to Cleitophon's dressing up as a woman, in Melite's gown, although Cleitophon is immediately recognised by Sosthenes as the μοιχός; cf. footnote 1206, p.336 (current document). Hägg, (1971b) p.133 and Reardon, (1994b) p.246, note 11, note that the surprise of the ego-narrative is spoiled by Cleitophon's mention that the servant reminded him of Leucippe, 5.17.3; however this practice is not in contradiction with the general attitude of closure and disclosure of information.

reading the letter and wants to see τοῖς ὄμμασι τὰγαθά¹²³⁹. The recognition of Leucippe is doubled by Melite's discovery of the letter, and the recognition of Leucippe is fulfilled, as a recognition of text, a result of ἀνάγνωσις:

ὥς δὲ ἀνέγνω καθ' ἑαυτὴν γενομένη καὶ τὸ τῆς Λευκίππης εὗρεν ὄνομα, βάλλεται μὲν τὴν καρδίαν εὐθέως, γνωρίσασα τοῦνομα¹²⁴⁰.

At this point Thersander's triumphal entrance suspends the full recognition of Leucippe who is reported missing: Melite pretends ignorance and tries to convince Thersander of her innocence with a nice plea in which she states that she took care of Cleitophon because his adventures reminded her of her husband's. Melite's manipulative version of the story is reported as τέχνην λόγων ἐπενόησεν, ἥτις μεμιγμένην εἶχε τῷ σοφίσματι τὴν ἀλήθειαν¹²⁴¹. Such sophistication in the delivery of a partial truth appears also in the double narrative about Leucippe: one version is presented by Thersander's spokesman, who delivers a nicely made-up tale about Leucippe's falsely-reported death¹²⁴²; the other is Cleitophon's confession of despair, now that what he thought to be true seems to evaporate like a dream¹²⁴³, to the court, to whom, after he is unable to see her with his eyes, he confesses having her murdered¹²⁴⁴: ἐγὼ δὲ πᾶσαν ὑμῖν ἐρῶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν¹²⁴⁵. But this time he knows that the truth is untrue.

¹²³⁹ 1.19.3.

¹²⁴⁰ 5.24.1-2.

¹²⁴¹ 6.8.4.

¹²⁴² 7.1.4, παρὰ τοῦ Θερσάνδρου δεδιδαγμένος τεχνικῶς πάνυ περὶ τῆς Λευκίππης λόγον ἐμβαλεῖν, ὥς εἴη περὶ οὐκ ἐκείνην.

¹²⁴³ 7.5.1, ἀληθὲς μοι γέγονεν ὄνειρων ἡδονή

¹²⁴⁴ Cf. 7.5.1, τίς μοι Λευκίππην ἔδειξεν εἰς καινὴν ὑπόθεσιν συμφορῶν;

¹²⁴⁵ 7.7.1-6.

Cleitophon, who cannot believe his eyes, seems to suffer from a Doubting Thomas complex. Yet he is able to craft a truth-like narrative, which echoes the same generic principles and devices of the novelistic διήγησις that I indicated above: all previous versions are false, ληροῦσι πάντες and only he is capable of telling πᾶσαν ἀλήθειαν. It takes some time before Leucippe as text/name/letter becomes Leucippe as person and the truth is revealed.

For Reardon, from this point onwards, AT 'is fighting a losing battle' against his strict ego-narrative focalisation¹²⁴⁶. Sostratus easily recognises Cleitophon who is about to be punished:

ἐνθα καὶ ὁ Σώστρατος ἐπιστὰς ὁρᾷ με καὶ γνωρίζει. καὶ γὰρ, ὡς ἔφην ἐν ἀρχῇ τῶν λόγων, ἐν Τύρῳ ποτὲ ἐγεγόνει...προσελθὼν οὖν μοι: 'Κλειτοφῶν οὗτος, Λευκίππη δὲ ποῦ;' ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν γνωρίσας αὐτὸν εἰς γῆν κατένευσα, οἱ δὲ παρόντες αὐτῷ διηγοῦντο ὅσα εἶπον κατ' ἐμαυτοῦ¹²⁴⁷.

The passage is important because it indicates the manipulation of information in the narrative: Sostratus easily recognises Cleitophon as his nephew, and his first question is about Leucippe, the main object of recognition, who has found refuge in Artemis' temple at the very moment of Sostratus' arrival, as underlined by Cleitophon¹²⁴⁸. This inconsistency of knowledge in Cleitophon's first-person narrative is fully compatible with the general attitude of his tale: hinting and releasing information at crucial moments of the narrative regarding Leucippe's recognition and at the same moment pretending that it is only *then* that he experienced the event, a

¹²⁴⁶ Hägg, (1971b) p.249.

¹²⁴⁷ 7.14.1-3.

¹²⁴⁸ 7.13.4, ὥστε μικροῦ τινος ἀπελείφθη τοῦ μὴ τῷ πατρὶ συντυχεῖν.

πρωτόπειρος. Meanwhile Cleitophon-narrator invites the reader to revise the consistency of his narrative reminding him that he had prepared for Sostratus' arrival already in 2.14.2, and in accordance with the ego-narrative device.

With Leucippe in the temple at the very moment of Sostratus' arrival the recognition scene is narrowly averted, and it gives way to a last emotional *stretto*: Sostratus listens to the recapitulatory narrative regarding Cleitophon's adventures - εἶπον κατ'ἐμᾶντοῦ - and learn, the official truth, that Leucippe is dead. At this very moment a messenger comes out of the temple to narrate what Cleitophon and Sostratus do not know. Cleinias interrogates the messenger as follows:

καὶ ἅμα πρὸς τὸν ἄγγελον εἶπε: 'μὴ καλή; 'οὐκ ἄλλην τοιαύτην, ἔφη, μετὰ τὴν Ἀρτεμιν εἶδον'. πρὸς τοῦτο ἐγὼ πηδῶ καὶ βοῶ· 'Λευκίππην λέγεις'. 'καὶ μάλα,' ἔφη· 'καλεῖσθαι γὰρ τοῦτο ἔλεγεν αὕτη, καὶ πατρίδα Βυζάντιον καὶ πατέρα Σώστρατον ἔχειν'¹²⁴⁹.

The above passage is again a partial recognition of Leucippe, since Cleitophon is in jail and cannot meet her. The means of recognition, Leucippe's beauty, is not enough evidence. This time a full account of her identity is given, equivalent to that of Cleitophon at the beginning of this tale. The reader is reminded that it is precisely the same information that Leucippe deliberately hid during her detention as Lacaena: name, husband's name, father's name, and country of origin¹²⁵⁰.

Of course, Cleitophon could not know at the time what Leucippe had in

¹²⁴⁹ 7.15.2.

¹²⁵⁰ 6.16.4-5, οὐδὲ πιστεύσειας, ἐμοὶ λεγούση. φοβούμαι καὶ ἐὰν μοι πιστεύσης...μὴ τὸ ἄκαιρόν μου τῆς ἐλευθερίας τὸν φίλτατον ἀπολέση.

mind; and the ego-focalisation seems disrupted. However the sequential alignment of information is in full accordance with the general narrative technique. Leucippe withholds the information regarding her identity until the very end, since whether Thersander will believe her or not, an inopportune recognition (ἄκαιρον) may subvert the narrative's orientation, its structure.

The end of Book 7 is the καίριον σημεῖον at which a recognition scene can take place. The audience praises Artemis' providence having learned τὸ πᾶν¹²⁵¹ and Cleitophon gazes ἅπαντα at his beloved's face¹²⁵². Cleitophon now faces the impartial truth, Leucippe's face, and the recognition is completed. However, a last twist awaits the couple. Leucippe not only has to be recognised as Sostratus' daughter and Cleitophon's wife, but also as a virgin.

Is Leucippe a virgin or not?

The recognition of Leucippe's virginity and of Melite's marital devotion which is Cleitophon's 'virginity test' is the culmination of AT's narrative. Leucippe first enters and exits the cave of Pan that proves her to be a virgin; Melite is tried in the spring after Leucippe, which prolongs the question regarding Cleitophon's chastity¹²⁵³, but finally is exculpated as well. After the double trial Sosthenes is captured and tortured (indeed one asks why he was

¹²⁵¹ 7.16.1.

¹²⁵² 7.16.4.

¹²⁵³ 5.20.5, εἴ τις ἔστι καὶ ἐν ἀνδράσι παρθενία.

not captured earlier), and *πάντα σαφῶς λέγει...οὐ παρέλιπε δὲ οὐδὲ ὅσα ἰδίᾳ πρὸ τῶν τῆς Λευκίππης θυρῶν διελέχθησαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους περὶ αὐτῆς*¹²⁵⁴. Sosthenes' detailed, even most private conversations are reported, and his confession is the source of Cleitophon-narrator's secret omniscience.

After the final recognitions, those of male and female chastity, which happen to correspond to those in the *Odyssey* - Penelope's proof of faithfulness - is the time for the complete recapitulation of the previous versions of the novel, during which each of the narrators gives his/her point of view. At this point the reader learns about Calligone's fate, and even the great αἰνιγμα of the novel, Leucippe's near-decapitation, is solved. The narrative does not withhold any other information and therefore is brought to its end.

This analysis of AT's narrative may illuminate another possible explanation for the ego-narrative inconsistencies: the ego-situation in AT should not be confused with the analogous mode of narrative in contemporary literature; Cleitophon-narrator, like Melite's account to Thersander, is delivering a product of the art of speech, a series of skilfully withheld and disclosed lies and truths, all of which he has previously hinted at in the course of his narrative. Cleitophon is an omniscient narrator of his own tale of adventures, who, although he invites the reader to experience suspense at a reversal of fortune, nevertheless gives the right number of

¹²⁵⁴ 8.15.1.

narrative hints (parallels, expressions, information) that encourage his reader to recall the previous material. There is nothing arbitrary in Cleitophon's narrative, which stops at the very moment the full truth according to the novelistic genre is revealed, i.e. Leucippe's (and Calligone's) virginity. Since there are no more hidden clues after the final recapitulations the narrative loses its sophistication and, simply, ends.

Heliodorus

After Chariton's novel Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* is probably the ὁμηρικώτατον. The use of Homer is not limited to the couple-recognition scene, but it extends to the entire narrative technique of the novel. Scholarship has discussed the Homeric intertexts extensively: firstly allusions like that of Calasiris (and/or Charicleia and/or Theagenes) to Odysseus, Charicleia to Penelope, or the νόστος journey; secondly, structural correspondences, like Calasiris' recapitulation and the *Apologoi*, or the meticulous recognition scene, and some details like the discussion on Homer the Egyptian¹²⁵⁵. Moreover, Winkler has discussed the Odysseus-like cunning of Calasiris, while Morgan reads the whole Heliodoran narrative as a 'riddle'¹²⁵⁶. More recently Whitmarsh and Elmer have discussed¹²⁵⁷ the hybridity of the text and

¹²⁵⁵ Morgan, (1996a) p.436, discussing Keyes, (1922). On recognition in Homer and Heliodorus Cave, (1988) pp.17-20. A very good discussion of Odyssean techniques is Anderson, (1997).

¹²⁵⁶ Winkler, (1982), Morgan, (1994).

¹²⁵⁷ Both based on Laplace, (1992) identification of Charicleia-protagonist with Charicleia-text/novel.

the importance of Homer in the construction of Greek identity¹²⁵⁸, while for Elmer Homeric echoes fade after the very Homeric beginning of the narrative¹²⁵⁹.

Two modes of storytelling

There is no reason to repeat the numerous Odyssean allusions encountered in the *Aethiopica*, for which see the previously mentioned major secondary literature. What I want to examine here is the release of information according to the two principal storytelling models: that of Cnemon and that of Calasiris, and to argue that, against the post-Winkler secondary literature, Heliodorus, through Charicles, opts not for Calasiris' mode of storytelling, but for that of Cnemon.

Cnemon's narrative is elaborated in a diachronic mode: the narrator describes a past event, already accomplished, and much is reported proleptically, via dreams, omens, and authorial statements and/or hints. This reading is self-indulgent and caters to the reader's pleasure because s/he can 'guess right' what comes next: in other words, the reader is given hints of how s/he should interpret seemingly equivocal dreams/omens/prolepsis. The pleasure from reading such a plot is that the reader is placed in the narrator's place, and is allowed, almost simultaneously, to control and to prescribe the

¹²⁵⁸ Whitmarsh, (1998) and Whitmarsh, (1999) p.22ff.: 'Heliodorus may be misreading Homer (as a nostos-journey)... that meaning strategically oversimplifying the parent text, in order to construct and represent his own literary difference'.

¹²⁵⁹ Elmer, (2008) p.416; also pp.418-419, Elmer claims that intertexts depend on the narrators' identity (i.e. the Athenian Cnemon narrates a Phaedra tale, Calasiris an Egyptian-Homer tale) and that the remaining third part of the narrative is left to the omniscient Phoenician narrator. For the identity of the Phoenician narrator see Bowie, (1998).

tale. There is not much surprise or suspense, since the outcome is already known. This is the narrative strategy that we have so far observed in Chariton, Xenophon, Longus, and AT.

The second mode of storytelling is a synchronic one: in it the events are narrated in the order of their happening, with little or no prolepsis, and are intended to surprise the unprepared reader¹²⁶⁰. In this, the omniscient first-person narrator pretends that he narrates the events 'as they occurred', without making connections with what follows, thus increasing suspense (φόβος) and surprise (θαῦμα).

The *Aethiopica* starts in the middle of the action and seems to have no direction and give no information. Not only are the brigands unaware of the identity of the couple, but readers too are launched into a detective story, as eloquently presented by Winkler¹²⁶¹, but without clues, as I will show. The seemingly steady informational equilibrium of the novel seems to be supported by the characters' ignorance of the situation: the robbers cannot decipher the scene, οὐδὲ συνιέναι¹²⁶²; equally Charicleia cannot understand the sudden changes of setting, οὐδὲν συνιῆσα¹²⁶³. There is nothing to discover in this narrative tableau, which leaves the reader without clues and motivated only by a desire to know what happens next, or how the narrative will start moving.

¹²⁶⁰ Winkler, (1982) p.287: 'suspense is an effect of knowledge, surprise of ignorance'; and previously by Bühler, (1976).

¹²⁶¹ Winkler, (1982) p.291.

¹²⁶² 1.1.7 and 1.3.2; other indications of ignorance: 1.2.1, θέαμα ἀπορώτερον; 1.2.6, ἀγνοία τῶν ὁρωμένων; 1.3.5, τῶν ὁρωμένων ἀγνοίας...εἰκαζον.

¹²⁶³ 1.4.1.

The term used to mark the beginning of the narrative, a narrative of clues not of images, is Charicleia's lamentation, ἀνακινούσης αὐτῆς τὰ πάθη, that gives the first information: their previous story, that contains ἀμαρτήματα such as exile, shipwreck, bandits and their names¹²⁶⁴. However, before any other clue is given Cnemon bursts in, willing to set into motion - κινεῖς κἀναμοχλεύεις - his own διήγημα¹²⁶⁵. Before, then, we enter the main narrative, περὶ Charicleia, Cnemon presents his version of a sophisticated, tragic-comic-fashioned, story-telling mode.

Cnemon as narrator: proleptic storytelling

Hunter, commenting on 1.10.4 (Cnemon's report of Demaenete's words to Aristippus), claims that the passage is 'the most striking example of narrative omniscience in his whole account', contesting Winkler's view of Cnemon's tale as an unsophisticated one, versus Calasiris' sophistication¹²⁶⁶. Indeed, as I argue, Cnemon's tale is a long narrative of prolepsis rather than a naive, straightforward, novella. After discussing Cnemon's tale, I will continue by arguing that Calasiris' διηγήματα are the opposite of what is traditionally held; not a cunning narrative of withheld information, but rather a straightforward narrative, interrupted and shaped at Cnemon's anticipation.

The Cnemon story is announced as a tragedy (serious or not, it does not

¹²⁶⁴ 1.8.1-3. The term ἀμαρτήματα probably echoing the novel's plot as the result of Eros' revenge; cf. Chariton 8.1.3, Chaereas, ὀβρισην; Xenophon, 1.4.5. Eros prepares a μεγάλην τιμωρίαν for Habrocomes.

¹²⁶⁵ 1.8.7.

¹²⁶⁶ Hunter, (1998) p.44. I am here elaborating on Hunter's thoughts, but my approach takes into consideration the different expressions of (ἀνα)γνωρίζω in the narrative.

matter since its main pattern, the Phaedra, is a 'tragic' one)¹²⁶⁷, set in Athens, and in the first five lines he gives all the necessary details of the content: his step-mother is described as a γύναιον ἀρχέκακον, and δεινὴ in the trickeries of love-games. The seduction of Aristippos is a result of a well-played act since Demaenete ὑπεποιεῖτο, and ἐπλάττετο continuously. The well-versed reader, like the audience of Lysias' *Against Eratosthenes*¹²⁶⁸, will have no doubts of the outcome when the determining hint is given, μητέρα ἀναπλάττουσα ... ἐρωμένην ὑποφαίνουσα¹²⁶⁹: a step-mother plot is to be expected. What matters is not the content of Cnemon's tale but the new details that spice up the old pattern, as I discussed in the 'Phaedra' chapters¹²⁷⁰.

Cnemon's proleptic presentation is more pronounced when he closes his first narrative unit, foretelling that οὐ μὴν ἀτιμώρητος Δημαινέτη περιελείφθῃ, but he refuses tell how the punishment was carried out¹²⁷¹, which makes his audience explicitly ask for the ending¹²⁷². What is important to notice, however, is that Cnemon's tale focuses on the details of the content and not on the outcome.

Cnemon's narrative introduces Thisbe, whose role is crucial for the first recognition of Charicleia, which I will discuss later. The Athenian youth knew beforehand that Thisbe was in Egypt, with Nausicles, but he is still amazed at the coincidence, i.e. to find Thisbe in the same cave he left Charicleia: he acts

¹²⁶⁷ Cf. Hunter, (1998) p.44 discussing Paulsen (1992): 'we are unable to take that 'tragedy' seriously'.

¹²⁶⁸ Hunter, (1998) p.45.

¹²⁶⁹ 1.9.2-4.

¹²⁷⁰ See above, p.230.

¹²⁷¹ 1.14.2.

¹²⁷² 1.14.2, καὶ μὴν προσεπιτρέψεις γε ἡμᾶς.

as if surprised ἀχανῆς ἐσθήκει¹²⁷³. This time his audience, Theagenes, urges him to continue their search for Charicleia, since Cnemon's Thisbe tale can be heard later, ἔξεσται καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα γιγνώσκειν¹²⁷⁴. Indeed, when Charicleia is found, Cnemon delivers the second part of his narrative, but only after Theagenes summarises the facts to Charicleia:

θαυμάσεις μὲν, Θίσβην δ' οὖν εἶναι Κνήμων ὅδε φησὶ τὴν Ἀθηναίαν ἐκείνην τὴν ψάλτριαν τὴν τῶν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐπιβουλῶν καὶ Δημαινέτην ποιήτριαν¹²⁷⁵.

Since Charicleia has the outcome in front of her eyes, Thisbe's body, then the only question remaining is πῶς Thisbe reaches Egypt, καθάπερ ἐκ μηχανῆς and πῶς she remained unnoticed¹²⁷⁶. To these questions Cnemon presents an account of his knowledge - ἃ γνωρίζω¹²⁷⁷ - based on the testimony of a certain Anticles¹²⁷⁸.

The third part of the Thisbe-tale is written in the letter she is carrying. In it she congratulates him on Demaenete's death, but postpones the revelation of the circumstances, τὸ δὲ ὅπως, until she meets Cnemon in person¹²⁷⁹. The second part of her adventure, her captivity among the bandits, is only to be expected since Cnemon and Theagenes (and the reader) have associated her with Thyamis' victim. Once more the Cnemon-tale, either in direct or indirect (letter) mode, manipulates prolepsis as its main narrative tool. Like tragedy, in which the myth-plot is known in advance, the interest is built upon the

¹²⁷³ 1.5.4. This is probably 'the most surprising event in Cnemon's world', as noted by Hunter, (1998) p.46.

¹²⁷⁴ 2.6.2.

¹²⁷⁵ 2.8.3.

¹²⁷⁶ 2.8.3.

¹²⁷⁷ 2.8.4.

¹²⁷⁸ 2.9.4, ἔχω γιγνώσκειν Ἀντικλέους τινός.

¹²⁷⁹ 2.10.1.

details that lead to the outcome and are not meant to surprise; rather the reader's amazement is to be centred on the interweaving of the different threads of action that lead to the recognition of the dead body as Thisbe's, in Cnemon's narrative.

It should be noticed that the identification of Charicleia's double with Thisbe is not necessary for the development of the main plot¹²⁸⁰. Besides, Charicleia's voice is heard before the recognition of the body as Thisbe's¹²⁸¹ and the reader knows from Thyamis' dream that she will not die¹²⁸². Nevertheless the scene is well staged as a 'recognition' process, as I will discuss in the recognition part of this section relevant to Charicleia.

Cnemon as reader: synchronic storytelling

What Cnemon knows at the beginning of Calasiris' tale is that Charicleia and Theagenes are alive and are somewhere on the way to Chemmis; he also 'knows', because he has been Thyamis' interpreter, that they are brother and sister¹²⁸³; the main narrative has tactfully omitted Cnemon from Theagenes' central lamentation scene, sending him to fetch the torch; thirdly, he believes that Charicleia's father will die, because he so interpreted her dream of her blinded eye¹²⁸⁴. What Cnemon reveals to Calasiris is only the first clue, namely that his 'children' are alive; then he asks for his payment, the full story.

¹²⁸⁰ Hunter, (1998) p.42: 'Cnemon's story is neither irrelevant (particularly for Nausicles) nor totally sealed off from the framing narrative'.

¹²⁸¹ 2.5.2.

¹²⁸² 1.18.2. The narrator informs the reader that this was the interpretation of Thyamis' desire, 1.19.1, οὕτως αὐτῷ τῆς επιθυμίας ἐξηγουμένης.

¹²⁸³ 1.21.3.

¹²⁸⁴ 2.16.5.

Calasiris characteristically replies to him that he has broken the narrative stability, by wanting to know *σμῆνος κακῶν καὶ τὸν ἐκ τούτων βόμβον ἄπειρον ἐπὶ σεαυτὸν κινεῖς*¹²⁸⁵. The emphasis on the movement - *κινεῖς* - recalls Cnemon's opening lines¹²⁸⁶, and revises the idea of the narrative-in-progress, contrasted with the narrative immobility that the first ending (the recognition of Charicleia's *Scheintod*) has brought. From the new διήγημα Cnemon learns that Calasiris is not Charicleia's father, and that the two beautiful young persons are not siblings but lovers.

Cnemon actively shapes Calasiris' narrative: because he knows that that Charicleia and Theagenes are alive (and in the second part that Charicleia is found), he takes all his time to listen to the most important details of the *Charicleia and Theagenes* account, without focusing on the main point, Charicleia's recognition. Firstly, Calasiris offers Cnemon a tale about Charicleia's origins¹²⁸⁷, which initially stirs Cnemon's curiosity; his most characteristic intervention is when he comments on Charicles' twice-embedded narrative, in which he expressed his curiosity regarding Charicleia's origins:

ὑπέστρεφον ἀνιαρῶς ἄγαν διατεθείς καὶ ὥσπερ οἱ βαρεῖάν τινα πληγὴν εἰληφότες ὅτι δὴ μοι γινῶναι μὴ ἐξεγένετο τὰ κατὰ τὴν κόρην τίς ἢ πόθεν ἦ τίνων. 'μὴ θαυμάσης' εἶπεν ὁ Κνήμων· 'ἀσχάλλω γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς οὐκ ἀκούσας,

¹²⁸⁵ 2.21.5. On the irony about Charicleia's paternity see Hunter, (1998) p.48, note 34. In my view, Cnemon's fictive interpretation is just a pretext in order to learn some information about Charicleia; and since the common way of introducing a character is his name, place of birth, and parents, this is the most obvious question - after having learned that they are Ephesians.

