

A COMMENTARY

ON

BOOKS 3 AND 4

OF THE

ETHIOPIAN STORY

OF HELIODORUS

BY

JOHN LAURENCE HILTON

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Classics, University of Natal.

Durban, 1998

ABSTRACT

The thesis consists of an introduction to and commentary on books 3 and 4 of the *Ethiopian Story* of Heliodorus. The introduction explores the meagre evidence for the life of the author, and concludes that he was probably a Phoenician living in the Syrian city of Emesa. The nature of the personal relationship between Heliodorus and the cult of the sun, mentioned explicitly in the final sentence of the romance, is discussed but must remain inconclusive. References to Helios in the romance are shown to be largely literary rather than programmatically religious. The narrative context surrounding the encounter between the hero and heroine of the story and the latter's strange birth, which constitutes the true opening of the romance, are investigated particularly closely. The possibility that the author represented his heroine, paradoxically born white to the black king and queen of Ethiopia, as what would today be termed an albino, is analysed, and the literary and cultural implications of this evaluated. Comparative anthropological studies of this hereditary condition in a variety of cultures show a strong connection with religious cults of the sun, while the internal evidence in the romance (particularly the heroine's miraculous birth, the constrained sexuality of the hero and heroine, and the high degree of cultural alienation in the work) further corroborate this argument.

The introduction also reviews the evidence for the date of the romance, such as the extent of the author's knowledge of the contemporary kingdoms of Axum and Meroë, his use of words and linguistic forms that were prevalent in the fourth century, the traces of Christian doctrines in the romance, the comparison between the sieges of Syene and Nisibis, and the similarity between the account of the triumphal procession of Aurelian in Vopiscus' biography of the emperor and the presentation of ambassadors to Hydaspes. This survey shows that there are strong arguments for the fourth century date for the romance. The introduction concludes with a brief survey of the language and style of Heliodorus.

The commentary provides detailed discussion of key passages for the interpretation of the author's narratological strategy, with particular regard to the role of Kalasiris in the plot. Other substantial notes look at the author's treatment of the conventions of romance, his ironical use of the superstition of the 'evil eye', his subtle characterisation, and his use of literary *topoi*. The thesis concludes with appendices on the intertextual relationship between the Homeric epics and the *Ethiopian Story*, the significance of the word ἀντίθεος, and the 'amphibolies', or double explanations for events in the narrative.

PREFACE

The TLG corpus of electronic Greek texts has been indispensable to me in writing this commentary. One of the greatest pleasures of reading Heliodorus comes when an echo is heard of the vast cast of Greek literature that preceded him, many of whom he was clearly familiar with. The TLG makes the task of recognising and confirming such intertexts far easier than it was in the past. The ready availability of so much of Greek literature is of special value to scholars working in libraries which do not carry a full range of even the standard editions.¹

With regard to modern scholarship, I have erred on the side of inclusiveness in view of the severe difficulties all but the best-stocked libraries have in providing adequate resources for the study of the *Ethiopian Story*. A commentary should, I believe, at least attempt to acknowledge scholarly work that has been and is being done on the text and its interpretation, though with the increasing rate of publication on the romances this is increasingly difficult to do.²

With regard to the spelling of Greek names, I have retained the traditional spellings found in library catalogues, such as Homer, Plato, and Herodotus (I reckon Heliodorus in this group). Where a name is less established in the English language I have adopted the closest possible transliteration, e.g., Kallirhoe, Arsake, and Demainete. In many cases of doubt, such as Helios, Philostephanus, and Onesicritus, I have followed the lead of the second edition of the *OCD*.³ Ideally, the names should be transliterated (and indeed pronounced) correctly, but this is rarely entirely successful and there is virtue in their being recognisable to non-Classicists, particularly in the case of authors and titles.

A number of colleagues have read and commented on this thesis. Where I have been able to follow their advice the result is doubtless much improved. The well-informed and critical remarks of John Morgan and Bryan Reardon in particular have contributed

¹ Every care has been taken to obtain the most reliable texts, but this has not been possible in all cases.

² The bulk of this thesis was written before the publication of J.R. Morgan's chapter on Heliodorus in G. Schmeling, *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden 1996) 417-456, which now provides the best short account of the author and his work.

³ The third edition of the *OCD* appeared after this thesis was written.

much to the final result. John Birchall and Tim Whitmarsh also greatly assisted me by reading the thesis and by providing me with photocopies of bibliographical material that I would otherwise have been unable to obtain. I am particularly indebted to Aileen Bevis for her careful reading of a draft of this thesis, to John Birchall for allowing me to read his PhD commentary on book 1 of the *Ethiopian Story*, to my supervisors, Professors Bernhard Kytzler and Anne Mackay, and to my colleagues in Durban, who allowed me leave of absence. The whole thesis is my own original work, except where I have referred to the writings and ideas of other scholars. I acknowledge the financial support of the South African *Human Sciences Research Council* and the University of Natal, Durban, which made it possible for me to spend six months in London. The staff of the Institute of Classical Studies, the Warburg Institute and the British Library made my researches so much more pleasant through their professionalism and courtesy.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	i
CONTENTS	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
The Author's <i>Sphragis</i>	1
The Central Paradox of the Romance: Albinism	8
The <i>Ethiopian Story</i> as a Religious Text	24
The Role of Helios in the <i>Ethiopian Story</i>	28
The Evidence of the Ecclesiastical Histories	31
Knowledge of Christian Doctrines in the <i>Ethiopian Story</i>	34
The Case for the Fourth Century Date	37
Heliodorus and the <i>Life of Aurelian</i> by Vopiscus	40
Philosophical Influences on the <i>Ethiopian Story</i> (Literary Texture)	42
The Opening of the Romance	48
Language	57
Style	64
A Note on the Manuscripts and Editions	78
BOOK THREE	81
The Procession	81
Charikleia	141
Theagenes	152
Kalasiris	159
BOOK FOUR	190
The Games	190
Kalasiris tests the feelings of Charikleia and Theagenes	208
Charikles attempts to solve his daughter's troubles	218
The Revelation of Charikleia's Birth	228
The escape from Delphi	274
APPENDICES	297
Appendix 1: Homer and Heliodorus	297
Appendix 2 : The Meaning of <i>Antitheos</i> (4.7.13)	309

Appendix 3: Amphibolies in the <i>Ethiopian Story</i>	314
BIBLIOGRAPHY	317
Abbreviations	317
Bibliographic Surveys of the Ancient Novels	318
Collections of Translations of the Ancient Novels	318
Historical Background	319
Religious Background	320
The Literary Context	323
Ancient Fiction	325
The <i>Ethiopian Story</i>	333
Aspects of the Commentary	336
The Date of the <i>Ethiopian Story</i>	344
The Language of Heliodorus	345
Translations of the <i>Ethiopian Story</i>	346
Commentaries on the <i>Ethiopian Story</i>	347
Manuscripts and Editions	347
ALPHABETIC LIST OF AUTHORS	349
INDEX	354
GREEK INDEX	356

INTRODUCTION

Recent studies of the *Ethiopian Story* emphasise the literary quality of the work rather than seeking to understand it primarily in terms of the cultural context in which it is set. This applies particularly to the religious structure of the work.⁴ There is much to this point of view that compels assent; the complex unfolding of the opening of the narrative, for example, has won critical approbation since Michael Psellus' famous comparison between the skilfully woven strands of the narrative and the intertwining coils of serpents (see further below).⁵ At the same time, however, Heliodorus clearly grounded his narrative in plausible detail and strove to give his work a sense of graphic actuality that would draw his readers into his story.⁶ While the argument in this introduction is by no means a defence of the view that the romance was written to illustrate the efficacy of an established religious cult, it nevertheless seeks to show that the details of Heliodorus' narrative afford the reader sufficient insight into his strange and enigmatic fictional world that an entirely unexpected and original perspective on it becomes possible. The argument must begin (paradoxically, as it should) with the concluding sentence of the work.

THE AUTHOR'S SPHRAGIS

The final sentence of the *Ethiopian Story* is usually thought to have been written by Heliodorus himself and has therefore been used as evidence for the identity of the author and as a key to the overall interpretation of the work.⁷ The text reads as follows:

Τοιόνδε πέρας ἔσχε τὸ σύνταγμα τῶν περὶ Θεαγένην καὶ Χαρίκλειαν
Αἰθιοπικῶν· ὁ συνέταξεν ἀνὴρ Φοῖνιξ Ἑμισσηνός, τῶν ἀφ' Ἡλίου γένος,
Θεοδοσίου πατρὸς Ἡλιόδωρος (10.41.4).

⁴ Cf., e.g., Morgan (1989, 319): 'the religious ending is there precisely to convey the sense of an ending.' Morgan expresses this more forcefully in his 1979 thesis (p. xxxviii): 'scholarly obsession with the spiritual background is merely the other face of a general failure to come fully to terms with the Greek romances as works of literature.' Cf. also n. 101 below.

⁵ Given as *testimonium* XII in Colonna (1938) 363-65.

⁶ Cf. Morgan (1994, 109 and n. 16; 1982, 222); Buehler (1976, 177-185).

⁷ Cf., e.g., Rohde (1914³, 465-467 [437-438]).

These words appear to have been written by the author⁸ because, in the first place, they constitute a σφραγίς or ‘seal’ (in the metaphorical sense) to the work.⁹ In the absence of copyright law, the σφραγίς established the author’s rights over his creation and, in the case of famous authors, it satisfied the desire of readers for information about their identity; it is therefore likely to have been autobiographical in nature.¹⁰ Secondly, Heliodorus’ final sentence is artfully constructed and shows signs of literary polish, although this does not necessarily mean that he was personally responsible for it. Thirdly, while the ‘autobiographical’ statements of the other Greek romance writers are generally made in the first rather than the third person, and are placed at the beginning rather than the end of their compositions,¹¹ Heliodorus may have used the third person as a deliberate imitation of the prefaces of the Greek historians (in keeping with the historiographical pose he adopts elsewhere in the work) and a final position was traditional in the case of a σφραγίς.¹² The

⁸ More recently, Hefti (1950, 129-131) regards the final sentence as suspect, but Morgan (1979, *ad loc.*) accepts it as genuine.

⁹ The term σφραγίς is more accurate than κολοφών since the latter is generally used of a concluding argument in a philosophical treatise in antiquity: cf., e.g., Plato *Euthd.* 301e; *Laws* 673d; *Tht.* 153c.

¹⁰ For σφραγίς in the sense of a warrant, cf. Theognis 19; as a guarantee of secrecy, cf. Pseudo-Lucian *Epigr.* 11, and particularly in magical texts (cf. LSJ *ad loc.* II). For the σφραγίς appended to poetic texts, see Fraenkel (1963, 362-363, 407); Kranz (1961); Aly *RE* A.2 1757. The most familiar example of a σφραγίς is Vergil *Georgics* 4.559-566.

¹¹ Winkler (1982, 96 and n. 6) states that the ‘novels of Longus, Achilles Tatius, Chariton, and Antonius Diogenes begin . . . by identifying the author and the circumstances of discovery (Diogenes, Ach. Tat.) or composition (Longus, Chariton) of the story.’ Cf. Chariton, Χαρίτων Ἀφροδισιεύς, Ἀθηναγόρου τοῦ ῥήτορος ὑπογραφεύς, πάθος ἐρωτικὸν ἐν Συρακούσαις γενόμενον διηγήσομαι (1.1.1); Τοσάδε περὶ Καλλιρόης συνέγραψα (8.8.16); Achilles Tatius, Ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα μὲν ἐπῆνουν τῆς γραφῆς, ἅτε δὲ ὦν ἐρωτικὸς περιεργότερον ἔβλεπον τὸν ἄγοντα τὸν βοῦν Ἔρωτα (1.2.1); Achilles Tatius then hands over the narrative to his fictional ego-narrator, Kleitophon, Ὁ δὲ ἄρχεται τοῦ λέγειν ὧδε· Ἐμοὶ Φοινίκη γένος, Τύρος ἢ πατρίς, ὄνομα Κλειτοφῶν (1.3.1); Longus, Ἐν Λέσβῳ θηρῶν ἐν ἄλσει Νυμφῶν θέαμα εἶδον κάλλιστον ὧν εἶδον (*Prologue* 1). Even the sophisticated Apuleius presents the prologue (for the most part) in the first person. According to Photius, Antonius Diogenes made use of the epistolary form (and so, presumably, the first person also) in dedicating his work to his sister, Isidora. Cf. Photius, Ἐπιστολὴν μὲν οὖν κατ’ ἀρχὰς τοῦ βιβλίου γράφει πρὸς τὴν ἀδελφὴν Ἰσιδώραν, δι’ ἧς εἰ καὶ τὴν προσφώνησιν αὐτῇ τῶν συγγραμμάτων δείκνυται πεποιημένος (*Bib.* 166.111a.41 [Bekker]).

¹² For example, Herodotus: Ἡροδότου Θουρίου ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξις ἦδε (Prol. 1.1); Thucydides Θουκυ-

possibility that it may reflect a scribe's or librarian's (as opposed to the author's) terminology is therefore extremely remote.¹³ If this passage is indeed autobiographical, it provides the best evidence we have about the author. I shall therefore discuss the passage phrase by phrase below.

Τῶν περὶ Θεαγένην καὶ Χαρίκλειαν Αἰθιοπικῶν

This phrase supplies a full title for the work. Some later writers and manuscripts refer to the romance simply as τὰ Αἰθιοπικά (hereafter *The Ethiopian Story*) but most Byzantine authorities use the title Χαρίκλεια.¹⁴ The focus on Charikleia at the expense of Theagenes in the later tradition is an acknowledgment of her central importance in the narrative and in the ideology of the work (see the note at 3.4.1 below). Similarly, the use of τὰ Αἰθιοπικά as a title for the work by the author, despite the fact that only book 10 is set in Ethiopia (most of the work takes place in Greece [books 3-4, 5:17-27] and Egypt [books 1-2; 5:1-16, 27-34; 6-9]), is an indication of the ideological importance of that land in the romance.¹⁵ The title τὰ Αἰθιοπικά also indirectly reinforces the importance of Charikleia in the story, since she is the only Ethiopian character to participate directly in the action of books 1-8. Heliodorus describes Ethiopia largely in literary terms, making use of, amongst others, Homer, Herodotus and, in particular, Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius* (see below n. 18). Consequently, the Ethiopia of the romance features a king and Brahmanic gymnosophist of India while locating the kingdom in Africa, to the south of Egypt (see the note on 4.8.3

δίδης Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων (1.1.1); Lucian *Hist. Conscr.* 54. Xenophon's *Ephesiaka*; the *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyrii*; the *Alexander Romance* are presented anonymously. The placing of the sentence at the end of the romance resembles the concluding autobiographical statement of Ammianus Marcellinus (31.16.7). For the historiographical pose of Heliodorus, cf. Morgan (1981, 221-265). Kranz (1961, 44-45) refers to similar statements by the authors of rhetorical and philosophical works and by vase painters such as Exekias (e.g., ΕΞΕΚΙΑΣΕΓΓΡΑΦΣΕΚΑΠΟΘΕΣΕΜΕ, Berlin 1720; *ABV* 143.1), although there the vase speaks.

¹³ For scribal subscriptions, cf. Reynolds and Wilson (1974², 35-37, 219) and the references there. The *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyrii* ends with a final sentence in the third person, but without any reference to the author.

¹⁴ Details of the titles used in the MSS. are given in the apparatus criticus of RL. For the usage of later authorities see Colonna (1938) Test. IV, IX (τὰ Αἰθιοπικά); II, X, XI, XII, XIII, XVI, XVII, XIX, XX (Χαρίκλεια).

¹⁵ For the idealisation of Hydaspes, the Ethiopian king, see Snowden (1970, 148), Morgan (1979 at 9.6.2).

below). Nevertheless, Heliodorus may yet have heard reports of the historical kingdoms of Axum and Meroë (see below on the fourth-century date of the work).

Ἄνθρωπος Φοῖνιξ ('a Phoenician')

This is best taken as an ethnic term qualifying the following geographic descriptor, Ἐμισσηνός, and had long been used as such.¹⁶ It is therefore unwarranted to deduce that the necessity for this phrase arose after Septimius Severus divided the province of Syria into Syria Coele and Syria Phoenike in 194 AD and that the use of the phrase would therefore provide a *terminus post quem* for the date of the author.¹⁷

Ἐμισσηνός ('from Emesa')

Emesa (modern Homs in Syria) was an important centre on the river Orontes that controlled the flow of eastern trade from the oasis at Palmyra through mountain defiles to the coastal ports of Lebanon.¹⁸ The town was also of strategic importance militarily in that it was often used to launch attacks against the Parthians. As a result, Emesa was granted the status of a Roman colony by Caracalla (212-217) and, as the home town of the emperor Elagabalus, who was priest of the cult of Helios there, and his family (Julia Domna, Julia Maesa, and Severus Alexander), Emesa achieved great prosperity at this time. Indeed, because of the strong parallels between the *Ethiopian Story* and Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, which was published some time after the death of his patroness, Julia Domna, in 217, the reigns of Elagabalus (M. Aurelius Antoninus, emperor 218-222) or Alexander Severus (Marcus Aurelius Severus Alexander, emperor 222-235) have been

¹⁶ The use of the word is similar to Herodian's description of Julia Maesa as a Φοίνισσα. Herodian 5.3.2, Μαῖσα ἦν τις ὄνομα, τὸ γένος Φοίνισσα, ἀπὸ Ἐμέσου καλουμένης οὕτω πόλεως ἐν Φοινίκῃ. For the expression cf. a fragment of Arcestratus, a contemporary of Aristotle (quoted by Athen. 3.77.25: ἔστω δὴ σοι ἄνθρωπος Φοῖνιξ ἢ Λυδὸς ἐν οἴκῳ). Millar (1993, 121-124, 306) points out the existence of three groups of people in Emesa; Arabs, Phoenicians and Greeks. Heliodorus' and Julia Maesa's identification of themselves by city and by race therefore serve to distinguish their identity more clearly than mere mention of the city would have done. Phoenicians feature quite prominently in the romance, though to some extent this is a literary convention (see 4.16.6.2 below and note).

¹⁷ Cf. Sandy (1982, 1-2 and nn. 1 & 2), who supports the third century date on this basis.

¹⁸ Millar (1993, 300-309) accepts the importance of trade with the east for the development of Emesa, which may be reflected in Heliodorus' description of the gifts of the ambassadors from the east (10.25.2-10.27.3), for example.

suggested as the most likely date for the *Ethiopian Story*.¹⁹ Syria produced a number of influential intellectuals in the second and third centuries AD and Julia Domna was known for her patronage of writers, one of whom may have been our Heliodorus.²⁰

There is certainly a very close relationship between the various works of Philostratus (especially the *Heroicus*, the *Gymnasticus*, the letters and the *Vita Apollonii*) and books 3-4 of the romance of Heliodorus in respect of the following points (see further the notes *ad loc.*): the hero-cult of Neoptolemus (3.1.1); the hymn to Thetis (3.2.4); the description of Theagenes as Achilles (3.3.3-3.3.7); the connection between sight and erotic love (3.5.4-3.5.5); the concept of φαντασία (3.13.1); the birth of Homer (3.14.2); the foot-race at the Pythian Games (4.1.1-4.3.1); the myth of Perseus and Andromeda (4.8.3); the birth of a white female offspring to a black mother (4.8.5); the pantarb stone (4.8.5); the remoteness of Ethiopia (4.12.1); the sacrifice of incense rather than a blood sacrifice to Helios (4.16.4); Phoenician merchants (4.16.6); and many verbal echoes cited in the commentary. The close resemblance between Kalasiris and Apollonius is particularly striking. Nevertheless, the opinions on the third century date for Heliodorus remain entirely circumstantial. Besides, Emesa was also an important centre in the fourth century

¹⁹ See RL p. xiv: 'Si l'on tient compte de ces rapports, Héliodore a dû écrire quelque temps après 220 environ, et on peut essayer de le situer dans le second quart du siècle, peut-être pendant ou peu après le règne d'Alexandre Sévère, qui fut assassiné en 235.' Cf. also Rattenbury (1926b, 176), Münscher (1912, 23-24: 'Damit rückt die Abfassung des H.-Romans etwa vor 250 . . . sie fällt in den recht engen Rahmen der drei Jahrzehnte etwa von 220-250'). Rohde (1914³, 496 [466]) wanted to date Heliodorus rather later, in the second half of the third century, on the grounds that the emperor Aurelian (a) won an important victory at Emesa over the forces of the Palmyrene queen Zenobia at this time, as a result of which he transferred the Emesan cult of Helios to Rome (SHA *Aurelian* 25; cf. also 35, 39) and (b) experienced a vision of Apollonius of Tyana in a dream (SHA *Aurelian* 24.2-9). By being moved to Rome, the Emesan cult of Helios was promoted to the status of the official religion of the Empire—certainly more creditably than it had been under Elagabalus. Lane Fox (1986, 137, 704 n. 52) rather ambivalently sides with the third century date: 'The case [of the date of Heliodorus] is far from settled, but of the two [sc. dates], the earlier is preferable, suggesting that the book may be connected with the literary sophist Heliodorus the Arab, who pleaded in the presence of the Emperor Caracalla and lived to an old age in Rome.'

²⁰ For Syrian writers of this period, see Stoneman (1992, 132), Rohde (1914³, 497 [466 n. 3]). The fourth-century also produced important Syrian writers, however: for example, the neoPlatonic philosopher, Sallustius hailed from Emesa, at least on his mother's side (*Suda* s.v. Σαλούστιος; Damascius *Vita Isidori* fr. 138.7).

when it was promoted to the status of a metropolis by Theodosius I,²¹ and there is more decisive evidence that suggests a fourth century date (see below).

Τῶν ἀφ' Ἡλίου γένος 'one of the descendants of Helios'

These words are crucial for any attempt to gain insight into the world of the author, but have proved exceptionally difficult to interpret. For example, in the dedicatory letter to his commentary (p. κβ'), Koraes ambivalently suggests that the ancestors of Heliodorus either imagined (ἐφροντάζοντο) they were descended from the sun, or that the phrase meant that they were priests of Helios. Rohde (1914³, 471 [443 n. 3])²² is similarly in doubt, but suggests that both interpretations were possible. However, it seems clear that the phrase refers to the author's birth (γένος) rather than his religious beliefs or identity (these are discussed below). Altheim (1942, 20) correctly notes the inclusion of Heliodorus' father, Theodosius, in the genealogy in 10.41.4—in fact, the phrase may conceal a typically Heliodoran play on the etymologies of the names Heliodorus and Theodosius²³—but he too takes the phrase to mean that Heliodorus worked as a priest in the temple of Helios. However, the evidence shows overwhelmingly that such expressions refer to genealogies (cf. οἱ ἀπὸ Δευκαλίωνος τὸ γένος, Hecataeus 1a,1,F14.2 [Jacoby]), claims of divine descent (cf. ἀπὸ Διὸς ἔχοντες τὸ γένος, Acusilaus 1a,2,F43.3 [Jacoby]; and in the *Alexander Romance* Alexander is described as γένος Διὸς)²⁴ or descriptions of biological categories

²¹ Rohde (1914³, 497 [466 n. 3]). For the prominence of the city in the fourth century, cf. Amm. Marc. 14.8.9.

²² Numbers given in between square brackets [] indicate the page numbers of the first edition, printed in the margins of the third edition.

²³ Merkelbach (1962, 292). The name Theodosius is attested by Strabo (12.4.9, referring to Theodosius of Bithynia, a mathematician and astronomer) as early as the 2nd century BC and cannot be used to demonstrate a late date for Heliodorus.