¹²⁸⁶ 1.8.7, *κινεῖς κἀναμοχλεύεις*.

¹²⁸⁷ Discussed thoroughly in Anderson, (1997).

ἀλλ' ἴσως ἀκούσομαι'. 'ἀκούση' ἔφη ὁ Καλάσιρις¹²⁸⁸.

Calasiris promises Cnemon in a short prolepsis that he will 'learn'; but the hasty Cnemon is unable to focus on one storyline and seeks the truth elsewhere, in the small details and digressions that surround the main narrative: the ritual procession for Neoptolemus, the hymn to Thetis, the clothing of Charicleia and Theagenes, and even a small detail regarding Calasiris' truth-like dream of Artemis and Apollo:

μὴ ὄναρ ἦν ἢ ὄψις ἀλλ' ὕπαρ...ἐγὼ δὲ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα συνίειν ὡς ἐωράκειν, εἰς τίνας δὲ ἀνθρώπους ἢ εἰς τίνα γῆν παραπέμπεσθαι τοὺς νέους τοῖς θεοῖς φίλον ἠπόρουν. καὶ ὁ Κνήμων: ταῦτα μὲν, ἔφη, ὦ πάτερ, εἰς ὕστερον αὐτός τε ἔγνωσ ἔρεῖς τε πρὸς ἡμᾶς· ἀλλὰ τίνα δὴ τρόπον ἔφασκες ἐνδεδεῖχθαί σοι τοὺς θεοὺς ὅτι μὴ ἐνύπνιον ἦλθον ἀλλ' ἐναργῶς ἐφάνησαν; ὃν τρόπον, εἶπεν, ὦ τέκνον, καὶ ὁ σοφὸς Ὅμηρος αἰνίττεται, οἱ πολλοὶ δὲ τὸ αἰνίγμα παρατρέχουσιν· ἵχνια γὰρ μετόπισθεν, ὡς ἐκεῖνός που λέγει, ποδῶν ἠδὲ κνημῶν¹²⁸⁹.

The text cites the *Odyssey*, μὴ ὄναρ ἦν ἢ ὄψις ἀλλ' ὕπαρ¹²⁹⁰, when Odysseus interprets Penelope's dream, foretelling to her - because of private knowledge - the death of the suitors. Calasiris tries to add suspense to his narrative, when he claims that he understood (once more, the term used is συνίειν) but did not know (ἠπόρουν) to which place, land, and people he to bring Theagenes and Charicleia. This is supposed to make his audience wonder, where by whom and how this is going to be implemented. But Cnemon again interrupts, requesting once more theatrical ἐνάργεια rather than epic inquisitiveness; hence he tells him that since he already knows the

¹²⁸⁸ 2.32.3.

¹²⁸⁹ 3.12.1-2.

¹²⁹⁰ Homer, *Odyssey*, 19.547, οὐκ ὄναρ, ἀλλ' ὕπαρ ἐσθλόν, ὃ τοι τετελεσμένον ἔσται.

answer to this question - εἰς ὕστερον αὐτός τε ἔγνωσ - he should focus on the details of his tale. The question Cnemon asks about the τρόπος (note that Calasiris repeats the formulation) of the divine apparition hints that Cnemon is investigating in the wrong direction: instead of asking 'how' they arrived there he asks 'how' Calasiris can perceive divine apparitions. This is because Cnemon too knows the happy end (that Charicleia and Theagenes are alive) beforehand and he can guess that Egypt is to be its location.

Calasiris then in retribution teases him (κνημάων¹²⁹¹) and offers the Athenian two other Homeric couplets: this time he makes clear that, concerning divine apparitions, οἱ πολλοὶ δὲ τὸ αἶνιγμα παρατρέχουσιν, in other words that they tend to 'run by/over' the Homeric passage without recognising the truth. On the other hand, Cnemon is doing a lot of 'running around' in the novel as Jones has pointed out, but also, he is 'running over' the main events of the narrative plot without respecting the constraints of storytelling imposed by Calasiris¹²⁹². In order to learn the truth, Cnemon asks another 'overrunning' question, seemingly focused on the recognition of who Charicleia really is but disrupting Calasiris' narrative line: he asserts that he knows the word but not its meaning (οἶδα τὴν λέξιν ... τὴν θεολογίαν ἡγνότηκα). First Calasiris tries to give a short explanation, during which he tries to convince Cnemon by changing the mood and the mode of storytelling

¹²⁹¹ For the etymology of Cnemon's name as 'lower legs' see Bowie, (1995) p.271 and Jones, (2006) p.557.

¹²⁹² This is a more convenient interpretation of his name, than Bowie's Menandrian Cnemon. Of course both interpretations exist and function in different levels of intertextuality. What I suggest as the etymology of Cnemon's name comes from a close reading of the text.

- πρὸς τὸ μυστικώτερον ἀνακινήσας. The verb ἀνακινῶ, as observed before, is used when a tale is introduced after a narrative equilibrium; here Calasiris' new narrative expands on how wise men recognise gods¹²⁹³.

But Cnemon continues his inquires concentrating on the wrong part of the narrative, the digression, and begs him not to μὴ παραδραμεῖν σε τοῦ λόγου τὴν ἀκρίβειαν¹²⁹⁴; Cnemon's desire to learn Homer's origin is the result of two previous hints in Calasiris' narrative, where he claimed that Homer was Egyptian¹²⁹⁵, but not πολλάκις as Cnemon maintains. When he gives such hints to someone who has been convinced that Homer is Greek, Calasiris naturally waits for the interruption; it is as if he did not want to make the digression autonomously, but needed Cnemon's intervention to break the flow of his narrative¹²⁹⁶. Cnemon's curiosity then generates the next digressive narrative about the Egyptian-Homer, which, although Calasiris describes it as ἔξωρον¹²⁹⁷, he is willing to narrate¹²⁹⁸.

What can be inferred thus far is that Cnemon is not reading for the plot, despite Calasiris' efforts, by avoiding prolepsis, to maintain the effects of suspense and of surprise to his tale. Cnemon as a reader/listener is not so much interested in 'what happened next', which he already knows, but in the

¹²⁹³ 3.13.2, τὴν δὲ σοφοῦ γνῶσιν.

¹²⁹⁴ 3.14.1.

¹²⁹⁵ 2.34.5 and 3.13.3.

¹²⁹⁶ Note the flow images regarding Calasiris' narrative: 3.13.3, the interpretation of the divine apparitions is based on εἰ ἀφ' ἡνῶντοι as coming from ῥέω (οἶον ῥέοντος ἐν τῇ πορείᾳ); in 2.24.4, Calasiris too has been compared by Cnemon to Proteus, οὐ κατ' αὐτὸν τρεπόμενον εἰς ψευδομένην καὶ ῥέουσιν ὅσιν ἀλλὰ με παραφέρειν πειρώμενον.

¹²⁹⁷ 3.14.1, εἰ καὶ ἔξωρον τὸ περὶ τούτων νυνὶ διαλαμβάνειν ἀλλ' ὅμως ἀκούοις ἂν ἐπιτέμνοντος.

¹²⁹⁸ Another occasion in 5.12.2, when Cnemon wants Calasiris to give a geographical aetiology for the tempests in the Ionian sea.

small details of Calasiris' 'text' that he does not know. For Cnemon 'reading' is a process of recognition but of a different kind: instead of patiently collecting the clues of a 'synchronic narrative', he interrupts and eagerly asks for explanations, or anticipating affirmations.

Recognising Charicleia

Heliodorus' in *medias res* composition does not revert to the main question of recognition encountered in his predecessors' narrative forms. The main questions remain: whether Charicleia is alive, where she is, and whether she is faithful. However these questions are treated only in the very first part of his narrative, before Charicleia's actual presentation by Calasiris. This is the innovation that the Heliodorean narrative adds to the well-known recognition pattern.

Is Charicleia dead or alive? A recognition tale by Heliodorus

There is no reason to worry if a character dies in the first two pages of a novel since, in this case, either he is not the protagonist or he does not 'really' die. Therefore the *Aethiopica's* narrative void at the opening rouses no anxiety about the half-dead hero. Only after their first night in captivity, during which Charicleia delivers her vague summary of their fortunes, can the reader sympathise with the couple. In order to do so, he is given uncertain pieces of information. The first is given in Charicleia's lamentation at the opening. She offers a reivew of their past (and future) adventure:

στέρησις τῶν οἰκείων καὶ καταποντιστῶν ἄλωσις καὶ θαλασσῶν μυρίος κίνδυνος καὶ ληστῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἤδη δευτέρα σύλληψις καὶ πικρότερα τῶν ἐν πείρᾳ τὰ προσδοκώμενα...εἰ μὲν εἰς θάνατον ἀνύβριστον, ἡδὺ τὸ τέλος. εἰ δέ με γινώσεταιί τις αἰσχροῶς, ἦν μηδέπω μηδὲ Θεαγένης, ἐγὼ μὲν ἀγχόνη προλήψομαι τὴν ὕβριν¹²⁹⁹.

Cnemon is not present at the scene, so he misses a great opportunity to learn their identity¹³⁰⁰. Charicleia here anticipates the Thyamis-adventures and claims that a happy end would be to die σώφρων without being 'known' to anyone - γινώσεταιί τις αἰσχροῶς. The sort of knowledge that Charicleia here envisages alludes to her virginity, but, in a second reading, it may also be read as a programmatic anticipation of what follows: the recognition of Charicleia as the chaste wife of Theagenes. The threat of a prematurely (un)-ἡδιστον end is not a real one since there are more pages to go.

On the contrary, these empty threats make clear that the narrative they allude to is a novel, and cannot end with the characters' death. This approach is supported by the numerous clues that Charicleia gives: shipwreck, bandits, virginity and purity¹³⁰¹, that classify their adventure within the frame of a 'novel'. All these, if not funnelled properly - meaning if sexual knowledge¹³⁰² comes before the right narrative moment - will generate an early ending to the tale.

¹²⁹⁹ 1.8.1.

¹³⁰⁰ Theagenes refers in the third person to the *μειράκιον*, who gave him the medicine for his wounds. Cnemon enters on that very moment, immediately after Theagenes' remark and addresses him in the second person, as someone who has overheard Theagenes' last words. 1.8.5.

¹³⁰¹ The theme of purity in Elmer, (2008).

¹³⁰² Anderson, (1997) p.312: 'though this episode is brief, the accumulation of finely interwoven and complementary erotic threads around this mysterious object makes an unusually concentrated and narratologically sophisticated contribution to the novel's exploration of desire, sex, marriage, and chastity'.

Thisbe as not-Charicleia

Theagenes and Cnemon light their torches and start their descent into the cave where Charicleia is hidden. Cnemon goes ahead, it seems, because he suddenly distinguishes a dead body that he mistakes for Charicleia's - although the reader knows that according to Thyamis' dream she won't be killed. The question then shifts from 'whether Charicleia is dead' to 'how Charicleia will be revived'. At this crucial moment of the recognition of the dead body, Cnemon *τό τε λαμπάδιον εἰς τὴν γῆν καταβαλὼν ἀπέσβεσε*¹³⁰³. In the darkness, Theagenes starts lamenting over the woman's dead body, while Cnemon goes back to fetch another torch. The torch here is a symbol of recognition and will be reused at the end of the narrative, in the now famous Heliodorean expression, *λαμπάδιον δράματος*.

During Cnemon's absence, Theagenes communicates much information regarding their adventure and his relationship to Charicleia:

τίς οὕτως ἀκόρεστος Ἑρινὺς τοῖς ἡμετέροις κακοῖς ἐνεβάκχευσε... ἐν μόνον ἀντὶ πάντων ὑπελείπετο καὶ τοῦτο ἀνήρπασται· κεῖται Χαρίκλεια¹³⁰⁴.

Theagenes' lamentation is a mirror of Charicleia's previous lament. This time Heliodorus' narrative presents us with the Charitonian formula *πᾶν-ἐν*: in this context Charicleia, metaphorically, is the only reason for storytelling, not the adventures. Theagenes tries to commit suicide, but Cnemon has removed his dagger; at this very moment, in the dark, he hears a voice calling

¹³⁰³ 2.3.3.

¹³⁰⁴ 2.4.1-2.

'Theagenes'. Cnemon returns with the torch and 'knows' - he uses the term οἶδα - that he left Charicleia deeper in the cave¹³⁰⁵. The recognition of the couples is accomplished and the narrative turns to the investigation of Thisbe's murder:

ή δὲ ἦν ἀληθῶς ή Θίσβη καὶ ξίφος τε πλησίον ἐκπεπτωκὸς ἐγνώριζεν ἀπὸ τῆς λαβῆς, ὁ παρὰ τὸν φόνον ὁ Θύαμις ὑπὸ θυμοῦ καὶ σπουδῆς ἐναπέλιπε τῇ σφαγῇ¹³⁰⁶.

The body is truly (ἀληθῶς) recognised as not Charicleia but Thisbe, and the emphasis on the verisimilitude of the recognition is meant to supplement the recognition scene; what remains obscure for the characters is the motivation for the murder. Thyamis' name reappears in Calasiris' resumé to Cnemon, but he pretends not to recognise it, and once more, he circles around the crucial information, keen to learn what happened before the events known to him¹³⁰⁷. The review of Thisbe's murder is repeated much later in Charicleia's summary to Calasiris in Book 6:

οἶσθα, εἶπεν, ὡς αἰχμάλωτος ἐλήφθην ὑπὸ τῶν βουκόλων· ἐκεῖ τοίνυν καὶ τὸν Θύαμιν ἐπηγάγετο πρὸς τὸν κατ' ἐμοῦ πόθον ή δυστυχῶς μοι προσεῖναι δοκοῦσα τῶν ὄψεων ὥρα, καὶ δέος, εἰ ἀναζητοῦντες ἐντύχοιμεν, μὴ ὀφθεῖσαν ἐκείνην εἶναί με ταύτην ὑπομνησθεῖς, τὸν γάμον ὃν τότε μοι προτεινόμενον παρ' αὐτοῦ διεκρουσάμην ἐπινοίαις εἰς ἔργον ἄγειν βιάσεται¹³⁰⁸.

Charicleia reveals to Calasiris what has happened but of course she is unable to decipher Thyamis' motivation from the murder. The only clue the

¹³⁰⁵ 2.5.4.

¹³⁰⁶ 2.6.1.

¹³⁰⁷ 2.25.7, συνεστάλη πάλιν ὁ Κνήμων ὥσπερ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Θυάμιδος βληθεὶς τὴν ἀκοήν, καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐκαρτέρησε σιωπῆσαι τῶν ἐξῆς ἕνεκεν.

¹³⁰⁸ 6.9.6.

couple's and Cnemon have is Thyamis' knife, found next to Thisbe's body; but no one inferred that the prospective victim was to be Charicleia. This small detail, which connects the plots of the Cnemon narrative to the main frame, is precisely what the narrator allows the reader to know privately, as an entrusted element (the Heliodoran term would have been ἐγχειρίζω¹³⁰⁹) of recognition of the Heliodoran narrative technique.

Charicleia as Thisbe

After Charicleia and Theagenes split off from Cnemon they decide to settle on a pair of recognition passwords, σύμβολα δι ὧν ἀπόρρητα τὲ γνωριοῦμεν παρόντες καὶ εἰ χωρισθῆναί ποτε συμβαίνοι μαστεύσομεν ἀλλήλους¹³¹⁰. As recognition tokens Heliodorus provides a plenitude of indications: first they will write their direction of travel on herms and the like, but since their mutual love is not alone a sufficient proof¹³¹¹, Charicleia proposes that they agree on body marks - the black ring on her arm and Theagenes' Odyssean scar on his knee - and on passwords- Charicleia is the λαμπάς and Theagenes the φοῖνιξ¹³¹². This emphasis on recognition tokens suggests that the separation of the lovers is imminent. Indeed, soon after, Mitranes captures Theagenes and Charicleia, sending the youth to Oroondates and keeping Charicleia for Nausicles, who deliberately identifies

¹³⁰⁹ The verb is used for the transfer of Charicleia's narrative from hand to hand: to Thyamis (1.18.4, ἐγχειρίζειν παρθένον and 10.37.2), Sisimithres to Charicles (2.31.4), Apollo and Artemis entrust the couple to Calasiris (3.11.5), Charicleia to Nausicles (5.8.4); Nausicles to Calasiris (6.8.2), Tyche to Arsake (7.12.2, δεσμώτας), Theagenes and Charicleia surrender to the Ethiopians (8.17.3, τῆς Τύχης ἐγχειριζομένους).

¹³¹⁰ 5.4.7.

¹³¹¹ 5.5.2.

¹³¹² 5.5.3.

her as not-Charicleia, but Thisbe, whereupon Charicleia colludes (συνέβαινε¹³¹³) in his plot and presents herself as Thisbe¹³¹⁴.

When Nausicles returns he tells Cnemon and Calasiris ἅπαντα, among other things how τινὰ φανείσαν κόρην ὡς Θίσβην ἀπέλαβε¹³¹⁵. The description of the girl's amazing beauty makes Calasiris and Cnemon recognise¹³¹⁶ that this is not Thisbe, but Charicleia - note that Cnemon has not yet revealed his information¹³¹⁷. Immediately not-Thisbe is brought in and the anticipated καθάπερ σκηνῆς ἀναγνωρισμός takes place¹³¹⁸. The recognition is simultaneous and mutual, and the main point is probably made by Cnemon who realises that she is ἀληθῶς Χαρίκλεια καὶ οὐχὶ Θίσβη¹³¹⁹.

After the recognition Nausicles, Cnemon, Charicleia, and Calasiris search for Theagenes at Chemmis, where they learn that he and Thyamis might be in Bessa. At this point Nausicles and Cnemon drop out of the plot. Cnemon gives an elaborate excuse for his withdrawal from the quest:

¹³¹³ Cf. Penelope's shroud with whom Charicleia is compared in 5.22.4. See also West, (2005).

¹³¹⁴ 5.8.4, Θίσβην ἑαυτὴν ὡμολόγει.

¹³¹⁵ 5.10.2. Note the comic effect of the misrecognition of Charicleia as Thisbe by Cnemon: 5.3.3, ζῆ γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἡ κακίστη Θίσβη. Cf. to previous formulaic expressions of fallacious certainty.

¹³¹⁶ 5.11.1, τὸ ἀφραστον κάλλος Χαρικλείας ἐγνώριζον.

¹³¹⁷ Nausicles learns about Cnemon's tale only in 6.2.3, ὁ Κνήμων ἔλεγεν ἅπαντα ἐπιτέμνων. Cnemon summarises (ἐπιτέμνων) what is not appropriate for Nausicles to know; again the expression ἅπαντα corresponds to a substantial amount of hidden information. We do not get Nausicles's own reaction, since he decides to postpone it (ὑπερθέσθαι κρίνων) and because they come across Mitranes' soldiers, 6.3.1. This is the end of the recognition of the Thisbe-narrative.

¹³¹⁸ 5.11.1; the recognition scene is reinforced by the use of similar expressions: ἐν θρήνοις ἐγίγνωσκε; πλέον τῆς γνώσεως ἀνθρώποις ἀπορουμένοις

¹³¹⁹ 5.11.2; the Bude editors exclude [τοῦ Κνήμωνος], although I believe his name should be mentioned because he is the one who has misrecognised Charicleia earlier as Thisbe.

ποῖ γὰρ τράπωμαι; τί δέ με καὶ χορὴ πράττειν; καταλίπω Χαρίκλειαν οὐπω
Θεαγένην ἀνευρηκυῖαν; ἀλλὰ δεινόν, ὦ γῆ, καὶ ἀθέμιτον· ἀλλ' ἔπεσθαί με χορὴ
καὶ συναναζητεῖν; εἰ μὲν ἐπὶ προδήλῳ τῇ εὐρέσει, καλὸν τὸ μοχθεῖν ἐπ' ἐλπίδι
τοῦ κατορθώσειν· εἰ δὲ ἄδηλον τὸ μέλλον καὶ πλέον τὸ δυσχερές, ἄδηλον ποῖ
ποτε καὶ στήσεται μοι τὰ τῆς ἄλης.

Cnemon drops out of the narrative when this becomes ἄδηλον, in other words when the plot is not anticipated, according to his reading needs. His opening lines with the direct questions - ποῖ γὰρ τράπωμαι; τί δέ με καὶ χορὴ πράττειν - recall Calasiris' monologue, when describing to Cnemon his impasse about his dream of Apollo and Artemis, and the equivalent reported-speech questions: εἰς τίνας δὲ ἀνθρώπους ἢ εἰς τίνα γῆν παραπέμπεσθαι τοὺς νέους. But as I have already discussed, Cnemon strongly disapproved of apparent rhetorical questions like these, since Calasiris knew what had happened then. However he adopts Calasiris' pretended impasse in order to deliver his a priori decision: not to follow the second quest for Theagenes. In fact, Cnemon drops out precisely because he is afraid of narratives without closure, just as he is afraid of the crocodile's shadow¹³²⁰. What he chooses instead of the *Theagenes and Charicleia* is the final chapter, already anticipated, of Aristippus' exoneration¹³²¹.

Cnemon's refusal is supported by Nausicles' practical argumentation, his presentation of his own reasons that forbid him to continue the quest. In it the businessman welcomed the guests in his home, told them that they could

¹³²⁰ 6.1.3, (Calasiris teases Cnemon), οὐ ὀνόματά σοι μόνον ἀκούμενα ἤδη δὲ καὶ θεάματα τῶν ἐν ποσὶ καὶ ἀδεᾷ τὰραχὸν ἐμβάλλει. The crocodile incident underlines Cnemon's fainthearted behaviour.

¹³²¹ 2.9.4, καὶ εἰς τὰς Αθήνας ἐπαναγαγὼν λύσαιμι μὲν τὰς κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑπονομίας τε καὶ αἰτίας.

share everything with him, but that he would be unable to follow them in their quest. Charicleia's eye, which is keen to perceive 'amorous' feelings, interprets the scene rightly:

ἡ δὲ Χαρίκλεια τὸν τε Κνήμωνα ἐκ πολλῶν ἤδη συμβάλλουσα τοῦ Ναυσικλέους ἐπὶ τὸ θυγάτριον ἐπτοημένον...καὶ τὸν Ναυσικλέα πρὸς τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ λεχθέντων συνεῖσα ὡς ἀσμένῳ γένοιτο ἂν τὸ κῆδος¹³²².

Charicleia's deciphering of the situation - the terms used are the ones used in the previous recognition scenes, συμβάλλω, συνίημι - allows her to read behind Cnemon's all too long monologue. The main point is that, just as Calasiris knew beforehand how his tale would evolve, Cnemon, knowing that Nausicles agrees to the wedding, presents Charicleia with the *de facto* answer, after having her ponder for a while in uncertainty. Charicleia's reading of Cnemon's intentions also illuminates the reason why Cnemon withheld the 'spicy' information regarding Thisbe, who happened to be Nausicles' lover, and why Nausicles decided not to push the Thisbe recognition plot further.