²⁴ 1.32 [A recension]: ἐπέγραψε γράμματα ε, Α Β Γ Δ Ε. τὸ μὲν οὖν Α Ἀλέξανδρος, τὸ δὲ Β βασιλεύς, τὸ δὲ Γ γένος, τὸ δὲ Δ Διός, τὸ δὲ Ε ἔκτισε πόλιν ἀείμνηστον). Cf. similar expressions in the work itself: e.g., οἰκειοῦται γὰρ ἀεὶ τὸ σοφῶν γένος, 4.12.1; περὶ τὸ βασιλείον γένος, 7.2.5. The omission of the article with γένος is quite common: cf., e.g., ἀπὸ Μάγδιος Θραικὸς γένος, Duris 2a,76,F28.2 (Jacoby) and occurs in Heliodorus also: cf., e.g., ἀλλ' ἔχειν τι καὶ ἡμερον γένος, 1.19.2; γένος μὲν ἔσμεν Ἴωνες, 1.22.2; Ἀινιάνων γένος, 2.34.5; ἔστι γὰρ μαχιμώτατον ἢ κόμη γένος, 6.13.2; ἀπεκρίνατο ἑαυτὸν δὲ καὶ τὴν Χαρίκλειαν Ἑλληνας γένος, 8.17.3; Θετταλὸς ὢν γένος, 10.36.3 (other instances occur at 1.8.6; 1.9.1; 1.19.7; 2.17.4; 2.34.4; 3.19.3; 4.5.5; 4.9.2; 4.11.4; 4.12.1; 4.20.2; 6.7.6; 6.8.1; 6.11.2; 7.2.5; 7.11.5; 7.12.6; 7.14.2; 7.19.6; 7.20.4; 8.3.7; 8.17.4; 9.25.5; 10.4.5 [with

(cf., e.g., *Top.* 153a33) and heredity (*Hippoc. Morb. Sacr.* 2.7 [Littré]). If Heliodorus had wanted to inform his readers that he was a priest of Helios he could surely have done so without using genealogical expressions of this kind.²⁵

Furthermore, any interpretation of this phrase (τῶν ἀφ' Ἡλίου γένος) must take the parallel expressions of Persinna (4.8.2: ὁ γενεάρχης ἡμῶν Ἥλιος; 4.8.3: ἡμῖν πρόγονοι θεῶν . . . Ἥλιός) into account. The words appear to suggest more than the conventional claim of the Persian kings to be descended from the sun and there is certainly no precedent for a queen to make such a claim.²⁶ Furthermore, Heliodorus could not have imagined Persinna

the article]; 3.1.5; 3.16.3; 3.16.4; 4.3.2; 4.18.5; 5.19.2; 7.8.3; 7.27.5; 8.9.4; 9.3.8; 9.27.3 [without article]). The meaning varies from 'kind' to 'nature' and 'nationality'. The prepositional phrase κατὰ γένος also occurs as a variation (2.9.2; 6.2.3). The usage was modelled on Herodotus (Κροῖσος ἦν Ἀυδῶς μὲν γένος, 1.6) and is also used by Philostratus (γένος Ἰνδικόν, *VA* 3.20). Heliodorus' fondness for this expression and its presence in the σφραγίς is further evidence to show that the final sentence is authentic. See Birchall's note on 1.22.2, and his introduction (p. 63), where he argues the γένος here means 'religious order'. Morgan (*ad loc.*) takes τῶν ἀφ' Ἡλίου γένος to be a kind of family name here.

²⁵ It was along these lines that Glava (1937, 1) speculated that the expression suggests that Heliodorus may have been born an Ethiopian, but her view has been rejected by Rattenbury (1938, 145) on the grounds that Heliodorus' knowledge of Ethiopia is evidently second-hand (as remarked above, Heliodorus' Ethiopia bears a closer resemblance to India than to the African kingdom; see the note on 4.8.1.8, for example). Snowden (1970, 188 and n. 120) and Dilke (1980, 271) revive Glava's idea, the latter emphasising the ending of the romance in which 'blacks and whites live happily together.' However, there is no evidence in the text that suggests that Heliodorus imagined his Ethiopians to have had negroid, rather than black Indian, features. The blush on Meroebos' black skin (10.24.2) and Sisimithres' comment on colour prejudice (10.10.4) could suggest either group. Similarly, Goethals (1959) later emphasised the relative absence of prejudice in the work as evidence of the author's sympathy with Ethiopians. The debate goes back as far as Thorlacius (1825) 6-8, who suggested a connection between the cult of Helios and Egyptian beliefs and had observed that the myth of Perseus originated in Africa. His views were sharply criticised by Naber (1872), who pointed out, sometimes with exaggerated vehemence, that Heliodorus makes a number of errors in describing Egyptian geography and clearly did not know Egypt at first hand.

²⁶ The word γενεάρχης conventionally means 'ancestor' or 'founder', cf. LSJ⁹ *ad loc.* For claims by Persian kings to be descended from the sun, cf. Plutarch *Artaxerxes* 1.2 (the Persians call the sun Cyrus and the kings were named after him) from which doubtless derives Chariton's statement at 6.1.10 (Ἥλιος προπάτωρ σός); cf. Hld. 4.8.2 and note. Another instance of γενεάρχης in a religious

to have been a priestess of Helios as he explicitly informs his readers that Ethiopian women were prohibited from even attending the sacrifice to Helios and Selene (10.4.4). Consequently, because Heliodorus refers to his descent from Helios in a similar way to Persinna, it is unnecessary to assume that the phrase τῶν ἄφ' Ἡλίου γένος meant that Heliodorus was a priest of Helios either. Careful consideration of the context of Persinna's remarks may help to clarify the meaning of Heliodorus' obscure autobiographical comment in the σφραγίς. Her words are taken from a letter (4.8) stitched into a swaddling band in which Charikleia had been exposed and which explained how it came about that she was born white to black parents. The final verdict on the author's description of himself as a descendant of the race of the sun must therefore follow full consideration of this letter (see below).

THE CENTRAL PARADOX OF THE ROMANCE: ALBINISM

Persinna's description of the miraculous and fantastic conception of her daughter by 'maternal impression' (4.8.4-5) has already been comprehensively discussed, and many scholars have pointed out the crucial importance of this passage for the interpretation of the romance.²⁷ The intricate opening of the novel *in medias res* finds its ultimate origin here and it is this passage which appears to reveal to the reader the essential information by which the action of the plot is finally resolved. In effect, all ancient accounts of this phenomenon, such as the ugly man who fathered a handsome son by this method (Galen *De Theriaca* 11.14.253 [Kühn]), women who gave birth to monkeys (Soranus *Gyn.* 1.39), and piebald sheep born to white ewes (*Genesis* 30.37-41; Aug. *De Trin.* 11.2), at least to the modern mind, show that it was an attempt to explain the mysteries of heredity in the absence of any theory of genetics. From this point of view, the birth of a white daughter to the black king and queen of Ethiopia as a result of maternal impression is most naturally taken to be a case of albinism.²⁸ To an ancient reader, on the other hand, such occurrences

context is cited by Altheim (1942, 20 [Julian of Laodicea]).

²⁷ Maternal impression: Reeve (1989), Dilke (1980) and Morgan (1979); importance: Bartsch (1989, 48) and Winkler (1982, 127).

²⁸ Pearson *et al.* (1911-1913) 21-22 cite Heliodorus as 'highly probable' evidence for this genetic condition. This exhaustive study by members of the Department of Applied Statistics of the University of London was published in two sections, Text and Atlas, both in four parts (except that part 3 of both sections never appeared). All references in this article are to part I of the text. The

would probably have been attributed to divine intervention and would have been thought of as sacred: that is, both holy and cursed, divine and prodigious—in short, demonic (δαίμονιος).²⁹ For example, Lucian describes how Ptolemy I (366-282), the son of Lagos, introduced a human prodigy into the theatre in Alexandria (after displaying a Bactrian camel)—a δίχρωμον ἄνθρωπον, ὡς τὸ μὲν ἡμίτομον αὐτοῦ ἀκριβῶς μέλαν εἶναι, τὸ δὲ ἕτερον ἐς ὑπερβολὴν λευκόν, ἐπ’ ἴσης δὲ μεμερισμένον (*You are a Prometheus* 4)³⁰—and describes the mixed reaction of the audience: some laughed, others abominated him as a prodigy (οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ ἐγέλων, οἱ δὲ τινες ὡς ἐπὶ τέρατι ἐμυσάττοντο).

Albinos feature also among the wonders of antiquity: for example, Pliny (*HN* 7.2) refers to ‘people born in Albania who have greyish eyes, are white from boyhood and who see better at night than during the day’—clearly a description of albinism.³¹ A similar account can be found in Aulus Gellius (*NA* 9.4), who claims to have found this information in books of *mirabilia* by Aristeas of Prokonnesos, Isigonus of Nicaea, Ctesias and Onesicritus, Philostephanus and Hegesias.³² The evidence of Pliny (*loc. cit.*) suggests that the source for both Latin writers was Isigonus. Antonius Diogenes also mentions people in Iberia who could see in the dark but were blind by day (in Photius 109b3 [Stephens & Winkler 1995, 123-124 and n. 45]). Eudoxus of Rhodes places this tribe among the Celts (Apollonius *Hist. mirab.* 24 [Westermann]) and Stephanus says that Aristotle records the existence of this tribe, the Germara, in his *Mirabilia* (Steph. Byz. *s. v.*

authors cite earlier authorities for their view of Charikleia’s condition. Since a foetus must inherit two recessive genes for this condition to manifest itself, it occurs rarely in all life forms but particularly strikingly in an African or Asian context, especially since the phenomenon was poorly understood even in Western scientific discussion before the twentieth century. Stannus (1913) 333-65 is an early twentieth century discussion of the medical aspects of albinism, but it was only after the discovery of DNA by Crick and Watson in the 1950s that the genetic character of the condition was properly understood. For a modern popular account of genetics, including discussion of the melanin controversy, see, e.g., Jones (1996, 192-194).

²⁹ Garland (1995, 2-3) states that albinism, among others conditions, was considered sacred in Graeco-Roman antiquity and notes such status of albinos in New Guinea and Senegal.

³⁰ See Rommel (1923) 30.

³¹ *Idem* [Isigonus of Nicaea] in *Albania gigni quosdam glauca oculorum acie, e pueritia statim canos, qui noctu plusquam interdiu cernant*.

³² *praeterea traditum esse memoratumque in ultima quadam terra, quae ‘Albania’ dicitur, gigni homines, qui in pueritia canescant et plus cernant oculis per noctem quam interdiu*.

Germera). Pomponius Mela (*De situ orbis* 1.4) describes a race of ‘white Ethiopians’ (*Leucaethiopes*) near the Trogydytes of the Nile, while Agathemerus (*Geographia* 2.5) locates this tribe west of Egypt, and Ptolemy (*Geographiae* 4.16) places them ‘at the foot of Mt. Ryssadius’ (*sub Ryssadio monte Leucaethiopes*)—apparently on the equator near the west coast of Africa. Finally, Pliny (*HN* 5.8) situates these people ‘in the interior of Africa near the equator beyond the Gaetulians and the deserts’.³³ However, these short accounts do not give enough information for us to judge whether albinos are meant or not.

Partial albinism is attested as a sacred condition in Philostratus, who gives an account of how Apollonius met a woman in India black from the top of her head to her breasts and white from her breasts to her feet (*VA* 3.3). Philostratus adds that such women are devoted to Aphrodite in India and are bred to serve the goddess, as Apis was in Egypt.³⁴ To what extent is such a conception of Charikleia borne out by the evidence the romance itself and how much does her sacred or daimonic nature (see further below) owe to the paradoxical circumstances of her birth?

First, stories in Aristotle, Pliny and Plutarch about the birth of a black child to a white parent in a mixed marriage (see 4.8.5 and note) cannot be compared with the prodigious birth of a white daughter to the black king and queen of the remote kingdom of Ethiopia, because these accounts concern children of mixed descent, whereas Charikleia’s parents are both black (and there is no suggestion of adultery or earlier intermarriage with Greeks—indeed adultery and illegitimacy are viewed with abhorrence in the romance and the royal couple are idealised).³⁵ The change in the colour of the child in the *Ethiopian*

³³ *interiori autem ambitu Africae ad meridiem versus superque Gaetulos, intervenientibus desertis, primi omnium Libyaegyptii, deinde Leucaethiopes habitant.*

³⁴ *VA* 3.3: ἱεροῦται δὲ ἄρα τῆ Ἀφροδίτῃ Ἰνδῆ τοιαύτη, καὶ τίκεται τῆ θεῶ γυνὴ ποικίλη, καθάπερ ὁ Ἄπις Αἰγυπτίους. Quoted by Kerényi (1927) 257 n. 138. Kerényi argues (256-59) that Hydaspes’ later doubts concerning the legitimacy of his daughter (10.13), and the striking parallel between the black mark on Charikleia’s arm (10.15) and the hair on Homer’s thigh (indicating his illegitimate birth) show that she was of divine birth and resembled Isis in being two-coloured.

³⁵ For the condemnation of adultery, the stories of Demainete and Arsake are sufficient evidence; for illegitimacy, see below. There is very little evidence elsewhere for a white child born to black parents, mainly because the Greeks had limited knowledge of black society, but also because black genes are dominant in children of mixed marriages (Jones 1996, 187). The only remotely probable case, to my knowledge, concerns Delphos (Schol. in Eur. *Or.* 1094; Paus. 10.6.3-4), who was the son of Poseidon by Melanthe, Melaena, Melanis, or Thyia (the name varies but clearly means

Story from black to white therefore requires an explanation. Goethals' argument (1959, 260) that Andromeda, and indeed Charikleia, were described as white 'to reduce improbability' because the Greeks thought that the heroines of romance could not be black, is questionable to say the least, since Heliodorus does not appear to have had racial prejudices; his guru Sisimithres, who may be expressing the moral views of the author here, says that the wise man does not judge people by the colour of their skins (10.10.4, « οὐ τοῖς προσώποις μόνον » ἔφη « τὰ δίκαια γίνεται ἰσχυρὰ παρὰ τοῖς σόφροσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς τρόποις »).³⁶ In any case, the extraordinary skin colour of Charikleia does not reduce the improbability of the plot—in fact, it greatly increases it.

Second, more emphasis should be placed on the parallel myth of Andromeda (4.8.3; 4.8.5) which also concerns the exposure of a white Ethiopian princess.³⁷ Evidence for the location of the myth in the Middle East is also to be found in the astronomical and astrological writers;³⁸ Vettius Valens ([2nd century A.D.] 1.12.10-1.12.26) states that the bright star Andromeda is associated with the zodiacal sign Aquarius, which lies opposite to (and thus exerts astrological influence on) Egypt and the Red Sea. This clearly suggests that the myth was traditionally associated with the region adjacent to Arabia and Ethiopia. However, most sources suggest an eastern location for the story, such as Joppa in Phoenicia, India, Babylon, and Persia.³⁹ Morgan suggests in a note to his translation (1989c, 433 n. 114) that the Andromeda myth was 'localised in Africa only at a comparatively late stage', i.e. the term Ethiopia originally referred to the East but when the Greeks acquired greater knowledge of Ethiopia south of Egypt they identified many of the myths previously connected with the east with the African kingdom.⁴⁰ A representation of the heroine on an Attic vase attributed to the Kensington Painter (*Para* 448) and dated to about 480 BC, shows a Persian princess accompanied by an Ethiopic attendant (Boston 63.2663, cf. also *LIMC* 1 s.v. 'Andromeda' I, 2-3).⁴¹ This at the very least suggests that, in the late

'black').

³⁶ Cf. also the sentiment of Queen Kandake in *The Alexander Romance* (3.18.3).

³⁷ For Andromeda as the archetype of Charikleia, cf. Merkelbach (1962, 237).

³⁸ E.g., Eudoxos ([4th century B.C.] 1.34.1-35.5); Aratos ([3rd century B.C.] 1.197-204).

³⁹ Joppa: Strabo 1.2.35; 16.2.28; Plin. *HN* 5.69; 5.128; Jos. *BJ* 3.420; India: *AP* 5.132.8; Babylon: *Hellanicus apud* Steph. Byz. *Χαλδαῖοι*; Persia: Hdt. 7.61; 7.150.

⁴⁰ Cf. Romm (1992, 45-60); Morgan (1989a, 433 n. 114); Lesky (1959, 27-38).

⁴¹ Andromeda is clearly painted white on this vase. This is significant, since the vase-painting convention of painting women white had not yet been established.

archaic era, the Greeks knew of Ethiopians as servants of the Persian elite and indicates that there was contact between the Middle East and Ethiopia (probably India) as early as the fifth century. This tradition is reflected in the plays of Sophocles and Euripides with the title 'Andromeda' (Soph. fr. 122-132; Eur. fr. 114-156 [Nauck²]). However, despite the fact that Andromeda is accompanied by Ethiopians, she is consistently portrayed as white. This suggests that the myth may originally have been concerned with the phenomenon of albinism.

Third, the description of Charikleia is clearly very different from the conventional romance heroine.⁴² Her eyes are said to shine *from birth* with a divine radiance (2.16.3; 2.31.1, καὶ ἄλλως καὶ τὸ παιδίον αὐτόθεν μέγα τι καὶ θεῖον τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐξέλαμπεν) which suggests the characteristically unusual eye-colour of albinism and may be the unique feature of her appearance to which the reader's attention is repeatedly drawn (cf. 3.4.6, 3.19.1. 5.7.3) and which Sisimithres recognises above all at the conclusion of the work (Ἐμοὶ δὲ καὶ τὸ βλέμμα τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν παρίσταται, καὶ τὸν ὅλον τῆς ὄψεως χαρακτῆρα καὶ τὸ ὑπερφυῆς τῆς ὥρας, ὁμολογοῦντα τοῖς τότε τὰ νυκτὶ φαινόμενα, γνωρίζω, 10.14.4).⁴³ His account of Charikleia's appearance emphasises her gaze as an unusual characteristic and clearly has nothing to do with romantic convention. In fact, her eyes appear to be intended to mark her quasi-divine status—Kalasiris later tells Knemon that an intense look is a distinguishing feature of divinity, and, although Kalasiris' statement is probably facetious in this context, there is independent evidence to suggest that piercing gaze was a common attribute of deities and people with divine qualities in antiquity (3.13.2-3; see further below). Theagenes recognises the disguised Charikleia by the

⁴² In what follows, the assumption should not be made that Heliodorus is describing a negroid albino princess. Charikleia's long hair alone makes this impossible (cf. 3.4.5, 6.8.6, 7.14.6). As has already been pointed out, Heliodorus' Ethiopia owes more to India than the African kingdom and albinism is a condition that affects all human races as well as the animal and plant kingdoms. Furthermore, I fail to comprehend the view that Charikleia is presented as a beauty and could not therefore be an albino. Experience and aesthetic theory tell me otherwise.

⁴³ Jax (1933, 167) shows that conventionally it was the round shape of the heroine's eyes that was considered attractive not their intense, unearthly quality, as in the case of Charikleia. There are numerous instances in which eyes are described as the 'windows of the soul' in the *Ethiopian Story*. A few instances will suffice: 2.25.2 (Kalasiris), 2.25.1 (Rhodopis), 4.18.3 (Kalasiris), 10.16.2 (Hydaspes), 7.6.1 (Arsake). The best illustration of this though is the discussions of the 'evil-eye' (3.7, 4.5.4), although Kalasiris is not being entirely serious here.

brilliance of her eyes at their reunion at Memphis (ἐνατενίσας τε καὶ ταῖς βολαῖς τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τῆς Χαρικλείας ὥσπερ ὑπ' ἀκτίνος ἐκ νεφῶν διαττούσης καταυγασθείς, 7.7.7)—surely a highly unusual manner in which to do so. The reader may be reminded of how Circe recognises Medea as a member of the race of Helios by her extraordinary gaze (ἴετο δ' αὖ κούρης ἐμφύλιον ἴδμεναι ὁμφὴν / αὐτίχ' ὅπως ἐνόησεν ἀπ' οὐδεὸς ὅσσε βαλοῦσαν / πᾶσα γὰρ Ἑλίου γενεῆ ἀρίδηλος ιδέσθαι / ἦεν, ἐπεὶ βλεφάρων ἀποτηλόθι μαρμαρυγῆσιν / οἶόν τε χρυσεὴν ἀντώπιον ἴεσαν αἴγλην, Ap. Rhod. 4.725-729).⁴⁴ Later in the epic, Medea uses the power of her gaze to cast the 'evil eye' on Talos (Ap. Rhod. 4.1669-1672)—an interesting coincidence in view of Heliodorus' evident interest in this superstition (cf. 3.7.2 below, and note). It is also notable that Sisimithres brings Charikleia to Egypt because he feared that her extraordinary appearance would lead to the revelation of the secret of her birth and therefore to her death, and punishment for himself (ἡ τῆς κόρης ἀκμὴ μείζονος ὥρας ἐφαντάζετο τοῦ εἰωθότος τὸ κάλλος, 2.31.3). If there had not been something special about her appearance—so unusual that it would shine out even if buried underground (*loc. cit.*)—Sisimithres' fears would have been singularly unfounded. Charikleia was seven at this point and possessed 'a kind of impossibly spiritual beauty' (ἀμήχανόν τι καὶ δαιμόνιον κάλλος, 2.30.6: cf. ἀμήχανόν τι κάλλος καὶ θεὸς εἶναι ἀναπειθουσα, 1.2.1) and so Sisimithres could not have been describing the conventional beauty of the nubile romance heroine.⁴⁵ In fact, Heliodorus avoids giving a detailed description of his heroine's appearance—instead he simply states that she was 'beautiful and wise' (ἡ καλὴ καὶ σοφὴ Χαρίκλεια, 3.4.1).⁴⁶ Charikleia is frequently given daimonic stature, partic-

⁴⁴ I owe this reference to my colleague, Mrs. Aileen Bevis. Two themes pervade the mythology of the House of the Sun—magic (Circe and Medea are examples) and miscegenation (as in the notorious case of the suggestively-named Pasiphaë 'all-shining', cf. Phaethon). For the connection with magic, cf. Petron. *Sat.* 127.6-7 (*non sum quidem Solis progenies, nec mea mater, dum placet, labentis mundi cursum detinuit*). I have already suggested that albinism is closely associated with magic and accusations of interbreeding with animals are all that can be invoked to explain what appear to be racial characteristics which cut across all the boundaries of the zoological genera.

⁴⁵ Philostratus' Apollonius may be a similar case of youthful precocity but his age is not specified (1.7). For the demonic quality of Charikleia, cf. 3.14.2.6 below and note. The adjective ἀμήχανος is used to describe the inexpressible beauty that Er saw during his journey in the underworld (Plat. *Resp.* 615a). For the importance of the term δαίμων in Heliodorus, cf. Birchall's Ph.D. thesis (1995) 10-22, although he does not address the heroine's daimonic character.

⁴⁶ Jax (1993, 170) notes the fact that Heliodorus avoids describing his heroine's appearance fully.

ularly in her epiphany scenes: e.g. 1.2.5-6 (Charikleia resembles Artemis or Isis); 7.7.7 (Theagenes recognises Charikleia); 10.9.3 (Charikleia on the gridiron at Meroë).

Furthermore, Heliodorus uses the extremely rare word ἀπρόσφυλον ‘not belonging to the tribe’ to describe her skin colour (4.8.5). This adjective serves as an adverb to the equally unusual participle ἀπαυγάζουσιν ‘gleaming’,⁴⁷ which reinforces the impression that Heliodorus was trying to describe a highly unusual condition for which no specific term existed in Greek.⁴⁸ In the same way, when Persinna finally recovers her long-lost daughter in Meroë, she is profoundly affected by her appearance (10.7.3, ὥστε κάκείνην παθεῖν τι πρὸς τὴν ὄψιν) and finds her strangely difficult to categorise, since she is neither clearly Greek nor Egyptian (10.7.5, Ἴσως δέ που καὶ Ἑλληνίς ἐστὶν ἢ ἄθλια· τὸ γὰρ πρόσωπον οὐκ Αἰγυπτίας). Why the doubt? Persinna must surely have known what Greeks looked like. Similarly, Hydaspes comments on the peculiarity of the stranger’s skin, which is again described in negative rather than positive terms (10.14.3, πρὸς γὰρ τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ χροίῳ ξένη τῆς Αἰθιοπίδος λαμπρύνη). These last two statements in particular would be singularly banal unless they referred to some remarkable quality in the heroine’s appearance.⁴⁹ Later in this same passage Sisimithres refers to the colour of her skin as an

Similarly, Wolff (1912, 177) notes that Heliodorus is not drawn into an *ekphrasis* of the picture of Andromeda.

⁴⁷ The words ἀυγή, ἀυγάζω and their compounds refer specifically to the rays of the sun, cf. LSJ *ad loc.* These words are used of Charikleia alone of the characters in the romance (4.8.5; 5.31.2; 7.7.7; 8.9.13 *bis*); otherwise they are used of the sun (1.1.1; 1.2.5; 2.1.1 *bis*; 5.27.4; 9.14.1; 9.22.4), moon (1.17.3; 5.8.5; 6.14.2), lamps (1.12.2; 2.6.3; 7.26.1; 8.12.3), and gems (2.30.3). The verbal forms are rare and poetic—although Philostratus uses them to describe magical eyes of a rare mountain snake (VA 3.8).

⁴⁸ It is surprising that LSJ cite ἀπρόσφυλον as a *dubia lectio* on the grounds that the MSS are equally divided between this reading (VMCZ) and ἀπρόσφιλον ‘hostile’ (BPAT). RL’s discussion of this textual problem in appendix II.2 makes no mention of the conclusive testimony of 10.14.3, but the editors commendably retain the former reading both here and at 5.7.3 (where the latter is more appropriate) for the rather weak reason that Heliodorus would have coined only one rare word with such an unusual structure. That this is not true can be seen from Heliodorus’ use of ἀπροσδοκίτωρ (1.13.2 *et saepe*); ἀπρόσμαχον (2.1.1); ἀπρόσμικτος (2.33.7); ἀπροσδιόνυσος (3.10.2); ἀπροσκορές (6.1.1); ἀπρόσκλητον (6.8.3). In my view, the manuscript confusion over the word shows that some later copyists were unsure of Heliodorus’ meaning and tried to normalise the passage by changing ἀπρόσφυλον to ἀπρόσφιλον.

⁴⁹ Morgan (1979) *ad loc.* notes the imprecise formulation here: ‘Heliodorus has not conceived a

ἀπορία (10.14.7, τῆς γε μὴν κατὰ τὴν χροιάν ἀπορίας φράζει μὲν σοι καὶ ἡ ταινία τὴν λύσιν). The words Sisimithres uses to describe the mark or ‘sign’ (σύνθημα) on the heroine’s arm (10.15.2, τὸ τῶν φόντων καὶ γένους μαρτύριον) are highly unusual, especially the reference to ‘race’, and suggest mottled skin or a melanoma—characteristic features of albinism.⁵⁰ The obscure oracle (τῆι περ ἄριστοβίων μέγ’ ἀέθλιον ἐξάψονται / λευκὸν ἐπὶ κροτάφων στέμμα μελαινομένων, 2.35.5; repeated with added resonance at the conclusion of the romance, 10.41.2), and particularly the present participle μελαινομένων may owe something to an awareness of albinism, not least the recognition of the essential indeterminacy of race.⁵¹

Accusations of adultery, child exposure and sexuality

This explanation of the paradox of Charikleia’s birth seems *prima facie* probable, but it also fits the circumstances of her exposure. The initial reaction of parents of albino children is to imply that adultery has taken place, and this is precisely the charge that Persinna fears (4.8.6).⁵² To forestall such a charge recourse could be made to infanticide⁵³

very clear picture of the contrast between her (sc. Charikleia’s) white skin and the black skin of the Ethiopians.’

⁵⁰ See Pearson *et al.* (1911-13) 21-22. Morgan (1979) *ad loc.* notes that συνθήματι is an unusual word for ‘birthmark’. LSJ⁹ read σπιλώματι with little justification from usage or the manuscripts (Z appears to be an isolated scribal gloss). Clearly συνθήματι is the *lectio difficilior* and should be retained. The word is used elsewhere by Heliodorus of the ‘signs’ the two lovers choose by which they may recognise each other should they be separated.

⁵¹ Morgan’s translation ‘a crown of white on brows of black’, taking the brows to belong to the Ethiopians (cf. Morgan 1979 *ad loc.*), is at variance with the others: cf., e.g., ‘una candida corona sulle tempie abbronzate’ (Colonna); ‘une blanche couronne ceindra leurs tempes noircies’ (Maillon). The words that follow these lines of the oracle (σπεφθέντες οὖν οἱ νέοι λευκαῖς ταῖς μίτρας) fulfil them and show that Theagenes and Charikleia alone are meant. Evidently Heliodorus imagines that the skin colour of his hero and heroine will adapt to their new environment (cf. Strabo 15.24). The majority of MSS read λευκῶν to agree with κροτάφων here for λευκόν (V superscr. A), the reading adopted by RL to agree with στέμμα. There is also some uncertainty about this word in the MSS at 2.35.5.

⁵² For example, a fragment of the Dead Sea Scrolls, which has been identified as a *Genesis* apocryphon (N. Avigad and Y. Yadin 1956, 40), records the dialogue between Lamech and his wife concerning the strange birth of their son, Noah, who is described as an albino in the *Book of Enoch* (see below, n. 50). Lamech states that he thought his wife had conceived from the ‘Watchers’ or the

and so Persinna decides to expose her child (4.8.6), although this was clearly something that grieved her intensely and was disallowed above all other sanctions by the gymnosophists (2.31.1).⁵⁴ The story of Persinna as a whole is psychologically accurate and full of pathos: her child has as yet no name (4.8.1), in consequence of the fact that the infant has not been recognised by Hydaspes and thus must lose her status and inheritance (cf. 4.12.1; 4.13.2); Persinna can only call Charikleia a daughter by virtue of her birth (accentuating her loss); the queen is aware that her daughter's chances of survival are very slim (4.8.2; 4.8.7; 4.8.8), subject to the inscrutable will of chance (4.8.6; 4.8.8) and actively opposed by hostile forces (4.8.8). Furthermore, Persinna had been barren before her conception (4.8.4), although the king needed a successor (4.8.5), and was unable to have other children because of the complications in giving birth (4.12.3). The emotional reunion of mother and daughter in the final book (10.16.1) emphasises the intensity of the queen's feelings for her daughter.

The treatment of the sexuality of the heroine is also a radical departure from the convention of romance.⁵⁵ Charikleia's concern to preserve her chastity does not derive from systematic moral or religious dogma so much as from the personal injunction of her mother, based on her experience of the miraculous birth of her daughter.⁵⁶ The concern for

'Holy Ones' or the 'fallen angels' but was ultimately convinced by her that the child was his. In Sumatra albinos were considered the offspring of a liaison between a woman and the devil (Pearson *et al.* 1911-1913, 62), while in African folklore albino children are thought to be the product of adulterous relationships, occasionally with other races but often (when this facile explanation is plainly impossible) with animals or divine agents; in Zulu thought witches consort with familiars who visit them in the form of light-coloured lovers (*amaxgebe*) at night (Berglund 1975, 285). For the question of consanguineous marriages among albinos in Norway relative to the 'normal' population, cf. V. Magnus (1922, 780).

⁵³ Cf. Tremearne (1913, 93). Harris (1926, 27), for example, reports that albinos were often killed at birth and Pearson *et al.* (*op. cit.* Text Vol. I, p. 50, 94, 104, 138, 142) provide extensive support for this assertion in Chinese, African, and Australasian societies. Stout (1946, 486-487) confirms the original practice of infanticide of albinos among the San Blas Indians.

⁵⁴ Child exposure, which had long been opposed by pagan and Christian alike, became a crime in 374 AD (*Cod. Just.* 8.51.2, *unusquisque subolem suam nutriat*).

⁵⁵ Charikleia is the only romance heroine firmly opposed to love (Hefti 1950, 41, 60).

⁵⁶ For the theme of chastity in the romance, cf. 4.8.7 and note. Goldhill (1995, 35-36, 118-121) offers no explanation for the importance of chastity in the romance beyond describing the hero and heroine as 'religiously committed' to it (p. 119), following Morgan's characterisation of it (1989,

chastity is the structural inverse of the theme of illegitimacy which pervades the romance.⁵⁷ Sexuality and marriage are intensely problematic (as they are in the *Ethiopian Story* as a whole, see 3.4; 4.18.4-6 and notes) and this could be attributed to the fact that the author envisaged the heroine as belonging to a psychologically and socially alienated group.⁵⁸

Erotic vision in the romance

Erotic sexuality is often linked to vision in the romance: the courtesan Rhodopis has eyes that seduce Kalasiris with a 'net of sensuality' (2.25.1-2) and Arsake, the depraved wife of the Persian king Oroondates, similarly casts on Theagenes 'eyes of lust' and allows her eyes to indulge in the pleasure of gazing at Theagenes during the duel of Thyamis and Petosiris, brothers in rivalry for a priesthood (7.6.1).⁵⁹ The link between sight and sensuality is also made in the discussion between Kalasiris and Charikles concerning the 'eye of envy' which the former claimed Theagenes had inflicted on Charikleia at the procession (3.7.5 and note). The person who casts the eye 'shoots arrows of passion as if borne on the wind into souls through the eyes.' Kalasiris' account is clearly similar to the discussion found in Plutarch's *Table Talk* (680C) and the material was well known,

320) as 'sacramental' (p. 121). However, he does point out that 'the very mainsprings of the plot, desire and elopement, are turned—with notable rhetorical care—to show this awe for chastity' (p. 120).

⁵⁷ Illegitimacy is ranked alongside death (4.8.6); Charikleia's royal parentage emphasises her loss of status (4.9.2); Hydaspes is concerned to protect the royal line of succession against spurious claims (10.13.5). For Homer's illegitimacy see 3.14.4 and further below. The concepts of chastity and illegitimacy are brought together at 10.22.3, παρθενεύειν νόθως χαρίζεται, which also works in a play on Charikleia's name.

⁵⁸ In many cultures marriage with albinos is rare; the adults are commonly isolated. Hrdlička (1926, 195) and Harris (1926, 27) state that 'normal' San Blas Indians in America did not wed with albinos, who intermarried among themselves, thus constituting a socially distinct group, almost a separate tribe. Kromberg and Jenkins (1982, 385) give similar findings for the Southern Sotho and Tswana group in South Africa, and Stout (1946, 489) notes that no marriage ceremony takes place when an albino marries a 'normal' San Blas Indian.

⁵⁹ Eyes are often treated as indices of emotion in the *Ethiopian Story*. After the eventual emotional recognition of Charikleia by her natural mother, Persinna, the eyes of Hydaspes are described by reference to the *Odyssey* (19.209) as 'eyes of horn or steel' (10.16.2).

although Kalasiris pretends that it comes from ‘sacred scripture’.⁶⁰ Moreover, the explanation Kalasiris gives is clearly ironic (3.7.2 and note)—falling in love is precisely what did occur at the ceremony of purification (3.5.4 and note). However, Kalasiris also tells Charikleia that Theagenes too was suffering from this condition (3.11.1) and that he was bewitching Charikleia by gazing at her forcefully with eyes ‘full of envy’ (4.5.4).⁶¹ Heliodorus also accepted the ancient medical theory of ‘maternal impression’ in terms of which the black Ethiopian queen, Persinna, physically conceived the image of a nude Andromeda as a result of looking at a painting in the room during sexual intercourse (4.8.5 and note *ad loc.*) and gave birth to a white child.⁶²

The eroticisation of vision is also manifest in Charikleia’s dream (2.16) in which a man with matted hair and covered with blood attempts to rape her while she is sitting on Theagenes’ knees—the attacker succeeds in striking out her right eye with a sword. Charikleia herself interprets the dream as meaning that she would lose Theagenes, the ‘eye’ of her life (2.16.1) and Knemon provides the conventional interpretation that the dream means that she will lose her parent (cf. Artemid. *Oneir.* 1.26).⁶³ However, the sexual nature of the dream is patent and it is also possible to interpret the dream as a fear for the loss of her virginity, especially if it is linked to Thyamis’ dream (that he will kill Charikleia and yet not kill her) which he takes to mean that he will deflower her (1.18.5). Chastity is a significant theme in the romance as can be seen when Charikleia makes Theagenes swear to respect her virginity (4.18) but Charikleia also displays a highly

⁶⁰ See more fully the note on 3.7.2 below.

⁶¹ In his discussion of the ‘eye of envy’ afflicting Charikleia, Heliodorus caustically tells us that the plover, a bird capable of taking to itself the effects of the ‘eye of envy’, tends to keep its eyes shut, in the interests of self-preservation (3.8.1).

⁶² Cf. the important article of Reeve (1989, 83-112). Later Charikleia is compared with the painting and found to be an exact likeness (10.14.7). The impressionability of the foetus is discussed by St. Augustine (*Ep.* 13.5), where *phantasia* is identified as the formative power—a passage which Watson (1988, 139-140) ascribes to neoPlatonic ideas (see further below).

⁶³ To Winkler (1982, 114-117) this interpretation is proved correct, though not in the way Knemon thinks. Instead it is Charikleia’s religious father, Kalasiris, who dies. In this view the incident is evidence of the authorial playfulness of Heliodorus, emphasised by later references to the blindness of Theagenes and Charikleia in this regard (7.12.2). Heliodorus rarely loses his sense of humour. After the dream of the loss of Charikleia’s eye, when Theagenes, Knemon and Charikleia decide to put on the clothing of beggars, Knemon jokes that the loss of her eye would make Charikleia more suited to the part (2.19.1).

passionate nature (6.8-9) and is described in sensual terms (3.4.1, a description of her black and gold serpent brooch).⁶⁴

Lastly, vision is associated with religious taboo. Kalasiris' misfortunes are ascribed to the malevolence of the 'eye of Kronos' (2.24.6—in astrological terms this is the planet Saturn), and Charikles feels that the disappearance of Charikleia is punishment for his eyes looking at what it was a sin to see (4.19.3). The death of Demainete is also observed by the eye of Justice (1.14.4—part of Heliodorus' purpose here may be to characterise Charias; cf. also 8.13.4—the eye of Justice can detect the wicked secrets of Arsake). In these cases Justice is a moral observer resembling the sun in Homer as noted below.⁶⁵ A similar reference to spiritual perception occurs in the reference to tears of the mind, not of the eyes, which Kalasiris sheds for the plight of the lovers (4.18.3, see note *ad loc.*). Kalasiris also claims the ability to perceive reality transcendently; he tells Knemon that there are two kinds of Egyptian wisdom, earthly wisdom and the true spiritual wisdom of the priests and the sacerdotal caste (3.16.3-4), which 'gazes up at the heavens,' ἄνω πρὸς τὰ οὐράνια βλέπει. It was this transcendental wisdom which led to Kalasiris leaving home and undertaking the tutelage of Charikleia (4.12.3).

The complex attitude to vision in the *Ethiopian Story* can only partly be explained in literary terms; the psychological depth underlying the incidents mentioned above and the almost obsessive emphasis on sight throughout the romance are highly unusual and constitute further indications of the author's unique sensibility.

Albinos as a sacred category

In many cultures albinos are considered sacred (with the full ambiguity of that term) and capable of using magic powers for good or evil.⁶⁶ It is not unlikely therefore, that the

⁶⁴ Cf. Bartsch (1989, 99), for the importance of the descriptions of dreams in Heliodorus, though she does not support the interpretation suggested here.

⁶⁵ Perception is problematic at all times in Heliodorus. Achaimenes, the son of Arsake's maid Kybele, is said to have had some trouble with his eyes, and to have sought ointment to relieve this condition (7.14.3) and later he wonders whether his eyes are playing tricks on him when he sees Theagenes, whom he had seen before as a prisoner being sent to Oroondates, the Persian king, as a prisoner in the court of Arsake, Oroondates' wife (7.16.3).

⁶⁶ The sacred character of albinism appears to be universal: Kromberg and Jenkins (1984, 103-104, 106) report that in South African Black society a significant majority of the population believe that albinos are a 'gift from God', that they die in mysterious circumstances, and that they are consequently 'special'; Woolf and Grant (1962, 391) report rumours that Hopi Indians attach

daimonic character of Charikleia in the *Ethiopian Story* (for which see above) is related to albinism. Moreover, the sacred character of the condition is frequently associated specifically with the astral cults of the sun and moon.⁶⁷ This is not surprising since the ancients were aware that the dark skin colour of Ethiopians was caused by the sun and was thereafter inherited (Strabo 15.24). Thus the uncanonical *Book of Enoch*, written in the second and first centuries BC, describes Noah in terms that clearly denote albinism:

‘his flesh . . . was white as snow, and red as a rose; the hair of his head was white as wool, and long; and his eyes were beautiful. When he opened them, he illuminated all the house, like the sun; the whole house abounded with light.’⁶⁸

Noah is compared with the sun in much the same way as Charikleia is:

‘soft sprays of laurel tied the rest of her hair in a garland away from the top

religious significance to albinism and that the gene for this condition was ‘culturally selected’. The authors refer to literary accounts of albino Hopi Indians who were leaders of the tribal and totemic dances and responsible for magic. Pearson *et al.* (61, 108, 137, 138) cite evidence for the religious role played by albinos in Africa and among the Maoris (who called them Korako, mythical white-skinned devils), and note (p. 141) that albinos in Africa were members of a sacred cult known as the Nolembo.

⁶⁷ The complex Dogon creation myth from Nigeria explains the custom of sacrificing and eating an albino three years after the inauguration of a *hogon* or sacred chief, perhaps as an act of purification. De Heusch suggests that the albino represents the substitute for the *hogon* himself. Alternative accounts suggest that the albino represents the mythological character Nommo after he had been ‘burnt on contact with the sun during his descent to earth.’ The practice of sacrificing an albino was followed also by the Bambara, during the enthronement of the kings of Segou (de Heusch 1985, 156). I owe this reference to Professor J. Kiernan of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Natal. Stout (1946, 483-490, particularly 489) records that albinos among the San Blas Indians were thought to be sacred and able ‘to scare away with a small bow and arrow, the demon devouring the sun or moon at times of eclipses’ and adds that they are referred to as *ibe*, an honorific term meaning ‘sun’. Pearson (1911-1913, 62) states that on the island of Amboina albinos were considered to be the offspring of the morning star and that among the Malays they were thought to be the children of the sun.

⁶⁸ *The Book of Enoch the Prophet* 12.5, 7.11, 105.120, quoted by Sorsby (1974, 17-18 and n. 3 p. 256). Lamech comments on his son’s appearance thus: ‘His eyes are bright as the rays of the sun; his countenance glorious and he looks not as if he belonged to me, but to the angels.’ Noah was considered to be spiritually pure and a mediator between divine wrath and human corruption (*Genesis* 5.28-29), perhaps as a consequence of his albinism.

of her head and forehead, binding her rosy tresses which shone like the sun, not allowing the breezes to stir them improperly.' (3.4.5)

Occasionally, albinism is attributed specifically to the moon, since albinos are inclined to favour pale light over bright light.⁶⁹ Charikleia's eventual role as priestess of Selene (10.41.2) should be borne in mind here. There is even quite remarkable evidence that the birth of an albino may be attributed to the doctrine of 'maternal impression' when the mother conceives after looking on the moon during intercourse in much the same way as Charikleia had been conceived.⁷⁰ Moreover, the astrologer Vettius Valens (5.26-27) clearly attributes white skin blemishes to the agency of the sun and moon (<K>ριός ἐστιν . . . ζῳδιῶν . . . δίχρωμον, ἐπεὶ ὁ ἥλιος καὶ ἡ Σελήνη ποιοῦσιν ἀλφοὺς λιχῆνες) while Antonius Diogenes refers to the eyes of Astraios that grew smaller and larger with the waxing and waning of the moon (Photius 109b3; Stephens & Winkler 1995, 124). The location of the albino tribes mentioned in ethnographical treatises (Pliny *NH* 7.2; Aulus Gellius *NA* 9.4) in the remote land of Albania (near modern Chechnya) may be explained by the prevalence of the cult of the Moon there (Strabo 11.491; Pliny *HN* 6.15.29, 39; Ptol. *Geog.* 5.12). However, the most striking association between the 'race of the Sun' (Ἡελίου γενεή) and unusual gaze (βλεφάρων . . . αἴγλην) occurs in the description of Medea as a member of the 'race of Helios' (Ἡελίου γενεή) in Apollonius of Rhodes (4.725).

Conclusion

What then is the reader to make of the fact that Heliodorus has portrayed his heroine in a way that so strongly suggests albinism? The answer to this question may reveal much about the literary character of the *Ethiopian Story* and the identity of its author. The resemblance between the description of Medea as a member of the 'race of Helios' (4.725) and Heliodorus' own comment that he was 'one of those descended from Helios' (10.41.4), when taken together with the anthropological evidence, Persinna's reference to Helios as the founder of her race, and the unusual birth, appearance and character of Charikleia, suggest the possibility that he had personal knowledge of albinism and that he may have attributed this condition extremely reticently and obscurely to Helios, but of course the

⁶⁹ Lionel Wafer's early description of American Indian tribes (1699 [ed. Winship 1903], 134) describes an encounter with 'White Indians' and relates how 'when the Moon-shiny nights come, they are all Life and Activity, running abroad, and into the Woods, skipping about like Wild-Bucks'. Keeler (1964, 1) clearly links albinism with the moon cult.

⁷⁰ Wafer goes on to say that such people came to be white 'through the force of the Mother's Imagination, looking on the Moon at the time of Conception'.

evidence can never be fully conclusive. One objection in particular must be faced: if Persinna is a descendant of Helios should she not also share her daughter's state? Against this, one could argue that the terms the queen uses refer to distant ancestry (γενάρχης, πρόγονοι) as opposed to immediate birth (γένος) and that the particular circumstances of her daughter's birth are highly exceptional; Persinna had been barren before her conception (4.8.4), although the king needed a successor (4.8.5), and was unable to have subsequent children because of complications in giving birth (4.12.3). Charikleia's birth is also enshrined in strongly religious terms, as if it were a miracle; Persinna swears an oath to the sun that her story is true (4.8.2); Hydaspes is instructed to lie with the queen by a dream (4.8.4 [although this was also a convention of fiction]); the birth occurs at the time of a public festival (4.8.5) and precisely at noon in mid-summer when the influence of the sun was at its height (4.8.4, see note *ad loc.*); the queen exhorts her daughter to honour chastity (4.8.7); and protects her with a magic ring (4.8.7). Besides, the random mutation of genes is something even the twentieth century finds difficult to explain, and the author has expressed himself on this matter with extreme reticence as is natural in the case of the mysteries of τὸ κρεῖττον.

The meaning of the phrase τῶν ἀφ' Ἡλίου γένος cannot therefore be demonstrated with any degree of conviction and the autobiographical detail is in any case in itself trivial. However, its possible effect on the literary character of the work is not. Whatever Heliodorus' personal knowledge of albinism (and it is quite possible that he merely read or heard reports of the phenomenon), it has clearly resulted in a highly original literary creation. The story of the heroine's unusual conception and birth sets an enigma at the very heart of the romance—a puzzle, or mystery, that constitutes its imaginative epicentre. Lucian (*You are a Prometheus* 4) used the anecdote of the δειχρωμον ἄνθρωπον to explain why his interlocutor in this dialogue described him as a literary Prometheus; his art, like the piebald man, has the quality of originality (τὸ καινούργιον) not appreciated by his readers.⁷¹ Similarly, Knemon characterises the poetry of Homer as 'mystery combined with sheer pleasure' (τὸ ἠνιγμένον τε καὶ ἡδονῆ πάση σύγκρατον, 3.15.1).⁷² The complex context of the letter of Persinna and its paradoxical contents suggest that Heliodorus was aiming at a similar quality in his own work.

A sense of cultural alienation has recently been observed in the *Ethiopian Story*. Létoublon (1993, 126-136), for example, describes the *Ethiopian Story* as a *roman du*

⁷¹ Cf. Swain (1996, 311 n. 48).

métissage written in the context of Hellenistic cosmopolitanism and even the distinction between the higher and lower wisdom of Egypt (3.16.3-4) is couched in terms of legitimacy and illegitimacy. The discussion between Kalasiris and Knemon on the strange birth of Homer (3.14) is entirely in keeping with this view of the world; Kalasiris tells the young Athenian that Hermes had intercourse with his high priest's wife and that Homer had a patch of hair on his thigh as evidence of his parentage. He adds that Homer concealed the circumstances of his birth because he wanted to be a citizen of the world rather than a citizen of one nation. The choice of Delphi as a starting point for the romance and Ethiopia as its terminus indicates that the action of the *Ethiopian Story* spans the οἰκουμένη from its centre to its periphery. Since Homer the Greeks had thought of Ethiopia as a utopia.⁷³ The outward movement of the plot and the conclusion of the romance on the edges of the earth effectively extends and challenges the cultural hegemony of the Greek world. Heliodorus' description of the numerous tribes which fought on the side of Ethiopia (9.18-20) and his account of the exotic embassies of the Chinese, Arabs, Troglodytes, Blemmyes and Auxomites (10.26-27), together with the presence of Persians and Greeks, make the court of Hydaspes a microcosm of the world.⁷⁴ The *Ethiopian Story* is also remarkable for the author's concern to present all his characters as individuals with their own story to tell; he recounts, for example, the ironic death of the barbarian bandit Thermouthis (2.20) and gives short vignettes of minor characters such as the Phoenician athlete (4.16) and Nausikles' friend, the lover of Isias (6.3), and informs his readers that one of the guards of the two lovers is a μιξέλλην (9.24.2).⁷⁵

All this is to a large extent inevitably speculative, but what is certain is that, whatever Heliodorus' own knowledge of albinism was, he chose to portray his heroine as a unique and daimonic being—a character marginal in a number of respects: neither Greek nor Ethiopian, neither entirely human nor wholly divine. This appears to be in keeping with his enigmatic style and his fondness for literary allusion that can also be seen in the religious and philosophical costume in which the romance has been dressed.⁷⁶

⁷² Reading ἠνιγμένον for ἀνηγμένον with RL.

⁷³ See Romm (1992, 45-60), who unaccountably omits any reference to Heliodorus.

⁷⁴ Létoublon (1993, 131) rightly points out the exoticism of the romance.

⁷⁵ For this rare word, which usually denotes outcasts from society, cf. Diodorus Siculus 25.2.2; Polybius 1.67.7.