Without their friends and once more disguised as beggars Charicleia and Calasiris leave for Bessa; the reason for the disguise is so that Charicleia will not be recognised by Thyamis. From Bessa they arrive in front of Memphis' walls where the big recognition scene between the couple takes place.

The bipartite recognition scene as a dramatic episode in the story of

¹³²² 6.7.8.

Calasiris and his two sons and in that of Charicleia and Theagenes has been discussed in Part I. Here I would like to emphasise the use of passwords that the couple have set previously. Charicleia recognises Theagenes, but the handsome Aenian does not recognise the woman dressed in rags; moreover, Theagenes is so absorbed in Calasiris' recognition scene that he does not have time to play his own¹³²³. This is a stunning meta-theatrical scene, in which the inset audience becomes the audience of another's drama, and forgets to play his own part. Charicleia then whispers the recognition-words, which have been prepared for that precise scene: ὦ Πύθιε, οὐδὲ τοῦ λαμπαδίου μέμνησαι¹³²⁴; The mention of the torch, the λαμπάδιον, associates this scene with the previous one (Thisbe as not-Charicleia) and inscribes it in the recognition progression of the Heliodoran narrative. Theagenes needs to make a conjecture in order to recognise Charicleia:

ὁ Θεαγένης ὥσπερ βέλει τῷ ῥήματι βληθεὶς καὶ τῶν συγκεκριμένων αὐτοῖς συμβόλων τὸ λαμπάδιον γνωρίσας, ἐνατενίσας τε καὶ ταῖς βολαῖς τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τῆς Χαρικλείας ὥσπερ ὑπ' ἀκτίνος ἐκ νεφῶν διαττούσης καταυγασθεὶς, περιέβαλλέ τε καὶ ἐνηγκαλίζετο¹³²⁵.

Theagenes needs to go through an evaluation of the tokens: the beloved's eyes and the torch. The assimilation of Charicleia to the torch, which is her symbol, is developed in the description of her dazzling eyes. Just as Cnemon's torch illuminated Thisbe's identity, so Charicleia's eyes make her

¹³²³ 7.7.5.

¹³²⁴ 5.5.1 has Πυθικός and Πυθιάς, not Πύθιος, as here in 7.7.7; equally their password is the λαμπάς, 5.5.2, not the λαμπάδιον. Nevertheless these are passwords because of their content and this inconsistency could be due to neglect of the author (or one of the transcribers).

¹³²⁵ 7.7.6.

identity shine. Charicleia is the novel's main object of recognition and the thread of the recognition plot.

Who knows what περὶ Χαρικλείας

After the couple's recognition scene at the beginning of Book 7 all that remains to be identified is Charicleia's origins. Whereas the Charicleia-Theagenes recognition has already been prepared from Book 1 with the setting of passwords, the Charicleia-Persinna recognition has been prepared before Calasiris' arrival at Delphi. Both recognitions are well prepared and belong to two different parts of the novel.

The couple's recognition, strategically placed at the beginning of Book 7, may be a hint at the other novels, of which two have the standard Cyropaedian number of eight books and a third, Longus, half of them¹³²⁶. The recognition scene may be an indication that at this stage the novel has or has almost reached its generic τέλος, the reunion of the couple, but that Heliodorus' remaining books point to a much more elaborate and painstaking happy end. Indeed, as I have shown in the relevant Iphigenia chapters¹³²⁷, Heliodorus has staged a detailed dramatic recognition of both Charicleia and Theagenes on the sacrificial altars of Hydaspes. Instead of adopting the couple recognition, the narrative manipulates the epic-Odyssean convention of the narrative as a prolonged recognition-process, while it makes the closure

¹³²⁶ For the separation into eight books in the *Cyropaedeia*, biography, Philostratus' *Apollonius* and the novel see Bowie, (1978).

¹³²⁷ Cf. current document pp. 259ff.

more dramatic by setting it in the Iphigenia context.

What I want to discuss here is the information relevant to Charicleia that each of her adoptive 'fathers' has and how this explains Charicles' appearance, 'the final rabbit in the hat'¹³²⁸, at Meroe, and also explains Calasiris' disappearance from the final act.

Charicles' version

It has been argued by Winkler that the charlatan Calasiris tricks Charicles into believing that his daughter needs 'exorcism' for the evil eye, in order to get his hands on Persinna's band. But this is not the entire truth. What the priest from Delphi knows from Sisimithris that the girl has been exposed, that she seems to be a child of higher social class, given the amount of precious stones that come with her, that the silk waistband has all her tale and that Sisimithres has hidden her for seven years, δείσας μὴ φωτισθείη τὰ κατ' αὐτήν¹³²⁹. Charicles knows that Charicleia is an extraordinary child from an extraordinary background, which he cannot discover because the evidence is written in ancient Aethiopian.

Charicles also knows what Apollo has foretold him, something he recalls only the day of Charicleia's 'abduction':

συνίημι γὰρ ὡς ἐκ θεῶν μῆνιδος ταυτηνὶ τίνω τὴν δίκην, ἣν ἐξ οὐπερ εἰς τὸ ἄδυτον ἄωρὶ παρελθὼν εἶδον ὀφθαλμοῖς ἃ μὴ θέμις ὁ θεός μοι προεῖπεν, ἀνθ' ὧν οὐ προσηκόντως εἶδον τῆς τῶν φιλτάτων ὄψεως στερήσεσθαι¹³³⁰.

¹³²⁸ Lowe, (2000) p.256.

¹³²⁹ 2.31.3.

¹³³⁰ 4.19.3.

Charicles recognises (συνίημι) that Charicleia's abduction is divinely willed; like Teiresias, or Actaeon, Charicles has looked inside the temple ἄωρί, not at the right moment. As a punishment for his curiosity Apollo prophesies to him that he will lose his loved ones; after his sufferings, πάντα, which Charicles summarises in his speech in front of the Delphians, Χαρίκλεια μόνη is his only consolation¹³³¹.

This incident highlights another aspect of Charicles' personality, his inquisitiveness, which comes out in his encounter with Calasiris. What Charicles wants the Egyptian priest to do is to convince Charicleia διὰ σοφίαν τινὰ καὶ ἰυγγα...ἢ λόγοις ἢ ἔργοις γνωρίσαι τὴν ἑαυτῆς φύσιν καὶ ὅτι γυνὴ γέγονεν εἰδέναι¹³³². For Charicles the recognition of Charicleia is twofold: first to recognise her 'nature', secondly to recognise herself as a 'woman'. Thesetwo points, nature and womanhood, may coincide but they may be different too; φύσις can be interpreted as womanhood but also as origin, ethnicity, and human nature¹³³³. If I am right on this, then Charicles has hinted to Calasiris the existence of the silk waistband, in order to increase his curiosity and make the Egyptian 'read' and reveal to him Charicleia's origins, or her φύσις.

Charicles' talent in withholding information is shown once more during

¹³³¹ 4.12.9.

¹³³² 2.33.6.

¹³³³ (I) For φύσις as related femininity/womanhood/maternity in 4.21.3, γυναῖκες ἀνδρείότερον τῆς φύσεως ἐορόνησαν; 7.21.2, γυναῖκα ὁμοίαν σοι τὴν φύσιν ἠλέησας; 9.24.8, ἡ μητρώα φύσις; 10.29.4, ἡ μητρώα φύσις τὸ θιγατρὸς καὶ τὸ θῆλυ συμπαθὲς τὸ πταῖσμα τὸ γυναικεῖον οἶδεν. (II) For φύσις as ethnic characteristics in 2.17.5, (Cnemon on Thermouthis) φύσει τε ἀβέβαιον καὶ ληστροκὸν καὶ δύσεριν τὸ ἦθος; 3.15.1, (about Homer) ὡς Αἰγύπτιον, καὶ τὸ τῆς φύσεως ὑπερέχον; 9.19.5, Αἰγύπτιοι...φύσει τε τλήμονες; (III) on human nature, as character, 5.4.1, τάχα δέ που καὶ τῆς ἀνθρώπων φύσεως; 6.15.1, παρανομοῦσαν εἰς τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν φύσιν.

his plea to Hydaspes¹³³⁴:

ὁ πρεσβύτες (ἦν δὲ ἄρα ὁ Χαρικλῆς) τὰ μὲν ἀληθέστερα τοῦ γένους τῆς Χαρικλείας ἀπέκρυπτε μή πη ἄρα καὶ κατὰ τὴν φυγὴν ἐκείνης τὴν ἄνω προαφανισθείσης πόλεμον καθ' ἑαυτοῦ πρὸς τῶν ἀληθῶς γεννησάντων ἐπισπάσῃται διευλαβούμενος, ἐξετίθετο δὲ ἐπιτέμνων ἅ μηδὲν ἔβλαπτε, καὶ ἔλεγεν¹³³⁵.

Thyamis has revealed ἅπαντα τὰ περὶ τὴν θυγατέρα¹³³⁶ to Charicles. Charicles, who wishes that the recognition should not take place yet, comes at the right moment, not to prevent the recognition of Charicleia as Hydaspes' daughter, but in order to recognise, above all, Theagenes as Charicleia's νυμφίος; hence although he appears to withhold deliberately the crucial information his words contribute to the opposite: Charicles' entrance, while blaming the charlatan Calasiris, whose action is only known to Persinna, explains why Calasiris had to leave the scene before the ending: had Calasiris' been there, Persinna's lack of σωφροσύνη would have been exposed, since the narrative would appear to have been the not the result of Providence but of careful manipulation; besides, unlike Cnemon, Calasiris already knew the end, because of his divinatory powers. While then the reader is made aware of the careful weaving of the different strains, the characters are not. The narrative is, for the inset audience, on the verge of confusion and for them

¹³³⁴ Morgan, (1978), discusses Hefti, (1950) and argues that the inconsistency here should be read as an example of Heliodorus' narrative technique, i.e. to postpone and to complicate the solution of his plot until the very last moment; this narrative aims results in the 'sloppiness of his writing' (vol. 2, p. 522). I think Morgan is dismissing the clues that Charicles had after his encounter with Sisimithres and that he stresses the amount of information he received from Thyamis; however we are never given Thyamis' review, but we are given Sisimithres' summary. In support of my argument see Lowe, (2000) p.257, who argues that Charicles learns everything from Thyamis.

¹³³⁵ 10.36.1.

¹³³⁶ 10.36.4.

more information is provided.

Sisimithres' intervention comes at the very moment when Charicles' censored narrative has broken the illusion of the providentially guided reunion of Hydaspes with his daughter, the crowds are confused, and πάντων σύγχυσις ἐγένετο¹³³⁷:

ὁ Σισιμίθρης δὲ ἐπὶ πολὺ διαρκέσας καὶ πάλαι τὰ λεγόμενα καὶ πραττόμενα γνωρίζων, εἰς τὸ ἀκριβὲς δὲ περιελθεῖν τὰ φανερούμενα πρὸς τοῦ κρείττονος ἀναμένων, προσέδραμέ τε καὶ τὸν Χαρικλέα περιεπτύσσετο, καὶ ὀφύζεται σοι ἢ νομισθεῖσα καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν ἐγχειρισθεῖσά ποτε θυγάτηρ, ἔλεγε, θυγάτηρ ἀληθῶς οὐσα καὶ εὐρεθεῖσα ὧν γινώσκεις¹³³⁸.

The editors of the Budé text note at this point that 'Héliodore a commis une inadvertance excusable¹³³⁹'. This is not true; in Charicles' speech to Hydaspes we already know that he has hidden ἄ ἔβλαπτε and delivered ἄ μὴ ἔβλαπτε. Charicles knows the truth from Thyamis, but even before that he is given enough clues to guess that the girl given to him is not an ordinary girl: Sisimithres decided to give the girl to Charicles because he gave him the impression of being Ἑλληνικὸν τῷ ὄντι¹³⁴⁰.

Charicles' Greekness, according to Sisimithres, is seen in his interest in travelling¹³⁴¹ and his curiosity about natural sciences, since he is gathering φύλλα καὶ ῥίζας τῶν Ἰνδικῶν καὶ Αἰθιοπικῶν καὶ Αἰγυπτίων¹³⁴². There is

¹³³⁷ 10.37.3.

¹³³⁸ 10.37.3.

¹³³⁹ Rattenbury, (1935) p.123, vol.3.

¹³⁴⁰ 2.31.5.

¹³⁴¹ 2.29.2 (Calasiris), ἤλθε γὰρ κάκειϊσε; 10.36.5, (Charicles about Syene) ἤλθον γὰρ κάκειϊσε. Cf. Homer, *Odyssey*, 6.146, (Odysseus to Nausicaa about Delos) ἤλθον γὰρ καὶ κεῖσε. It is not fortuitous that the priest of Apollo at Delphi, who, like Odysseus has searched the world for his daughter, alludes to a passage concerning Delos.

¹³⁴² 2.30.1ff.

wordplay on φύλλα (meaning plants) and φυλή, φύλον (meaning tribe, blood descent), and on the double meaning of ῥίζας as both root and origin, on Charicles' interest in plants and his interest in Charicleia's origins. Sisimithres goes further, presenting him with precious stones; the next day his hopes to learn more about Charicleia's origins disappear along with the Ethiopian ambassador, who had to leave the country because he proposed that the satrap should keep away from τῶν σμαραγδείων μετάλλων ὡς Αἰθιοπία προσηκόντων¹³⁴³.

But Charicles had just aquired the most precious pearls, whose whiteness stands for Charicleia's, and of sapphires, whose blue colour intensifies the impression of the emeralds, which are given a lengthy ecphrasis¹³⁴⁴. The almost political scandal initiated by Sisimithres (which made his flight compulsory) indicates to Charicles the origin of the girl, which, like the emeralds, could have been a political scandal; Charicleia, like the emerald mines, is an Ethiopian possession, she προσήκει Αἰθιοπία. Charicles then has enough evidence to fight against providence and to search out the girl's origins. Being Greek, and curious, he is no less important in determining the plot of Charicleia's novel, than Calasiris and the all-knowing Sisimithres (all, but Theagenes' existance), in order to confirm that nothing in the *Aethiopica* is left to Τύχη, and that everything has been well anticipated. Narratorial

¹³⁴³ 2.32.2.

¹³⁴⁴ 2.30.3. For the precious gems see Laplace, (1996); for the ring as an allusion to Longus Bowie, (1995). Also for Charicleia and the engraved amethyst see Hardie, (1989) p.28-29. Recently Elmer, (2008) p. 423, argues that 'the ceicure of Charicleia match the abduction that open Herodotus' *Histories*.

providence is completed with Charicles' recognition of Theagenes as Charicleia's fiancé, which is the summit of the Heliodoran composition, the λαμπάδιον τοῦ δράματος¹³⁴⁵.

There is a final point, which is not justified by the plot: at the end of Book 4 Charicles was left lamenting over his fortune and the harsh divine punishment for his curiosity, when Calasiris encouraged him to chase after the rapist: why? One explanation could be that Calasiris wants to buy time for the couple's escape, while creating confusion, since at this stage the couple is hiding at his place; Charicles and the Delphians are at a loss, ἀγνοία δὲ τῶν γεγονότων καὶ ἀμηχανία τῶν πρακτέων¹³⁴⁶. At this stage broadly by Charicles' lack of information the plot is at an impasse; however Charicles' decision to object to divine will, Apollo's oracle, indicates that human, and narratorial resourcefulness can be successful, provided there is a clue: Charicles knows τίς ὁ τὸν βαρὺν τοῦτον ἐπενεγκῶν πόλεμον ἐγινώσκομεν¹³⁴⁷.

Charicles' unique clue is Theagenes, and it is Theagenes whom he recognises at the novel's end, next to the Ethiopian sacrificial altars. Like the good reader, Charicles, in the midst of confusion, uncertainty, and partial-truths, has never lost his hope in that one clue, which ultimately led him to the 'recognition' of the whole plot. Charicles' detective reading skills account

¹³⁴⁵ 10.39.2. Cf. the inset audience recognises the truth gradually: 10.38.7, εἰς ὑπόνοιαν τῶν ἀληθῶν ἐλθόντες.

¹³⁴⁶ 4.19.1.

¹³⁴⁷ 4.19.3.

for the naming of the protagonist¹³⁴⁸, since the plot is generated by the inquisitiveness of the Greek priest, as Sisimithres had already noticed at Catadoupoi. Hence, after Charicles, the name of the story is about *Charicleia*: the *Aethiopica* then appear to be the result of the imaginative curiosity of one person, Charicles.

Partial conclusions

The above analysis of the recognition scenes and of the narrative recognitive strategy leads to the following observations.

Plots of recognition

First, the novel, like the *Odyssey*, seems to be patterned on a consequential recognition scene pattern, in which the heroes are separated and reunited after some adventure-time has passed, at which stage they find each other faithful and chaste¹³⁴⁹. The shape of this narrative, which corresponds to my definition of myth as διήγησις, is characterised by strong authorial and/or narratorial (by each of the internal narrators of retrospective accounts) manipulation of information, which can be summarised in the formula (οὐ)...πάντα-μόνον; withheld information is revealed gradually and each step is presented as if it were the full truth. The final recognition of course reveals the full ἀληθεία of the novel's narrative.

Therefore, the recognition, at the level of narrator-reader, is well

¹³⁴⁸ We never learn what name Persinna had thought of giving to her child; she addresses her only as 'daughter' 4.8.1, Περσίννα Βασίλισσα Αιθιοπῶν τῇ ὃ τι δὴ κληθισμένη καὶ μέχρι μόνων ὠδίνων θυγατρί.

¹³⁴⁹ The discussion of the Bakhtinian chronotope in Branham, (2002) p.166.

structured, giving unsurprising, premeditated and anticipatory indications via oracles, dreams, and authorial hints, and leaves no space to Τύχη as a subversive creator of the plot. In the novel's wor(l)d Τύχη is just the pretext that justifies the liberties the author takes with his fictive material: if nothing of these events happened, and I (the author) happen to have invented them, then, the only reason behind this perfect plot is Τύχη; in other words Τύχη replaces the liberties that the Μοῦσα allowed the epic poet, although the novels' plots reflect a close control of the information that is at each point disclosed. As noticed by Lowe, 'only gods and playwrights can get away with creating a universe so unremittingly purposeful'¹³⁵⁰.

The ἀληθεία of this recognitive plot, which is full of unbelievable coincidences, is contrasted not only with the myth of the novel as narrative, myth^{III} but with the plausibility of myth *qua* tale from mythology. This is why it is seconded by many references to the veracity of the information given: the 'true' story of the novel is revealed after a well defined process of near-truth situations, which are often introduced with the formulaic expression νῦν ἀληθῶς and which develop into false-recognition scenes, until the very end, when the full ἀληθεία is revealed.

The persistence with which the novels describe every recognition scene as 'truth-like', and moreover, the occasions on which, also in Longus, the recognition scene is opposed to myth^I, may give a hint towards the

¹³⁵⁰ Lowe, (2000) p.258.

understanding of myth^{III} not only as a narrative, but also as a truth-like narrative and/or myth^I-(un)like narrative, hence fiction. Myth^{III} is then the main myth of fiction in the Greek novels, or, in other words, the recognition process from untrue events, to partially true events, to fully true events which are yet *μύθοις ὅμοια* events, is the literary path that may indicate the transition from myth to fiction.

The husband-wife reunion theme

Novelistic couple-recognition scenes

This recognitive pattern, as I call it here, does not need to be based on the *Odyssey* as such: novels like *Joseph and Aseneth*, *Sesonchosis(?)*, and those of Iamblichus', or Xenophon do achieve their ending through a wife-husband recognition scene, but this does not mean that they are echoing the *Odyssey*, rather they rework the common, folk-tale, motif of the happy reunion of the husband and the wife. If one can take Xenophon and *J&A* as examples for the genre as a whole, so far as this is possible, it can be inferred that the novel's narrative aim is a reunion/recognition which has to be mutual and equal and for which both partners' chastity is required¹³⁵¹; similar mutual couple-recognitions are presented in all the novels, although they might not always be placed at the very end.

However, in all the novels the central recognition motif is that of the

¹³⁵¹ Doody, (1996) p.77.

girl's chastity, and (if she is a virgin) of her virginity, which enables her to marry her beloved. The inventiveness regarding the final virginity test indicates that triumphant chastity was the main object of recognition.

Odyssean recognition scenes

Some novels, like Chariton and Heliodorus, make explicit use of the Homeric epic as a reference text: so the final reunion scene of Chaereas and Callirhoe is underlined by citing two lines from Book 23 of the *Odyssey*, and the different Homeric allusions in Heliodorus allow all his characters to display Odyssean characteristics and are of course supporters of chastity; indeed the *Aethiopica* alludes to the end of the *Odyssey*, since it develops over a timeline of thirty-nine days, in contrast to the 40 of the *Odyssey*, as Lowe has observed¹³⁵².

However, even on these occasions the couple's recognition scene is not Odyssean but 'generic' to the novel, and is (almost) simultaneous, symmetrical and impulsive. Charicleia indeed uses 'signs' to attract Theagenes' attention, but this is because he is very absorbed in another, simultaneous recognition scene, that of Calasiris and his sons. It is also interesting that Heliodorus did not choose to finish with the couple's recognition scene, but crafted a well prepared parent-child reunion, which makes use of the *Odyssey*, especially in Charicleia's careful revelation of her

¹³⁵² Lowe, (2000) p.244: 'no doubt by invited accident rather than strict calculation; Heliodorus has nevertheless brouth his novel in at a day below the chronological budget of the *Odyssey*'.

identity, but the setting is not Odyssean, but rather dramatic, that of the two *Iphigenias*.

Moreover, these quasi-Odyssean recognitions are conscious comments on the *Odyssey*'s structure: in Chariton's ending with the couple's reunion (plus the return narrative and recapitulation) and in Heliodorus' thirty-nine days-span, the πέρας, of the *Odyssey* is set at 23.296, and not at the end of Book 24, following the views of Aristophanes and Aristarchus¹³⁵³.

Other recognition scenes

Longus indeed provides us with an almost non-generic recognition scene, that of parents and children. But as I argued the recognition material in the *Pastorals* develops through the same technique of withholding, anticipation, and disclosure as in the rest of the novels and its object is not the social reinstatement of the couple (who return to their pastoral duties) but Chloe's virginity; this is why, I believe, the novel closes with Chloe's first night, after the short prolepsis about their future married life.

Characterisation

Odyssean allusions and Penelopean chastity

Whereas not all the novels make use of the *Odyssey* for the reunion-recognition pattern, (almost) all of them, except Xenophon, allude to it out of the need for characterisation. In all the extant novels Penelope is the model of

¹³⁵³ Dindorf, (1855) p.723.

the perfect wife and the embodiment of female cunning and chastity. The preoccupation of the novels with faithfulness and chastity, which are not compatible with the adventurous Helen-plot they adopt, makes Penelope a point of reference for characterisation. Nevertheless in the novels the Penelope-figure is not always chaste.

Callirhoe, although faithful to death to Chaereas, uses her beauty to conceal her pregnancy. In doing this she is presented in the liminal mythological space between Helen, with whom she shares beauty and an unsettled life, and Penelope, whom she becomes only near the end, after resisting Artaxerxes' advances. Anthia is faithful and chaste to the very end, and there are no allusions to the *Odyssey* at all, so her characterisation could be interpreted as belonging to a standard novelistic portrayal of the heroine as stunningly beautiful and amazingly chaste. Chloe is not compared to Penelope, but to Helen, although her only unfaithfulness is her kiss with Dorcon. But the Penelope characterisation is subverted when applied to Lycaenion's case, presented as Phaedra using Penelopean-Helen wording.