⁷⁶ For the theme of albinism in modern literature in English, cf. the South African writer Jack Cope (*Albino*), the Australian, David Malouf (*Remembering Babylon*), the Hungarian György Sebestyén

THE *ETHIOPIAN STORY* AS A RELIGIOUS TEXT

The argument presented above suggests that Heliodorus was motivated by a very personal religious sensibility and that there is no compelling evidence in the σφραγίς that he was a priest of Helios. This would mean that Kerényi's (1962², 43) view that the Egyptian myth concerning the search of Isis for Osiris underlies the narrative of the *Ethiopian Story* is unlikely. Kerényi's argument rests on the following main points: the theme of death and resurrection underpins what he calls the *pietà* scene in the *Ethiopian Story* (1.2); the romance is mainly located in Egypt, the home of Isis (pp. 49-51); the pun on μέλος—μέρος alludes to the dismemberment of Osiris (p. 51);⁷⁷ Charikleia's dream that her right eye has been knocked out (2.26) echoes Egyptian stories of the loss and recovery of the eye of the sun (pp. 51-53), despite Knemon's very different interpretation of it, which follows Artemidoros (*loc. cit.*);⁷⁸ Charikleia's miraculous delivery from the fire of Arsake (8.9) fits in with the aretalogy of the goddess (p. 136);⁷⁹ her clothing recalls the robe of Isis (pp. 144-147);⁸⁰ the story of Knemon parallels the Egyptian stories of Joseph and Potiphar and Anubis and Bata (pp. 249-252); Kalasiris resembles Nektanebos in the *Alexander Romance*—both are involved in the search for a new ruler (pp. 253-254); the anecdote of the temptation of Kalasiris reflects the Egyptian tale of Petesis (p. 255); and finally, the mark on Charikleia's arm (10.15) indicates that she is a manifestation of the goddess Isis herself (pp. 257-260). However, the mere fact that parallels from Egyptian literature can be seen in the romance is no proof that the author necessarily subscribes to the ideology that underlies such stories. Heliodorus' personal statement that he will observe mystic silence about the rites of Isis (9.10.1) was conventional and his exposition was common knowledge in antiquity (cf., e.g., Plut. *On Isis and Osiris*). Besides, in an aretalogy in honour of Isis one would expect the goddess to be far more prominent in the romance. The

(*A Man Too White*) and Herman Melville (*Moby Dick*).

⁷⁷ However, the play on these words appears to have been common in the Christian writers of the fourth century and in Philo. Cf. Birchall (1996, 25), although word-play is widespread in the *Ethiopian Story* (cf. the section on style and language below).

⁷⁸ Kerényi (1962², 51-53) circumstantially links the confession of Charikles (that he looked on things he should not have, 4.19), his loss of Charikleia (the 'eye' of his life) and this dream.

⁷⁹ And also (p. 174) with Apuleius *Met.* 4.33 (the fiery bridal chamber of Psyche). However, the scene of Charikleia on the pyre has also been linked to Christian martyrology.

⁸⁰ On the basis of a comparison between the description of this garment at 10.9.3 and Apuleius *Met.*

arguments for the inspiration of the cult of Isis are far stronger in the case of the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius, but even there the religious reading has not been universally accepted.⁸¹

Altheim (1942, 13; 1957, 68) shifts the emphasis to the cult of Helios rather than Isis, references to which, he believes, permeate the *Ethiopian Story*.⁸² In his view, Heliodorus could not have been a Christian (1942, 13; 1957, 68) and must have written the romance a little after the reign of Elagabalus (emperor 218-222), when the sun cult was at its height (1957, 47).⁸³ Altheim attempts (not always convincingly) to tie the details of the romance to the actual cult of Helios at Syrian Emesa but there seems to be very little similarity between the orgiastic worship of Emesan Baal and the chaste literary references to Helios found in the *Ethiopian Story*.⁸⁴ A third attempt to prove that the work was religiously inspired was put forward by Merkelbach (1962, 234-325), who also argues that Heliodorus was writing a story which illustrated the workings of the cult of Helios, but not with reference so much to the *realia* (as in the case of Altheim) as to the allegorical interpretation of the work.⁸⁵ Merkelbach (1962, 321-325) proposes a neoPlatonist interpretation of the romance—that Charikleia represents the human soul, which has fallen into the material world from which it must flee to its spiritual home (p. 246), adducing as parallels the hymn to the soul from the apocryphal *Acts of Thomas* (pp. 299-320, providing a text and commentary), the speech of Synesius on the Osiris myth (pp. 320-321) and the evidence for the initiation of the emperor Julian into the cult of Helios (Libanios *Or.* 18.18; Julian *Or.* 7, 227C-234C). This is a very compelling argument—Julian (355-363) did draw extensively on the beliefs of his friend Sallustius, in his work *On King Helios*, which gives a neoPlatonist interpretation to the cult of Helios. However, the specifically neoPlatonic (or neoPythagorean) ideas in the romance appear to have been added to embellish the literary texture of the romance rather than being systematic articles of belief (see further below). Here, the focus falls on the idea that the *Ethiopian Story* is a cult text in the same way as the other exemplars of the genre. If Merkelbach were right, one would

11.24.

⁸¹ Cf., e.g., Winkler (1985). See also Geyer (1977, 179-196), for a critique of the view that Longus' *Daphnis & Chloe* was related to Dionysian mystery rites.

⁸² 'Der ganze Roman ist durchzogen mit Hinweisen auf den großen Gott von Emesa, *Helios*.'

⁸³ For a survey of Syrian religion, see Stoneman (1992, 137-152).

⁸⁴ See Morgan (1979, xlii-xliv).

⁸⁵ 'Den rechten Heliosroman hat Heliodor von Emesa geschrieben.' (p. 234).

again expect more consistency in the treatment of Helios and a closer focus on the workings of the god. Instead, there is a large variety of divine forces at work in the romance and no discernible pattern to their invocation.⁸⁶

The views of Kerényi, Altheim and Merkelbach attempt to explain all of the extant romances as religious texts and this is where their theories are vulnerable. In the nineteenth century, Rohde's pioneering work (the first edition of *Der Griechische Roman* was published in 1876) and many subsequent studies viewed the romances as essentially similar exemplars of a single genre, but more recent studies have stressed the individual character of these compositions and also their literary quality.⁸⁷ The works span a considerable amount of time (from the first century BC in the case of the *Ninus* fragment to the fifth or sixth century AD in the case of *Apollonius, King of Tyre*)⁸⁸ and it is highly improbable that all these compositions are driven by the same fundamental religious impulse. In the case of Achilles Tatius, the attempt to interpret the text as a *roman à clef* is patently ridiculous—the evidence for his irreverent parodies and salacious wit at the expense of the conventions of romance is too clear to doubt.⁸⁹ Merkelbach excludes consideration of Chariton altogether, presumably because a religious interpretation of the romance is not wholly convincing.

These religious interpretations of the ancient romances have been subjected to thorough criticism in a lengthy review article by Turcan (1963, 149-199). However, Turcan's argument is largely taken up with a discussion of Apuleius (pp. 151-171) and Heliodorus is awarded only a few pages (pp. 195-198). In the first place, Turcan claims (p. 195) that Persinna as a 'divinité génératrice' cannot possibly, in neoPlatonic thinking at least, be responsible for the fall of the soul (Charikleia) into the world of matter (the fact is that Heliodorus provides his readers with a psychologically realistic and affecting portrayal of the Ethiopian queen; cf. 4.8 and notes). Secondly, the notion that the romance

⁸⁶ See Morgan (1979, xlv-lxi).

⁸⁷ E.g., Morgan (1994, 64); Konstan (1994, 49); Goold (1995, 8).

⁸⁸ Goold (1995, 1) accepts the first century date for Chariton but others believe that the novel dates to the second century AD. The date of *Apollonius* is more difficult to assess, since it appears to have been based on an earlier Greek original, but the riddles appear to have been added in a later rewriting of the text in Latin. Cf. Kortekaas (1984, 130).

⁸⁹ Cf. Durham (1938, 1-19). The salacity of Achilles can be seen in his mischievous string of illustrations of the power of Eros (1.17-18), which together constitute a covert description of a sexual ejaculation.

essentially concerns the return of Charikleia to her spiritual home leaves her chosen husband (always a less significant figure in the romance) curiously out on a limb (p. 195). However, Turcan does not pay due regard to the allegorical interpretation of Theagenes' name (see appendix 1). Furthermore, the evidence to back Merkelbach's theory—some of which, as even Turcan admits (p. 196), is quite striking—is summarily discounted (pp. 195-197). The reviewer also points out that the experiences which Theagenes and Charikleia undergo do not develop in significance (p. 197), although the wanderings of the two lovers are clearly directed towards Ethiopia throughout the romance, as the oracle (2.25.5; 4.4.5) indicates. Finally, Turcan argues (p. 197) that the theatre metaphors are more suited to New Comedy than to a religious text (however, heavy religious overtones are given to some of the passages in which such figures occur, e.g. 7.8.1-2).

Since these criticisms are not particularly strong, it is not at all surprising to find that claim and counter-claim concerning the religious purpose of the author have come to characterise the scholarship on the question. Kovendi (1966a, 136-197) believed that the romance was religiously motivated since the lovers carry on without knowing Apollo's plan. Reardon (1971, 381-392) also argued that the plot of the novel unfolds purposefully, and that, unlike the protagonists in comparable novels, the lives of Theagenes and Charikleia are fundamentally affected by their experiences.⁹⁰ Reardon's comments on Heliodorus lend qualified support to the religious interpretation of the *Ethiopian Story*, but as in the case of Philostratus and Aelius Aristides, this religious feeling is vague and ill-defined: 'Il manque singulièrement ce que de nos jours on appellerait une vraie doctrine religieuse' (p. 390). Hani (1978, 268-273) has more recently attempted to revive the idea that the romance is a ritual text,⁹¹ and the idea still attracts support, although Morgan (1989c, 351) regards the 'divine apparatus' as a 'literary device to give the plot a sense of direction'. Bowie (1985, 695-696) prefers to point out the ambiguities in Heliodorus' point of view: 'A religious stamp is indeed given by the role of Delphi, the priests and the traditionally pious Ethiopians . . . but . . . it is not for religious ends that Kalasiris is brought on in the way he is'. Recently Dihle (1994, 365) has written: 'What makes Heliodorus' novel special is . . . in particular the religious concern of the author, which has no parallel in the novelistic genre.' Clearly the question of the religious character of the

⁹⁰ Reardon states (p. 389): 'd'un bout à l'autre le roman est pénétré de ce sentiment religieux, si bien que toute appréciation littéraire doit partir de ce fait.'

⁹¹ Cf. p. 271: 'C'est trop peu de dire que les Aithiopiennes sont un roman religieux; c'est plus que cela: un roman sacerdotal.'

romance deserves careful consideration, and close scrutiny must be given to the references to Helios in the work.

THE ROLE OF HELIOS IN THE *ETHIOPIAN STORY*

There are numerous references to Helios in the *Ethiopian Story*. The sun is present to witness the beauty of Theagenes and Charikleia at the festival at Delphi (3.4.8) and the god is frequently invoked in oaths: Persinna, for instance, makes Kalasiris swear by Helios to find her daughter and bring her home (4.13.1),⁹² Theagenes swears by ‘Helios and the other gods’ that he will kill himself if the marriage of Charikleia and Achaimenes is not broken off (7.26.3),⁹³ and Charikleia swears by Helios that she is innocent of the murder of Kybele and invokes the aid of Helios, Ge and the gods above and below the earth when burning at the stake (8.9.11-12), and calls on the god as witness of her truthfulness (10.11.3). Helios is often given an omniscient role in the romance: for example, Kybele, the nurse of Arsake, is overjoyed at the apparent willingness of Charikleia to go along with the adultery of Arsake with Theagenes, and she invokes the proverbial expression that not even the sun will know of the affair (7.21.2).⁹⁴ Similarly, Kalasiris left Memphis for Thebes because of his knowledge of the future feud of his sons, which the sun would shrink from witnessing (2.25.6). The sun and sunlight are also often used symbolically or aesthetically in the *Ethiopian Story*: in the opening *ekphrasis*, Charikleia is marked out by the sun shining on her weapons (1.2.5). Elsewhere Charikleia’s eyes are compared to the beams of the sun (2.16.3), and in book 5 an Ethiopian amethyst ring shines like the beams of Helios (5.13.3; 5.14.3); the rays of the sun shine into the faces of the Persians increasing the splendour of their appearance (9.14.1). Occasionally, other gods are assimilated to Helios. Hydaspes offers sacrifices to his ancestral gods, Selene, Helios and Dionysus (τοῖς πατρίοις ἡμῶν θεοῖς, 10.2.2; cf. 4.8.3, 10.6.5)—Dionysus being the manifestation of the sun in the underworld,⁹⁵ and Apollo, who, together with Artemis, directs the fate of the lovers,

⁹² ἐπισκῆπτουσά μοι πολλὰ τὸν ἥλιον, ὄρκον δὲ οὐδεὶν σοφῶν ὑπερβῆναι θεμιτόν, ‘charging me many times to do so by the sun, an oath which it is not right for any of the wise to transgress.’

⁹³ ἐπόμνυμί σοι θεῶν τὸν κάλλιστον ἥλιον καὶ θεοὺς τοὺς ἄλλους.

⁹⁴ οὐδ’ ὁ ἥλιος, τὸντο δὴ τὸ τοῦ λόγου, γνῶσεται.

⁹⁵ Cf. Macrobius (*Sat.* 1.18.8, *in sacris enim haec religiosi arcani observatio tenetur ut sol cum in supero . . . hemisphaerio est Apollo vocitetur, cum in infero . . . Dionysus*). Sometimes Helios and Selene are invoked without mention of Dionysus: cf. 10.4.5, 10.7.7, 10.8.2, 10.21.1, 10.28.1,

was also identified with the sun (cf. 3.1.2 and note).⁹⁶

These references to Helios are mainly literary and many may quite naturally be attributed to Heliodorus' most important model, Homer.⁹⁷ Sunlight is also used in descriptions of beauty in Homer.⁹⁸ But in Homer too, the sun has a moral character—a common epithet of Helios is 'the one who sees all' (*Od.* 11.109) and it was Helios who told Hephaistos of the adultery of Aphrodite with Ares (*II.* 8.302).⁹⁹ There are also elements of religious taboo associated with Helios in the Homeric epics: the witch Kirke is the descendant of Helios (*Od.* 10.138) and the sin of the followers of Odysseus in killing the cattle of the sun leads to the years of wandering of the hero, since Zeus swears that he will punish Odysseus and his men for this act (*Od.* 1.8; 12.260-387; 19.276; 23.329). Helios plays a significant part in the *Iliad*, since the god is linked with Zeus.¹⁰⁰ The sun appears to be the arbiter of Destiny when Zeus weighs the fates of Trojans and Greeks (*II.* 8.68). Helios appears as the taker of life: just as Odysseus kills the suitors Helios kills fish (*Od.* 22.388).¹⁰¹

In short, many of the allusions to Helios in Heliodorus invoke his foremost literary

10.36.3, 10.41.1).

⁹⁶ Frequent reference is made to Apollo and Helios in Plato's *Laws* (946b-c; 947a).

⁹⁷ The best discussion of the relationship between Homer and Heliodorus is to be found in Fusillo (1989, 24-31) who describes the link between the *Odyssey* and the *Ethiopian Story* as hypertextual. Further comment, in order of usefulness as well as date, may be found in Hägg (1983, 110-111); Sandy (1982a, 83-89); and Feuillâtre (1966, 105-114). For Homer's attitude to Ethiopia, see Lesky (1957).

⁹⁸ *II.* 10.547, the Trojans shine like the rays of the sun; *II.* 14.185, Hera's veil shines in the sun; *II.* 22.135, Achilles shines like the rising sun; *Od.* 4.45, the house of Odysseus shines in the sunlight [the same description is given to the house of Alkinoös *Od.* 7.84]; *Od.* 18.296, a gold and amber necklace shines like sunlight; *Od.* 19.234, Odysseus' tunic shines like sunlight and reveals the hero; *Od.* 24.148, Penelope's weaving shone like the sun.

⁹⁹ So too, Zeus promises Hera that not even Helios will see their lovemaking through the golden cloud he puts around them (*II.* 14.344); the boar which wounded Odysseus hid in a bush impenetrable to the rays of the sun (*Od.* 19.441); and Apollo brings a mist to protect Hektor from the rays of the sun (*II.* 23.190).

¹⁰⁰ Thus Menelaus and Agamemnon offer sacrifices Helios and Zeus (*II.* 3.104, 3.277, 19.197; 19.259).

¹⁰¹ So too on the death of Patroklos the sun appeared to leave the sky and a mist fell (*II.* 17.167) and Helios appears to favour the Trojans while the Achaeans are covered by a mist (*II.* 17.372).

model, Homer (see also appendix 1). Other references to the sun show a more intellectual attitude; in book 2 for example, Theagenes and Knemon do not perceive that the island on which they are standing in the marshes is on fire for as long as the sun shines because (the author speculates) daylight overcomes the light of the fire (2.1.1; cf. Philostr. *Ep.* 9 [Kayser]); there is also a discussion about whether cocks crow at dawn to greet the god (Helios) on his return or because they are disturbed by the increasing heat (1.18.3).¹⁰² This rationalistic attitude to Helios has caused scholars to deny the importance of religion in the *Ethiopian Story* and interpret the work aesthetically.¹⁰³ Helios/Apollo is clearly not the only deity to influence the lives of Theagenes and Charikleia—Chance and Destiny, demons and magic play their part as well.¹⁰⁴ This can be seen in the words of Kalasiris (4.9.1), where he describes human existence as ἄστατόν τι καὶ ἀβέβαιον. To counter such uncertainty Kalasiris studied the higher form of Egyptian wisdom (astrology or theurgy); his account of this (3.16.4) is couched in terms of illegitimacy—the lower form of Egyptian wisdom was ‘born illegitimately’ from the higher (evidently astrology). Interest in the influence which the heavenly bodies have on human life can be found readily in the text: for example, Heliodorus takes care to inform his readers that the departure of

¹⁰² Such rationalistic statements induced Capelle (1953, 167) to claim that Heliodorus lacked ethical or religious conviction altogether, particularly in view of the statement in the final book of the romance to the effect that religious principles (that blood sacrifices are wrong) must yield to political expediency (10.9.7). The German scholar held the author in low esteem and believed that Heliodorus was a typical example of the Second Sophistic, a revival of Greek literature under the Antonines, cf. Dickie (1991, 17).

¹⁰³ Cf. Heiserman (1977, 186): ‘Does a religious or moral thesis gather conventions into a poetic argument that persuades us to join a particular cult? Several episodes and many speeches, as well as the narrative method of Heliodorus’ masterpiece, tempt us to answer these dismal questions in the affirmative. On the other hand, the whole work seems to derive from another principle of invention—the desire to make an affecting, beautiful story with profound but imprecise implications about wisdom and destiny’; Sandy (1982a, 54): ‘Heliodorus was ultimately more concerned to tell a good story than to present coherent religious doctrine. Nonetheless, the *Ethiopian Story* is not without value as a document of Greek and Oriental religious thought’ and ‘religion in the *Ethiopian Story* is an aspect of motivation and plot.’; Winkler. (1982, 93-158): ‘It is not that Heliodorus is any kind of believer but merely that he must employ beliefs to illustrate the comedy of composing a romance. There has to be some Noble Message or other at the end, any one will do’ (p. 157).

¹⁰⁴ It is Apollo and Artemis who are chiefly responsible for advancing the plot of the *Ethiopian Story* (cf. 3.11.5 and note). For the importance of destiny in the romance, cf. 4.5.1 and note.

Kalasisiris, Theagenes and Charikleia from the island where they had been hiding from the pirates takes place on the first day of the new moon after its juncture with the sun (5.22.8).

It would therefore appear as if, apart from a number of significant references to astrology, many of the references to Helios in the romance are literary in character and that the presence of these allusions in the text is not primarily determined by a conscious attempt to illustrate the efficacy of the sun cult in the world.

THE EVIDENCE OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORIES

In his continuation of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* of Eusebius the Byzantine lawyer, Socrates (c. 380-450), refers to a Heliodorus from Triikka in Thessaly,¹⁰⁵ who introduced the official practice of ecclesiastical celibacy there and who was said to have put together a romance, which he called the *Ethiopian Story*, in his youth (*Hist. Ekkkl.* 5.22.151). This individual was in all probability the author of the *Ethiopian Story*:

Ἔγνων δὲ ἐγὼ καὶ ἕτερον ἔθος ἐν Θεσσαλίᾳ· γενόμενος κληρικὸς ἐκεῖ, ἦν νόμῳ γαμήσας πρὶν κληρικὸς γένηται, μετὰ τὸ κληρικὸς γενέσθαι συγκαθευδήσας αὐτῇ ἀποκήρυκτος γίνεται· τῶν ἐν ἀνατολῇ πάντων γνώμη ἀπεχομένων, καὶ τῶν ἐπισκόπων εἰ καὶ βούλοιντο, οὐ μὴν ἀνάγκη νόμου τοῦτο ποιούντων· πολλοὶ γὰρ αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς καὶ παίδας ἐκ τῆς νομίμης γαμετῆς πεποιήκασιν. Ἄλλὰ τοῦ μὲν ἐν Θεσσαλίᾳ ἔθους ἀρχηγὸς Ἡλιόδωρος Τρίκκης τῆς ἐκεῖ γενόμενος, οὗ λέγεται πονήματα ἐρωτικά βιβλία, ἃ νέος ὢν συνέταξε καὶ Αἰθιοπικὰ προσηγόρευσε.

We have no reason to doubt the testimony of Socrates, who was, in general, a scrupulous historian.¹⁰⁶ Among many other sources, he made use of the *Acta* composed by Sabinus, the bishop of Herakleia in 375, for his account of the eastern churches.¹⁰⁷ He also made use of the historical work of Athanasius, the bishop of Alexandria (c. 295-373),¹⁰⁸ as well as that of Tyrannius Rufinus of Aquileia (c. 345-410).¹⁰⁹ Rufinus was responsible for communicating to the western half of the Roman Empire the works of a number of early

¹⁰⁵ The text of Socrates as given by Colonna (1938, 361) does not refer to Heliodorus as a bishop but he must clearly have occupied a position of influence within the church. No date for Heliodorus is supplied but the assumption must be made that this Heliodorus lived shortly before Socrates in the latter part of the fourth century.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Rattenbury (1926b, 169).

¹⁰⁷ Sabinus is not extant, but cf. Socrates *Hist. Ekkkl.* 1.8; 2.15; 2.17; 2.20; for Socrates see Schaff & Wace (1979); Eltester (1927, 893-901).

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Socrates *Hist. Ekkkl.* 2.28; 3.8.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Socrates *Hist. Ekkkl.* 1.12; 1.19; 2.1; 3.19; 4.24.

church writers, among which were the fictional pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions*, which Rufinus translated into Latin and which Heliodorus himself may have read.¹¹⁰ Socrates may therefore have had a particular interest in fiction and may have learnt of Heliodorus' work as a result. It is quite probable that Heliodorus was read at this time, since Menander the Guardsman evidently borrows from the romance in the sixth century (cf. 4.17.5 and note).

Moreover, Socrates states that he had personally heard reports (Ἐγνων δὲ ἐγὼ) of how Heliodorus had introduced celibacy in Thessaly (he uses the word λέγεται with respect to the *Ethiopian Story*).¹¹¹ Alternatively, he may have chosen to use this expression in order to disclaim intimate knowledge of romantic fiction, which was not considered proper reading for clerics at this time. The emperor Julian, for example, held that fiction was a corrupting factor in society and that priests should read history rather than fiction (*Ep.* 89b.345-354).¹¹² In either case, the passage suggests that the introduction of celibacy by Heliodorus had occurred in the recent past. Furthermore, the claim that Heliodorus introduced the practice of priestly celibacy to Thessaly is entirely in keeping with the Thessalian origins of the hero and the emphasis on chastity in the work.¹¹³ Chastity is a conventional virtue in the Greek romances (cf., e.g., Achilles Tatius 4.1.4) and is sometimes treated conventionally in the *Ethiopian Story* (cf., e.g., 2.33.4-5), but the

¹¹⁰ In an unpublished paper delivered at Groningen in 1994, D.U. Hansen noted the close resemblance of a passage of Heliodorus (4.5.7, «Εἶτα ἀποκρύπτεις» ἔφην «ὦ τέκνον, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ θαρσοῦσα λέγεις, ὅπως ἂν καὶ βοηθείας εὐπορήσαιμεν;») to the words spoken by Appion in the *Clementine Recognitions* (5.3.2, Τέκνον, ὡς πατρὶ θαρσήςσας λέγε, τίς σου τῆς ψυχῆς ἢ νόσος;). Cf. also *Hld.* 3.11.5 (Αὐτός τε οὖν ἐξιθι καὶ τούσδε ὑποδεξάμενος ἄγε, συνεμπόρους ἴσα τε παισὶ ποιούμενος) and *Clem. Rec.* 12.15.3 (Γύναι, ἐξαιτῆς ἅμα τοῖς διδύμοις σου τέκνοις ἐπὶ χρόνον τινά, μέχρις ὄτε μηνῶσω ἐπανελθεῖν σε ἐνταῦθα, ἔκβηθι τὴν πόλιν). The reasons given by Mattidia in this passage for leaving Rome are similar to those given by Kalasiris for leaving Memphis (2.25.3-5)—namely, to avoid a feud between their sons.