Leucippe is not explicitly compared to Penelope and although chaste is not very cunning, at least when compared with Callirhoe and Charicleia; her disguise as a beggar might indeed rather recall Odysseus, trying to confirm Penelope's faithfulness. However, the third woman, Melite, is like Lycaenion, a Phaedra with a Helen aspect who manipulates Penelopean words. The side-plot with Thersander in the role of Odysseus, and Cleitophon in that of the

suitors or of Penelope, is an exquisite piece of mythological parody just like the chastity test, which Melite-Penelope passes successfully. Only the *Aethiopica* make an explicit connection between Charicleia's wit and Penelope's chastity, whereas her rival, Arsace, is depicted in clearer Phaedra colours.

Penelopean characterisation then, although it does not interfere with the development of the various plots, is essential to maintain one of the major recognition goals of the novels, chastity. However, the examples of AT and of Longus prove that the heroine does not need to be Penelope-like in order to be chaste and faithful.

Of these three functions of the *Odyssey* - plot as a δι' ὅλου ἀναγνώρισις, reunion of faithful husband and wife, and Penelopean characterisation - the most important, for the novels which I have analysed here, is the first, and it does not need to be a direct reworking of the *Odyssey*. Besides, the eponymous Homeric poem, which navigates among different cultures, languages, cities, peoples, and ways of thinking, the novel is probably the best example of literary hybridity and cosmopolitanism.

Finally whereas the *Odyssey* ends in closural uncertainty, if we consider Book 24 as introducing the *Telegony*, all the novels have a precise closure to their narrative; the means to bring the novel's narrative to an end is precisely the recognition scene, which is the narrative landmark of the end. Had Hippothous not recognised Anthia, in Xenophon she would have been

moved from one suitor to the other endlessly; Chariton makes the point by making Aphrodite 'end' the continuous partial-truth plot with a solemn recognition; above all, Heliodorus manipulates all possible means to prolong and intensify his ending of epic dimensions. All narratives have to come to an end, to reveal the ἀπόρρητα, while in between they have navigated a πέλαγος λόγων¹³⁵⁴.

¹³⁵⁴ Plato, *Protagoras*, 338a; cf. 5.1.3, τὴν διήγησιν εἰς πέλαγος ὄντως ἀφείς.

Final Conclusions

Zadig à genoux adora la Providence et se soumit.
L'ange lui cira du haut des airs, 'Prends ton chemin vers
Babylone'. *Ibid.* chapitre, XX.

To Babylon!

I have examined the different meanings attributed to the word *μῦθος* in the Greek novels and put forward three different interpretations. Here I will discuss briefly the outcome of this tripartite categorisation and simultaneously, I will try to present some side effects and conclusions that may derive from this study.

Mῦθος as a tale from mythology

Firstly, *μῦθος* is a tale from mythology, characterised by its unbelievable, fictional content. The novels, although often compared to mythology, nevertheless distinguish themselves from it, and especially in respect of the content of (by then canonical) Greek myth. The opposition is all the more obvious in the discussion of love: whereas in Greek myth love often leads to death, passion is equated with lust, and disaster awaits even the most romantic lovers, the novel presents a literary world in which love is positive; in the novels, although the heroes are often compared to traditional mythological figures, they do not share their fate. This is also true for the intertextual, and

structural, affinities of the three myths studied here, those of Helen, Phaedra, and Iphigenia. Classical myth is then used intertextually to blur the 'ideal' expectations of the novel's readership, to promote suspense and fear, but it never subverts the happy ending of a novel.

Different, more classically-based, readings of Greek myth can be found in the works of the Second Sophistic I have studied here, which, despite their critique of classical tradition and occasional subversive reworkings of it, like Lucian's *Stratonice* and Apollonius' *Timasion*, in general tend to adopt a relatively conservative view of Greek myth. It should be observed too that the more subversive reworking of Classical myth in the works of the Second Sophistic tend to relocate the the Greek myth in a non-Greek, and often Near-Eastern, setting; the novels too mostly set their subversive reworkings of classical myths on non-Greek soil.

However, it is impossible to argue with confidence whether the novels' approach is influenced by these few subversive writings of the Second Sophistic, or, whether they are influenced directly by non-Greek sources, especially given that at least two among them, Iamblichus and Heliodorus, clearly present themselves as non-Greeks; note also that the narrator of *AT* is also a non-Greek, a Tyrian. It is highly likely that the novels echo a more general trend in literary hybrids, of which the most pronounced manifestation is the *Joseph and Aseneth* novel. If this is the case, then one could argue that although the ideal Greek

novels often maintained the pattern of classical myths, their content was nevertheless, influenced by non-Greek material, which is responsible for the new, 'ideal' happy ending, and which may be located in Near Eastern lore. Love, fidelity, and marriage were the proeminent ingredients of Egyptian, Indian, Persian, and other storytelling.

Mūthos as dramatic plot

Secondly μῦθος is a term used for plots: it characterises the different episodes/ chapters of the novels, which I have discussed under the names of the three major dramatic models for the novels, the *Helen*, the *Phaedra*, and the two *Iphigenias*; of these the *Helen* and the *Iphigenias* are chosen because of their close relevance to the novel's exotic setting and 'happy ending'; even when it comes to the 'less ideal' Homeric version of the Helen story and to the Phaedra myth, the novel imposes its own, positive reading on its classical predecessors, offer, just as is the case in the treatment of myth as a tale from mythology, while it maintains the dramatic opportunities that the variations of the relevant drama-plots offer.

These patterns are structured around motifs of retardation and of motion, although, because of their theatrical quality, motifs of retardation prevail, as these incidents are staged as if in a theatre, and hence are composed as if they were static. The alteration between the different motifs is what creates suspense and tension, and it is what maintains their interconnection as patterns.

Nevertheless, the relevant pattern may exist even without allusions to these dramas, and this indicates that the pattern of the novel's components is not a result of intertextual influence from the above dramas, but that the reception of canonical, by then, literature reshaped already existing material. The main domain in which Greek influence is visible is the number of stage-terms, and related terminology. Indeed, these components are characterised by pronounced and conscious theatricality, both on the part of the author-narrator and on the part of the characters and their inset audience: in other words the novel's cast sometimes 'consciously' acts as if in a play.

Mūthos as narrative

Thirdly, μῦθος is the term used to express the large-scale recognition thread of the novel's narrative, the novel's master διήγησις: this category of myth is what connects the different chapters of the novel together, it is what gives the narrative the impetus to move on, it is what it keeps up the reader's suspense until the very end. This notion of myth is structured around the recognition not only of the heroine and/or the hero, but around the revelation of the narrative strategy adopted by the narrator in order to achieve the obligatory final recognition.

The importance of authorial control of the manipulation of the cognitive process of the novel is crucial for the understanding of the novel's myth. The different, seemingly random, episodes of the novels - myth^{II} - are not mere

coups du hasard, or, as they tend to be presented in the novels *coups de théâtre* staged by a φιλόκαινος δαίμων, who is pleased by the reversal of fortunes. These dislocated dramatic episodes, if read through the recognition thread of myth^{III} can be fully deciphered as necessary requirements of the larger well-articulated plot; Callirhoe's closing prayer to Aphrodite, Anthia's and Leucippe's courage until the very end, Habrocomes' faith even after having seen Anthia's grave, and especially Charicleia's and Hydaspes' weaving of the final recognition scene of the *Aethiopica*, show that not only the external reader, but also the internal readers and actors in the Greek novels, are able to decipher the narrative as the product of a literary Providence.

Rather than being the victims of a capricious Tyche, a novel's cast of characters is able to create, via recognition, the meaning of their adventures, they are able to control the development of their itinerary, and, to the degree that this is possible, to shape their lives and to narrate them coherently. Unlike Frye's, Reardon's, and Pavel's view of the Greek novel's heroes as the isolated victims of a capricious fate, I tend to believe that the novels, on the contrary, present a positive understanding of the world of words, and maybe of the real one as well. As Claude Moatti has demonstrated identity in the Empire was a flexible notion¹³⁵⁵, and people could move easily around the Mediterranean, while they were able to acquire more than one identity. The novel's protagonists are also given more than one identity, and this is evident at least in the three

¹³⁵⁵ Moatti, (2004).

basic mythological models discussed above: Charicleia is Helen in Egypt, and Theagenes is Hippolytus at Memphis; in her homeland Charicleia arrives as Iphigenia, in order to be recognised as the princess of the Ethiopians. The world is big and confusing, but its happy ending is there for the taking by the good and perceptive readers.

The high improbability of the *coups du hasard*, which is characterised by the (often dramatic) exaggeration with which these events are presented (e.g. Leucippe's triple escape from death), is a sign that these plots should not be read as 'real' (historical) accounts but as signifiers of a more ample content that can be summarised as follows: although misfortunes are common to human beings, a happy ending is not impossible and it depends on the personal reading of a given plot. In this context the novel's stories are to be understood as truth-like μῦθοι. This last use of μῦθος has affinities not only with the narrative but also with μῦθος as 'a tale from mythology', to which it is often compared because of its apparent mendacity and/or fictiveness. This use of μῦθος is probably closer to our modern term 'fiction': a false narrative which nevertheless presents itself as 'truer than true' and whose fictionality is understood not by the novel's cast, but rather by the reader, or the inset 'ideal' reader, who, like Cleitophon's companion, is willing to listen to a tale εἰ καὶ μύθοις ἔοικε.

Is then the novel really the missing link between classical myth and modern fiction? Given the few samples a positive answer would be speculative.

However, if we repeat the question with respect only to the plots of the ideal Greek novels then a possible answer could be that the plots of the five Greek novels are proof of the transformation into a myth of a genre that had the potential 'simply' to be fiction. Just as 4th century drama, and especially that of Menander, instead of taking advantage of the marginalisation of the traditional mythological subjects, rendered its own, fictive, plot into a highly stereotypical plot, that of New Comedy, so too the ideal novel, despite or because of its reworking of the previous mythological tradition of epic and drama, resulted in a highly formulaic pattern in which everything was anticipated, and in which there was only a small place left for surprise.

My analysis of the recognition process of the novel's δῆγησις has demonstrated that almost no, or very few, incidents are not foreshadowed in the narrative; hence, just as in classical drama where the audience enjoyed not the story, but 'how' each tragedian presented his own version of the traditional myth, so the novel's readership is continuously invited to observe the variations on the stereotypical motifs and patterns of the genre, one example of which is Xenophon's triple death of Anthia and its imitation in Achilles Tatius.

Greek novels are not read for the plot but for the plotting; by this I mean that, unlike modern fiction, they seem to invite a reading not about 'what follows' or about 'how all this will end' but about 'how the happy ending will be enacted'. It would have been interesting to know whether novels like Antonius

Diogenes and *Apollonius King of Tyre* were solitary exceptions to the rule or whether they had literary siblings with which they shared, like the ideal novels, a common, formulaic plot-line. However, even if we take into consideration only *Callirhoe* and her ideal literary *soeurs*, I believe that we have enough evidence to argue that the literary structures of Greek thought remained faithful to its mythological predecessors.

*

Is then the ideal Greek novel μῦθος, λόγος, or πλάσμα? I am inclined to argue for the first, although I am aware that this might not be the only answer. However, if you happen to be in Lesbos during the harvest and you encounter an old man willing to narrate a tale of eternal devotion and love, it is better if you surrender to him as a *τερπνὸς μαθητής*, and take pleasure in his words ὥσπερ μῦθον οὐ λόγον ἀκούων.

* * *

Anna Lefteratou,
25th of April 2010
Trinity term, Oxford

APPENDIX

This Appendix:

- *Tables 1 to 5 (Part I)* list all myths found in the novels, which are not fully cited in my main text.

- *Tables 6 to 8 (Part I)* list the terms discussed in the dissertation (μῦθος, δῶμα, δῆγμα) as these appear in each author. I did not opt for a classification of the terms under my definitions Myth^I, Myth^{II}, and/or Myth^{III}, because my aim is to create reference tables, which could be used for further research. My classification as treated in the main body of the dissertation (M-I, M-II, M-III) is side-scripted. The asterisk (*) is used to draw attention to 'side-uses' of the terms, e.g. δῆγμα, meaning tale from mythology.

- *Tables 1 to 11 (Part II)*: list the main motifs of the Helen, the Phaedra, and the Iphigenia patterns.

- The motifs that do not conform to the pattern but are distant variations of it are *italicised*.

Part I

T 1 Chariton

	Myth	Narrator	References	Allusions
2	Nymph, Nereid, Aphrodite Parthenos	Chariton-N	ἦν γὰρ τὸ κάλλος οὐκ ἀνθρώπινον ἀλλὰ θεῖον, οὐδὲ Νηρηίδος ἢ Νύμφης τῶν ὀρεῶν ἀλλ' αὐτῆς Ἀφροδίτης.	
2, 41	Aphrodite	The villagers	οἱ μὲν δοκοῦντες θεὰν ἑωρακέναι... καὶ γὰρ ἦν τις λόγος ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς Ἀφροδίτην ἐπιφαίνεσθαι.	
3	Eros (god and plotmaker)	Chariton-N	φιλόνηκος δέ ἐστιν ὁ Ἔρως.	
3	Achilles, Nireus, Hippolytus, Alcibiades	Chariton-N	Χαιρέας γὰρ τις ἦν μειράκιον εὐμορφον, πάντων ὑπερέχον, οἶον Ἀχιλλέα καὶ Νιρέα καὶ Ἱππόλυτον καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδην	
14, 45.9	Penelope	Chariton-N	τῆς δ' αὐτοῦ λυτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ.	Od.4.703 etc
16	Artemis hunting	Chariton-N	ἐπεὶ δὲ προῆλθεν εἰς τὸ δημόσιον, θάμβος ὅλον τὸ πλήθος κατέλαβεν, ὥσπερ Ἀρτέμιδος ἐν ἐρημίᾳ κυνηγέταις ἐπιστάσης.	
16	Thetis and Peleus marriage (comparatio)	Chariton-N	τοιοῦτον ὕμνουσι ποιηταὶ τὸν Θέτιδος γάμον ἐν Πηλῷ γεγονέναι. πλὴν καὶ ἐνταῦθα τις εὐρέθη βάσκανος δαίμων, ὥσπερ ἐκεῖ φασὶ τὴν Ἑριν.	
11/ 25	Phthonos/Zelotupia	Chariton-N	ἐστρατολόγει δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὸν κατὰ Χαιρέου πόλεμον ὁ Φθόνος./ ἐφοπλιῶ γὰρ αὐτῷ Ζηλοτυπίαν, ἥτις σύμμαχον λαβοῦσα τὸν Ἑρωτα μέγα τι κακὸν διαπράττει.	
16	Chaereas as Achilles	Chariton-N	τὸν δ' ἄχεος νεφέλη ἐκάλυψε μέλαινα.	Il. 18.22-24
12	Polycharmos as Patroclus	Chariton-N	Πολύχαρμος δὲ ἐκώλυε, φίλος ἐξαίρετος, τοιοῦτος οἶον Ὅμηρος ἐποίησε Πάτροκλον Ἀχιλλέως.	
12	Ariadne sleeping	Chariton-N	κατέκειτο μὲν Καλλιρόη νυμφικὴν ἐσθῆτα περικειμένη καὶ ἐπὶ χρυσηλάτου κλίνης μείζων τε καὶ κρείττων, ὥστε πάντες εἵκαζον αὐτὴν Ἀριάδνη καθευδούση.	
17	Alcinous philoxeny	Dionysios	οὐκ ἤκουσας οὐδὲ Ὀμήρου διδάσκοντος ἡμᾶς· καὶ τε θεοὶ ξείνοισιν εὐκότες ἄλλοδαποῖσιν ἀνθρώπων ὕβριν τε καὶ εὐνομίην ἐφορῶσι;	Od. 17.485-487
18	Nymphs/Nereids/Thetis?	Leonas	οὐκ εἶδον, δέσποτα, ἀλλὰ ἤκουσα· τοῦτ' ἐκείνο· μία Νυμφῶν ἢ Νηρηίδων ἐκ θαλάσσης ἀνελήλυθε. καταλαμβάνουσι δὲ καὶ δαίμονας καιροὶ τινες εἰμαρμένης ἀνάγκην φέροντες ὁμιλίας μετ' ἀνθρώπων.	
5.11	Alcinous' philoxeny	Callirhoe	τὸν Ἀλκίνοον ἀγάμεθα δὴ καὶ πάντες φιλοῦμεν ὅτι εἰς τὴν πατρίδα ἀνέπεμψε τὸν ἱκέτην· ἵκετεῦν σὲ καγώ.	
6.1	Menelaus and Helen	Dionysios	ἀνέπλαττον ἑμαυτῷ βίον μακάριον ὑπὲρ Μενέλεων τὸν τῆς Λακεδαιμονίας γυναικός· οὐδὲ γὰρ τὴν Ἑλένην εὐμορφον οὕτως ὑπολαμβάνω γεγονέναι.	
9.4	Medea (for killing her baby)	Callirhoe	πασῶν ἀσεβεστάτη, μαῖνη, καὶ Μηδείας λαμβάνεις λογισμούς; ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς Σκυθίδος ἀγριωτέρα δόξεις.	
9.5	Zethos, Amphion, Cyrus	Callirhoe	ὅσους ἀκούομεν θεῶν παῖδας καὶ βασιλέων ἐν δουλείᾳ γεννηθέντας ὕστερον ἀπολαβόντας τὸ τῶν πατέρων ἀξίωμα, τὸν Ζῆθον καὶ τὸν Ἀμφίονα καὶ Κύρον;	Xenoph.Cyropaedia (esp.Book 7)

18	Zeus Helios	Dionysios	ὦ Ζεῦ καὶ Ἥλιε, τέκνον ἐκ Καλλιρόης.	
146	Theseus, Ariadne, Dionysos Actaeon, Semele, Zeus, Thetis and Peleus	Chaereas	διὰ τοῦτο καὶ αἰφνίδιον ἀπέθανεν, ἵνα μὴ νοσήσῃ. οὕτω καὶ Θησέως Ἀριάδην ἀφείλετο Διόνυσος καὶ Σεμέλην ὁ Ζεὺς... ἡ Θέτις θεὰ μὲν ἦν, ἀλλὰ Πηλεῖ παρέμεινε καὶ υἱὸν ἔσχεν ἐκεῖ-νος ἐξ αὐτῆς, ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν ἀκμῇ τοῦ ἔρωτος ἀπελείφθην.	
3, 11		Chariton-N	οὕτω πᾶν εἴρητο ἔπος.	<i>Il.</i> 10.540, <i>Od.</i> 16.11
6	Hecuba	Chaereas' mother	τάδ' αἶδεο καὶ μ' ἐλέησον/ αὐτήν, εἰ ποτέ τοι λαθικήδεα μαζὸν ἐπέσχον.	<i>Il.</i> 22.82
6	Artemis/Athena with baby	Chaereas	οὐδεὶς γὰρ αὐτῶν ἐποίησεν Ἄρτεμιν ἡ Ἀθηνᾶν βρέφος ἐν ἀγκάλας κομίζουσιν.	
6	Nemesis	Chariton-N	Διονύσιος... ἡσυχὴ τὴν Νέμεσιν προσεκύνησε.	
3	Achilles lamenting Patroclus	Dionysios	θάπτε με ὅτι τάχιστα πύλας Αἰδεο περήσω	<i>Il.</i> 23.71
5	Achilles' tomb at Ilion	Chariton-N	ὥς κεν τηλεφανῆς ἐκ πόντοφιν ἀνδράσι εἶη	<i>Od.</i> 24.83
8	Ariadne/Leda on beauty	Chariton-N	ὄνομα Καλλιρόης, οἷον οὐδὲ Ἀριάδνης οὐδὲ Λήδας.	
8	Hera, Helen, Andromacha, Nausicaa. Ino, Marpessa, Danae	Chariton-N	ἀστράπτουσα δὲ τῷ προσώπῳ. καὶ παραγυμνοῦσα τοὺς βραχίονας <καὶ τὰς κνήμας> ὑπὲρ τὴν Λευκώλενον καὶ Καλλίσφυρον ἐφαίνετο τὰς Ὀμήρου.	<i>Il.</i> 1.55, .3.121, 6.371 <i>Od.</i> 6.101
5	Athena to Telemachus	Mithridates	κείνου βούλεται οἶκον ὀφέλλειν, ὅς κεν ὀπύιῃ.	<i>Od.</i> 15.21
9	Lykaon (Dionysios reading Chaereas' letter)	Chariton-N	τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ λυτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ.	<i>Il.</i> 21.114
9	εἶτα σκότος τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ κατεχύθη		κατὰ δ' ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἀχλύς.	<i>Il.</i> 5.696 etc
5	Penelope	Chariton-N	Ἀρτεμίδι ἱκέλῃ ἡ χρυσεῖη Ἀφροδίτῃ.	<i>Od.</i> 17.39, 19.54
7	(Misoumenos)	Chariton-N	ἐξὸν καθεύδειν τὴν τ' ἐρωμένην ἔχειν.	Menander
4	Achilleus (Chaereas lamenting)	Chariton-N	ἀμφοτέρῃσι δὲ χερσὶν ἐλὼν κόνιν αἰθαλόεσσαν χεύατο κακὴν κεφαλῆς, χαρίεν δ' ἤσχυνε πρόσωπον.	<i>Il.</i> 18.23
8	Menelaus, Helen, Paris	Dionysios	εἰς Βαβυλῶνα Καλλιρόην ἄγεις, ὅπου Μιθριδάται τοσοῦτοι; Μενέλαος ἐν τῇ σώφρονι Σπάρτῃ τὴν Ἑλένην οὐκ ἐτήρησεν.	
6	God's assembly/ Persian assembly-court	Chariton-N	οἱ δὲ θεοὶ παρ Ζηνὶ καθηήμενοι ἡγορόωντο.	<i>Il.</i> 4.1
9	Helen (on the wall)/ Callirhoe at the court	Chariton-N	οἱ δ' ἀμφὶ Πριάμον καὶ Πάνθοον ἦδὲ Θυμοίτην.	<i>Il.</i> 3.146
9	Penelope (the suitors)/ Callirhoe at the court	Chariton-N	πάντες δ' ἡρήσαντο παρὰ Λεχέεσσι κλιθῆναι.	<i>Od.</i> 1.366, 18.213
101	Protesilaos	Dionysios	ποῖος οὗτος ἐπ' ἐμοῦ Προτεσίλεως ἀνεβίω;	
109	Achilles lamenting Patroclus/ Chaereas	Chaereas	εἰ δὲ θανόντων περ καταλήθοντ' εἰν Αἶδαο αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ κείθι φίλου μεμνήσοιμ' ἐταίρου.	<i>Il.</i> 22.386
22	Banquet	Chariton-N	κνίσῃ δ' οὐρανὸν ἵκεν ἐλισσομένη περὶ καπνῶ	<i>Il.</i> 1.137