¹¹¹ Cf. Rohde (1914³, 443 [415 n. 1]).

¹¹² Similar prejudice also attached to earlier emperors who read romances, as is shown by the letter of Septimius Severus (193-211) to the senate in which the emperor complains that Statilius Corfulenus had praised Clodius Albinus (Augustus in 196 but defeated at Lugdunum by Septimius in 197) for his knowledge of literature including the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius. Septimius considered such work trivial and laughable (*SHA* 12.12.1-14). Macrobius likewise disapproved of the work of Petronius and Apuleius (*Comm. in somn. Scip.* 1.2.7).

¹¹³ Cf. Dörrie (1938, 275).

emphasis on male chastity is unique (4.18.5 and note),¹¹⁴ and the emphasis on marriage is also unusual (4.10.5 and note).¹¹⁵ The information provided by Socrates is therefore plausible and the fact that the *Suda* (s.v. Achilles Statios) also makes Achilles Tatius a Christian and a bishop in later life (perhaps falsely) need not imply that the anecdote concerning Heliodorus was also fictitious.¹¹⁶

Photius in the ninth century rehearses the information given in the final sentence of the romance in which Heliodorus identifies himself as a Phoenician from Emesa (10.41.4, see above) but also adds that he was later thought worthy to be a bishop (*Bibl.* 73.51b.41). Theodosius Melitenos (eleventh century) also claimed that Heliodorus was the bishop of Triikka and adds that he lived during the reign of Theodosius the Great. The emperor concerned was probably Theodosius I (379-385) because Theodosius Melitenos recorded his comment on Heliodorus next to the entry for this emperor in the chronological work he was writing.¹¹⁷

Another Byzantine author, Nikephoros Kallistos (fourteenth century), tells us that Heliodorus was charged with corrupting the youth with this romance and that he chose to leave the priesthood rather than to burn the book (*Hist. Ekk.* 12.34):

Ἄλλὰ τοῦ μὲν ἐν Θεσσαλίᾳ ἔθους προκατήρξεν Ἡλιόδωρος ἐκεῖνος Τρίκκης ἐπίσκοπος, οὗ πονήματα ἐρωτικά εἰσέτι νῦν περιφέρεται, ἃ νέος ὢν συνετάξατο, Αἰθιοπικά προσαγορεύσας αὐτά· νῦν δὲ καλοῦσι ταῦτα Χαρίκλειαν δι' ἃ καὶ τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ἀφῆρέθη. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ πολλοῖς τῶν νέων κινδυνεύειν ἐκεῖθεν ἐπήει, ἢ ἐγχώριος προσέτατε σύνοδος, ἢ τὰς βίβλους ἀφανίζειν καὶ πυρὶ δαπανᾶν, ὑπαναπτύσας τὸν ἔρωτα, ἢ μὴ χρῆναι ἱεράσθαι τοιαῦτα συνθέμενον· τὸν δὲ μᾶλλον ἐλέσθαι τὴν ἱερωσύνην λιπεῖν, ἢ ἐκ μέσου τιθέναι τὸ σύγγραμμα· ὃ καὶ ἐγένετο.

While it is not entirely improbable that the *Ethiopian Story* provoked some discussion in the early Christian church, since it dealt with love and marriage, it is also not difficult to believe that Heliodorus stood by his work, as the troubles of eros are dealt with in a very moral way in the romance, and it seems unlikely the charge that the romance was a

¹¹⁴ Cf., e.g., 10.9.1 (Theagenes on the gridiron). In Achilles Tatius it does not appear to be significant that Kleitophon is unfaithful to Leukippe with Melite (5.27). Cf. also Lacombrade (1970, 81), who notes further differences from the conventional norms of romance.

¹¹⁵ This attitude to marriage may reflect the author's own psychology (see above on sexuality in albinism).

¹¹⁶ Dörrie (1938, 276) and Gärtner (1969, 48) argue that it would have been natural for Christian readers of the *Ethiopian Story* to claim its author as one of themselves.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Colonna (1950, 86).

corrupting influence on the young could have been sustained with any degree of conviction. However, the anecdote is very late, derivative (νέος ὄν), and rhetorical (ὑπαναπούσας τὸν ἔρωτα) and may have been invented.

KNOWLEDGE OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES IN THE *ETHIOPIAN STORY*

The evidence in the text of the *Ethiopian Story* for the view that Heliodorus was acquainted with Christian doctrine was first presented by Koraes (1804-1806) in his ground-breaking commentary. Koraes discusses a number of passages in which Heliodorus shows a knowledge of the Christian scriptures, which were then collected by Rohde to give proof of 'der völligen Nichtigkeit' of Koraes' arguments.¹¹⁸ However, Rohde's dismissal of the evidence for Heliodorus' knowledge of Christian doctrine was part of his overall argument for the third century date of Heliodorus, which has long been under attack by those who prefer the fourth century.¹¹⁹ Moreover, at least one authority has called into question Rohde's outright rejection of the circumstantial, but nevertheless compelling, evidence that the author was familiar with Christian teaching.¹²⁰ The fact that Heliodorus was familiar with Christian concepts and writings does not constitute proof of the fourth century date, but it is nonetheless suggestive. The evidence falls into the following categories and will therefore be briefly reviewed here:

Verbal echoes of the scriptures

There are numerous verbal echoes of the scriptures in the romance, some using highly unusual vocabulary:

2.4.1: κινδύνους θαλασσῶν, κινδύνους πειρατηρίων (cf. *2Cor.* 11.26: κινδύνους ποταμῶν, κινδύνους ληστῶν, κινδύνους ἐκ γένους, κινδύνους ἐξ ἔθνῶν, κινδύνους ἐν πόλει, κινδύνους ἐν ἔρημῖα);

2.10.1: Πρῶτα μὲν εὐαγγελίζομαι σοι [σε?] τὴν Δημαινέτης τελευτὴν (cf. *Luke* 2.10:

¹¹⁸ Cf. Rohde (1914³, 433 [415 n. 1]).

¹¹⁹ Cf. most recently, Bowersock (1994, 149-160), who supplies most of the relevant literature for the fourth century date.

¹²⁰ Cataudella (1975, 161-190, esp. 172-174) did not go as far as to claim that Heliodorus was a Christian, but he did argue that Heliodorus knew the Christian writings. Lacombrade (1970, 70-89 esp. 81) suggests that the scandal surrounding the novel (according to the 14th century Byzantine scholar Nikephoros) was used by priests opposed to Heliodorus' introduction of the custom of celibacy in Thessaly to drive him out of his see.

εὐαγγελίζομαι ὑμῖν χαρὰν μεγάλην [with the dative]; *Gal.* 1.9.2: εἴ τις ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζεται παρ' ὃ παρελάβετε, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω [with the accusative]);

2.17.1: κλύδωνι κακῶν βεβυσθισμένοι (cf. *1Tim.* 6.9: αἵτινες βυθίζουσιν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους εἰς ὄλεθρον καὶ ἀπώλειαν);

2.28.2: βίβλοις ἱεραῖς ἀναγεγραμμένα μόνοις τοῖς προφητικοῖς καὶ γινώσκειν καὶ ἀναγινώσκειν ἔξεστι (cf. *Acts* 8.30.4: Ἐγὼ γὰρ γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις;);

3.15.1: εἰ μὴ τινος θείας καὶ δαιμονίας ὡς ἀληθῶς μετέσχε καταβολῆς (cf. *Matthew* 25.34: κληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, and frequently in the letters of Paul);

4.7.12: ὀχλεῖται γὰρ ὑπὸ δυνάμεων ἃς αὐτὸς κατέπεμψα (*1 Ep. Petr.* 3.22: ὃς ἐστὶν ἐν δεξιᾷ [τοῦ] θεοῦ, πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν, ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων; *Acts* 8.10: Οὗτός ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη Μεγάλη [Simon the Magician]— but this is not exclusively a Christian concept, cf. *Porph. Abst.* 2.34; *Pmag. Par.* 1.1275);

4.18.6 φόβω τοῦ κρείττονος (*Acts* 9.31: τῷ φόβῳ τοῦ Κυρίου; *2Cor.* 5.11: τὸν φόβον τοῦ κυρίου; *Eph.* 5.21: ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ);

7.10.2: οὐ μέρους μόνον ἢ μέλους (the pun is also found in Paul *1 Cor.* 12.28: Ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους);

7.11.4: ἄχρι τοῦ παρόντος ὄψονται τὸν πατέρα (cf. *John* 16.16: Μικρὸν καὶ οὐκέτι θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με);

7.27.4: διαγογγύσαντα (cf. *Luke* 15.2: καὶ διεγόγγυζον οἱ τε Φαρισαῖοι; 19.7: καὶ ἰδόντες πάντες διεγόγγυζον λέγοντες);

8.9.17: φόνων ἐργάτιν (cf. *Luke* 13.27: ἐργάται ἀδικίας).

Echoes of Christian concepts

Occasionally concepts peculiar to Christianity are suggested, such as incarnation 2.31.1: οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν μοι θεμιτὸν ἐν κινδύνῳ ψυχὴν ἅπαξ ἐνανθρωπήσασαν παριδεῖν (cf. *Eus. Dem. Evang.* 4.6.10: ἐπειδὴ γὰρ δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πᾶσαν ἀνεδέξατο ὕβριν ἐνανθρωπήσας); 3.11.2: ἐνεψυχωμένων (cf. *Conc. Chalc.* 2.1.1.p.13.8-10: «λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν» τουτέστιν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σώματι ὅπερ ἔλαβεν ἐξ ἀνθρώπου καὶ ὁ πνεύματι ζωῆς λογικῆς ἐνεψύχωσεν);¹²¹ providence 4.9.1 (see note *ad loc.*): τὴν ἐκ θεῶν οἰκονομίαν ἐθαύμαζον (cf. *Euseb. Hist. Ekk1.* 1.1.2.8-10: ἀπὸ πρώτης ἄρξομαι τῆς κατὰ τὸν σωτήρα καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκονομίας). The synonymous term διοίκησις is

¹²¹ Cf. *Colonna* (1981, 203-4).

used at 10.38.1;¹²² being of the same nature 4.5.7: ὁμόψυχος—a late, Christian term. Cf. *Macc.* 4.14.20; Eus. *Vita Const.* 2.68.2: καὶ πρὸς τὴν ὁμόψυχον ὑμῶν ἀγχίνουσαν γράφων, τὴν τε θεῖαν πρόνοιαν καλέσας; and the notion of an ‘opposing god’ 4.7.13: ἀντίθεος (for the meaning of this word cf. appendix 2). The language of miracle-working is present in the romance: 10.16.6: θαυματουργοῦντες; 7.7.7, 8.10.1: θαυματουργία; (cf. Greg. Naz. *Or.* 43: θαυματουργεῖ τι κἀνταῦθα τῶν προειρημένων οὐκ ἔλαττον).¹²³ Compare also the story of the trick of Jacob (*Gen.* 30) and the birth of Charikleia by ‘maternal impression’ (4.8). Similarly, Charikleia and Theagenes avoid trouble by pretending to be brother and sister (1.11; 9.11) just as Sara and Abraham do (*Gen.* 20)—a trick approved of by Chrysostom and Ambrose. However, Weinstock (1934, 52) points out that such stories may have reached Heliodorus indirectly by the oral tradition as other oriental narratives did.

The language of martyrdom

The sufferings of Charikleia and Theagenes occasionally closely resemble the persecution of the Christian saints:¹²⁴

8.8.4: γέλωτα ἐφαίνετο καὶ χλεύην τὰ παρόντα ποιουμένη (the saints often laughed contemptuously at their tormentors);

8.9.13: περιρρέοντος αὐτὴν μᾶλλον τοῦ πυρός (cf. the miraculous deliverance from fire of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego [Daniel 3.27]);

10.9.7: τῷ περιλάμποντι φωτὶ τοὺς ξένους, ὑπερμαχεῖν τινα τῶν κρειπτόνων διασημαίνοντι (cf. the halo of the saints).

To sum up: the church historians suggest that the *Ethiopian Story* was written by young pagan who later became a Christian bishop of Triikka in Thessaly, known as Heliodorus. This, together with the internal evidence of the text itself, suggests a fourth century date for the work. The general resemblance between the heroine of the romance,

¹²² Cf. Kerényi (1962², 57), who notes that a similar expression can be found in the Greek legend of Tefnut, which paraphrases a demotic text.

¹²³ Cf. Cataudella (1975, 172-174). Cataudella concluded that there is no evidence that Heliodorus himself was a Christian, but that he may have known and been influenced by the Bible: ‘che non vi sono nel romanzo tante tracce di cristianesimo da far supporre che l’autore fosse stato un cristiano: ma tracce vi sono, ma tali da giustificare solo la supposizione che egli abbia avuto una qualche conoscenza dei Libri Sacri, e che magari ne abbia subito qualche parziale, fuggevole influo.’ Of course, a fourth century date for the author would make this influence all the more likely.

¹²⁴ Cf. Musurillo (1972).

Charikleia, who is described as καλή καὶ σοφή (3.4.1) and Christian holy women,¹²⁵ the emphasis on male chastity, the absence of homosexuality, the use of religious writers such as Philo (see below), who was also read by Augustine and other church fathers, and the importance attached to marriage and the family in the work,¹²⁶ all serve to lend further credence to this view.¹²⁷

THE CASE FOR THE FOURTH CENTURY DATE

Further evidence for the fourth century date of Heliodorus has been found in his anachronistic account of the use of cataphracts in the battle at Syene (9.15.5), which resembles a similar description by Julian of the deployment of these armoured horsemen at the battle of Mursa between Constantius and Magnentius in 350 (*Orat.* 2.57B).¹²⁸ Cataphract tactics had been part of military strategy since at least the first century B.C.,¹²⁹ but they had become something of a rhetorical commonplace in the fourth century A.D.,¹³⁰ and Julian's description of them (*Or.* 1.30, καθάπερ ἀνδριάντας) is strikingly close to that of Heliodorus (9.15.5, ἀνδριὰς κινούμενος).¹³¹ Moreover, although the tactics used to counter cataphracts by the Blemmyes in Heliodorus (ripping open the bellies of the horses from beneath) are the same as those of Crassus' Gallic cavalry against the Parthians, the later account shares a similar sense of confidence in the success of these manoeuvres against heavily armoured horsemen as that of the Alamanni in the battle of Strasbourg in 357 and both accounts stress the consequent helplessness of the unhorsed riders.¹³² All this suggests that Heliodorus composed his highly rhetorical and dramatic account of these impressive fighters in the fourth century.

¹²⁵ Cf. Cloke (1995).

¹²⁶ The story of Knemon, for example, provides an instructive contrast to the moral relationship between Theagenes and Charikleia. Cf. Morgan (1989b, 99-113).

¹²⁷ Edwards (1987, 9-14) provides a recent discussion of the relationship between the *New Testament* and the ancient romances.

¹²⁸ Van der Valk (1941, 100).

¹²⁹ Cf. Xen. *Anab.* 1.8.6; *Cyr.* 6.4.1; 7.1.2 (armoured horses only); Plut. *Crassus* 19, 25; Rattenbury (1942, 113-116); Altheim (1942, 33-41).

¹³⁰ Morgan (1979, ad 9.15.5), referring to Ammianus Marcellinus (16.10.8), Julian (*Or.* 1.37C; 2.57B), Claudian (*In Ruf.* 2.359), Libanius (*Or.* 59.70) and the *de VI cons. Honor.* (572-4).

¹³¹ Cf. also similar expressions in Amm. Marc. 16.10.8; Claud. *In Ruf.* 2.359-360.

¹³² Cf. Bowersock (1994, 159); Amm. Marc. 16.12.22; Hel. 9.18.1-2; Plut. *Crass.* 25.

Secondly, Heliodorus' extensive and detailed description of the siege of Syene by the Ethiopian king, Hydaspes (9.3-13), closely resembles the fragmentary description of the siege of Nisibis by the Persian king Sapor II in 350, found in the panegyrics of Julian (emperor 361-3) to Constantius (Jul. *Orat.* 1.27A-30B, 2.62B-2.67A). Initially it was thought that Heliodorus had made use of Julian's account and that he therefore belonged to the fourth century,¹³³ and when other contemporary Greek and Syriac evidence was taken into account the fourth century date appeared even more plausible.¹³⁴ However, the long, and heroic struggle over the frontier city of Nisibis from the time it was first attacked in 338, when it was said to have been saved by St. Jacob, the teacher of Ephraim (Theodoret. 2.26), until 363, when it was ceded to the Persians by Jovian in 363 (Amm. Marc. 25.7), must have been followed with keen interest by all the inhabitants of the region, but particularly in Emesa, only about 300 miles away and dependent on Nisibis to buffer it against hostile incursions. It is therefore not necessary to assume that Heliodorus modelled his account on Julian's¹³⁵ or on any historical or fictional narrative of earlier sieges.¹³⁶ It is

¹³³ Cf. van der Valk (1941, 100) 'Il paraît logique de placer le roman après l'année 351, et pas trop longtemps après cette année-là, parce que les impressions des événements de ces années sont encore fraîches.'

¹³⁴ Colonna (1950, 86: 'Scompare così ogni incertezza, ed acquista pieno valore la tesi sostenuta dal Van der Valk, che la composizione delle *Etiopiche* sia cioè posteriore al 357 d.C.' Colonna (1950, 79-87) gives the evidence of Theodoretos (*Hist. Ekk.* 2.26 = PG 82.1076ff; *Life of St. James of Nisibis* = PG 82.1294ff), the *Chronicon Pascale*, the hymns of St. Ephraim and the account of Zonaras (13.7ff) in support of the fourth century date. As a corollary of this argument Colonna suggested that Heliodorus was indeed the bishop of Trikka under the emperor Theodosius I (379-395) on the basis of the marginal manuscript note of the eleventh century Byzantine scribe George Cedrenus (who was in reality Theodosius Melitenus) next to the chronological entry for Theodosius I). Cf. *contra* Maróth (1979, 239-45: '... le siège enregistré, d'après Héliodore, par Julien ne semble pas être le même qu'on lit chez Aphrem').

¹³⁵ Lightfoot (1988, 119) argues Julian was making use of information about the siege of Nisibis from veterans of the battle, but that he supplemented his information with literary accounts, most plausibly Heliodorus, on the grounds that Julian's account of the siege is simply incredible (particularly the ships and the lake surrounding the city—the very features which Julian shares with Heliodorus). Clearly the basic elements of the story were rhetorically embellished in contemporary accounts but Julian would have been quite able to provide such embellishments himself without having recourse to fiction.

¹³⁶ As suggested by Szepessy (1976, 276: '... l'aiguille de la balance de la probabilité semble

also unlikely that Julian would have needed to consult Heliodorus' fictional account of the siege of Syene, particularly as he thought the genre improper reading (Jul. *Ep.* 89.301b).¹³⁷ If these events occurred within living memory of Heliodorus and Julian, or at least within one or two generations, it is quite possible that they knew of them from contemporary reports. The bitter tone of Ammianus Marcellinus, who fought in this campaign, when he relates how the city was finally ceded to the Persians by Jovian in 363 (25.7) shows how keenly the loss of Nisibis was felt. The siege was clearly a major event and this may explain the presence of Heliodorus' lengthy fictional account of events at Syene in the romance—these spectacular events are anachronistic otherwise have no purpose in the narrative of the *Ethiopian Story*.¹³⁸ The much-discussed description of the collapse of the mound of earth used to keep the water out of the city (9.8) must have been particularly dramatic, especially when the resulting muddy morass unexpectedly prevented the attackers from taking the city and provided an opportunity for the inhabitants of the city to escape (9.11).¹³⁹

nettement montrer non vers le 4^e, mais vers le 3^e siècle.'). who argued that Heliodorus was making use of similar sieges such as the siege of Mantineia in 385 BC combined with the account of Achilles Tatius of the diversion of the Nile (4.14). Cf. Morgan (1979, xiv-xviii) and Anderson (1984, 91), who adds the implausibly remote case of the siege of Hatarikka (cf. Pritchard 1969, 655). In his 1979 PhD thesis (pp. xiv-xviii) Morgan analysed all known sieges which could have constituted a parallel to the account in Heliodorus and concluded that both Heliodorus and Julian may have shared a common source. Despite the fact that there is no exact model for the siege of Syene in the previous sieges, the cumulative effect of all of them, combined with the rhetorical character of some, indicate that the diversion of rivers during sieges was something of a literary *topos* before Heliodorus. However, it must be said that Julian specifically comments on similar sieges in the past and claims that the siege of Nisibis was unparalleled (Jul. *Or.* 1.29A-1.30A).

¹³⁷ As Weinreich (1950 323-376 [repr. 1984, 408-431]) claims. Cf. Bowersock (1994, 154); Morgan (1979, xxvi).

¹³⁸ Morgan (1979; 1982, 226 n. 15; 1994, 111 n. 10): 'Since the only discernible reason for the inclusion of the siege of Syene in the *Aithiopica* is to exploit public excitement about the siege of Nisibis, it would seem plausible to date the *Aithiopica* as soon after 350 as possible; we may estimate that Heliodorus wrote within the twenty years 350-370.'

¹³⁹ Bowersock (1994, 155) concluded that the accounts of Julian and Heliodorus use the same word as Ephraim for the earthworks which surrounded Syene (χώματα in Greek, *talâla* in Syriac)—I do not know how anyone can be so confident of the precise denotation of a word in a translation of a 4th century Syriac hymn. Cf. Chuvin (1991², 321-25): 'Si on se refuse à torturer les témoignages

HELIODORUS AND THE *LIFE OF AURELIAN* BY VOPISCUS

The victory celebrations of Hydaspes in the *Ethiopian Story* (10.22.6-27.4) share similar details with the description of Aurelian's triumph in the life of the emperor in the *Historia Augusta* (33-34, 41).¹⁴⁰ These are: the description of Zenobia paraded in triumph in golden chains (34.3) echoes Hydaspes' treatment of Theagenes and Charikleia in Heliodorus (9.1.5);¹⁴¹ silk is mentioned as cargo in the romance (1.3.2; 5.19.2) and as the material on which Persinna recorded the story of Charikleia (2.31.2); Vopiscus refers to silk as tribute from the Palmyrene queen Zenobia (26.9), which was highly prized in Aurelian's court (45.5; 46.1); the fictional Axumites present Hydaspes with a giraffe, an animal mentioned also by the biographer, Flavius Vopiscus (33.4); Vopiscus also mentions the Blemmyes, the Arabs from Arabia Eudaimon, the Seres and the *Exomitae* 'people of Axum' among the captives led in Aurelian's triumph (33.4; 41.10)—the list is similar to the roll of the embassies that are introduced to Hydaspes: the Arabs (10.26.1, οἱ Ἀράβων τῶν εὐδοκίμωνων), the Blemmyes (10.26.2, ἡ Βλεμμύων . . . πρεσβεία), the Seres (9.16.3; 9.17.2; 9.18.3; 9.18.7; 10.25.2, οἱ Σηρῶν . . . πρεσβευταί), and the Axumites (10.27.1, οἱ Αὐξωμιτῶν πρεσβευταί); and finally, cataphracts are paraded in Aurelian's triumph over the Parthians and feature in the battle of Syene (9.15).¹⁴² The similarities between the two works suggest that Vopiscus included material from the recently published romance of Heliodorus in his life of Aurelian and this in turn supports the traditional, fourth century, date of Heliodorus.

There remains one further piece of evidence that suggests that the fourth century date for Heliodorus is correct. It has to do with the kingdom of Axum, which Heliodorus describes as 'exempt from tribute but friendly and bound by a treaty (sc. to Meroë)' (φόρου μὲν οὐκ ὄντες ὑποτελεῖς, φίλοι δὲ ἄλλως καὶ ὑπόσπονδοι, 10.27.1). This appears to be a

d'Éphraïm, de Julien et de Socrate, tous les trois auteurs sûrs et bien informés, à les soumettre à des parallèles boiteux et à leur préférer des récits plus tardifs et confus, ils concordent à placer l'activité d'Héliodore dans la seconde moitié du IV^e siècle. Il est sage de s'en tenir là.' Keydell (1966, 245-250) argues that Heliodorus introduces the use of ships to attack Syene and the collapse of the mound of earth unnecessarily from Julian's account of the siege of Nisibis (pp. 347-348).