15	Thetis	Artaxerxes	πλήν εἰ μή τις ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταβέβηκε τῶν ἄνωθεν ἢ ἐκ θαλάττης ἀναβέβηκεν ἄλλη Θέτις.	
6	Artemis-Nausicaa	Chariton-N	οἷη δ' Ἀρτεμις εἶσι κατ' οὐρεα ἰοχέαιρα, ἢ κατὰ Τηϋγετον περιμήκετον ἢ Ἐρύμανθον, τερομένη κάπροισι καὶ ὠκείησ' ἐλάφοισι	<i>Od.102-104</i>
4	Hector to Achilles	Chaereas	ἢ μὰν ἀσπουδί γε καὶ ἀκλειῶς ἀπολοίμην, ἀλλὰ μέγα ῥέξας τι καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι.	<i>Il.22.304</i>
5	Diomedes	Chaereas	νῶϊ δ' ἐγὼ Σθένης/Polycharmos τε μαχησόμεθ' εἰς ὃ κε τέκμωρ Ἰλίου εὖρωμεν· σὺν γὰρ θεῷ εἰλήλουθμεν.	<i>Il.9.48</i>
3		Chariton-N	ἀσπισ ἄρ' ἀσπίδ' ἔρειδε, κόρυς κόρυιν, ἀνέρα δ' ἀνῆρ.	<i>Il.13.131</i>
6	Diomedes in the battle	Chariton-N	κτεῖνε δ' ἐπιστροφάδην· τῶν δὲ στόνος ὄρνυτ' αἰκῆς ἄορι θεινομένων, ἐρυθαίνετο δ' αἵματι γαῖα. ὥς δὲ λέων μήλοισιν ἀσημάντοισιν ἐπελθὼν αἶγεςιν ἢ οἶεσσι κακὰ φρονέων ἐνορούσῃ, ὥς μὲν Θρηϊκάς ἀνδρας ἐπώχετο Τυδέος υἱός.	<i>Il.10.483-487</i>
2	Ariadne sleeping/ Arados	Chariton-N	μόνην δὲ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐκεῖ καταλίπη οὐχ ὥς Ἀριάδνην καθεύδουσαν, οὐδὲ Διονύσω νυμφίῳ, λάφυρον δὲ τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ πολεμίοις.	
3	Paris – Chaereas	Chariton-N	ὅτι δῶρον παρ' αὐτῆς λαβὼν τὸ κάλλιστον, οἶον οὐδὲ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Πάρις, ὕβρισεν εἰς τὴν χάριν.	
17	Penelope-Odysseus	Chariton-N	ἀσπάσιοι λέκτροιο παλαιοῦ θεσμὸν ἵκοντο.	<i>Od.23.296</i>
15	Astyanax, Callirhoe's son	Dionysios	πήλας ταῖς χερσί (not fully quoted).	<i>Il. 6.474</i>

T 2 Xenophon

Myth	Narrator	References	Allusions
Eros (deus) against Habrocomes	Xenophon-N	μηνιᾷ πρὸς ταῦτα ὁ Ἔρως· φιλόνεικος γὰρ ὁ θεός καὶ ὑπερηφάνος ἀπαραίτητος·	
Artemis Ephesia	Xenophon-N	ἦγετο δὲ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἐπιχώριος ἑορτὴ ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερόν.	
Anthia as Artemis	Xenophon-N	πολλάκις αὐτὴν ...Ἐφέσιοι προσεκύνησαν ὥς Ἀρτεμιν.	
Apollo of Colophon	Xenophon-N	ὀλίγον δὲ ἀπέχει τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ ἐν Κολοφῶνι Ἀπόλλωνος .	
Isis Soter	The oracle	Ἰσιδι σεμνὴ σωτείρη	
Aphrodite-Ares	Xenophon-N	ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐτέρῳ Ἀρης ἦν οὐχ ὠπλισμένος, ἀλλ' ὥς πρὸς ἐρωμένην τὴν Ἀφροδίτην κεκοσμημένος, στεφανωμένος, χλανίδα ἔχων· Ἔρως αὐτὸν ὠδήγει.	<i>Od.8.265</i> , καλὸν αἰεὶ Ἄρεος φιλότῃτος εἶναι τ' Ἀφροδίτης
Hera of Samos (dea)	Xenophon-N	Σάμον κατήντησαν τὴν τῆς Ἥρας, ἱερὰν νῆσον.	
Helios of Rhodes	Xenophon-N	εἰς τὸ Ἡλίου ἱερόν.	
Apsyrtos	Xenophon-N	ἄρχοντας ληστηρίου, Ἀψύρτου τοῦνομα.	Not Medea
Manto	Xenophon-N	θυγάτηρ, Μαντῶ ὄνομα.	Not Teiresias' daugh
Nile (deus)	Habrocomes	ὦ θεῶν φιλανθρωπότατε.	
Apis (deus)	Xenophon-N	ἐν Μέμφει, ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀπιδος.	

T 3 Longus

Myth	Narrator	References	Allusions
Eros (god), Nymphs, Pan	Longus-N	ἀνάθημα μὲν Ἐρωτι καὶ Νύμφαις καὶ Πανί.	
Daphnis	Longus-N	ὥς δ' ἂν καὶ τοῦνομα τοῦ παιδίου ποιμενικὸν δοκοίη, Δάφνιν αὐτὸν ἔγνωσαν καλεῖν.	Daphnis
<i>Daphne?</i>			
Zeus fed by goat, Pan, Dionysus	Daphnis	ἐμὲ αἰξ ἀνέθρεψεν ὥσπερ τὸν Δία· νέμω δὲ τράγους τῶν τούτου βοῶν μεῖζονας· ὅζω δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ὅτι μὴδὲ ὁ Πάν, καίτοι γε ὦν τὸ πλεόν τράγος... ἀγένειός εἰμι, καὶ γὰρ ὁ Διόνυσος· μέλας, καὶ γὰρ ὁ ὑάκινθος· ἀλλὰ κρείττων καὶ ὁ Διόνυσος Σατύρων καὶ ὁ ὑάκινθος κρίνων.	
Phatta	Daphnis	Ἦν παρθένος, παρθένε, οὕτω καλὴ καὶ ἔνεμε βοῦς πολλὰς οὕτως ἐν ὕλῃ.	Longus' invention
<i>Pan and Pitys?</i>		cf. references to Πίτυς.	Pan and Pitys?
Philetas' Eros	Philetas	Φιλητᾶς, ὦ παῖδες, ὁ προεσβύτης ἐγώ.	Orphic Eros?
Syrinx	Lamon	αὕτη ἡ σύριγξ τὸ ὄργανον οὐκ ἦν ὄργανον ἀλλὰ παρθένος καλὴ καὶ τὴν φωνὴν μουσικὴ.	
Itys	Longus-N	αἱ δ' ὑπεφθέγγοντο ἐν ταῖς λόχμας καὶ τὸν Ἴτυν κατ' ὀλίγον ἡκρίβουν, ὥσπερ ἀναμνησκόμεναι τῆς ῥῆξης ἐκ μακρᾶς σιωπῆς.	
Penelope Helen	Lycaenion	σῶσόν με, Δάφνι, τὴν ἀθλίαν· ἐκ γὰρ μοι τῶν χηνῶν τῶν εἴκοσιν ἓνα τὸν κάλλιστον ἀετὸς ἤρπασε Od. 19.536 χῆνές μοι κατὰ οἶκον εἴκοσι πυρὸν ἔδουσιν ἐξ ὕδατος Od.15.171-178, ὡς ἄρα οἱ εἰπόντι ἐπέπατο δεξιὸς ὄρνις, / αἰετὸς ἀργὴν χῆνα φέρων ὀνύχεσσι πέλωρον, / ἡμέρον ἐξ αὐλῆς	Od. 19.536 Od.15.171-178
Echo	Daphnis	Νυμφῶν, ὦ κόρη, πολὺ γένος, Μελίαι καὶ Ἀρυάδες καὶ Ἑλαιοὶ· πᾶσαι καλάι, πᾶσαι μουσικαί. καὶ μίας τούτων θυγάτηρ Ἥχῳ γίνεται.	
Helen-Aphrodite	Daphnis	τοῦτο Ἀφροδίτῃ κάλλους ἔλαβεν ἄθλον· τοῦτο ἐγὼ σοὶ δίδωμι νικητήριον. Ὅμοίους ἔχετε τοὺς μάρτυρας· ἐκεῖνος ἦν ποιμὴν, αἰπόλος ἐγώ.	
Semele giving birth, Ariadne, Lycurgus, Satyroi, Bacchae, Pan	Longus-N	εἶχε δὲ καὶ ἐνδοθεν ὁ νεῶς Διονυσιακὰς γραφάς· Σεμέλῃν τίκτουςαν, Ἀριάδνῃν καθεύδουσαν, Λυκοῦργον δεδεμένον, Πενθέα διαιρούμενον· ἐπῆσαν καὶ Ἰνδοὶ νικῶμενοι καὶ Τυρρηνοὶ μεταμορφούμενοι· πανταχοῦ Σάτυροι πατοῦντες, πανταχοῦ Βάκχαι χορεύουσαι· οὐδὲ ὁ Πάν ἡμέλητο·	
Demeter (goddess)	Longus-N	(Dionysophanes) θεοὶς ἔθυσεν, ὅσοι προεστᾶσιν ἀγροικίας, Δήμητρι καὶ Διονύσῳ καὶ Πανί καὶ Νύμφαις.	
Apollo at Laomedon's house	Longus-N	εἰ ποτε Απόλλων Λαομέδοντι θητεύων ἐβουκόλησε, τοιόσδε ἦν, οἷος τότε ᾤφθη Δάφνις.	
Anchises and Aphrodite, Apollo and Brachus, Zeus and Ganymedes	Gnathon	εἰ δὲ νέμοντος ἡράσθην, θεοὺς ἐμιμησάμην. Βουκόλος ἦν Ἀγχίστης, καὶ ἔσχεν αὐτὸν Ἀφροδίτῃ· αἶγας ἔνεμε Βράγχος, καὶ Απόλλων αὐτὸν ἐφίλησε· ποιμὴν ἦν Γανυμήδης, καὶ αὐτὸν ὁ τῶν ὄλων βασιλεὺς ἤρπασε.	

T 4 Achilles Tatius

Myth	Narrator	References	Allusions
Astarte	Achilles-N	σώστρα ἔθουν ἑμαυτοῦ τῇ τῶν Φοινίκων θεᾷ· Ἀσάρτην αὐτὴν καλοῦσιν οἱ Σιδώνιοι.	
Europa/Selene	Achilles-N	Εὐρώπης ἡ γραφή· Φοινίκων ἡ θάλασσα· Σιδώνας ἡ γῆ.	
Eros	Achilles-N	ἔβλεπον τὸν ἄγοντα τὸν βοῦν Ἑρωτα· καί, Ὅϊον, εἶπον, ἄρχει βρέφος οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης.	
Apollo and Daphne	Cleitophon	τὸ δὲ ἄσμα ἦν Ἀπόλλων μεμφόμενος τὴν Δάφνην φεύγουσαν καὶ διώκων ἅμα καὶ μέλλων καταλαμβάνειν, καὶ γινομένη φυτὸν ἡ κόρη, καὶ Ἀπόλλων τὸ φυτὸν στεφανούμενος. τοῦτό μοι μάλλον ἄσθὲν τὴν ψυχὴν ἐξέκαυσεν ... ἰδοὺ καὶ Ἀπόλλων ἐρᾷ, κἀκεῖνος παρθένου.	
Pandora Phaedra	Cleinias	τοῖς δ' ἐγὼ ἀντὶ πυρὸς δώσω κακόν	Hesiod, <i>WD</i> 57; <i>Eur.Hipp.</i> <i>TrGF</i> 429.
Sirens, Eriphyle, Philomela, Aerope, Procne, Chryseis, Briseis, Candaules' wife, Helen, Penelope, Phaedra, Clytemnestra,	Cleinias	ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν ἰδιώτης ἦσθα μουσικῆς, ἡγνόνεις ἂν τὰ τῶν γυναικῶν δράματα· νῦν δὲ κἂν ἄλλοις λέγοις, ὅσων ἐνέπλησαν μύθων γυναικες τὴν σκηνὴν· <ὁ> ὄρμος Ἑριφύλης, Φιλομήλας ἡ τράπεζα, Σθενεβοίας ἡ διαβολή, Αἰετοπύτης ἡ κλοπή, Πρώκνης ἡ σφαγή	
Eos, Tereus	birds and cicadas	οἱ ὦδοι δέ, τέττιγες καὶ χελιδόνες· οἱ μὲν τὴν Ἥους ἄδοντες εὐνὴν, αἱ δὲ τὴν Τηρέως τράπεζαν.	
Alpheios and Arethusa	Satyros	γίνεται δὲ καὶ γάμος ἄλλος ὑδάτων διαπόντιος. καὶ ἔστιν ὁ μὲν ἐραστής ποταμὸς Ἥλειος, ἡ δὲ ἐρωμένη κρήνη Σικελική.	
Bull and Boar fight	Leukippe	ἡ δὲ πρῶτον μὲν ἦσεν Ὀμήρου τὴν πρὸς τὸν Λέοντα τοῦ σὺς μάχην. ἔπειτά τι καὶ τῆς ἀπαλῆς μούσης ἐλίγαινε· ὁδὸν γὰρ ἐπῆνει τὸ ἄσμα.	<i>Il.</i> 16.823
Dionysus of Tyre Cadmus and wine	Cleitophon	τὸν γὰρ Διόνυσον Τύριοι νομίζουσιν ἑαυτῶν, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸν Κάδμου μῦθον ἄδουσι. ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸν Κάδμου μῦθον ἄδουσι· καὶ τῆς ἐορτῆς διηγούνται πατέρα μῦθον	
Heracles and Omphale	Cleitophon	καὶ μὴν πέπρακέ μέ τις σοι θεῶν ὥσπερ τὸν Ἡρακλέα τῇ Ὀμφάλῃ.	
Hephaestos and Athena	oracle	χρησμὸν ἴσχουσιν οἱ Βυζάντιοι τοιόνδε· / νῆσός τις πόλις ἐστὶ φυτῶνυμον αἶμα λαχοῦσα, / ἰσθμὸν ὁμοῦ καὶ πορθμὸν ἐπ' ἡπείροιο φέρουσα, / ἔνθ' Ἥφαιστος ἔχων χαίρει γλαυκῶπιν Ἀθήνην / κείθι θυηπολίην σε φέρειν κέλομαι Ἡρακλεῖ.	
Lion and Conops	Conops	ὁ λέων κατεμέμφετο τὸν Προμηθεά πολλάκις.	
Elephant tale	Satyros	ἀπὸ κώνωπος καὶ λέοντος, ὃν ἀκήκοά τινος τῶν φιλοσόφων· χαρίζομαι δέ σοι τοῦ μύθου τὸν ἐλέφαντα.	
Cyclops-Odysseus	Satyros	κεῖταί σοι καθεύδων ὁ Κύκλωψ· σὺ δὲ ὅπως Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀγαθὸς γένη.	
Menelaus in Egypt	Menelaus	ἐγὼ Μενέλαος, εἶπεν, τὸδὲ γένος Αἰγύπτιος.	
Ganymedes	Menelaus	τὸν καὶ ἀνῆρείψαντο οἱ θεοὶ Διὶ οἰνιοχεύειν.	<i>Il.</i> 20.234
Alcmene, Danae, Semele	Menelaus	οὐδεμία δὲ ἀνέβη ποτὲ εἰς οὐρανοῦς διὰ κάλλος γυνή (καὶ γὰρ γυναιξὶ κεκοινώνηκεν ὁ Ζεὺς), ἀλλ' Ἀλκμήνην μὲν ἔχει πένθος καὶ φυγὴ, Δανάην δὲ λάρναξ καὶ θάλασσα, Σεμέλη δὲ πυρὸς γέγονε τροφή.	
Europa, Semele,	Cleitophon	διὰ γυναικᾶ ποτε Ζεὺς ἐμυκήσατο, διὰ γυναικᾶ ποτε Σάτυρον ὠρχήσατο, καὶ χρυσόν	

	Antiope		πεποιήκεν ἑαυτὸν ἄλλη γυναικί.	
3	Perseus, Heracles, Dionysos		Σεμέλην δὲ εἰς οὐρανούς ἀνήγαγεν οὐκ ὄρνις ὠμηστής, ἀλλὰ πύρ. καὶ μὴ θαυμάσης, εἰ διὰ πυρός τις ἀναβαίνει εἰς οὐρανόν· οὕτως ἀνέβη Ἡρακλῆς. εἰ δὲ Δανάης τὴν λάρνακα γελᾷς, πῶς τὸν Περσέα σιωπᾷς;	
	Poseidon	Cleitophon	ἐλέησον, ἔφην, δέσποτα Πόσειδον.	
	Zeus Cassius with pomegranate	Cleitophon	Ἔστι δὲ ἐν τῷ Πηλουσίῳ Διὸς ἱερὸν ἄγαλμα Κασίου. τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα νεανίσκος, Ἀπόλλωνι μᾶλλον ἑοικώς.	
	Andromeda	Cleitophon	ἡ δὲ εἰκὼν Ἀνδρομέδα καὶ Προμηθεύς, δεσμῶται μὲν ἄμφω.	
3	Niobe	Cleitophon	καὶ τάχα ὁ τῆς Νιόβης μῦθος οὐκ ἦν ψευδής, ἀλλὰ κάκεινη τοιοῦτόν τι παθοῦσα ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν παιδῶν ἀπωλείᾳ δόξαν παρέσχευ ἐκ τῆς ἀκνησίας ὥσει λίθος γενομένη.	
2	Hecate	Cleitophon	καλῶ γὰρ τὴν Ἑκάτην ἐπὶ τὸ ἔργον.	
1	Phoenix the bird	Menelaus	Φοῖνιξ μὲν ὁ ὄρνις ὄνομα, τὸ δὲ γένος Αἰθίοψ.	
	Artemis (dream)	Leucippe	ἡ γὰρ μοι θεὸς Ἀρτεμις ἐπιστᾶσα.	
	Aphrodite (dream)	Cleitophon	ἐδόκουν γὰρ τῇ παρελθούσῃ νυκτὶ ναὸν Ἀφροδίτης ὄραν.	
	Helios and Selene	Cleitophon	ἐκατέρωθεν ἐκ τῶν Ἡλίου πυλῶν ἐς τὰς Σελήνης πύλας.	
	Zeus/Serapis		ἱερομηνία τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ, ὃν Δία μὲν Ἕλληνες, Σέραπιν δὲ καλοῦσιν Αἰγύπτιοι.	
1	Philomela/Procne/Tereus		γραφὴν ὥρῃ κειμένην, ἣτις ὑπηνίττετο προσόμοιον Φιλομήλας γὰρ εἶχε φθορὰν καὶ τὴν βίαν Τηρέως καὶ τῆς γλώττης τὴν τομήν.	
5	Poseidon and Amphitrite	Melite	νυμφοστολήσουσι δὲ ἡμᾶς Ποσειδῶν καὶ Νηρεΐδων χορός· ἐνταῦθα γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς Ἀμφιτρίτην γαμεῖ.	
4	Tantalos	Melite	τοιαύτην ἔχω τὴν εὐνὴν, οἷαν ὁ Τάνταλος τὴν τροφήν.	
4	Isis	Melite	ἀναμνήσθητι τῆς Ἰσιδος.	
2	Penelope		ἡγήσεται δέ σοι τῆς ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας ὁδοῦ Μελανθώ.	
3	Achilles in Sikyon	Melite	παρὰ πολὺ γέγονας τῇ στολῇ· τοιοῦτον Ἀχιλλέα ποτ' ἔθεασάμην ἐν γραφῇ.	
3	Codros, Croesus	Leukippe	ἐμοὶ δὲ οὐδὲν μέλει τούτων, εἴτε ἐστὶ καὶ Κόδρου εὐγενέστερος εἴτε Κροίσου πλουσιώτερος.	
3	Artemis of Taurians/Skythes	Cleitophon	οὐ βάρβαροι τοῦτο καὶ Ταῦροι καὶ ἡ Ἀρτεμις ἡ Σκυθῶν; ὁ παρ' ἐκείνοις μόνος ναὸς οὕτως αἰμάσσεται· τὴν Ἰωνίαν Σκυθίαν πεποίηκας	
1	Syrinx and Pan	Artemis' priest	φέρει καὶ οἶόν ἐστιν εἶπω καὶ τὸν ταύτη τοῦ Πανὸς πάντα εἶπω καὶ τὸν ταύτη τοῦ Πανὸς μῦθον.	
11	Syx (Rhodope and Euthunikos)	Artemis' priest	τὸ δὲ τῆς Στυγὸς ὕδωρ εἶχεν οὕτως. παρθένος ἦν εὐειδής, ὄνομα Ῥοδώπις, κυνηγίῳ ἐρώσα καὶ θήρας.	
11	Heracles of Tyre	Sostratos	εὐφημοῦντες τὸν Ἡρακλέα καὶ τὴν Ἀρτεμιν, ἐχειροτονήθημεν, ἐγὼ μὲν ἐνταῦθα τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι, ὁ δὲ εἰς Τύρον Ἡρακλεῖ.	

T 5 Heliodorus

Myth	Narrator	References	Allusions
Artemis, Isis and Osiris	Heliodorus-N	οἱ μὲν γὰρ θεὸν τινα ἔλεγον, καὶ θεὸν Ἀρτεμιν ἢ τὴν ἐγχώριον Ἴσιν, οἱ δὲ ἱέρειαν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεῶν ἐκμεμηνυῖαν καὶ τὸν ὀρώμενον πολὺν φόνον ἐργασαμένην.	
Hippolytus/Theseus?	Demaenete?	καὶ περιβαλοῦσα ὁ νέος Ἱππόλυτος, † ὁ Θησεύς ὁ ἐμός † ἔλεγε.	Eur. <i>Hipp.</i>
Thisbe (and Pyramos?)			
Hector to Andromache	Thyamis	ὁ δὲ πόλεμος ἡμῖν μελήσει.	<i>Il.</i> 6.490 (Aristoph. <i>Lysistr.</i> , 536-8)
Trojan War (proverbial)	Kalassiris	Ἰλιόθεν με φέρεις.	Demosth.19.148
Pandora ?	Calasiris	σμήνος κακῶν.	Hesiod <i>WD</i> , 594ff.ὡς δ' ὁπότεν ἐν σμήνεσσι κατηρεφέεσσι μέλισσαι κηφήνας βόσκωσι, κακῶν ξυνήονας ἔργων...ὡς δ' αὐτῶς ἄνδρεςσι κακὸν θνητοῖσι γυναῖκας
Odysseus-Calasiris	Calasiris	βίος γάρ, ὦ παῖ, κἀκείνῳ πλάνος καὶ ἔμπορος καὶ πολλὰ μὲν πόλεις πολλῶν δὲ ἀνθρώπων ἦθη τε καὶ νοῦς εἰς πείραν ἤκουσιν ὅθεν.	<i>Od.</i> 1.3
Dionysos (metaphor for wine)	Cnemon	Διόνυσος χαίρει .	
Proteus	Cnemon	ἡῦρον σε κατὰ τὸν Πρωτέα τὸν Φάριον.	
Oedipus/ Eteocles-Polyneikes?	Calasiris	οἱ παῖδες ἦσαν, οὓς ἡ ἄρρητός μοι πολλάκις ἐκ θεῶν σοφία ξιφήρεις ἀλλήλοις συμπεσεῖσθαι προηγόρευε.	
Apollo at Delphi	Calasiris	Δελφοὺς Ἑλληνίδα πόλιν ἱερὰν μὲν Ἀπόλλωνος.	
Eros and Aphrodite	Charicles	Ἔρωτα δὲ καὶ Ἀφροδίτην καὶ πάντα γαμήλιον θιάσον ἀποσκορακίζουσα.	
Aenians and Deukalion	Charicles	Θετταλικῆς ἐστὶ μοῖρας τὸ εὐγενέστατον καὶ ἀκριβῶς Ἑλληνικὸν ἀφ' Ἑλλήνος τοῦ Δευκαλίωνος.	
Neoptolemos and Orestes	Charicles	πέμπουσιν Αἰνιᾶνες Νεοπτολέμῳ τῷ Ἀχιλλέως.	
Homer Egyptian	Calasiris	ἢ γὰρ Ὅμηρου τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου ποίησις τὸν Ἀχιλλέα Φθιώτην ἐνδείκνυται.	
Theagenes-Achilles Aenianan	Charicles	Ἀχιλλεΐδης γὰρ εἶναι σεμνύνεται ὁ τῆς θεωρίας ἐξάρχων.	
Thetis and Peleus	Charicles	τὴν Θέτιν ἐκ τοῦ Μαλιακοῦ κόλπου γήμασθαι τῷ Πηλεΐ	
Theagenes:Lapiths and Centaurs, Athena and Gorgon	Calasiris	φοινικοβαφῇ χλαμῦδα καθειμένος, ἥς τὰ μὲν ἄλλα χρυσὸς ἐποίκιλλε τοὺς Λαπίθας ἐπὶ τοὺς Κενταύρους ὀπλίζων, ἢ περόνη δὲ Ἀθηναῖν ἠλεκτρίνην ἔστεφε τὴν Γοργοῦς κεφαλὴν εἰς θώρακα προασπίζουσιν.	
Charicleia-Eos	Calasiris	ἥμος δ' ἡριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος ἥως	formula
Charicleia-Athena snakes)	Calasiris	Δυσὶν γὰρ δρακόντοιν τὰ μὲν οὐραῖα κατὰ τῶν μεταφρένων ἐδέσμενε τοὺς δὲ αὐχένας ὑπὸ τοὺς μαζοὺς παραμείψας.	

Charicleia-Artemis (arrows)	Calasiris	ἔφερε δὲ τῇ λαῖᾳ μὲν τόξον ἐπὶ χροσσὸν ὑπὲρ ὤμων τὸν δεξιὸν τῆς φαρέτρας ἀπηρτημένης	
Apollo and Artemis hand Theagenes and Charicleia to Calasiris		ἦδη δὲ μεσοῦσης τῆς νυκτὸς ὁρῶ τὸν Ἀπόλλω καὶ τὴν Ἀρτεμιν ὥς ὦμην, εἴ γε ὦμην ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀληθῶς ἐώρων· καὶ ὁ μὲν τὸν Θεαγένην ἦ δὲ τὴν Χαρίκλειαν ἐνεχειρίζεν.	
(Poseidon and Oeleus)	Calasiris	ἴχνια γὰρ μετόπισθεν...ποδῶν κνημῶν.	<i>Il.</i> 13.71
Homer Vita	Calasiris	Αἰγύπτιον δὲ Ὅμηρον ἀποκαλοῦντός σου πολλάκις.	
Achilles at Scamander (Theagenes' agon)	Calasiris	καὶ μόγισ ἀναμένων, σεμνὸν τι θέαμα καὶ περιβλεπτον καὶ οἷον Ὅμηρος τὸν Ἀχιλλέα τὴν ἐπὶ Σκαμάνδρῳ μάχην ἀθλοῦντα παρίστησιν.	<i>Il.</i> 18.571
Oedipus	Theagenes	ὥς τάχ' οὐκέθ' αἵματηρόν τοῦμόν ἀργήσῃ ξίφος.	<i>Eur. Phoen.</i> 628 (<i>Polyneikes</i>)
Achilles	Charicleia	ὦ Ἀχιλεῦ Πηληϊὸς υἱέ, μέγα φέρεται' Ἀχαιῶν.	<i>Il.</i> 16.21
Helios, Dionysus, Andromeda, Memnon	Persinna	ἡμῖν πρόγονοι θεῶν μὲν Ἥλιός τε καὶ Διόνυσος ἡρώων δὲ Περσεύς τε καὶ Ἀνδρομέδα καὶ Μέμνων ἐπὶ τούτοις.	
Heracles of Tyre	Calasiris	τὸ δὲ παρὸν Ἡρακλεῖ Τυρίῳ τήνδε νικητήριον ἀποθύειν.	
Odysseus- Orestes/ Theagenes scar/	Calasiris	οὐλήν δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ γόνατος ἐκ θήρας συὸς ὁ Θεαγένης.	<i>Od.</i> 19.392 <i>Eur. Electra</i> , 572
Helen / Trojan War	Nausicles	οὐ τοι ἀπόβλητ' ἐστὶ θεῶν ἐρικυδέα δῶρα.	<i>Il.</i> 3. 65
Dionysos and Demter	Calasiris	οἱ μὲν ἄνδρες ἐμβατήρια τῷ Διονύσῳ καὶ ἦδον καὶ ἔσπενδον αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες ὕμνον τῇ Δήμητρὶ χαριστήριον ἐχόρευον.	
Hermes and Dionysos	Calasiris	τὸν Ἑρμῆν ἱλάσαιτο.	
Odysseus dream	Calasiris	θῦε διαπλεύσας εἰς Ἰθάκην ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Ὀδυσσεῖ καὶ αἶτει τῆς μήνιδος ἀνείναι τῆς καθ' ἡμῶν.	
Polyneikes-Eteocles	Thyamis	αἵματος ἀνταδέλφου.	<i>Aesch. Sept.</i> 718
Hector-Achilles Petosiris-Thyamis	Heliodorus-N	ἀπεδίδρασκε δὴ τέως, ὥς εἶχε τάχους, περὶ τὸν κύκλον τοῦ ἄστεως, ἦδη καὶ τὰ ὅπλα ἀποβαλὼν.	
Helen	Cybele	σὺ δ', ὦ τάλαινα, μὴ 'πὶ τοῖς ἀνηνύτοις τρύχουσα σαυτήν.	<i>Eur. Helen.</i> 1285
Phaedra	Messenger	βρόχον κρεμαστὸν ἀγχόνῃς ἀνήψατο.	<i>Eur. Hipp.</i> 802
Pan (Paneion)	Heliodorus	ἔλος καὶ παρὰ τοὺς Γυμνοσοφιστὰς ἐλθοῦσα, οἴκησιν τὸ Πανεῖον πεποιημένους.	
Helios, Selene, Dionysos	Persinna	ἐπισκόπει τὴν Ἀνδρομέδαν ἀπαράλλακτον ἐν τῇ γραφῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ κόρῃ δεικνυμένην.	

[illegible]

T 7 Δόγμα

CHARITON	A.TATIUS	HELIODORUS
12 ο δημιουργός του βιβλίου ήταν Έλληνας	1.3 η Τύχη, όταν έδωκεν συμπύκναι τι παρόθεν	1.3.1 φόνω τῷ καθ' ἡμῶν δόγμα τὸ περὶ ἡμᾶς καταστρέψαντες.
12 η φιλοκαίνος Τύχη δόγμα σκωθώπων τῶν περὶ τρέπεσκε.	1.8.4 ἡννέας ἀν τὰ τῶν γυναικῶν δόγματα· νῦν δὲ κἂν ἀλλοις λέγοις.	2.11.3 οὐ γὰρ δὴ κάμει τε καὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ὄψιν εἰποις ἀν ὡς ἐγοητεύουσεν, οὐδὲν κοινωνοῦντα τὸν δόγματος.
16 προφάσει δὲ δίκης ἡλθεν ἐπ' εἰς καὶ ὅλον τὸ δόγμα τὸτο ἐκείνη κατεσκεύασε.	1.9.1 Ἐγὼ δὲ πρὸς τὸν Κάλειαν καταλέγω μὴν τὸ δόγμα πῶς ἐγένετο.	2.23.5 καθάρπεν ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τῷ λόγῳ διασκεύαζεν.
1.10.7 ἐὰν δὲ μάθαισκότερον ἡδὴ θέλῃ, χορηγήσων τὴν ὑπόκρισιν, μὴ ἀπολέσῃς σου τὸ δόγμα.	8.5.3 ἐν μόνον παρῆκα τῶν ἐμῶν δόγματων, τὴν μετὰ ταῦτα πρὸς Μελίτην αἰδῶ.	2.29.4 ἐπετραγῶδαι τοῦτω τῷ δόγματι καὶ ἔτεγον πάθος ὁ δαίμων.
2.28.1 οὐκ ἐρεῖς, ἔφη, τὴν συσκευὴν τοῦ δόματος; ἰδοὺ καὶ ἡ Κάλειά πεφύγευεν.	8.5.9 ὁ δὲ Σάστρατος καὶ ἐπεδάκρυεν, εἰ ποτε κατά Λευκίτην ἐγγύονε <τὸ> δόγμα.	5.6.3 τοιοῦτον παῖζει καθ' ἡμῶν πόλεμον ὥσπερ σκηνὴν τὰ ἡμέτερα καὶ δόγμα πεποιήμενος.
3.7.9 τὸ μὲν τῆς ἀνδρομέδας δόγμα τὸτο	8.9.13 ὁ γὰρ δόγμα σου τὸ ἦκουσάμεν.	
3.23.4 ὦ θάλαττα ἀγνώμων, ἐφθόνησας ἡμῖν ὀλοκαήθου τοῦ τῆς φιλανθρωπίας σου δόματος.	8.10.8 δόγματος πᾶσαν ἀπεκάλυψε τὴν αἰδῶ, ἀναίσχυντας.	
5.3.4 ἦν δὲ ὀλοκαήθου τὴν γὰρ τὸ διήγημα τοῦ δόματος, ὁ πέλγος, ὁ Τηρεῖς, ἡ τράπεζα.	8.15.4 οὐκ ἐρεῖς ἡμῖν τὸν μῦθον τῶν τῆς φάου ἡστῶν ... τοῦτο γὰρ μόνον ἐνδέει πρὸς ἀκρόασιν τοῦ παντός.	
5.5.5 ψάλλει γὰρ πέλγον ἀγγέλον καὶ τὸ δόγμα πλέκει τὰς κρόκας.		
6.3.1 εἶμοι δὲ ἡ συνήθης Τύχη πάλιν ἐπιτρέται καὶ συντίθεται κατ' ἐμὸν δόγμα καινόν.		

[illegible]

[illegible]

PART II

T 1 The Helen pattern

The tits patterns	A: The heroine is engaged with the hero/RETARD.	B: Plot against heroine's chastity/ MOTION	C: The heroine defends her chastity/RETARDATION	D: The hero's quest and the recovery of the heroine /MOTION
Semiramis	Semiramis marries Ninus	Semiramis follows Ninus in his campaigns and is kidnapped?	?	Ninus recovers Semiramis?
Parthenope	Parthenope is engaged? to Metiochos.	Meandrius imprisons her.	Parthenope defends herself from various suitors.	Reunion?
Sesonchosis	Sesonchosis engaged to Meameris.	?	?	Sesonchosis gets his throne from his brother.
Sinonis	Sinonis married to Rhodanes.	Garmus pursues the couple.	Sinonis defends herself with violence (Setapos) or guile (Garmus).	Rhodanes' campain; Recovery of Sinonis.
Anthia	Anthia's wedding with Habrocomes.	Euxeinos/Moiris/ Hippochoos/ Perilaos/ Psamis/ Aghialos/ brothel-Hippochoos.	Sold to Apsyrtos/Lampon Saved by Perilaos (?) Suicides. Murders / fakes epilepsy.	Habrocomes and Hippochoos look for Anthia Hippochoos recovers Anthia.
Heroic Helen	Helen married to Menelaus.	Paris abducts Helen.	Helen in Troy.	Recovery of Helen by Menelaus.
Epidean Helen	Helen married to Menelaus.	Hermes carries Helen in Egypt.	Helen against Theoclymenus.	Menelaus recovers Helen (after short battle).
Helen in Dio's	Marriage to Paris.	The Greeks against Troy	Helen in Troy.	Greeks win the war.
Helen in Arch (and Proclus)	Marriage to Menelaus .	Paris abducts Helen, but she is kept in Egypt.	Helen in Egypt.	Recovery of Helen by Menelaus .
Helen in Dionysius's, True Stories	Helen marries Menelaus.	Cinyras abducts Helen.	Helen does not react.	Menelaus recovers Helen.
Helen in Dionysius's True Stories	Helen marries Menelaus.	Hermes brings Helen in Egypt.	Helen in Egypt enamoured of Achilles.	Achilles recovers Helen.
Penelope]	Penelope marries Odysseus.	The suitors besiege the palace (no motion).	Penelope's guile against the suitor.	Recognition and recovery of the queen and the throne.

T 1 Chariton

The motifs	A: The heroine is engaged with the hero/ RETARD.	B: Plot against heroine's chastity/MOTION	C: The heroine defends her chastity/ RETARD.	D: The hero's quest; recovery of the heroine /MOTION.
novelistic pattern	Callirhoe married to Chaereas.	Two plots against Callirhoe's chastity (resulting in her death)-transportation by Theron.	Callirhoe defends herself against the pirates.	Chaereas' first quest for Callirhoe (Capture of Theron) – Chaereas' second quest (to Miletus).
Euripidean plot	Callirhoe marries Chaereas.	Dionysios (as Proteus, Paris and Theoclymenus) postpones Callirhoe's departure.	Callirhoe defends herself against Dionysios' advances.	(Quest failed- Chaereas is captured).
Homeric pattern	Wedding with Dionysios-Menelaus.	Pharnabazos and Mithridates – Mithridates uses Chaereas to drag Dionysios to Babylon.	<i>Charicleia as a prize/present.</i>	(Chaereas in search for Callirhoe).
and Euripidean plot	Callirhoe married to Dionysos (and Chaereas).	Artaxerxes in love (as Proteus and Theoclymenus) – Callirhoe in Arados.	Callirhoe defends herself against Artaxates – plans to suicide.	Chaereas joins the Egyptian army against the King and Dionysios – recovers Callirhoe.
modified Homeric patterns	-Callirhoe married to Chaereas. -Stateira and Rhodogoune married to Artaxerxes and Megabyzos. -Callirhoe married to Dionysios.	-The Egyptian general as potential suitor. -Stateira and Rhodogoune to Sicily? -Chaereas abducts Callirhoe to Sicily.	-Callirhoe prefers suicide. -Stateira and Rhodogoune as prize/present. - Callirhoe as a prize/present.	-Callirhoe recognizes Chaereas. -Artaxerxes recovers Stateira after the war. -Dionysios does not react.

T 2 Xenophon

(see above in the general Helen pattern)

T 3 Longus

The motifs The patterns	A: The heroine is engaged with the hero/ RETARDATION	B: Plot against heroine's chastity/ MOTION	C: The heroine defends her chastity/ RETARDATION	D: The hero's quest and the recovery of the heroine /MOTION
	Daphnis herds with Chloe.	- Dorcon tries to force Chloe. - Pirates attack the seashore and captive Daphnis.	<i>Choe does not understand.</i> <i>Daphnis captured.</i>	Chloe with Daphnis. Dorcon saves Daphnis.
Eros' first plot	Daphnis is in love with Chloe.	- Daphnis' goat eats the rope – War between Methymnians and Mytilenians; Chloe is abducted		Pan recovers Chloe after a naval battle. (Daphnis is praying to Pan).
Chloe as a present	Chloe's open engagements.	Daphnis is rejected The Nymphs help Daphnis to get betrothed to Chloe.		
Eros second plot	Daphnis engaged to Chloe.	- Lampis destroys Daphnis' garden Lampis abducts Chloe. - <i>Gnathon desires Daphnis.</i>		Gnathon recovers Chloe Daphnis marriage to Chloe.

T 4 Achilles Tatius

The motifs The patterns	A: The heroine is engaged with the hero/ RETARD.	B: Plot against heroine's chastity/ MOTION	C: The heroine defends her chastity/ RETARDATION	D: The hero's quest and the recovery of the heroine /MOTION
doublet Pattern I	Calligone engaged to Cleitophon.	- Cleitophon in love with Leucippe; tries to persuade her. - Callisthenes abducts 'Leucippe'.	Leucippe resists Cleitophon attempts especially after Artemis' dream.	Cleitophon recovers and marries Leucippe.
doublet Pattern II	Calligone engaged to Cleitophon.	Callisthenes abducts Calligone.	Calligone resists go Callisthenes.	Marriage of Callisthenes and Calligone after the latter's excellence at the war.
trimeric divisions of the plot in Egypt	Leucippe engaged to Cleitophon.	- Charmides plans to force Leucippe. - Gorgias in love with Leucippe – gives her a drug. - Chaereas abducts Leucippe.	- Menelaus tricks Charmides. - <i>Leucippe in comma.</i>	Charmides goes to war. War and decapitation of 'Leucippe'.
plot in Cyrenaica?	Leucippe faithful to Cleitophon.	- Sosthenes - Thersander.	- <i>Leucippe escapes.</i> - <i>Leucippe defends Thersander's advances.</i>	Escape.

T 5 Heliodorus

The motifs The patters	A: The heroine is engaged with the hero/ RETARDATION	B: Plot against heroine's chastity/ MOTION	C: The heroine defends her chastity/ RETARDATION	D: The hero's quest and the recovery of the heroine /MOTION
First Homeric plot	Charicleia enaged to Alcamenes.	Theagenes elopes with Charicleia.	<i>Charicleia consents</i> .	An Amphictyonic war? Theagenes seizes Charicleia .
Second Homeric plot	Charicleia 'engaged' to Theagenes.	Trachinus desires Charicleia (towards Egypt) Peloros desires Charicleia.	Charicleia postpones the wedding Peloros tricked by Calasiris.	Duel Peloros-Trachinus The battlefield at the Nile's delta. Theagenes fights Peloros Theagenes dead?
Euripidean plot	Charicleia engaged to Theagenes.	Thyamis against Charicleia.	Charicleia conceals Theagenes' identity Charicleia in the cave.	<i>Petosiris attack.</i>

T 6 The Phaedra pattern

The motifs The patterns				
	A: The hero is engaged with the heroine/ RETARDATION	B: Plot against hero's chastity/ MOTION	C: The hero defends her chastity/ RETARDATION	D: The hero's exculpation-punishment of the 'other woman'/MOTION
The two brothers	Bata is handsome and chaste.	Anubis' wife plots against Bata – Anubis against Bata.	Bata castrates himself and is self-exiled in the Pine Valley.	-Anubis realises the plot and kills his wife. -Bata's reincarnation on the Egyptian throne (killing of his wife).
Joseph	Joseph beautiful and chaste.	-Potiphar's wife desires Joseph.- She accuses him to Potiphar.	Joseph in prison	-Joseph interprets the Pharaoh's dreams and is set free. -Joseph marries Pentephres' daughter.
Bellerophon	Bellerophon is chaste	Proitus wife (Stheneboea/ Ante(i)a) desires Bellerophon; he rejects her and she accuses him of ravishing	Proetus sends Bellerophon to Stheneboea's father, Iobates with a letter to kill him– Iobates has him to kill Chimaera.	-Bellerophon refuses to sleep with the women of the palace-exoneration. -Iobates gives him his daughter Antheia for a wife.
Hippolytus	Hippolytus is a devotee of Artemis.	Phaeda desires Hippolytus and has him falsely accused to Theseus (and commits suicide).	Theseus has Hippolytus exiled and killed by Poseidon's bull.	-Artemis reveals the truth. -Hippolytus becomes object of a cult.
Phoenix	Phoenix	Young stepmother, former concubine, accuses him to his father.	Phoenix exiled.	?
Metiochus	Metiochus condemns Eros.	Hegisipyle plots against Metiochos.	Metiochos is (self) – exiled in Samos.	?
Bacchon	Bacchon a youth.	Ismenodora is widowed and courts Bacchon.	---	Marriage of Bacchon and Ismenodora .
Combabus	Combabus castrates himself in an act of chastity.	Stratonice desires and (does not) accuses Combabus to the King.	The king asks for Combabus' death.	-Combabos brings the proofs of his castration. - Combabos' castration results in a ritual by Hera.
Ninus	Ninus has given an oath of purity.	?	?	?
Rhodanes	Rhodanes is engaged to Sinonis.	Rhodanes kisses the farmer's daughter.	Sinonis 'marries' Garmus.	?

T 7 Chariton

The motifs The patterns	A: The hero is engaged with the heroine/ RETARDATION	B: Plot against hero's chastity/ MOTION	C: The hero defends her chastity/ RETARDATION	D: The hero's exculpation-punishment of the heroine'/ MOTION
Artaxerxes?	Callirhos the chaste wife.	Artaxerxes desires Callirhoe (no accusation).	Callirhoe's judgement postponed; in Arados.	Nothing happens and both heroes are rewarded.
Stateira?	Callirhoe the chaste wife of Chaereas.	Stateira accuses Callirhoe of seducing the king?	<i>Callirhoe imprisoned? sold?</i>	Nothing happens and both heroines are rewarded.

T 8 Xenophon

The motifs The patterns	A: The hero is engaged with the heroine/ RETARDATION	B: Plot against hero's chastity/ MOTION	C: The hero defends her chastity/ RETARDATION	D: The hero's exculpation - punishment of the heroine'/MOTION
Euripidean Hippolytus	Habrocomes condemns Eros.	Habrocomes in love with Anthia – Anthia reciprocates his feelings.	The Apollo oracle: Habrocomes and Anthia adventures.	Habrocomes reunited with Anthia.
Manto	Habrocomes, slave, chaste.	Manto desires Habrocomes and accuses him to her father of rape.	Habrocomes is tortured and imprisoned.	Habrocomes governing Apsyrus' household No more mention of Manto.
Cyno	Habrocomes, slave, chaste.	Cyno desires Habrocomes; she kills her husband and Habrocomes is accused.	Habrocomes punished twice: by crucifixion and on the pyre. Habrocomes is miraculously saved twice- his innocence proved – but remains imprisoned.	Hippochoos buys Habrocomes' freedom. Cyno crucified.
Rhenaëa	Anthia is chaste.	Rhenaëa accuses Anthia of seducing Polyidos.	Anthia sold to a brothel in Sicily.	Hippochoos buys Anthia's freedom No mention of Rhenaëa.

The motifs The patterns	A: The hero is engaged with the heroine/ RETARDATION	B: Plot against hero's chastity/ MOTION	C: The hero defends her chastity/ RETARDATION	D: The hero's exculpation-punishment of the 'other woman' /MOTION
A pastoral Phaedra	Daphnis faithful to Chloe.	Lycaenion desires Daphnis – and he agrees (because he is in love with Chloe).	---	Daphnis marries Chloe Lycaenion at Daphnis' wedding.

T 9 Longus

T 10 Achilles Tatius

The motifs patterns	A: The hero is engaged with the heroine/ RETARDATION	B: Plot against hero's chastity/ MOTION	C: The hero defends her chastity/ RETARDATION	D: The hero's exculpation - punishment of the 'other woman' /MOTION
homosexual hippolytus	Charicles and Cleinias reject all women and marriage.	Charicles is going to be betrothed to an ugly woman.	Charicles dies by his boyfriend's horse.	Cleinias exiled.
Cleitophon	Cleitophon teases Cleinias Cleitophon in love with Leucippe.	- Cleitophon a devotee of both Aphrodite and Artemis - Melite does not accuse Cleitophon.	Thersander accuses and imprisons Cleitophon.	- Melite rewarded by Aphrodite and exonerated - Cleitophon marries Leucippe, as predicted by Artemis.