¹⁴⁰ Conti Rossini (1919, 234); Schwartz (1967, 551); Straub (1974, 55) has also noted that the international role of the civilisation of Axum belonged to the fourth or fifth century. The description of the Axumites in the *Historia Augusta* would therefore have been very topical.

¹⁴¹ But cf. also Hdt. 3.23.

¹⁴² Cf. *SHA Aur.* 34.4; *SHA Alex. Sev.* 56.5.

fairly close reflection of the historical situation in the fourth century.¹⁴³ A Meroitic inscription (*SEG* 24 [1969] 1246) survives, probably from the fourth century, in which an Axumite king (perhaps Ezana) records his conquests in the region. A king, who must be from Meroë, is specifically mentioned in line 7 of the inscription.¹⁴⁴ This document is normally taken as evidence that an invasion of the Meroitic kingdom in the fourth century by Axum brought about the decline of the power of the kingdom and that Axum thereafter assumed control of trade in the region.¹⁴⁵ However, the fact that a king of Meroë is mentioned in the inscription suggests that the monarchy there continued into the fourth century, but under the suzerainty of Axum.¹⁴⁶ Heliodorus inverts the relationship between Axum and Meroë, suggesting that the former was under the control of the latter, possibly because Meroë had been identified as the city of the Ethiopians in the literary tradition since the time of Herodotus (2.29) and because the power of Axum was not yet fully established, but he does seem to have some idea of the alliance between Axum and Meroë in the fourth century (a situation that did not exist in the third).¹⁴⁷ Two points may be made to suggest that this information is not merely fictional: first, the narrative did not require Heliodorus to refer to the relationship between Meroë and Axum at all, since he was describing the presentation of a series of embassies to the king and Axum could have been treated in the same way as the Seres, Arabs, Trogydites or Blemmyes; and second, in making this comment Heliodorus further weakens the illusion that the action of the romance is set in the fourth century BC—he must have thought the remark sufficiently interesting to his readers to have made this sacrifice worthwhile.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴³ Cf. Bowersock (1994, 150).

¹⁴⁴ Discussed by Hägg (1984, 436-441), who links this inscription with another discovered by Shinnie in 1975 (Sudan National Museum, no. 24841).

¹⁴⁵ Arkell (1961, 171-172).

¹⁴⁶ Burstein (1984, 220-221; 1981, 47-49), cf. Török (1988, 287-290). This evidence suggests that the raids of the Blemmyes in the third century were not fatal to the Meroitic kingdom (Updegraff 1988, 87-90). However, they did cause the Romans to withdraw to the First Cataract under Diocletian (Updegraff 1988, 73).

¹⁴⁷ Altheim & Stiehl (1966, Vol. 5.1, p. 18; cf. Morgan [1979, *ad* 10.27.1]) argued that the power of Meroë was destroyed in the third century and that Heliodorus should accordingly be dated to this time. However, the evident continuation of the Meroitic kingdom and the development of the power of Axum in the fourth century may be held against this argument.

¹⁴⁸ Morgan's suggestion (1979 *ad loc.*) that, by making the Axumites allies of Meroë, Heliodorus

PHILOSOPHICAL INFLUENCES ON THE *ETHIOPIAN STORY* (LITERARY
TEXTURE)

Heliodorus has woven many allusions to philosophy, particularly the writings of Plato and his followers in the third and fourth centuries, into the literary fabric of his romance. Platonic and neoPlatonic influences can be seen especially in the metaliterary use of words such as icon (εἰκόν), symbol (σύμβολον) and fantasy (φαντασία) in the work.

Plato's *Phaedrus*

When the hero and heroine meet at the festival of Delphi (3.5.5) and exchange glances, their souls recall a previous meeting and they fall in love (see note *ad loc.*). The *topos* of love-at-first-sight is a commonplace in the romances (Achilles Tatius 1.4.4; 7.18.1-2; Char. 1.1.6; Xenophon 1.3.1-3), but the scene Heliodorus describes carries clear echoes of Plato's *Phaedrus* (251b).¹⁴⁹ The connection between beauty and sight can also be found in Plotinus who argues that perception discerns form in objects which makes them beautiful (*Enn.* 1.6.1-3).¹⁵⁰ The perception of beauty in objects produces delight in the viewers and those who feel this delight most acutely are called lovers (*Enn.* 1.6.4). Love of earthly beauty brings to mind the memory of the reality of Love itself (*Enn.* 3.5.1). At one point, Plotinus even supposes that love and vision are connected etymologically (*Enn.* 3.5.3, ὄρασις is derived from ἔρως, cf. the same play on words in Heliodorus, 3.5.4 below, and note).¹⁵¹ The spiritual nature of Charikleia's beauty and her interest in philosophy (ἡ καλὴ καὶ σοφὴ Χαρίκλεια, 3.4.1 below and note) invite the reader to interpret her presence in the work allegorically (as intelligible beauty); her beauty is not material and therefore, in neoPlatonic terms, not entirely illusory.¹⁵² Naturally, this does not make Heliodorus an

was hinting at their future power, is rather fanciful, but he does acknowledge the contemporary importance of Axum.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. M.B. Trapp in Russell (1990a, 141-173) for the influence of the *Phaedrus* on the Second Sophistic.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. *Enn.* 1.6.1, 'Beauty addresses itself chiefly to sight' (tr. McKenna).

¹⁵¹ In the philosophy of Plotinus, light, vision, perception and intellection are interrelated in complex ways, cf., e.g., Emilsson (1988 *passim*). For the philosophical decor of the work, cf. Sandy (1982b, 164-167). On Plotinus' doctrine of beauty, cf. O'Meara (1993, 88-99).

¹⁵² Similarly Plotinus distinguishes between perception of material beauty, which is an illusion, and an inner vision (*Enn.* 1.1.8-9). In order to perceive true beauty, the eye must not be dimmed by

exponent of neoPlatonic philosophy (Charikleia is far from spiritual on occasion, cf. 3.4.2 below, and note), but it does show the degree to which he makes use of philosophical vocabulary and intertextual effects to elevate and sanctify the love of his hero and heroine. In what follows, Heliodorus should be contrasted with the modern philosopher, Iris Murdoch, who does explore metaphysical or ethical doctrines in her works of fiction.¹⁵³ In the *Ethiopian Story*, philosophical allusions serve to buttress the literary structure of the work.

Icon and symbol

The suggestion that some Platonic or neoPlatonic literary influence may be at work in the account of how the picture of Andromeda was responsible for the mysterious birth of Charikleia, remains to be considered. The picture is called an εἰκών (4.8.3), which Plato uses in the sense of ‘mental image’, ‘imaginary form’ (Plat. *Rep.* 588b; *Phlb.* 39c).¹⁵⁴ Signs and symbols (σύμβολα) are also of considerable importance in Heliodorus and are in keeping with the general enigmatic character of the work (in 3.13.3 Homer—an Egyptian, of course—is said to write allegorically [συμβολικῶς] and in 3.15.1 his verses are characterised by the quality of enigma [τὸ ἠνιγμένον]). Examples are: 1.22.6 (insignia of Charikleia’s priesthood); 2.31.2 (the birth tokens of Charikleia); 3.14.2 (the hair on Homer’s thigh is a mark of his divine birth); 4.8.7 (the pantarb ring is marked with a symbol); 5.4.7, 5.5.2, 7.7.7 (the secret passwords of Theagenes and Charikleia); 10.9.7 (Sisimithres knows through signs from the gods that the sacrifice of Charikleia will not go ahead); 10.41.2 (Hydaspes places his mitre, the insignia of his priesthood, onto the head of Theagenes).¹⁵⁵

vice, and must become sunlike (*Enn.* 1.1.9—perhaps a reference to the famous sun simile in Plato *Rep.* 6.508-9).

¹⁵³ Murdoch discusses the relationship between her philosophy and her fiction in her recent book, *Existentialists and Mystics* (1997).

¹⁵⁴ That images play an important part in the *Ethiopian Story* may be seen in the symbolic scene in which images or icons of the Ethiopian gods and heroes are set in a pavilion above the gymnosophists and ringed by soldiers during the preparations for the sacrifice of Theagenes and Charikleia by Hydaspes (10.6.3). The picture of Andromeda which caused Charikleia to be born white is also called an εἰκών in the recognition scene (10.15.1). Kerényi (1962², 145) seeks to link the word to representations of Isis, but the term is neoPlatonic according to Coulter (1976, 32-72).

¹⁵⁵ Coulter (1976, 60-72) gives a sketch of the development of the word σύμβολον into a literary concept and discusses (pp. 32-60) the later neoPlatonists’ views of literary interpretation.

Fantasy

The word φαντασία wavers between an active and a passive sense in the *Ethiopian Story*; it sometimes refers to an image that impinges objectively on the sensibilities of others: image projected by a person (1.20.2); a pretentious show (7.12.3); an apparent resemblance between a host of arrows and a cloud (9.18.5); images or visual forms of resemblance (10.14.7); and apparitions of things which do not exist, i.e. ghosts (3.16.3); sometimes to the subjective psychological effect an image or apparition has on the mind.¹⁵⁶ For example, the concept of φαντασία as the capacity to dream is broadly Aristotelian. In the *Problems* (957a1-35) Aristotle remarks that fantasies occur when sleep overcomes people while they are thinking or have something before their eyes. The faculty of imagination here overlaps with visions and dreams (cf. also *Metaph.* 1024b24, false dreams; *Mir.* 846a3; *Prob.* 957a29). Heliodorus uses the word in this way to refer to objective apparitions, or visions in a dream (2.16.7). Elsewhere (*On the Soul* 427a17-427b28) Aristotle also uses φαντασία of the relational power we have to call up mental pictures, as people do who arrange their ideas according to a mnemonic system based on images, a power that is differentiated from perception, αἴσθησις, and thought, διάνοια. Heliodorus' comment that a small movement or visual clue may give a lover an intuition about his beloved is similar (7.7.5). Somewhat stronger, however, is the notion that Hydaspes' dream of his daughter is a result of the prophetic insight of his soul (9.25.2) and φαντασία as a state of heightened imagination induced by the visitations of the gods (3.13.1) goes some way beyond Aristotle's usage. The last case resembles Philostratos' contrast between φαντασία ('imagination') with μίμησις ('imitation'); Philostratus argues that, because φαντασία acts metaphorically, it is able to imagine divinities without being confounded by terror (*VA* 6.19.23-39) and enables the subject to engage with reality (τοῦ ὄντος). In this way the gods can be represented symbolically (e.g., the owl stands for Athena) and yet appear more impressive.¹⁵⁷ These usages resemble the modern idea of imagination as an intellectual faculty. On

¹⁵⁶ Quintilian uses the word in the technical sense of the rhetorical technique in which actions are described so vividly that the reader or audience imagines that they are actually seeing or experiencing them (6.2.29; 8.3.88) but also of the mental faculty of imagination (10.7.15: *capiendae sunt illae . . . rerum imagines, quas vocari φαντασίας indicavimus . . . pectus est enim, quod disertos facit, et vis mentis*). Quintilian also used the word of the visual arts (12.10.6, Theon of Samos).

¹⁵⁷ μίμησις μὲν γὰρ δημιουργήσει ὁ εἶδεν, φαντασία δὲ καὶ ὁ μὴ εἶδεν, ὑποθήσεται γὰρ αὐτὸ πρὸς τὴν ἀναφορὰν τοῦ ὄντος, καὶ μίμησιν μὲν πολλάκις ἐκκρούει ἐκπληξίς, φαντασίαν δὲ οὐδέν, χωρεῖ γὰρ

the other hand, Persinna's explanation of the birth of her daughter is similar to Augustine's discussion of the story of Jacob and Laban, which emphasises the physical role of φαντασία in the 'Andromeda Effect'. This ambivalence between φαντασία as a capacity of the mind and an impression on the body may suggest some neoPlatonic influence.¹⁵⁸

Magic

Magic clearly plays a considerable part in the imagination of Heliodorus, although he despises the insincere use of its powers. Besides the necromancy of the witch of Bessa (6.14-15) and the account of the 'eye of envy' (3.7; 4.5.2), Kalasiris ironically pretends to carry out an exorcism of Charikleia in which the paraphernalia used closely resemble the materials used in the sensational conspiracy of Patricius and Hilarius against the emperor Valens in 371 (Amm. Marc. 29.1.27-32). The conspirators confessed under torture to having used a Delphic tripod, consecrated with spells and incantations, from which a ring was suspended over a ouija board in a room fumigated with Arabian spices, to spell out the letters of the name of Valens' successor, Theodoros. The proceedings were conducted by a man wearing linen garments, shod in linen sandals and carrying branches of an auspicious tree. All the elements of Kalasiris' rites are present in this incident: clothing, tripod, laurel branch, fire and incense. While some of these were doubtless conventional the occurrence of all five in the two passages is suggestive.

However, magic is also viewed positively in the romance: for example, the pantarb stone (an apotropaic amulet) is mentioned in Persinna's description of Charikleia's birth and exposure. The ring later saves the heroine from death by fire (8.11.8) and plays an important part in the recognition of Charikleia as the daughter of Hydaspes (4.8.7; 10.14.3). For further discussion of this stone see 4.8.7 and note.

The interpretation of Philip the Philosopher

The *Ethiopian Story* therefore reveals unusual concerns and has a rare quality which can

ἀνέκκλητος πρὸς ὃ αὐτὴ ὑπέθετο. σοφὸν γάρ, εἴπερ τι Αἰγυπτίων, καὶ τὸ μὴ θρασύνεσθαι ἐς τὰ τῶν θεῶν εἶδη, συμβολικὰ δὲ αὐτὰ ποιεῖσθαι καὶ ὑπονοούμενα, καὶ γὰρ ἂν καὶ σεμνότερα οὕτω φαίνοιντο.

¹⁵⁸ The concept of 'fantasy' has been examined in a monograph and a subsequent study by G. Watson (1988, 96-133; 1994, 4765-4850). It is interesting to note that Photius (*Bib.* 166.111b.32 [Bekker]) groups Heliodorus together with the neoPlatonist Damaskios—a writer he condemns because of his stories about 'spirits', *περὶ δαμονίων διηγημάτων*, *Bib.* 130.96b-97a (Bekker). For the later development of the concept, particularly in the Mannerist movement in later European art and literature, cf. Hocke (1957, 1959).

best be described as Mannerist.¹⁵⁹ As a result, it has proved susceptible to elaborate schemes of interpretation. According to the interpretation of the *Ethiopian Story* by Philip, the romance is an instructive allegory of the progress of the triadic soul (consisting of mind, soul and body), represented by Charikleia, from ignorance (Ethiopia) to knowledge (Greece).¹⁶⁰ In Greece, Charikleia leads a practical life of chastity with Charikles until she encounters Theagenes ('the vision of true being') through contemplation of whom she overcomes the material world and desires to regain her earlier state. She is led by her teacher, Kalasiris, over the salt sea (representing matter) towards the state of goodness, despite the opposition of strife (the pirate, Trachinos). She is subjected to the trials of carnal pleasure (Arsake) but rebuffs them through the pantarb stone (fear of God), despite the plots of Cybele. She advances towards her fatherland where she is tested by fire but emerges unscathed from the flames.¹⁶¹ The names Charikleia and Theagenes are both open to an allegorical interpretation (see appendix 1).

Ethiopia is clearly idealised in the romance and takes on the character of a utopia (pp. 244-247),¹⁶² and the philosophical significance attached to the figure of Hydaspes, the ideal ruler (pp. 247-251). Furthermore, the three priests, Charikles, Kalasiris and Sisimithres, are ranked in an ascending scale of piety and wisdom, and the action of the work is goal-directed, giving the work an allegorical tone.¹⁶³ However, where Heliodorus

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Hocke (1957, 1959).

¹⁶⁰ On the disputed date, authorship, setting and interpretation of this work, see Tarán (1992, 203-230) who argues that the work was composed in the 6th century (but not necessarily in Southern Italy); Wilson (1983, 216-217 [12th century]) follows Mosino (1979-80, 207-208) and Lavagnini (1974, 3-12) in arguing that the work was written in Southern Italy during the 12th century. The work was edited initially by Hercher (1869, 382-388), more recently by Colonna (1938, 365-370), and translated by Lamberton (1986, 306-311).

¹⁶¹ Cf. the notes on 3.1.2; 3.3.4; 3.4.1; 3.13.2; 4.8.7 for details of Philip's argument.

¹⁶² Szepessy (1957, 241-259) notes (p. 251) that the cult of Helios is often associated with utopias. Cf. Pliny *HN* 10.4, where Helios is the highest god in the utopia of Euhemerus. On the 'utopischen Roman' in antiquity, cf. Kytzler (1988, 7-16).

¹⁶³ Szepessy (1957, 252-253, 254). For the allegorical feel of the work, cf. Schlam (1977, 73); Geffcken (1978, 84-85), who calls the *Ethiopian Story* 'a work of neo-Platonist propaganda' in favour of a utopian state founded on the cult of Helios. However, Sandy (1982b, 164) disagrees strongly: 'I should like to state emphatically my disagreement with Geffcken's view that "the tale is a work of Neoplatonist propaganda."' According to Sandy (1982b, 164-167) the philosophical elements merely lead the reader through the narrative. Winkler (1982, 122) links the 'ideological

does raise the possibility of two levels of interpretation (3.12.3 and note), the context is ironic and focused on a point of incidental literary interest rather than on the significance of the plot in allegorical terms.

In a key passage which suggests at least an awareness of allegory, Heliodorus describes in the first person how the Syenians and the Ethiopians declare an armistice during the siege of that city (9.9). The armistice happens to coincide with the *Neiloa*, 'the greatest of all festivals in Egypt'. According to popular belief, the festival celebrates the divinity of the Nile, which brings moisture to the earth regularly without the need of clouds or rain (cf. Philo's *Life of Moses* 2.195, with which the passage in the *Ethiopian Story* shares close verbal similarities, cf. the section *Borrowed Vocabulary* below), but Heliodorus goes on to give a 'deeper', allegorical interpretation of the festival's significance. According to this view, the Nile is Osiris and the land Isis, who longs for her husband's return and rejects Typhon, who represents the dry and hot desert sun. This is the allegorical exegesis of the festival which philosophers and theologians do not disclose to anyone other than Isiac initiates 'in the privacy of the holy shrine, in the light cast by the blazing torch of truth' (tr. Morgan).¹⁶⁴ Heliodorus concludes this excursus by asking the pardon of the gods for divulging the greatest mysteries. However, in this case the information is rather well-known, as is evident from Plutarch's treatise *De Iside et Osiride*.

In sum, while there is evidence of Platonic, neoPlatonic and other philosophical material in the *Ethiopian Story*, it is largely literary rather than programmatic in character

framework' to 'the novel's own structure of progressive and problematic intelligibility.' Bowie (1985, 696) pushes the neoPlatonic motifs into the intellectual background of the romance. More recently, Lamberton (1986, 149) has been more equivocal: 'there is no reason to believe either that the novel is committed to any particular religious or philosophical tradition or that it is an example of deliberate allegory' but later (1986, 157) the same author states that 'The *Ethiopica* is, then, a romance that hints at mystical allegory . . . It is not a systematic allegory, but no doubt it was possible early in its history to read it as one. The tradition of the mystical allegorical reading of Homer is perceptible in the work itself, influencing its approach to its material and its aspirations.' Holzberg (1995, 103) avoids the problem, stating that Heliodorus 'creates as setting for the traditional idealistic myth of salvation an additional fictional world, one of a visionary nature.'

¹⁶⁴ The passage recalls Herodotos' description of the festival of Isis at Saïs, during which many lamps are kept burning throughout the night (2.62). Apuleius explains that the lamps referred to the birth of Isis from the stars (11.10).

and relates more to the complex of ideas concerning sight, sexuality and conception—the elements involved in the central paradox of the work—than with a systematic exposition of the doctrines of these philosophies.

THE OPENING OF THE ROMANCE

There is certainly a dynamic interplay in the *Ethiopian Story* between the drive to tell and hear stories on the one hand (cf. 3.1.2 and note) and to convolute the narrative and wrap the tale in enigma on the other. The opening of the narrative *in medias res* exemplifies this. The beginning of a literary plot, according to Aristotle (*Poet.* 1450b 27-28),¹⁶⁵ is that which is not necessarily the consequence of something else but has some state or happening naturally consequent on it.¹⁶⁶ The start of the *Ethiopian Story* should be the dream in which the Ethiopian king, Hydaspes, was commanded to lie with his wife—an action which had as its consequence the miraculous conception, birth and exposure of the heroine, Charikleia (4.8.4). In this analysis, the plot is circular and Charikleia's wanderings resemble the νόστος of Odysseus. Looked at in this light, Heliodorus' romance superficially resembles the *Chaereas and Kallirhoe* of Chariton, which begins and ends in Syracuse (1.1.1 and 8.8.15) or the *Ephesiaca* of Xenophon, in which the hero and heroine return to Ephesus after their trials and adventures (5.15.1). Achilles Tatius similarly finishes his account in Byzantium after much travelling between that city and Tyre, which is very near Sidon (8.19.2-3). Besides this, Byzantium and Tyre are both mentioned together in the narrator's opening statements (1.3.1). Longus is unique in locating his tale in one place and describing the impact of the outside world on the protagonists but this is really a more extreme form of the circular plots of the other romances. The territorial extent of the action has been telescoped into a very narrow range. Despite this overall pattern, however, critical opinion prefers to describe Heliodorus' plot as linear and goal-directed rather than cyclical.¹⁶⁷ This debate can be neatly resolved if the structure of the romance is born in mind—books 1-5 are clearly circular, while books 6-10 have a purposeful and linear structure. In what follows I intend to demonstrate that the first half of the novel, which centres on the enigma of Charikleia's birth (4.8), is, in narrative terms,

¹⁶⁵ Aristotle is discussing tragedy here, but his comments are applicable to any literary structure.

¹⁶⁶ Ἀρχὴ δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ αὐτὸ μὲν μὴ ἐξ ἀνάγκης μετ' ἄλλο ἐστίν, μετ' ἐκεῖνο δ' ἕτερον πέφυκεν εἶναι ἢ γίνεσθαι. For literary openings in general cf. Nuttall (1992).

¹⁶⁷ Cf. the series of maps in Létoublon (1993, xxii-xxvi).

highly complex.

The narrative opening

In terms of strict narrative sequence the romance begins at the Heracleotic mouth of the Nile in Egypt (1.1.1). However, the reader soon becomes aware that this is a false opening and that he has been thrown *in medias res* like the readers of the *Odyssey*. This technique was well-known in antiquity and is discussed quite fully by Horace (A.P. 146-152)¹⁶⁸—the final two lines of this passage (*atque ita mentitur, sic veris falsa remiscet, / primo ne medium, medio ne discrepet imum*) convey well the narrative effect brought about by the opening of the *Ethiopian Story*. This technique creates a need in the reader to find an explanation for what has happened, a beginning point from which he or she can construct the narrative. Heliodorus frustrates this need by providing a number of false starts to the plot. Michael Psellus, the eleventh-century Byzantine polymath, compared the beginning of the *Ethiopian Story* of Heliodorus to a mass of intertwined snakes with their heads buried in their coils.¹⁶⁹ The aptness of this comparison is amply borne out by the intricate and convoluted deployment of information in the beginning of Heliodorus' narrative, which has the effect of engaging the reader in the task of actively interpreting the storyline as it unfolds.¹⁷⁰

False openings: Knemon

The first of these false starts is the appearance of an Athenian, Knemon, among the prisoners of Thyamis, the pirate who had captured Theagenes and Charikleia after the

¹⁶⁸ Lucian was also clearly familiar with this passage (*Hist. Conscr.* 23).

¹⁶⁹ *De Chariclea et Leucippe iudicium* 19-23 (given as *Testimonium* 12 in Colonna's edition [Rome 1938] 363-365): καὶ αὐτὴ δ' ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ συγγράμματος ἔοικε τοῖς ἐλικτοῖς ὄφεσι. οὐτοὶ τε γὰρ τὴν κεφαλὴν εἴσω τῆς σπείρης κατακαλύψαντες τὸ λοιπὸν σῶμα προβέβληνται, καὶ τὸ βιβλίον τὴν τῆς ὑποθέσεως εἰσβολὴν ἐν μέσῳ διολισθήσασαν ὥσπερ κληρωσάμενον ἀρχὴν πεποιήται τὴν μεσότητα. By using the extremely rare word διολισθήσασαν Psellus indicates that he is thinking of the description of the ζώνη of Charikleia (καὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς διολισθῆσαι τοῦ βρόχου συγχωρήσας 'allowing them to slip their heads through the knot' 3.4.3). Διολισθῆσαι 'slip through' is rare and mostly late, though it does occur in Plato (*Lys.* 216d1; *Phil. Imag.* 2.17.14.6). Hesychius uses this form as a gloss on ἐκπερδικίσαι 'escape like a partridge' (*Ar. Av.* 768).