T 11 Heliodorus

The motifs patterns	A: The hero is engaged with the heroine/ RETARDATION	B: Plot against hero's chastity/ MOTION	C: The hero defends her chastity/ RETARDATION	D: The hero's exculpation- punishment of the 'other woman' /MOTION
Demaenete's hippolytus I	Cnemon	Demaenete desires Cnemon, he refuses; Demaenete accuses him to Aristippus of violence.	Cnemon is tortured as a slave/inertia.	
Demaenete's hippolytus II	Cnemon	Demaenete cunningly accuses 'herself' of having a lover.	Cnemon is judged for parricide and exiled/ motion.	<i>Demaenete suffers after Cnemon's departure?</i>
Thisbe's Arsinoe	Demaenete?	Thisbe accuses Demaenete of having a lover.	Death of Demaenete	Exoneration of Cnemon <i>Thisbe hides at Arsinoe's.</i>
Arsinoe's Demaenete	Thisbe? (and as a result Aristippus).	Arsinoe reports Thisbe as Demaenete's murderer.	- Aristippus is ruined financially - Thisbe flees to Egypt Death of Thisbe .	<i>Exoneration of Aristippus (fore-coming?) And Arsinoe?</i>
Phaon's Arsinoe	Theagenes faithful to Charicleia.	Arsace attempts to seduce Theagenes.	<i>Theagenes pretends to consent.</i>	
Cybele's Theagenes	Theagenes Charicleia	-Achaemenes classifies Theagenes as a slave. -Cybele accuses Charicleia of poisoning her.	-Theagenes tortured. -Cybele's death Charicleia on the pyre.	- Charicleia's innocence proved on the pyre. - Achaemenes' death. - Arsace's death.

T 12 The Iphigenia pattern

The motifs e patterns	A: A war setting or a custom; a god requests for sacrifice RETARDATION	B: The victim's sacrifice is executed by a kinsman/ RETARDATION	C: Recognition of the victim by the kinsman, or vice versa/ RETARD.	D: (Averted) Sacrifice by transportation of the victim /MOTION
Iphigenia	The Trojan War-Artemis punishes Agamemnon.	Iphigenia in Aulis.	<i>Iphigenia recognises her father's motivations.</i>	Iphigenia rescued (?)
Orestes	Thoas sacrifices strangers to Artemis.	Orestes is to be sacrificed in Tauris.	Orestes recognises Iphigenia.	Reunion and escape.
Chryses	Thoas sacrifices strangers to Artemis.	Orestes and Iphigenia are to be sacrificed by Chryses in Tauris.	Recognition?	Escape?
Electra	--	Orestes and Iphigenia are to be sacrificed by Electra at Mycaenae.	Recognition.	Happy end.
Orestes	Apollo's request.	Alcestis replaces Admetus on his deathbed.	<i>Heracles' entrance.</i>	Heracles saves Alcestis and restores her to Admetus.
Andromeda	Nereids - Poseidon sends the Cetos.	Andromeda on the rocks.	<i>Erotic recognition - Perseus falls in love with Andromeda.</i>	Perseus slays the Cetos and brings Andromeda to Greece.
Menelaus	Theoclymenus sacrifices strangers.	<i>Menelaus risks being sacrificed/executed (but not by Helen).</i>	Helen recognises Menelaus.	Reunion and Escape.

T 13 The Greek novels on Iphigenia

The motifs patterns	A: A war setting or a custom; a god requests for sacrifice/ RETARD.	B: The victim's sacrifice is executed by a kinsman/ RETARDATION	C: Recognition of the victim by the kinsman, or vice versa/ RETARDATION	D: (Averted) Sacrifice by transportation of the victim /MOTION
Callirhoe	Aphrodite plans Chaereas' punishment.	Chaereas kicks Callirhoe to death.	<i>Misidentification of Callirhoe's golden image.</i>	Callirhoe's Scheintod. Rescued by Theron; transferred to Miletus.
Anthia	Anthia is offered as sacrifice to Ares?	Hippochoos responsible for the sacrifice.	<i>Hippochoos recognizes Anthia as Habrocomes' bride only later. Perilaos falls in love with Anthia</i>	Perilaos saves Anthia.
	Anthia has to marry Perilaos.	Eudoxus helps her to commit suicide - but the drug does not kill her.	<i>Habrocomes finds the empty tomb.</i>	Anthia's Scheintod. Bandits save and sell Anthia (different destinations).
	Anthia in the den with the dogs.	Hippochoos responsible for the execution.	Hippochoos does not recognize Anthia.	Amphinomos saves Anthia; then sold to Polyidos.
Leucippe	Leucippe is offered as <i>ιερεῖον</i> .	Menelaus and Satyrus carry out the sacrifice.	<i>Leucippe recognizes Menelaus as Cleitophon's friends.</i>	Satyrus and Menelaus save Leucippe.
	Charmides abducts Leucippe - war.	Leucippe is decapitated.	<i>Misinterpretation of the scene.</i>	Leucippe replaced by a prostitute and sold as slave.
	Thersander/Sostratus attempt to kill Leucippe.	Cleitophon appears to have killed Leucippe.	Cleitophon and Sostratus recognize Artemis' suppliant as Leucippe.	Reunion and escape.
Cleitophon	-	<i>Cleitophon is condemned and about to be executed.</i>	Sostratus recognises Cleitophon.	Reunion and escape.
Thisbe	Thisbe is abducted by Thermouthis	Thyamis 'sacrifices' Charicleia-Thisbe	-	-
Charicleia	Charicleia captured by Thyamis.	Thyamis 'sacrifices' Thisbe-Charicleia.	<i>Theagenes misrecognizes Thisbe as Charicleia-Theagenes recognises Charicleia</i>	Reunion and escape.
	The Ethiopian customs.	Charicleia is to be sacrificed by her father.	Hydaspes recognizes Charicleia as his daughter.	The gods and humans interfere and the sacrifice is averted - aetiology.
Theagenes	The Ethiopian customs.	Theagenes is to be sacrificed by Charicleia?	Charicles recognises Theagenes.	Reunion and marriage.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography includes all the texts cited in my dissertation.

The titles of the novels, and of the tragedies, are italicised when they are cited in an article title, and non-italicised (regular) when they are part of a book title.

I have kept the names of the authors and of the novels according to the preferences of each scholar (e.g. Aithiopika and Aethiopica may co-exist). This applies only in the bibliography and not in my dissertation.

The texts

HOMER: Von Muehl, P. (1984), *Homeri Odyssea*, Munich, Leipzig: Teubner.

EURIPIDES: All the texts of Euripides, if not indicated otherwise, according to Diggle, J. (1981), *Euripidis fabulae*; Oxonii: typographeo Clarendoniano.

THE FRAGMENTS: Winkler, J. J. and Stephens, S. A. (1995), *Ancient Greek Novels, the fragments. Introduction text translation and commentary*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

CHARITON: Reardon, B.P. (2004), *Chariton Aphrodisiensis: De Callirhoe narrationes amatoriae*, Munich, Leipzig: Teubner.

XENOPHON OF EPHESUS: O'Sullivan, J.N. (2005), *Xenophon Ephesius: De Anthia et Habrocome Ephesiacorum, libri V*; Munich, Leipzig: Teubner.

LONGUS: Morgan, J.R. (2004), *Longus, Daphnis and Chloe*, Oxford: Aris and Phillips Classical texts.

ACHILLES TATIUS: Garnaud, J.P. (1991), *Achille Tatius d'Alexandrie: Le roman de Leucippée et Clitophon*, Paris: Budé, Les Belles Lettres.

HELIODORUS: Rattenbury, R. M., Lumb, T. W., and Maillon, J. (1935), *Héliodore: Les Éthiopiennes ou Théagène et Chariclée*; Paris: Budé, Les Belles Lettres.

JOSEPH and ASENETH: Philonenko, M. (1968), *Joseph et Aséneth*, Leiden: Brill.

Relevant secondary literature

Aarne, A. and Thompson, S. (1928), *The types of the folk-tale: a classification and bibliography ; Antti Aarne's Verzeichnis der Märchentypen (FF communications no. 3)*; Helsinki: Suomalainen tiedeakatemia = Academia scientiarum Fennica.

Adams, K. J. (1985), *Pragmatics and fiction*; Amsterdam, Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Pub. Co.

Allan, W. (2008), *Euripides Helen*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alvares, J. (1997), 'Chariton's erotic history', *The American Journal of Philology*, 118 (4), 613-629.

Anderson, G. (2000b), *Fairytale in the ancient world*; London: Routledge.

Anderson, M. T. (1997), 'The 'sophrosune' of Persinna and the Romantic Strategy of Heliodorus'

- Aethiopica*, *Classical Philology*, (4), 303-332.
- Andreassi, M. (2002), 'Il mimo tra 'consumo' e 'letteratura' : Chariton e Moicheutria', *Ancient Narrative*, 2, 30-46.
- Aretz, V., S. (1999), *Die Opferung der Iphigeneia in Aulis*; Stuttgart, Leipzig: Teubner.
- Austin, C. and Olson, D., S. (2004), *Aristophanes: Thesmophoriazousae*; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Austin, N. (1975), *Archery at the dark of the moon: poetic problems in Homer's Odyssey*; Berkeley, London: University of California Press.
- (1994), *Helen of Troy and her shameless phantom*; London, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (2006 (1941)), *Επος και μυθιστόρημα* (Epos i Roman: translated by Kiourtsakis, G.); Athens: Polis.
- Barns, J. W. B. (1956), 'Egypt and the Greek romance', in Gerstinger, H. (ed.), *Akten des VIII Internationalen Kongresses fur Papyrologie: Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien*, 29-40.
- Barrett, W. S. (1964), *Euripides, Hippolytos*; Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Barthes, R. (1973), *Mythologies* (translation by Annette Lavers as Mythologies); London: Paladan books.
- Bartsch, S. (1989), *Decoding the ancient novel; the reader and the role of description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius*; Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Beck, R. (2003), 'Mystery religions, aretology and the ancient novel', in Schmeling, G. (ed.), *The novel in the ancient world*; Leiden: Brill, 131-150.
- Behaeghel, J. (1995), *Osiris, le dieu ressuscité*; Paris: Berg International.
- Betz, H. D. (2004), 'Hero worship and Christian belief: observations from the history of a religion on Philostratus' *Heroikos*', in Bradshaw, A., E. and McLean, J. (eds.), *Philostratus' Heroikos*: Atalanta, 25-45.
- Billault, A. (1990), 'L'inspiration des 'ecphraseis' d' oeuvres d'art chez les romanciers grecs', *Rhetorica* 2, 8 (2), 153-160.
- (1998a), 'Le comique d' Achille Tatius', in Trédé, M. and Hoffmann, P. (eds.), *Le Rire des anciens: actes du colloque international, Université de Rouen, ENS, 11-13 Janvier 1995*; Paris: Presses de l'École Normale Supérieure, 143-158.
- (1998b), 'Les romanciers grecs et la tragédie', *Cahiers de la Villa "Kérylos"* Paris: Beaulieu-sur-Mer (Alpes-Maritimes), 178-194.
- (2000), *L' univers de Philostrate*; Bruxelles: Latomus, Revue des Études Latines.
- Biraud, M. (1985), 'L'hypotexte homérique et les rôles amoureux de Callirhoé dans le roman de Chariton', in Goursonnet, A (ed.), *Sémiologie de l'amour dans les civilisation méditerranéennes, Actes du centre des recherches*; Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 21-27.
- (1996), 'La dévotion à Aphrodite dans le roman de Chariton', in Dubrocard, M. (ed.), *Hommage au doyen J. P. Weiss*; Nice: Association des publications de la Faculté des Lettres de Nice, 137-143.
- Blázquez, J. M. (2003), 'Las vinculaciones de la novela - *Asno de oro*, *Dafnis y Cloe*, *Las Efesiacas* - con la mitología religiosa', in Blázquez, J. M. (ed.), *El Mediterráneo y España en la antigüedad*; Madrid: Cátedra, 306-323.
- Boedeker, D. (1997), 'Becoming Medea: assimilation in Euripides', in Clauss, J. J. and Johnston, S. I. (eds.), *Medea*; Princeton: Princeton, 127-148.
- Bompaire, J. (1958), *Lucien Écrivain: imitation et création*; Paris Edition de Boccard.
- Borthwick, E. K. (1992), 'Observations on the opening scene of Aristophanes' *Wasps*', *The Classical Quarterly* 42 (1), 274-278.
- Bowie, E. (1978), 'Apollonius of Tyana: tradition and reality', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 2, 16 (II), 1652-1671.

- (1989), 'Greek sophists and Greek poetry in the Second Sophistic', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, II, 33 (1), 209-258.
- (1991), 'Hellenes and Hellenism in writers of the early Second Sophistic ', in Said, S. (ed.), *Ελληνισμός: Quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque, Université des sciences humaines de Strasbourg. Travaux du centre de recherche sur le proche-orient et la Grèce antiques* (vol11).I.; Leiden: Brill, 183-204.
- (1995), 'Names and a gem: aspects of allusion in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', in Innes, D., Pelling, C. B. R., and Russell, D. A. (eds.), *Ethics and rhetoric: classical essays for Donald Russell on his seventy-fifth birthday*; Oxford: Clarendon
- (1998), 'Phoenician games in Heliodorus', in Hunter, R. (ed.), *Studies in Heliodorus*; Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society 1-18.
- (2002), 'The Chronology of the early Greek Novels since B.E. Perry. Revisions and precisions', *Ancient Narrative*, (2), 47-63.
- (2004), 'The function of mythology in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*', in López Férez, J. A. (ed.), *Mitos en la literatura griega helenística e imperial*; Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas: Comunidad de Madrid, 361-376.
- (2007), 'Pulling the other? Longus on tragedy', in Kraus, C., Goldhill, S., Foley, H., and Elsner, J. (eds.), *Visualizing the Tragic. drama, myth, and ritual in Greek art and literature. Essays in Honour of Froma Zeitlin*; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 338-352.
- (2008), 'Literary milieux', in Whitmarsh, T. (ed.), *The Greek and Roman novel*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 17-38.
- (2009), 'Quotation of earlier texts in the *Τὰ εἰς τὸν Τυανέα Ἀπολλώνιο*', in Demoen, K. and Praet, D. (eds.), *Theios Sophistes: Essays on Flavius Philostratus' Vita Apollonii*; Leiden: Brill, 57-74.
- Bradshaw, A., E. and Maclean, J. (2004), *Philostratus' Heroikos; religion and cultural identity in the 3rd c. CE*; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Branham, R. B. (2002), 'A truer story of the novel?', in Branham, R. B. (ed.), *Bakhtin and the Classics*; Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 161-186.
- (2005), *The Bakhtin Circle and ancient narrative*; Groningen: Barkhuis.
- Braun, M. (1938), *History and romance in Graeco-Oriental literature*; Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Bremmer, J. N. (2007), *Introduction à la philosophie du mythe*; Paris: J. Vrin.
- Brown, S. S. (1991), *Late Carthaginian child sacrifice and sacrificial monuments in their Mediterranean context*; Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Bucher, L. (1989), 'Rhodopis, Héliodore et les Perses', in Piérat, M. and Curty, O. (eds.), *Historia testis*; Fribourg, Suisse: Festschrift Zawadzki.
- Bühler, W. (1976), 'Das Element des Visuellen in der Eingangsszene von Heliodors *Aithiopika*', *Wiener Studien*, 10, 177-185.
- Burkert, W. and Bing, P. (1983), *Homo necans: the anthropology of Ancient Greek sacrificial ritual and myth*; Berkeley; London: University of California Press.
- Burkert, W. and Raffan, J. (1987), *Greek religion: archaic and classical*; Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Burnett, A. P. (1971), *Catastrophe survived: Euripides' plays of mixed reversal*; Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Buxton, R. G. A. (1999), *From myth to reason? Studies in the development of Greek thought*; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cameron, A. (2004), *Greek mythology in the Roman world*; New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cave, T. (1988), *Recognition, a study in poetics*; Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Chalk, H. H. O. (1960), 'Eros and the *Lesbian Pastorals* of Longos', *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, (80), 32-51.
- Chaniotis, A. (1997), 'Theatricality beyond the theater: staging public life in the Hellenistic world', in

- Le Guen, B. (ed.), *De la scène aux gradins: théâtre et représentations dramatiques après Alexandre le Grand*; Toulouse: Presses universitaires de Mirail, 219-259.
- (2009), *Θεατρικότητα και δημόσιος βίος στον Ελληνιστικό κόσμο*; Herakleion: University of Crete Press.
- Clader, L. (1976), *Helen, the evolution from divine to heroic in Greek epic tradition*; Leiden: Brill.
- Clavo, M. T. (2003), 'Comunicare a Delfi: lo *Ione* euripideo e le *Etiopiche* di Eliodoro', in Guglielmo, M. and Bona, E. (eds.), *Forme di comunicazione nel mondo antico e metamorfosi del mito: dal teatro al romanzo*; Torino: dell' Orso, 299-321.
- Collard, C., et al. (1995), *Euripides: Selected fragmentary plays*, Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Colonna, A. (1987), *Le Etiopiche di Eliodoro*; Torino: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese.
- Conte, G. B. (1996), *The hidden author: an interpretation of Petronius' Satyricon*; Berkeley; London: University of California Press.
- Corbato, C. (1968), 'Da Menandro a Caritone. Studi sulla genesi del romanzo greco e i suoi Rapporti con la Commedia Nuova', *Quaderni Triestini sul Teatro Antico*, (1), 5-44.
- Cotkin, G. (2003), *Existential America*; Baltimore, London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Courtney, E. (2001), *A companion to Petronius*; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crane, G. (1987), 'The Laughter of Aphrodite in Theocritus, *Idyll 1*', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 91, 161-184.
- Csapo, E. (2005), *Theories of mythology*; Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cueva, E. P. (1996), 'Plutarch's Ariadne in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*', *The American Journal of Philology*, 117 (3), 473-484.
- (2004), *The myths of fiction: studies in the canonical Greek novels*; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Cusset, C. (2003), *Ménandre, ou la comédie tragique*; Paris: CNRS éditions.
- Dalmeyda, G. (1926), *Xénophon d'Éphèse: Les Éphésiaques ou Le roman d'Habrocomès et d'Anthia*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Danek, G. and Wallisch, R. (1993), 'Notizen zu Longus *Daphnis und Chloe*', *Wiener Studien* (106), 45-60.
- Dennis, D. H. (1991), *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece*; London: Routledge.
- Diggle, J. (1981), *Euripidis fabulae* (3 volumes); Oxonii: typographeo Clarendoniano.
- Dindorf, G. (1855), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam* (2. vol.); Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dodds, E. R. (1965), *Pagan and Christian in an age of anxiety: some aspects of religious experience from Marcus Aurelius to Constantine*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Doody, M. (1996), *The true story of the novel*; New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- Dowden, K. (1989), *Death and the maiden: girls' initiation rites in Greek mythology*; London: Routledge.
- (1999), 'The Passage Rite in Myth, Ritual and the Greek Novel', in Padilla, M. (ed.), *Rites of passage in ancient Greece: literature, religion, society*; Lewisburg, London, Toronto: Bucknell University Press, Associated University Press, 221-243.
- (2005), 'The ancient novel and the ritual of life: an exercise in taxonomy', in Harrison, S., Paschalis, M., and Panayotakis, S. (eds.), *Metaphor and the ancient novel*; Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing and Groningen University Library, 23-35.
- Dunn, F., M. (1996), *Tragedy's end: closure and innovation in Euripidean drama*; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Elmer, D., F. (2008), 'Intertextuality, paternity and the Nile river in the *Aethiopica*', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 138 (2), 411-450.
- Feuillâtre, E. (1966), *Études sur les Éthiopiennes d'Héliodore*; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Fitzgerald, J. T. (1997), *Greco-Roman perspectives on friendship*; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.

- Foley, H. (2001), *Female acts*; Princeton University Press.
- Frye, N. (1957), *Anatomy of criticism: four essays* (Ανατομία της κριτικής, τέσσερα δοκίμια- transl. Μ.Γεωργουλέα, Athens, Gutenberg, 1996) New York: Atheneum.
- (1976), *The secular scripture: a study of the structure of Romance*; Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Fusillo, M. (1991 (1989)), *Naissance du roman*; Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Futre-Pinheiro, M. (1991), 'Calasiris' story and its narrative significance in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* ', *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 4, 4, 69-83.
- Gainsford, P. (2003), 'Formal analysis of recognition scenes in the *Odyssey*', *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 123, 41-59.
- Gangloff, A. (2006), *Dion Chrysostome et les mythes: hellénisme, communication et philosophie politique*; Grenoble: Jérôme Millon.
- Garnaud, J.-P. (1991), *Achilles Tatius d' Alexandrie: Le roman de Leucippé et Clitophon*; Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Genette, G. (1997 (1982)), *Palimpsests: literature in the second degree*; Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Gérard, A. S. (1993), *The Phaedra syndrome: of shame and guilt in drama*; Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Goldhill, S. (1991), *The Poet's voice; essays on poetics and Greek literature*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1995), *Foucault's virginity : ancient erotic fiction and the history of sexuality*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldman, S. (1995), *The wiles of women. The wiles of men. Joseph and Potiphar's wife in Ancient Near Eastern, Jewish and Islamic Folklore*; Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Griffiths, J. G. (1978), 'Xenophon of Ephesus on Isis and Alexandria', *Hommages à M.J.Vermaseren* vol.1; Leiden: Brill, 409-437.
- Gumpert, M. (2001), *Grafting Helen: the abduction of the classical past*; Madison: Wisconsin University Press.
- Hägg, T. (1971), 'The naming of characters in the romance of Xenophon Ephesius', *Eranos*, (69), 25-59.
- (1971b), *Narrative technique in Ancient Greek romances: studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius and Achilles Tatius*; Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen.
- (1983), *The novel in antiquity*; Oxford: Blackwell.
- (2004 (1994)), 'Orality, literacy and the 'readership' of the early Greek novel', in Hägg, T. (ed), *Parthenope: selected studies in ancient Greek fiction (1969-2004)*; Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 109-140.
- ((1987) 2004), 'Callirhoe and Parthenope: the beginnings of the historical novel', in Hägg, T., *Parthenope: selected studies in ancient Greek fiction (1969-2004)*; Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press University of Copenhagen, 73-108.
- Hägg, T., Utas, B., (2003), *The virgin and her lover: fragments of an ancient Greek novel and a Persian epic poem*; Leiden: Brill.
- Hale, N. G. (1995), *The rise and crisis of psychoanalysis in the United States: Freud and the Americans, 1917-1985*; New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, E. (2009), 'Iphigenia in Oxyrhynchus and India: Greek tragedy for everyone', in Jakob, D. and

- Tsitsiridis, S. (eds.), *Festschrift for Gregory Sifakis*; Herakleion: Crete University Press, 393-414.
- Halloran, M. R. (1995), *Euripides: Hippolytus*; Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Hardie, P. (1989), 'A reading of Heliodorus' *Aithiopika* 3.4.1-3.5.2', in Hunter, R. (ed.), *Studies in Heliodorus*; Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 19-39.
- (1992), 'Plutarch and the interpretation of myth 4780-1.', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 2.33 (6), 4743-4787.
- Harris, M. (2001), 'Not black and/or white: reading racial difference in Heliodorus's *Ethiopica* and Pauline Hopkins's *Of One Blood*', *African American Review*, Fall, 2001 (online), http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2838/is_2833_2835/ai_79758783/pg_79758783/.
- Harris, W. V. (2009), *Dreams and experience in classical antiquity*; Cambridge, Mass. ; London: Harvard University Press.
- Harrison, S. (2006), 'Literary texture in the adultery-tales of Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* Book 9', in Nauta, R., R. (ed.), *Desultoria scientia: genre in Apuleius' Metamorphoses and related texts*; Leuven: Peeters, 19-31.
- Harrison, T. (2002), *Greeks and barbarians*; Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hawkes, T. (1977), *Structuralism and Semiotics*; London: Methuen.
- Haynes, K. (2003), *Fashioning the feminine in the Greek novel*; London, New York: Routledge.
- Heever, v. d. G. (2005), 'Novel and mystery: discourse on myth and society', in Shea, C. and Brant, J. A. (eds.), *Ancient fiction: the matrix of the early Christian and Jewish narrative*; Leiden: Brill, 89-114.
- Hefti, V. (1950), *Zur Erzählungstechnik in Heliodors Aethiopica (diss.)*; Vienna: Buchdruckerei und Verlag A.Halitzhausen.
- Hirschberger, M. (2001), 'Epos und Tragödie in Charitons *Kallirhoe*: Ein Beitrag zu Intertextualität des griechischen Romans', *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft*, Band 25, 157-186.
- Hock, R., F. (1997), 'An extraordinary friend in Chariton's *Callirhoe*: the importance of friendship in the Greek novels', in Fitzgerald, J. T. (ed.), *Graeco-Roman perspectives on friendship*; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 145-162.
- Hock, R. F. (2005), 'The educational curriculum in Chariton's *Callirhoe*', in Brant, J. A. and Shea, C. (eds.), *Ancient fiction: the matrix of early Christian and Jewish narrative*; Leiden: Brill, 15-36.
- Hollis, S. T. (2008), *The ancient Egyptian tale of Two Brothers : a mythological, religious, literary, and historico-political study*; Oakville, CT: Bannerstone Press.
- Holmberg, I. E. (1995), 'Euripides' *Helen*; most noble and most chaste', *The American Journal of Philology*, 116 (1), 19-42.
- Huber, G. (1990), *Das Motiv der "Witwe von Ephesus" in lateinischen Texten der Antike und des Mittelalters*; Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Huet, (1971(1669) P.-D., *Lettre-traité de Pierre-Daniel Huet sur l'origine des romans*, Gégou, F., and Chapelain, J. (eds.); Paris: A.-G. Nizet.
- Hughes, D. (1991), *Human sacrifice in ancient Greece*; London, New York: Routledge.
- (2007), *Culture and sacrifice: ritual death in literature and opera*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Humphrey, E. M. (2000), *Joseph and Aseneth*; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Hunter, R. (1983), *A study of Daphnis and Chloe*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1989), *Apollonius' Argonautica, Book III*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1994), 'History and historicity in Chariton', *Aufstiegn und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, 34 (2), 1057-1084.
- (1998), 'The *Aithiopika* of Heliodorus: beyond interpretation?', in Hunter, R. (ed.), *Studies in Heliodorus*; Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 40-59.

- Hutchinson, G. O. (2004), 'Euripides' Other *Hippolytus*', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, (149), 15-28.
- Jaekel, S. (1964), *Menandri Sententiae*; Lipsiae: Teubner.
- Jones, C. P. (1993), 'Greek drama in the Roman empire', in Scodel, R. (ed.), *Theater and society in the classical world*; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 39-52.
- Jones, M. (2006), 'Heavenly and Pandemic names in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', *Classical Quarterly*, 2 (56), 548-562.
- Jong, I. J. F. d. and Sullivan, J. P. (1994), *Modern critical theory and classical literature*; Leiden: Brill.
- Kahil, L. (1955), *Les enlèvements et le retour d'Hélène*; Paris Éditions de Boccard.
- Karavas, O. (2005), *Lucien et la tragédie*; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.
- Kasprzyk, D. (2001), 'Théron, pirate, conteur et narrateur dans le roman de Chariton, Chaeréas et Callirhoe', in Pouderon, B. (ed.), *Les personnages du roman grec. In collaboration with Christine Hunzinger and Dimitri Kasprzyk. Collection de la Maison de l'Orient 29, Litt. 7*; Lyons: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée - Jean Pouilloux.
- Kaufmann, W. A. (1956), *Existentialism from Dostoevsky to Sartre*; New York: Meridian Books.
- Kerényi, K. (1927), *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*; Tübingen: Mohr.
- Keyes, C. (1922), 'The Structure of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', *Studies in Philology*, 19, 42-51.
- Kirk, G. S. (1970), *Myth, its meaning and functions in ancient and other cultures*; Berkley, Los Angeles: Cambridge University Press, University of California Press.
- Konstan, D. (1994), *Sexual symmetry: Love in ancient novels and related genres*; Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kovacs, D. (1995), *Euripides*: II (vol. 484); Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Kraemer, R. S. (1998), *When Aseneth met Joseph : a late antique tale of the biblical patriarch and his Egyptian wife, reconsidered*; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kyriakou, P. (2006), *A commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*; Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Lalanne, S. (2006), *Une éducation grecque*; Paris: Éditions La Découverte.
- (2008), 'L'odyssée des héroïnes du roman grec', *Clio*, 28, 121-132.
- Laplace, M. M. (1980), 'Les légendes troyennes dans le roman de Chariton Chairéas et Calliroé ', *Revue des Études Grecques*, 93 (2), 83-125.
- (1992), 'Les Ethiopiques d'Heliodore, ou la genèse d'un panegyrique de l'amour', *Revue des Études Anciennes*, 94, 199-230.
- (1996), 'L'emblème esthétique des Éthiopiennes d'Héliodore: une bague d'ambre au chaton daméthyste gravée', *Poésie et Lyrique Antiques*, DuBois, L. (ed.); Lille: Septentrion, Presses Universitaires de Lille, 179-202.
- (2007), *Le roman d'Achille Tatios; discours panégyrique et imaginaire romanesque*; Peter Lang.
- Lattimore, R. A. (1964), *Story-patterns in Greek tragedy*; London: University of London, Athlone Press.
- Lavagnini, B. (1921), *Le origini del romanzo greco*; Pisa: F. Mariotti.
- Legrand, P. E. (1925), *Bucoliques grecs: Theocritus, Bion, Moschus*; Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Létoublon, F. (1993), *Les lieux communs du roman: stéréotypes grecs d'aventure et d'amour*; Leiden: Brill.
- (2003), 'La lettre dans le roman grec, ou les liaisons dangereuses ', in Panayotakis, S., Zimmerman,

- M., and Keulen, W. (eds.), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*; Leiden: Brill, 271-288.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1958), *Anthropologie structurale*; Paris: Plon.
- Liapis, V. (2006), 'Achilles Tatius as a reader of Sophocles', *Classical Quarterly*, 56 (1), 202-238.
- Lightfoot, C. S. (1988), 'Facts and fiction: the third siege of Nisbis (A.D. 350)', *Historia*, 37 (1), 105-125.
- Lightfoot, J. L. (1999), *Parthenius: The poetical fragments and the Erôtika pathêmata*; Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- (2003), *Lucian, On the Syrian goddess*; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lindsay, J. (1974), *Helen of Troy, woman and goddess*; London: Constable.
- López Férez, J. A. (2004), *Mitos en la literatura griega helenística e imperial*; Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas: Comunidad de Madrid.
- Loraux, N. (1987), *Tragic ways of killing a woman*; Cambridge, Mass. ; London: Harvard University Press.
- Lowe, N. J. (2000), *The classical plot and the invention of western narrative*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacGlathery, D. (2001), 'Bakhtinian parody and Petronius' tale of the Widow of Ephesus', in Barta, P. I. (ed.), *Carnivalizing difference: Bakhtin and the other Studies in Russian and European literature*; London, New York: Routledge, xvii, 265 p.
- MacQueen, B. D. (1990), *Myth, rhetoric, and fiction: a reading of Longus' Daphnis and Chloe*; Lincoln, London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Marini, N. (1993), 'Il personaggio di Calliroe come "nuova Helena"', *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica*, 11, 205-215.
- Maronitis, D. (1991), *Αναζήτηση και νόστος του Οδυσσέα. Η διαλεκτική της Οδύσσειας (Search and return of Odysseus; the dialectic of the Odyssey)*; Athens: Kedros.
- Maspero, G. (1915), *Popular stories of ancient Egypt*; London: H. Grevel and Co.
- Merkelbach, R. (1962), *Roman und Mysterium in der Antike*; München: Beck.
- (1988), *Die Hirten des Dionysos: Die Dionysos-Mysterien der römischen Kaiserzeit und der bukolische Roman des Longus*; Stuttgart: Teubner.
- (1995), *Isis Regina, Zeus Sarapis: die griechisch-ägyptische Religion nach den Quellen dargestellt*; Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner.
- Mignogna, E. (1997), 'Leucippe in Taurida (Achilles Tatius 3.15-22): mimo e pantomimo tra tragedia e romanzo', *Materiali e Discussioni per l'Analisi dei Testi Classici*, 38, 224-236.
- Moatti, C. (2004), *La mobilité des personnes en Méditerranée de l'Antiquité à l'époque moderne : procédures de contrôle et documents d'identification*; Rome: Ecole française de Rome.
- Morales, H. (2004), *Vision and narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2007), *Classical mythology*; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Morgan, J. (1978), *Commentary on Books IX and X of Heliodorus' Aithiopika*; Oxford: (DPhil thesis).
- (1989), 'A sense of ending: the conclusion of Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 119, 299-320.
- (1989a), 'The story of Knemon in Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*', *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 109, 99-113.
- (1994), 'The *Aithiopika* of Heliodoros; narrative as riddle', in Morgan, J., Stonman, R. (ed.), *Greek fiction: the Greek novel in context*; London, New York: Routledge.
- (1996a), 'Heliodorus', in Schmeling, G. L. (ed.), *The novel in the Ancient World*; Leiden Brill, 417-456.
- (2004), *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe*; Oxford: Aris and Phillips.
- (2005), 'Le blanc et le noir: perspective païennes et chrétiennes sur les *Éthiopiques* d'Héliodore', in Pouderon, B. (ed.), *Lieux, décors et paysages de l'ancien roman des origines à Byzance: actes du 2e colloque de Tours, 24-26 octobre 2002*; Lyon: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée, 309-318.

- Morgan, J. R. (1982), 'History, romance and realism in the Aethiopica of Heliodorus', *Classical Antiquity*, 1 (2), 221-265.
- (1993), 'Make-Believe and Make Believe: the fictionality of the Greek novels', in Gill, C. and Wiseman, T. P. (eds.), *Lies and fiction in the ancient world*; Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 175-229.
- (1996), 'Erotika Mathemata: Greek romance as sentimental education in Greek fiction', in Sommerstein, A. H. and Atherton, C. (eds.), *Education in Greek fiction*; Bari: Levante Editori, 163-189; 191-205. .
- (2009), 'The Emesan connection: Philostratus and Heliodorus', in Demoen, K. and Praet, D. (eds.), *Theios Sophistes: Essays on Flavius Philostratus' Vita Apollonii*; Leiden, Boston: Brill, Mnemosyne Supplements, 263-282.
- Morgan, J. R. and Stoneman, R. (1994a), *Greek fiction: The Greek novel in context*; London, New York: Routledge.
- Morgan, T. (1998), *Literate education in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Most, G. (1989), 'The stranger's stratagem: self-disclosure and self-sufficiency in Greek culture', *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, (109), 114-133.
- Neimke, C. F. P. (1889), *Quaestiones Heliodoreae*; Halle.
- Nimis, S. (1999), 'The sense of open-endedness in the ancient novel', *Arethusa*, 32, 215-238.
- (2001), 'Cycles and Sequence in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*', in Watson, J. (ed.), *Speaking volumes: orality and literacy in the Greek and the Roman world*; Leiden: Brill, 187-200.
- O'Brien, M. J. (1988), 'Pelopid history and the plot of *Iphigenia in Tauris*', *The Classical Quarterly*, 68 (1), 98-115.
- O'Connor-Visser, E. A. M. E. (1987), *Aspects of human sacrifice in the tragedies of Euripides*; Amsterdam: B.R. Grüner Pub. Co.
- O'Sullivan, J. (1984), 'The Sesonchosis romance', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 56, 39-44.
- O'Sullivan, J. (1995), *Xenophon of Ephesus: his compositional techniques and the birth of the novel*; Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Pattoni, M. P. (2005), 'I Pastoralia di Longo e la contaminazione dei generi. Alcune proposte interpretative', *Materiali e Discussioni per l'Analisi dei Testi Classici* 53 (2004), 83-124.
- Paulsen, T. (1992), *Inszenierung des Schicksals. Tragödie und Komödie im Roman des Heliodor*; Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.
- Pavel, T. (2003), *La pensée du roman*; Paris: Gallimard.
- Perkins, J. (1994), *The suffering self: pain and narrative representation in the early Christian era*; London: Routledge.
- Perry, B. E. (1967), *The ancient romances*; Berkeley and LA: Sather Classical Lectures, 37.
- Philonenko, M. (1968), *Joseph and Aseneth*; Leiden: Brill.
- Pletcher, J. (1998), 'Euripides in Heliodorus' *Aithiopika* 7-8', *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel*, IX, 17-27.
- Radt, S. (1999 (1977)), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta', (vol.4, Sophocles)*; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- Raglan, L. (1996), 'The hero of tradition', in Segal, R. (ed.), *Theories of myth: anthropology, folklore, myth*; New York, London: Garland publishing, 193-208.
- Rattenbury, R. M., Lumb, T. W., and Maillon, J. (1935), *Héliodore: Les Éthiopiennes ou Théagène et Chariclée* (3 vols); Paris: Budé.
- Rautman, A. E. (2000), *Reading the body: representations and remains in the archaeological record*; Philadelphia, Pa., London: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Reardon, B. P. (1991), *The form of Greek romance*; Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- (1994b), 'Achilles Tatius and Ego-narrative', in Morgan, J., R., and Stoneman, R. (eds.), *Greek fiction: the Greek novel in context*; London, New York: Routledge, 80-96.
- (2001), 'Callirhoé et ses soeurs', in Pouderon, B. (ed.), *Les personnages du roman grec - in collaboration with Christine Hunzinger and Dimitri Kasprzyk. Collection de la Maison de l'Orient 29, Litt. 7*; Lyons: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée - Jean Pouilloux, 21-27.
- (2004), 'Mythology in Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus', in López Férez, J. A. (ed.), *Mitos en la literatura griega helenística e imperial*; Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas: Comunidad de Madrid, 377-389.
- (2004a), 'Variations on a theme: reflections on Xenophon Ephesius', in Janka, M. (ed.), *Εγκύκλιον κήπιον, Rundgärtchen zu Poesie, Histoire und Fachliteratur der Antike*; Leipzig: Saur München, 183-193.
- (2008), *Collected Ancient Greek novels*; Berkeley, California, London: University of California Press.
- Rehm, R. (1994), *Marriage to death: the conflation of wedding and funeral rituals in Greek tragedy*; Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Reineke, M., J. (1997), *Sacrificed lives: Kristeva on women and violence*; Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Reitzenstein, R. (1974 (1906)), *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen*; Leipzig: Darmstadt (Teubner).
- Repath, I. (2006), 'Callisthenes in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Cleitophon* :Double Jeopardy?', *Ancient Narrative*, 6 (101-129).
- Richardson, N. J. (1983), 'Recognition scenes in the *Odyssey* and ancient literary criticism', in Cairns, F. (ed.), in Cairns, F. (ed.), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin seminar*: Liverpool, 219-235.
- Rife, J. L. (2004), 'Officials of the Roman provinces in Xenophon's *Ephesiaca*', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 138, 93-108.
- Rijksbaron, A. (1984), 'Chariton 8.1.4 und Aristotle *Poetics* 1449b 28', *Philologus* 128, 306-307.
- Rocca, R. (1976), 'Eliodoro e i due *Ippoliti* Euripidei', *Materiali e Contributi per la Storia della Narrativa Greco-Latina*, (1), 25-31.
- Rohde, E. (1876), *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*; Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
- Rose, H. J. (1925), 'The bride of Hades', *Classical Philology*, 20 (3), 238-242.
- Rosenmeyer, T. G. (1963), *The masks of tragedy: essays on six Greek dramas*; Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Ruiz-Montero, C. (1988), *La estructura de la novela griega* (Doctoral Thesis, 1979); Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- (2003), 'Xenophon of Ephesus and Orality in the Roman Empire ', *Ancient Narrative*, 3, 43-62.
- (2003 (1995)), 'El mito en Caritón de Afrodiasias y Jenofonte de Éfeso ', in López Férez, J. A. (ed.), *Mitos en la literatura griega helenística e imperial*; Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas, 345-359.
- Russell, J. (1993), 'On Mysticism and Esotericism among the Zoroastrians', *Iranian Studies*, 26 (1/2), 73-94.
- Salmon, P. (1961), 'Chariton d' Aphrodiasias et la révolte égyptienne de 360 av. J.-C.', *Chronique d'Égypte*, 36, 365-376.
- Sandy, G. N. (1982), *Heliodorus*; Boston: Twayne.
- Santelia, S. (1991), *Charition liberata: P.Oxy 413*; Bari: Levante.
- Scarcella, A. M. (1971), 'La tecnica dell'imitazione in Longo Sofista', *Giornale Italiano di Filologia*, 23, 34-59.
- Schmeling, G. L. (2005), 'Callirhoe: God-like beauty and the making of celebrity', in Harrison, S., Paschalis, M. (ed.), *Metaphor and the ancient novel*; Groningen: Barkhuis, 36-49.
- Seaford, R. (1987), 'The tragic wedding', *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 107, 106-130.

- Shklovsky, I. S. (1991 (1929)), *Theory of prose* (translated by Sher, Benjamin); Illinois: Dalkey Archive Press.
- Sirinelli, J. (2000), *Plutarque de Chéronée, un philosophe dans le siècle*; Paris: Fayard.
- Smith, P., Avishai, G. (2005), 'The use of dental criteria for estimating postnatal survival in skeletal remains of infants', *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 32, 83-89.
- Smith, P., Kahila, G. (1992), 'Identification of infanticide in archaeological sites: a case study from the Late Roman-Early Byzantine periods at Ashkelon', *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 19, 667-675.
- Smith, S. (2007), *Greek identity and the Athenian past in Chariton: the romance of Empire*; Groningen: Barkhuis.
- (2007a), 'Wonders beyond Athens: reading the 'Phaedra' stories in Apuleius and Heliodorus ', in Zimmerman, M., Paschalis, M. and Frangoulidis, S., Harrison, S. (eds.), *Ancient Narrative: The Greek and the Roman novel, Parallel readings*; Groningen: Barkhuis, 219-237.
- Solmsen, F. (1934), 'Onoma and Pragma in Euripides' *Helen*', *Classical Review*, 48 (4), 119-121.
- Stanford, W. B. (1968), *The Ulysses theme: a study in the adaptability of a traditional hero*; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Steiner, G. (1969), 'The graphic model from myth in Greek Romance', *Classical Studies presented to B.E.Perry*; Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 123-137.
- Stephens, S. (1996), 'Fragments of lost novels', in Schmeling, G. (ed.), *The novel in the ancient world*; Leiden: Brill, 655-684.
- *Tilg, S. (2010), *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the invention of the Greek novel*; Oxford: Oxford University Press. (*The book was not available when I was writing my dissertation, therefore I have not made use of it. I cite it here for further reference).
- Trenkner, S. (1958), *The Greek novella in the classical period*; Cambridge: University Press.
- Turcan, R. (1963), 'Le roman initiatique: à propos d'un livre récent', *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 163, 149-199.
- Van Mal-Maeder, D. (2001), *Apuleius Madaurensis: Metamorphoses* (Book II); Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- Veyne, P. (1983), *Les grecs ont-ils cru à leurs mythes? Essai sur l'imagination constituante*; Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Vieillefond, J.-R. (1987), 'Longus: *Pastorales* ou *Daphnis et Chloé*', (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Walden, J. (1894), 'Stage terms in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, (5), 1-43.
- Watson, P. A. (1995), *Ancient step-mothers: myth, misogyny and reality*; Leiden: Brill.
- Wehrli, F. (1969), *Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar*, (10 vols) Basel, Stuttgart: Schwabe.
- West, M. L. (1965), 'Euripides *Hippolytus* 88', *Classical Review*, (15), 156.
- West, S. (2005), 'Kerkidos paramythia: for whom did Chariton write?', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 143, 63-69.
- Whitmarsh, T. (1998), 'The birth of a prodigy: Heliodorus and the genealogy of Hellenism', in Hunter, R. (ed.), *Studies in Heliodorus*; Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 93-124.
- (1999), 'The Writes of Passage: cultural initiation in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', in Miles, R. (ed.), *Constructing identities in late antiquity*; London: Routledge, 16-40.
- (2005), 'The Greek novels: titles and genre', *The American Journal of Philology*, 126 (4), 587-611.
- (2007), 'Divide and rule: segmenting Callirrhoe and related works', in Panayotakis, S., Paschalis, M., and Schmeling, G. (eds.), *Readers and writers in the Ancient Novel*, 36-50.
- (2009), 'Desire and the end of the Greek novel', in Nilsson, I. (ed.), *Plotting with Eros; essays on the poetics of love and the erotics of reading*; Copenhagen: Museum of Tusculanum Press, 135-152.

- Whitmarsh, T. and Morales, H. (2001a), *Achilles Tatius: Leucippe and Clitophon*; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wills, L. M. (1995), *The Jewish novel in the ancient world*; Ithaca London: Cornell University Press.
- Wilson, N. G. (1994), *Photius, The Bibliotheca*; London: Duckworth.
- Wilston, J. P. (1996), 'Tragedy and rhetoric: the use of tragedy and the tragic in fourth century', in Silk, M. S. (ed.), *Tragedy and the tragic; Greek theatre and beyond*; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 310-331.
- Winkler, J. (1990), 'The education of Chloe: hidden injuries of sex', in Winkler, J.J. (ed.), *The Constraints of Desire. The anthropology of sex and gender in ancient Greece*. (New York: Routledge, 101-126.
- Winkler, J., J. (1990a), 'Penelope's cunning and Homer's', in Winkler, J. J. (ed.), *Constraints of Desire: The anthropology of sex and gender in ancient Greece*; New York: Routledge, 129-161.
- Winkler, J. J. (1980), 'Lollianios and the desperadoes', *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 100, 155-181.
- (1982), 'The mendacity of Kalasiris and the narrative strategy of Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*', *Yale Classical Studies*, 93-158.
- (1985), *Auctor and Actor : a narratological reading of Apuleius' Golden Ass*; Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Winkler, J. J. and Stephens, S. A. (1995), *Ancient Greek novels, the fragments. Introduction text translation and commentary*; Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Wouters, A. (1987), 'Irony in Daphnis' and Chloe's love lessons ', *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, New Series, 26 (2), 111-118.
- Wright, M. (2005), *Euripides' escape-tragedies: a study of Helen, Andromeda, and Iphigenia among the Taurians*; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yildirim, B. (2004), 'Identities and empire; local mythology and the self-representation of Aphrodisias', in Borg, B. (ed.), *Paideia, the world of the Second Sophistic*; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 23-52.
- Yohannan, J. D. (1968), *Joseph and Potiphar's wife in world literature; an anthology of the story of the chaste youth and the lustful stepmother*; New York: New Directions Pub. Corp.
- Zeitlin, F. (1993), 'Gardens of desire in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*', in Tatum, J. (ed.), *The search for the ancient novel*; London, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 148-169.
- (1995), 'Figuring fidelity in Homer's *Odyssey*', in Cohen, B. (ed.), *The Distaff Side: Representing the female in Homer's Odyssey*; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 117-152.

* * *