¹⁷⁰ Cf. Morgan (1994, 97-113); Nuttall (1992, 214-216), who discusses the auditor's engagement with the narrative in the case of the *Iliad*.

battle on the beach.¹⁷¹ Knemon tells Theagenes and Charikleia the story of his exile. The reader is led to expect that Knemon may provide the starting-point of the narrative from the enthusiastic reception which he is given (1.8.6). To bolster this expectation, Heliodorus also skilfully interweaves the story of Knemon with that of Theagenes and Charikleia. For example, during a raid on Thyamis' camp Theagenes believes that Charikleia has been killed but the corpse turns out to be Thisbe, the slave-girl who had brought about Knemon's exile from Athens (2.5.4). The reader is therefore never sure that he or she may not discover the origin of the central narrative in the convolutions of the sub-plot.

False openings: Kalasiris

The second possible starting point to the story is presented in the form of an old Egyptian priest, Kalasiris, whom Knemon encounters on the banks of the Nile after the prisoners have escaped from captivity.¹⁷² Kalasiris claims Theagenes and Charikleia as his children but only in a spiritual sense (2.23.2). It is Kalasiris who first brings the narrative from the wilderness to the relatively civilised town of Chemmis (2.21.7). In the course of telling Knemon about himself Kalasiris describes how he came to Delphi in his wanderings (2.26.2) and how he met his 'children' (2.29-33). The telling of this second sub-plot brings the narrative tension to a climax before the main story is introduced.¹⁷³

Conventional openings: the location

There are a number of reasons why Delphi should be considered to be the beginning of the story in terms of literary convention, although it is not the chronological starting point of the story or the point at which the author begins his narrative. The story of the birth of the heroine, her exposure and adoption are telescoped into a few vital chapters which precede the description of the ceremony of purification at Delphi. Furthermore, the story of the conception of this remarkable child and the reasons for her exposure follow immediately after it (4.8). In this way the love encounter between Theagenes and Charikleia at Delphi is framed and marked out as a point of significance that gives impetus to the main

¹⁷¹ Cf. Morgan (1989b, 99-113).

¹⁷² Cf. Winkler (1982, 93-158).

¹⁷³ Cf. Futre Pinheiro (1991b, 69-83, esp. p. 71; Hefti (1950, 103-105); and Neimke (1889, 39: *'Apparet, Heliodorum uti hoc artificio—dico, eum errorum descriptionem, sequentem exemplum Odysseae Homericae, interrumpere enarratione eorum, quam Calasirim proferentem facit, ut hac nova re diligentiam legentium magis excitet eorumque animos magis delectet. '*)

storyline of the romance.¹⁷⁴

Heliodorus' description of events at Delphi closely resembles the conventional openings of the Greek romances. Most of the ancient Greek romances begin by clearly establishing the location of their narratives in a particular city. *Chaereas and Kallirhoe*, for example, begins in Syracuse, the *Ephesiaca* in Ephesus, and *Apollonius, King of Tyre* in Antioch.¹⁷⁵ The titles of the *Ephesiaca*, the *Babylonica*, and the *Phoenicica* indicate that the stories are rooted in particular places or regions.¹⁷⁶ Achilles Tatius gives a sexually nuanced description of the city of Sidon at the start of his romance (1.1.1), which is followed by an elaborate authorial *ekphrasis* of an painting of Europa and the Bull leading into the narrative of Clitophon.¹⁷⁷ The descriptions of Sidon and Europa give a clear indication of the tone of the work and thus constitutes a programmatic opening. The opening paragraph of Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* has a similar function (Prologue 1)—the *ekphrasis* of the painting in the grotto on Lesbos foreshadows the plot of the story that is about to be related. The narrative proper starts with an elaborate description of Mytilene and the estate of a nobleman of the city (1.1.1). Here again the description is carefully constructed and establishes a thematic contrast between the city and the country, which Longus explores more fully in the romance itself.

Conventional openings: the protagonists

The protagonists of the narrative are also conventionally described and their ancestry delineated in the first pages of the romances. Chariton (1.1.1), Xenophon and the *Alexander Romance* serve as models.¹⁷⁸ This technique is characteristic of popular tales

¹⁷⁴ Cf Nuttall (1992, 201) 'Births really are natural beginnings.'

¹⁷⁵ The beginning of Photius' account of the *Wonders Beyond Thule* of Diogenes is difficult to assess. Photius mentions the narrator, Dinias, as well as his homeland but the story is set in imaginary northern regions. Lucian's *True Story* is exceptional. It begins at the Pillars of Hercules but thereafter, like Diogenes' story, describes places which are entirely fictitious.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. Giangrande (1962, 132-159), who refers to Lavagnini (1950, 22), and Rohde (1914³, 121 [113]), for discussion of the importance of local legends for the evolution of the romance as a literary genre. This article does not address the question of the evolution of the genre.

¹⁷⁷ The undertone of sexual *double entendre* is pervasive in this work. Cf. especially 1.16-18. For the *ekphrasis* see Bartsch (1989, 48-50).

¹⁷⁸ Xenophon: Ἦν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἀνὴρ τῶν τὰ πρῶτα ἐκεῖ δυναμένων, Λυκομήδης ὄνομα (1.1.1). The *Alexander Romance*: τὰς δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρου πράξεις καὶ τὰς ἀρετὰς τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τὴν ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις εὐτυχίαν καὶ τὴν ἀνδρείαν ἤδη λέγομεν, τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ

such as *Cupid and Psyche*, the *Widow of Ephesus*, and *Apollonius, King of Tyre*.¹⁷⁹ Typically the hero and heroine of the Greek romances meet at festivals—Chariton and Xenophon describe how their lovers met at festivals of Aphrodite (1.1.4) and Artemis (1.2.2) respectively; both also describe the marvellous beauty of the hero and heroine in extravagant set pieces (1.1.2, 1.2.5-9). Such descriptions, in the view of Lucian, constitute virtual prefaces in that they introduce the protagonists and the love-theme at the very beginning of the work (*Hist. Conscr.* 52).

The encounter between the hero and heroine of Heliodorus' *Ethiopian Story* is therefore strongly reminiscent of the conventional opening of the romances but there are important differences. For example, the episode takes place at Delphi during a memorial service (ἐναγισμός) in honour of Neoptolemus, the son of Achilles, rather than a festival (ἑορτή).¹⁸⁰ This service was performed by the Thessalian Ainianes every four years at the time of the Pythian Games to commemorate the death of Neoptolemus, whom Orestes had murdered at the altar of Apollo (2.34.3).¹⁸¹ The sacrifices for the religious ceremony are preceded by elaborate descriptions of the Thessalian athlete and the acolyte of Artemis. During the ceremony itself, Heliodorus also takes great pains to underline the significance of the meeting between the hero and heroine by likening their interview to Plato's metaphor of the soul as a charioteer recalling a memory of beauty (*Phaedr.* 254b5). The love encounter occurs in the context of religious purification and is followed by the revelation of the true opening of the story, the story of the conception and exposure of Charikleia that is related in Persinna's letter to her daughter (4.8). The scene in which the souls of Charikleia and Theagenes recognise each other's worth (τῆς ψυχῆς . . . τὸ ὄμοιον ἐπιγνούσης καὶ πρὸς τὸ κατ' ἀξίαν οἰκεῖον προσδραμούσης, 3.5.4) gains much from its positioning near the reawakening of Charikleia's pride in her birth (4.12.1) that initiates her homeward journey.

In effect, therefore, Heliodorus has deliberately chosen to postpone the conventional opening of his story and has placed it in a context which differs significantly

ποιούμενοι καὶ τίνος ἦν πατρὸς υἱός (1.1.1).

¹⁷⁹ Cf. Winkler [3] 96, who argues that Xenophon here gives us a 'virtual proem' such as is suggested by Lucian *Hist. Conscr.* 23.

¹⁸⁰ Hesychius defines ἐναγισμός as follows: <ἐναγίζεῖν> τὸ χοῶς ἐπιφέρειν, ἢ θύειν τοῖς κατοικομένοις ἢ διὰ πυρὸς δαπανᾶν ἢ φονεύειν. <Ἄγος> γὰρ τὸ μίασμα. <ἐναγίσματα> ὄλοκαυτώματα (Hsch. *ad loc.*).

¹⁸¹ Cf. 3.1.1 and the notes there.

from those of the other romances. Aristotle emphasises that plots should not begin at random: δεῖ ἄρα τοὺς συνεστῶτας εἶ μύθους μὴθ' ὁπόθεν ἔτυχεν ἄρχεσθαι μὴθ' ὅπου ἔτυχε τελευτᾶν, ἀλλὰ κεχρησθαι ταῖς εἰρημέναις ιδέαις (1450b32-34) and should be well-ordered (1450b35-36). By deferring the usual opening and by locating it in Delphi, Heliodorus associates his narrative with the rich symbolic resonance of the oracle.¹⁸² The lead-up to the ceremony at Delphi also gives forward momentum to the complex plot of the romance by means of establishing a strong and coherent symbolic subtext.¹⁸³

The symbolic subtext

The romance is initially located on *terra nullius*, a deserted beach near the Heracleotic mouth of the Nile in Egypt (1.1.1). The action begins with the immediate aftermath of a battle, which the reader later discovers had broken out between the pirates Trachinus and Pelorus over possession of Charikleia (5.32.1-33.2). It is a scene of death and desolation. Heliodorus establishes strong associations with the underworld in the passage. The beach is covered with the bodies of men who had died in a variety of ways (1.1.3). A girl nurses a wounded young man who appears to be coming round from the world of the dead (1.2.3). On reviving, he assumes that the girl bending over him is a ghost or spirit (1.2.4). When she leaps to her feet the bandits who gaze on this scene assume she is a goddess (1.2.5) and that the young man is a corpse (1.2.7). When the girl notices the bandits approaching, she observes their black faces and asks whether they are ghosts. If not, she begs to be killed (1.3.2).¹⁸⁴ An atmosphere of conflict, strife and death is created in the opening sections of the work.

The topography chosen by Heliodorus for the story of Knemon and Thisbe continues to develop the associations with the underworld which have been set in motion in the opening scene. The prisoners are taken from the beach to a marsh, shallow at the edges but infinitely deep at the centre (1.5.2). The Herdsmen who inhabit the marsh have constructed labyrinthine channels among the reeds which are impenetrable to outsiders

¹⁸² The mythological setting also helps Heliodorus characterise Theagenes as a latter-day Achilles—a characterisation which is supported by many incidental details, such as the heroic spear wielded by the hero (3.3.5).

¹⁸³ For the importance of the oracle given to Kalasiris in Delphi (2.35.5) in the development of the plot, cf. Bartsch (1989, 101-102).

¹⁸⁴ Cf. Bühler (1976, 177-185), who describes as cinematic the technique of Heliodorus in this scene.

(1.6.2). During Knemon's long narrative the suicide of Demainete in the Pit in the Academia is described (1.17.5). During the attack on the bandits' hideout in the marsh, Thyamis orders Knemon to take Charikleia to a cave on an island in the lake (1.28.2). The cave contains numerous shafts and tunnels that provide a kind of a maze surrounding the central chamber (1.29.1-2). The cave is as dark as night (1.29.4). During the attack, the huts of the lake dwellers are set alight (1.30.2). Soon the island becomes a raging inferno (1.30.3). In the cave, Thyamis fatally stabs a woman, whom he takes to be Charikleia, to avoid having her taken captive (1.30.7). Emerging from the cave, he sprinkles earth on the threshold and notes ironically that death is his bridal gift to the girl he hoped to marry (1.31.1).¹⁸⁵ The aura of death is reinforced by the suicidal despair of Theagenes, who mistakenly thinks that Charikleia has been killed in the cave (2.1.3, 2.3.4). On hearing Charikleia's voice he assumes that it is her unburied spirit (2.5.2). Only later does the real death of Thisbe come to light (2.9.5). The similarities between this terrain and the landscape of the mythical underworld are suggestive. Towards the end of Knemon's story, however, the tone changes with the mention of Delphi (2.11.5) but not before Thisbe is mourned by Thyamis (2.14.5) and given a lugubrious burial (2.18.2). Finally, Thermouthis dies of an eponymous snake bite (2.20.2).

The morbid atmosphere of the opening episodes of the romance changes when Kalasiris describes his first arrival in Delphi. The importance of this site is marked by a description that is reminiscent of the elaborate openings of Achilles Tatius and Longus (2.26.2). Here Kalasiris receives an oracle from the Pythian priestess, which is acclaimed as a special distinction by a crowd of bystanders (2.27.1). He encounters Charikles, who tells him how an extraordinary child was entrusted to his care by an Ethiopian ambassador in the Egyptian town of Catadupi (2.30-31). Finally, he receives an enigmatic utterance concerning Theagenes and Charikleia (who are as yet unknown to him) by the oracle (2.35.5). The change in tone from despair to hope, from darkness and despondency to light and good cheer provides essential onward impetus to the plot.

¹⁸⁵ A sentiment also expressed later by Theagenes (2.1.3, 2.2.2, 2.4.3). Cf. the death of Charikles' natural daughter (2.29.4). Xenophon relates the story of Aigialeus and Thelxinoe in which marriage and death are also juxtaposed (5.1). The theme of 'marriage to death' is a common but powerful theme in Greek Tragedy, in the romances in general, and in Heliodorus in particular. Cf. Rehm (1994); Szepessy (1972, 341-357).

Delphi as the location of the opening of the romance

Delphi was particularly appropriate as the effective starting-point of the narrative of the romance for a number of additional reasons.¹⁸⁶ First, Delphi had a strong connection with the cult of the mother goddess, which preceded the oracle of Apollo on the site (Eurip. *I.T.* 1259-1283).¹⁸⁷ The Delphic Sibyl was also called Artemis,¹⁸⁸ and Charikleia is frequently likened to the virgin huntress, who was a manifestation of the mother goddess (1.2.6; 5.31.1), in addition to her obvious connection with the goddess as her acolyte (1.22.2; 2.33.4; 2.35.3; 3.4.1; 10.36.2). Heliodorus exploits this aspect of the oracle in his description of his heroine at the ἐναγισμός of Neoptolemus, particularly in his description of the heroine's breastband (ζώνη) (3.4.3-4). This description is rich in literary associations (see commentary *ad loc.*).

Secondly, Delphi was located in the centre of Greece; the ὀμφαλός at Delphi was said to be where two eagles met after being released by Zeus from opposite edges of the earth (Paus. 10.16.2; Pind. *Pyth.* 4.6). Heliodorus emphasises this by describing how the whole of Greece admired Theagenes and Charikleia on the day of the festival (3.4.8). By opening his narrative in Delphi, Heliodorus is able to give his story a sense of direction. The action of the romance progresses from the heart of Greece to the remotest regions of the earth.¹⁸⁹

Thirdly, the Pythia at Delphi was required to be a chaste virgin (Diod. Sic. 16.26.6) as was the priestess of Artemis at Orchomenos in Arcadia (Paus. 8.5.11). After the virgin Pythia was raped by the Thessalian Echekrates, however, only women over fifty years old (though they continued to be dressed as young girls) were appointed. The emphasis on virginity and chastity is significant in the light of the preoccupation of the romance with this virtue.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁶ For the historical veracity of Heliodorus' description of Delphi, cf. Pouilloux (1983, 259-286); Feuillâtre (1966, 45-67).

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Parke & Wormell (1956, 4-7).

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Fontenrose (1978, 160).

¹⁸⁹ Cf. Reardon (1971, 381-392), who comments that the plot of the romance unfolds purposefully, and that unlike the protagonists in comparable romances, the lives of Theagenes and Charikleia are fundamentally affected by their experiences.

¹⁹⁰ E.g., 1.18.5 (Thyamis' interpretation of a dream as the defloration of Charikleia); 2.33.4 (Charikleia's resolve to remain virgin); 4.10.3 (Charikleia's respect for the solemn name of virginity); 4.18.4 (the oath Charikleia makes Theagenes swear to respect her virginity); 5.4.5 (Charikleia

Fourthly, the oracle was associated with Socrates and philosophical wisdom (Plato *Apol.* 21a; Plut. *The E at Delphi*). Kalasiris relates how he was attracted to Delphi because it was a retreat for philosophers (2.26.1) and reports that he found happiness here in discussion with the many lovers of wisdom who congregated at the site (2.27.2). Charikleia herself was brought up listening to and participating in philosophical argument (2.33.6) and is given the epithet ‘wise’ in addition to the conventional ‘beautiful’ (3.4.1). Like Socrates, Kalasiris relies on an inner voice to guide his actions (2.25.5). It is not accidental that the discussion of higher and lower wisdom occurs in the context of the events in Delphi (3.16.2)¹⁹¹—it is noticeable in this regard that Philostratus states that Apollonius corresponded with the ‘Delphians’ (VA 1.2) and reports an inscription by Dionysus to Apollo of Delphi (VA 2.9) and also one by Alexander (VA 2.43). The gymnosophists contrast the practice of nudity at the Pythian and Olympic games with their own more philosophical practice (VA 6.10). They use the games as an analogy to the philosophic life (VA 5.43). The oracle in Delphi in late antiquity was strongly influenced by Platonist philosophy: for example, the oracle made a fifty line pronouncement on the fate of Plotinus’ soul (Porphyry *Vit. Plot.* 22) despite Plutarch’s lament that oracles were no longer given in verse (*Mor.* 397). The oracle has been made the subject of a poem by W.B. Yeats (‘The Delphic Oracle upon Plotinus’ in *Words for Music Perhaps* 25; *Collected Poems* p. 306). It is known also that Platonists attended the Pythian Games at this time (Gell. 12.5.1; *SIG*³ 868),¹⁹² and the emperor Julian purified and reopened the spring of Castalia (which Hadrian had blocked up) in the fourth century.¹⁹³

Lastly, Apollo was commonly identified with Helios in antiquity (cf. Plato *Laws* 12.945-947; Hor. *Carm. Saec.* 9; Macrobian. 1.17.7; Plut. *Mor.* 375F; 386B; 393C; 400C-D; 425F; 433D-E; 435A; Augustine *City of God* 7.16) and in the romance itself the connection between the two gods is made explicit by Charikles (10.36.3).¹⁹⁴ Apollo, like Helios, is a

reminds Theagenes of his oath); 10.8.2 (the test of the virginity of the hero and heroine by means of a gridiron). Cf. Rattenbury (1926a, 59-71).

¹⁹¹ Statistically, most of the fifty-four usages of σοφός and its derivatives are grouped in books 2-4 and 10.

¹⁹² Cf. Lane Fox (1986, 184-188).

¹⁹³ *Amm. Marc.* 22.12.8.

¹⁹⁴ In countering the view that the *Ethiopian Story* was composed as a cult text in honour of the Emesan cult of Helios, Morgan (1979 xlv-xlv) discounts the connection between Apollo and Helios on the grounds that it is made purely to reinforce Charikles’ case against Theagenes. However, the

decisive and directing influence on the lives of the hero and heroine (cf. 2.26.5; 2.35.5; 3.11.5; 4.15.1; 4.16.3) and the identification between the Greek and the Ethiopian sun-god allows some continuity in the divine machinery of the plot (this does not imply that the work is written to prove the efficacy of Helios in the world, as discussed above). This link is but one of the many that are made between events in Delphi and Ethiopia.

By deploying the conventional opening of his story (including the sanctified description of the love encounter of the hero and heroine) in a central position in the narrative close to the chronological opening—charged as it is with so much emotional significance—Heliodorus has created a highly complex and suggestive plot. Further, the choice of Delphi as the location for this opening adds significantly to the symbolic subtext of the romance and considerably enhances the enigmatic nature of his story.

LANGUAGE

References to linguistic points of interest in books 3 and 4 have been collected here for convenience, rather than being scattered throughout the commentary.¹⁹⁵ The linguistic usage of Heliodorus in the *Ethiopian Story* is chiefly of interest for his relative readiness to diverge from the expected Attic forms.¹⁹⁶ This short survey of Heliodorus' language endeavours to show the extraordinary diversity and richness of his vocabulary and expression, despite his evident awareness of correct Attic usage.

Voice

Heliodorus often deviates from Classical usage in using the active for the middle voice (cf., e.g., ἀπαιωροῦντες 'let hang down', 3.1.4; ἀναπεμπάζοντες, 3.5.5; ἀναφαίνειν, 4.21.1;

link between the two gods in Classical literature is not in dispute.

¹⁹⁵ The syntax of the verbs in the *Ethiopian Story* has been described in detail by Barber (1962). The reader should be warned that in his descriptive study of Heliodorus' syntax, Barber refers only to book and chapter of the romance (and not to section or line) and his references are not always accurate.

¹⁹⁶ Anderson (1993b, 86-100) provides a short but lively discussion of Atticism in the Second Sophistic in general, while Fritsch (1901-1902, 1-34) concludes that 'Heliodor aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach der Atticistik angehört und sich, was aus zahlreichen Einzelheiten erhellt, außer Lucian und Aelian besonders Philostrat zum Muster seiner Diction genommen hat' (p. 34). My thanks are due to Professor Reardon for providing me with a copy of this rare work. The chief authority for Atticism is Schmid (1887-1896), though now dated and in need of replacement.

Barber p. 5) and the middle for the active (χαλκευσάμενος with the general sense of ‘forge’, 3.4.2; Barber p. 6). In all of these cases the non-Classical form enables homoioteleuton: ἀπαιωροῦντες rhyming with πληροῦντες and σκηφοῦντες in the same sentence, ἀναπεμπάζοντες with πήξαντες, γνωρίζοντες and ιδόντες, ἀναφαίνειν with συμβαλεῖν and χαλκευσάμενος with τεχνησάμενος and δυνησόμενος.

Tense

Heliodorus varies his use of tenses in narrative passages to increase the pace or cinematic ‘focus’ of his story. The graphic historic present tense is often used for an imperfect or aorist: cf. 3.6.2 (ἐντυγχάνω); 3.7.1 (καταλαμβάνομεν); 3.10.1, 3.18.2; 4.7.5 (φησὶν [a frozen form]); 3.18.1 (καταλαμβάνω, part of a series), 4.5.2, 4.19.1 (καταλαμβάνω); 3.11.5, 4.6.3, 4.14.7 (ὄρω); 4.16.8 (ἄγει); 4.4.1, 4.4.1 (ἀνακουφίζει); 4.4.2 (ἐμπίπτει); 4.17.4 (ἀναρπάζουσιν); 3.14.2 (ποιεῖ); 3.10.1 (ἐφίσταται); 4.18.1 (part of a series including καταφεύγουσι); 4.13.1 (ἦκω); Barber 9-22. The use of historic present tenses in chapter 4.4, in which Theagenes wins a foot-race, accelerates the narrative suitably. In chapter 4.6, in which a rapid series of events is related, Heliodorus uses a series of graphic imperfect tenses (compounds of ἰέναι) instead of the aorist: 4.6.1 (ἐξήειν); 4.6.3 (παρήειν); 4.6.7 (ἀπήει), suggesting that the narrative is being compressed at this point. The imperfects continue into the ensuing reported narrative in 4.7 (ἐφίλει . . . ἐθρυπτόμην . . . ἀπήει). Contrast the use of the aorist ἦλθεν (3.14.2; 4.17.5) in passages of less immediate narrative. Variation between the imperfect and aorist tenses also occurs in chapters 4.8, 4.11, 4.16, 4.18, 4.19, and 4.21. Combinations of the historic present, imperfect and aorist tenses give immediacy and pace to the narrative (cf. ὑπέθηκε . . . ἐντυγχάνω . . . ἦδετο, 3.6; ἀνακουφίζει . . . ἠνύετο . . . παρέφθη, 4.4.1. Cf. also ; 4.5; 4.7; Barber pp. 23-134, 229).

The imperfect tense is also used in descriptive passages, where aorists might have been expected (cf., e.g., the word-picture of the chorus of girls and the cavalcade of epebes: ἐρρυθμίζετο . . . συνέταπτεν . . . ἐμέριζε . . . ἐσφιγγετο, 3.3.1-2; Barber 23-134). The imperfect is suitably durative at 4.8.1 (ἐπελεγόμην). The aorist tense is used to conclude episodes (ἀπηλλάγημεν, 3.19.4; 4.7.12; Barber 1962, 35) and gnomic aorists are used in the excursuses (cf., e.g., 3.7.3 πάθος ἐγκατέσπειρεν).

The use of the ‘resultative’ or narrative perfect tense for the present tense is a feature of Late Greek and a few examples can also be found in the *Ethiopian Story*: cf. 3.14.1 (μεμύηκας is found in the perfect tense only here); 4.6.6 (ἡγνοήκας), 3.8.2 (ἀκήκοας) and 4.7.4 (εἰσκέκληκας); 4.11.2 (ἔρρωται ‘has become strong, supports’); Barber p. 142. The perfect imperative is occasionally more forceful and decisive than the present and

often lends solemnity to the expression. Cf., 3.11.3 (σπενδέσθω . . . Ἑσπέισθω); 3.16.5 (ἐπιτετρέφθω); 4.8.2 (ἐπικεκλήσθω); and the prodigious 4.21.1 (ἐπικεχειροτονήσθω); Barber p. 357.

The pluperfect tense may be used instead of a simple past tense in narrative: cf. ἐσφήκωτο (3.3.2); ἐκεκλήρωτο (4.3.1 [see note on text]); ἔσχαστο (4.3.3); τέτατο (4.3.3); ἐωράκειν (4.6.4); Barber pp. 148-152. However, sometimes the aorist is used instead of the pluperfect. Cf. 3.10.3 (διήτησεν); Barber (p. 211, 364).

At times Heliodorus uses μέλλω with the present infinitive in the sense of ‘being on the point of . . .’ (cf. 4.12.2, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀπαίρειν μέλλοντά με οἴκαδε ἦσθετο) but he also uses the future infinitive without a sense of purpose (cf. 4.16.8, εἰς ἔω γὰρ ἀφήσειν, ᾧ λῶστε, μέλλομεν; Barber p. 304). The future tense may be used as a command. Cf. 4.8.7 (μεμνήση); 4.16.9 (νομιοῦμεν); Barber p. 154, 158.

Participles

Participles are used freely and loosely in the *Ethiopian Story* in a manner which recalls the style of Apuleius. Adverbs are formed from participles as they were in the Classical period (e.g. 4.9.1, ὑπερβαλλόντως) but these forms are sometimes distorted by Heliodorus (e.g., ἐσπουδασμένως, 2.32.1; 2.14.4; Barber p. 349). Notoriously, τοὺς φόντας should mean ‘children’ not ‘parents’ (cf. Naber 1873, 151)—Heliodorus was evidently quite oblivious of this, however, and the phrase may reflect the normal usage of his day (cf. 2.16.6; 2.23.4; 4.8.7; 4.13.2; 5.28.2; 6.9.7; 6.15.1; 7.7.2; 7.8.2; 7.14.7; 9.11.6; 9.25.4 twice; 10.15.2; 10.38.1). Naber comments: *oratio scatet vitiis* (*loc. cit.*) but notes that the use of φόντας is the worst of his grammatical errors. The use of the participle without an article in an indefinite sense, which is quite common in the romance, is unusual. Cf., e.g., 3.10.5 (ἐρῶντος . . . μεθύοντος); 3.16.4 (μελλόντων); 4.16.4 (θαυμάζουσι). Occasionally the article is omitted where the participle is not indefinite, e.g. 4.3.4 (ὄρῶντας . . . παρόντας); Barber p. 340.

Heliodorus frequently uses the Thucydidean construction τὸ + neuter participle. Cf. 3.4.11 (τῶν λυπούντων); 3.7.3 (τὸ περιέχον); 3.15.1 (τὸ . . . ὑπερέχον; τὸ ἠνιγμένον); 3.15.3 (τὸ λειπόμενον); 3.19.1 (τὸ φλέγον); 4.4.4 (τοῦ πάσχοντος); 4.4.5 (τὸ συνοῖσον); 4.5.7 (τῷ λυποδντι); 4.15.3 (τὸ κατηναγκασμένον); Barber (1962, 338).

Mood

The optative is occasionally used in primary sequence (cf., e.g., 4.18.5, πρὶν . . . ἐμπεδ-

ωθείη).¹⁹⁷

Infinitives

Heliodorus uses articular infinitives, such as τὸ περὶ τούτων νυνὶ διαλαμβάνειν (3.14.1) frequently, perhaps to add solemnity to his style (Barber pp. 327-328). Other examples are to be found at 3.14.4; 4.13.4; 4.10.3; 4.17.5; 4.19.2. ‘Imperatival’ infinitives are sometimes found (cf., e.g., μόνον εὐθυμος εἶναι καὶ ὑψηγομένῳ τὰ δέοντα πείθεσθαι πράττειν, 3.17.5; πείθεσθαι, 4.6.7; περιμένειν, 4.18.3; Barber pp. 325-326) as well as the absolute use of the infinitive (ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, 4.1.2; ὡς εἰπεῖν (4.19.9); Barber p. 327).

Conjunctions

Heliodorus prefers ὡς to ἵνα in final clauses—a feature of post-classical Greek. Consider ὡς ἄν . . . ἐγγίνοιτο, 3.2.2; ὡς ἄν . . . ἐγγίνοιτο, 3.4.11; Barber (1962, 253), although this is not apparent from books 3 and 4, since examples of ἵνα occur at 3.4.4 (ἐπιδείξεται) and 4.18.2 (κερδήσωσι).¹⁹⁸ The same conjunction is preferred to ὅτι in indirect speech, as often in late Greek (cf. 4.7.8; Barber p. 180)—sometimes even with a participle rather than a finite verb (cf. 4.13.3). In addition this conjunction is used in temporal (4.21.2), causal (4.10.6), and, of course, comparative clauses (4.7.11), which are very frequent.¹⁹⁹

Hiatus

Heliodorus generally avoids hiatus, to the extent that he occasionally uses alternative syntactic structures,²⁰⁰ and this suggests that he wrote for an educated rather than a popular

¹⁹⁷ Naber (1873, 341) regards this instance as irregular but Barber (p. 243) suggests that a remote condition is implied here.

¹⁹⁸ Barber (p. 292) claims that ὡς is also used consecutively at 3.4.3 (τὰς κεφαλὰς διολισθῆσαι τοῦ βρόχου συγχωρήσας, ὡς περίττωμα τοῦ δεσμοῦ κατὰ πλευρὰν ἑκατέραν ἀπηώρησεν ‘and allowing their heads to slip through the tie, he suspended them on each side *like the unused ends of a rope*’), but this usage is better taken comparatively as my translation shows; a clearer example of the consecutive usage occurs at 3.3.1 (οὕτω συμβαίνων ὁ κρότος τοῦ βήματος πρὸς τὸ μέλος ἐρρυθμίζετο, ὡς τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν τῶν ὀρωμένων ὑπερφρονεῖν ὑπὸ τῆς ἀκοῆς ἀναπειθεσθαι ‘the beat of their steps kept such rhythm with the song, that the eye was persuaded by the hearing to think little of what it was watching’).

¹⁹⁹ Naber (1873, 158) notes the high frequency of use of ὥσπερ (e.g., 3.2.3.4) in Heliodorus and in later Greek as compared with the Attic authors.

²⁰⁰ Barber (1962, 180) notes the use of alternative syntactical structures to avoid hiatus (cf. 3.12.1

readership.²⁰¹ Papyrological evidence, supported by meagre accounts of ancient readers of fiction, also suggests that the romances were no more common than the works of authors of the established literary canon.²⁰²

Vocabulary

The vocabulary of the *Ethiopian Story* is very rich and diverse. The following rare words are discussed in the commentary: ἐπεκράδαινεν 3.1.3; βλακῶδες, 4.7.2; ἀγλαΐαν, ἰλήκοις, 3.2.4 (poetry); διολισθῆσαι, 3.4.3; κοιμήματι, 3.4.4; ἠλιῶσαν, 3.4.4; ἀνάγραφτος (3.8.1), cf. 4.7.13; 4.8.7; μισόλεκτρος (3.9.1); ἀξιέραστος 3.17.4; περισώζω, 4.8.6; προεισόδιον, 4.9.1. Occasionally unusual words have entered into unprecedented syntactic structures (cf., e.g., the infinitive after ἐνεδρεύω: τοῦ μεσεύοντος ἀπείρου διαστήματος συνεκδραμεῖν τῇ πτήσει τὴν θέαν ἐνεδρεύσαντος, 4.14.2; Barber p. 309).

The richness of Heliodorus' vocabulary derives from his use of poetic vocabulary, such as: κυλοιδιᾶ . . . τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς 'her eyes are swollen' (4.7.7); πληθον, participle meaning 'full' (4.14.2); ὀμφή 'voice' (4.10.5).²⁰³ At times Heliodorus brings his descriptions to life by means of personification (χλαμύδα) . . . ἧς τὰ μὲν ἄλλα χρυσὸς ἐποίκιλλε τοὺς Λαπίθας ἐπὶ τοὺς Κενταύρους ὀπλίζων (3.3.5); τοῦ Παρνασοῦ πρὸς τὴν βοήν ὑπόχαλκον αὐτοῖς συνεπηχοῦντος (4.17.5); or hyperbole—a figure Heliodorus was clearly conscious of, as the description of Charikles as πρὸς ὑπερβολὴν περίλυπον (4.14.1) shows; cf. also μυρίον εἶδος (3.5.6); μυρία φιλήσας (3.19.2); ἐκεκίνητο μὲν δὴ καὶ πᾶσα πρὸς τὸ παράδοξον ἢ Ἑλλάς (4.3.2); μυρίας τοῦ νοῦ τροπὰς τε καὶ ὀρμάς (4.6.1).

Diversity of expression is also secured by means of synecdoche—ὕπερ ἀστράγαλον (3.3.2, 'over the ankle' for 'over the ankles', retaining the reading of the MSS with Colonna 1987b, 38), χρυσός (3.3.5) 'gold' for 'gold threads'; antonomasia—Apollo is called Πύθιος (3.5.3; 4.14.2; 4.13.2; 4.16.3; 4.19.8). Some of these instances occur in the hymn to Thetis where poetic usage is to be expected: Aphrodite is Παφίη (3.2.4), Achilles

ὅτι μὴ . . . ἦν). Cf. also 3.17.4; 4.11.3; 4.16.10.

²⁰¹ Reeve (1971, 514-539) notes that, in general, 'all the novelists avoided most kinds of hiatus' and that consequently they show 'a serviceable measure of literary pretensions' (p. 537) and that therefore their work was not aimed at the popular readership as Perry (1967, 33) would have us believe it was.

²⁰² Stephens (1994, 415). For direct evidence of ancient readers, see Bowie (1994b, 453).

²⁰³ For a recent short survey of the controversial use of poetic vocabulary and figures in prose from Gorgias to the third century, cf. Bowie (1989, 212-14).

Ἄρεα πολέμων (3.2.4) and Ἑλλάδος ἀστεροπᾶν (3.2.4). Periphrasis, as in the standard expression περὶ πλῆθουςαν ἀγοράν (4.7.10), and euphemisms also occur—Persinna avoids all mention of death, εἰ δ' ὅπερ καὶ ἀκοὴν λάθοι τὴν ἐμήν (4.8.8), and Charikles uses a metaphor, τὴν πρώτην μοι καὶ γνησίαν, ὡς ἴστε, θυγατέρα ταῖς νυμφικαῖς λαμπάσι συναπέσβεσε (4.19.8). Finally, litotes is common—οὐκ ἀδύνατον (3.18.3; 4.10.4); οὐκ ὀλιγάκις (3.6.2); οὐκ ἀπεικότως (3.11.1); οὐκ ὀλίγης μοίρας (4.4.2); οὐκ εὐτυχῶς (4.8.5); οὐκ ὀλίγον . . . χρόνον (4.11.1); οὐκ ὀλίγα . . . συνεκφορήσαντες (4.17.4); οὐ προσηκόντως (4.19.3); οὐχ ἤκιστα (4.20.1).

Borrowed Vocabulary

Heliodorus uses a number of words that are also found in Xenophon, whose language was held up as the standard of Attic Greek in antiquity.²⁰⁴ Many of these words are also used by Heliodorus' contemporaries, however, and they cannot therefore be considered to be direct borrowings. The following instances are discussed more fully in the commentary: προμετωπίδιοις (3.3.3); ἐφεστρίδα (3.6.1); τὸ φαϊδρότερον (3.10.4); the resumptive use of οὗτος (3.17.3); ἀξιέραστος (3.17.4); ἀντίβλεψις (4.4.4); βλακῶδες (4.7.2); γνωρίσματα (4.7.13); χαρίστηριον (4.8.5); περισώζω (4.8.6); παρεγγυήσας (4.16.2); ἀλαλάχαντος (4.17.5); συνεπηγοῦντος (4.17.5); ἀποθύσαντος (4.18.6); συναπήγαγεν (4.19.8); ἀφιππᾶσαντο (4.18.1); ἐπαφῆκεν (4.21.3).

Heliodorus also uses similar expressions to those found in Achilles Tatius: cf., e.g., οἰσטרηθεῖς τῷ φόβῳ (Ach. Tat. 1.12.3), ὕπ' . . . ἔρωτος . . . οἰσטרηθεῖς (H. 7.29.1); πλέον οὐδὲν ἦν (Ach. Tat. 2.12.3), πλέον ἐγένετο οὐδὲν (H. 8.9.5); περιχυθεῖσά σοι (Ach. Tat. 5.15.5), περιχυθεῖσα αὐτῷ (H. 1.2.6).²⁰⁵ The similarity between the description of Meroë in the *Ethiopian Story* (9.22) and in Strabo (17.817C) suggests that Heliodorus made use of Strabo's source, Artemidoros.²⁰⁶ In addition, Heliodorus was most probably aware of

²⁰⁴ Baumgarten (1932, 1-36) argues that Heliodorus used many words which derive from the Athenian historian Xenophon (*proposui . . . multa Heliodorum . . . Xenophonti debere*, p. 3-4).

²⁰⁵ Cf. Wifstrand (1944-1945, 37 [105]); Neimke (1889, 22-57), who thought Achilles was later than Heliodorus.

²⁰⁶ Capelle (1953, 166-175). Capelle (1953, 175-179) also compares Heliodorus (3.7) and Plutarch (680C-683B), concluding that here the author of the *Ethiopian Story* had read Plutarch's source, Phylarchos (p. 179) rather than Didymos as Rohde (1914³, 486 [456 n. 2]) suggests. Dickie (1991, 18) has recently proposed that Heliodorus did in fact read Plutarch and not Phylarchos. There are close verbal echoes of Plutarch's version in the *Ethiopian Story*, which have been noted in the

Plutarch's Delphic essays (see above under the heading *Openings*) and Philo, a first century Jewish historian of Alexandria, who was hostile to Egyptian religion. Philo comments that the Egyptians speak of the Nile and the land in divine terms (θεοπλαστοῦσι τῷ λόγῳ τὸν Νεῖλον Αἰγύπτιοι ὡς ἀντίμιμον οὐρανοῦ γεγονότα καὶ περὶ τῆς χώρας σεμνηγοροῦσιν, Philo *On the Life of Moses*, 2.37.195; cf. θεοπλαστοῦσι τὸν Νεῖλον Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ κρειττόνων τὸν μέγιστον ἄγουσιν, ἀντίμιμον οὐρανοῦ τὸν ποταμὸν σεμνηγοροῦντες, *Aith.* 9.9). Furthermore, Winkler suggests (1982, 135) that 'Herodian's *History* . . . may have been on Heliodorus' reading list', while listing a number of linguistic features to substantiate his claim, though many of these may more plausibly be referred to earlier historians.²⁰⁷

In addition to these authors, Heliodorus borrowed words and phrases from the Classical writers such as Homer (cf., e.g., 3.4.4, μετάρφρενον, cf. *Il.* 5.40; 3.2.1, βαθύζωνος, cf. *Il.* 7.139; 3.4.4 βλοσυρός, cf. *Il.* 7.214), Euripides (cf., e.g., 3.1.3, πέλεκυς δίστομος, Eur. *fr.* 530.5), Sophocles (cf., e.g., 3.3.3, ὀρθὸν οὔς, cf. Soph. *El.* 25), Herodotos (cf., e.g., 3.4.10 θυμὸν ἔχε ἀγαθόν, Hdt. 1.120) and, of course, Plato (cf., e.g., 3.1.1 κατόπιν ἑορτῆς ἦκοντα, cf. Plat. *Gorg.* 447A). In addition to these, there are traces of the writers of the Second Sophistic (cf., e.g., 4.3.3 συνεξαίρομένης, Lucian *De Domo* 4.1) and the other writers of romance besides Achilles Tatius (cf., e.g., 4.1.1, βραβεύων ἔρωτος, cf. Char. 5.10.6). Further borrowings and parallels are indicated in the commentary—suffice it to say that the vocabulary of Heliodorus resembles nothing so much as a polychromatic quilt of words reflecting the colours of other writers.

The exotic vocabulary of Heliodorus suggests a fourth century date for the composition of the *Ethiopian Story*.²⁰⁸ His periodic style is unlike the ἀφέλεια of third century writers like Aelian, Maximus of Tyre and Clement of Alexandria and more closely resembles the style of Julian, Themistius and Basil of Caesarea. Expressions such as τὸ κρεῖττον (cf. 3.16.4 and note), ἡ ἐνεγκοῦσα (cf. 3.11.5 and note), λοιπὸν for ἤδη (cf. 4.3.4 and note), εἰς in the sense of ὡς and syntactic features such as the use of adjectives in the predicative position without a predicative meaning (cf. word-order below) are also unusual

commentary (see notes *ad loc.*).

²⁰⁷ Herodian may have lived in Syria in the third century AD (*OCD* s.v. 'Herodian [2]'). He wrote a history of the Roman Empire from Marcus Aurelius to Gordian III (180-238 AD).

²⁰⁸ Cf. Wifstrand (1944-1945, 36-41 [104-109]): 'Alles scheint die Ansicht zu bestätigen, dass Heliodor ins 4. Jahrh. zu setzen ist; unter solchen Umständen kann man die Tradition nicht ohne weiteres verwerfen, die ihn später Bischof von Triikka werden lässt.'

and late.²⁰⁹ To these should be added: ὀλοσώματος (4.17.1 and note); ὁμόψυχος (4.5.7 and note) and ὁμοιοειδές (4.8.5 and note) and other cases discussed in the commentary.²¹⁰

STYLE

Photius in his *Bibliotheca* (cod. 73 [Bekker] = Colonna [1938] 4) describes the *Ethiopian Story* as a dramatic composition with a style characterised by simplicity (ἀφελεία) and sweetness (γλυκύτητι), clear diction (λέξεσι τε εὐσήμοις καὶ καθαραῖς), controlled figurative language (εἴ που . . . ταῖς εἰς τροπὴν κλινούσαις ἀποχρήσαιτο, εὐσημοί . . . εἶσι), and a symmetrical periodic sentence structure (περίοδοι σύμμετροι). The Byzantine writer, Michael Psellus, (*De Chariclea et Leucippe iudicium* = Colonna [1938] 12) has an exuberant description of Heliodorus' style, which he describes as having an intrinsic beauty which was neither over-embellished nor slavishly Attic, but distinguished by its grandeur. He adds that it has poetic embellishments and originality of expression, which resemble Demosthenes with the addition of some Dionysian inspiration; the neologisms are restrained and, in short, the work has a mixture of youth and grace, sweetness and beauty that are unique.²¹¹

The main features of Heliodorus' style are discussed below.

Word order

In general, Heliodorus places the verb in the initial position at the beginning of descriptive passages, as is the case with ἦγειτο (3.1.3-3.2.2).²¹² This would appear to be a common feature of narrative style and is used commonly with copulative verbs (cf., e.g., Apuleius

²⁰⁹ The widely respected Greek scholar, R. Keydell (1966, 345-350), also supported the late, fourth century date.

²¹⁰ See also the introduction to Birchall's commentary on book 1 of the *Ethiopian Story* (1996).

²¹¹ Rohde (1914³, 490 [460]) thought that Heliodorus' style was that of a sophist with exotic words plundered from the poets, pretentious expressions, neologisms, and a confused mixture of Atticisms, late Greek and simple barbarisms. Sandy (1982a, 76) is more forgiving; he finds room within Psellus' term 'grandeur' to explain the highly unusual expressions which Heliodorus makes use of on occasion (see below on vocabulary), though he concludes (p. 78) that Heliodorus 'stumbled in his ascent of Mount Helicon'. Gärtner (1969, 51 n. 13) emphasises the baroque character of the neologisms and *catachresis* in the *Ethiopian Story*.

²¹² Mazal (1954, 23-24) notes the variation in the position of the verb from initial, medial to final position in this passage.

Met. 4.28, *erant in quadam civitate rex et regina*; Long. 1.27, Ἦν οὕτω, παρθένε, παρθένος . . .). Further instances occur before the singing of the hymn to Thetis: εἶχε γὰρ ᾠδή πως ἢ ᾠδή (3.2.3), before the narration of the events at the Pythian games: γίνεται γὰρ τι τοιοῦτον (4.1.1), and before the reported narrative of the Phoenician sailors: Ἔλεγον δὲ οὖν εἶναι μὲν Φοίνικες Τύριοι (4.16.6).²¹³ A fronted verb can conclude descriptions too: e.g., ἐξέπληττε (3.3.8). Participles can occupy a similar position: e.g., γελάσας οὖν εἰρωνικόν (3.7.2), cf. also 3.19.2. As is usual in Greek, the verb is often fronted in questions: e.g., οὐ παύση, ἔλεγον, ὑβρίζων ἐμέ; (4.6.4); ἐρᾷ μου Χαρίκλεια; (4.6.5, RL's text, see commentary *ad loc.*); οἴχεται οὖν μοι τὸ θυγάτριον; (4.7.5); οὐ καταλήψεσθε καὶ τιμωρήσεσθε τοὺς ἐξυβρικότας; (4.19.2). But fronting the verb is also used to convey a sense of excitement as in «Τοῦτο σοφία, τοῦτο φιλία» συνεχῶς ἀναβοῶν «ἤνυσταί σοι μέγα ἔργον, ἐάλωκεν ἡ δυσάλωτος καὶ νενίκηται ἡ δυσκαταμάχητος; ἐρᾷ Χαρίκλεια.» (4.7.1). Exhortations are also moved to the front: e.g., ἐπικεκλήσθω μάρτυς ὁ γενεάρχης ἡμῶν Ἥλιος (4.8.2); συντρέχωμεν τῇ βουλήσει τῶν κρειπτόνων (4.8.2). Imagery may also be emphasised by being moved forward in the sentence: e.g., Χαρίκλειά μοι βίος ἦν, ἐλπὶς καὶ διαδοχὴ τοῦ γένους, Χαρίκλεια μόνη παραψυχὴ καὶ ὡς εἰπεῖν ἄγκυρα (4.19.9); ἡμεῖς δὲ μὴ συμβαπτίζόμεθα τῷ τούτου πάθει μηδὲ λάθωμεν ὥσπερ ρεύμασι τοῖς τούτου δάκρυσιν ὑποφερόμενοι (4.20.1).

Verbs may also be used chiasmically to frame a clause, e.g., Ἦσχόλου δὲ οὐδὲν εἰς ταῦτα τὰς χεῖρας ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἀχθοφοροῦσαι πρὸς χορὸν στιχῆρη καὶ ἐγκάρσιον ἀλλήλων εἶχοντο (3.2.2); ἀψάμενοί τε λύχνον πρότερον καὶ τὰ κοιταῖα τοῖς νυχίοις θεοῖς ἐπισπείσαντες (3.4.11); οἴχεται οὖν μοι τὸ θυγάτριον καὶ ἐλπίδος ἐκτὸς γέγονεν (4.7.5); εἰσῆγον ὡς ἐκέλευσας τὸν Ἀλκαμένην καὶ ἀβρότερον ἐδείκνυον (4.7.11).²¹⁴ A final verb may be framed by an attribute and its noun: e.g., εἰ μὴ τινος θείας καὶ δαιμονίας ὡς ἀληθῶς μετέσχε καταβολῆς (3.15.1); καὶ ἀπλῶς κλύδων μέ τις εἶχε φροντισμάτων (3.15.3); ὅπερ καὶ ἀκοὴν λάθοι τὴν ἐμήν (4.8.8); ὁ δὲ νομιζόμενός σοι πατήρ ἄλλον εὐτρεπίζεται νυμφίον (4.11.2). An adverb may also be placed after the verb in the final position, perhaps to create a clausula: e.g., ἐπιτελούμενα δὲ ἐκ τοῦ παραχρήμα θαρραλεώτερον ἠνύσθη

²¹³ Cf. also 3.14.4; 3.16.2; 3.17.2; 3.17.5; 3.18.1; 3.19.4; 4.2.1; 4.3.2; 4.6.4; 4.7.7; 4.7.12; 4.12.1; 4.13.3.

²¹⁴ Mazal (1954, 29) labels a clause with a final verb followed by one with an initial verb 'Innenstellung': e.g., Ἦ γὰρ τῶν ἐρωτικῶν ἀντίβλεψις ὑπόμνησις τοῦ πάσχοντος γίνεται καὶ ἀναφλέγει τὴν διάνοιαν ἢ θεά (4.4.4). A further instance is to be found at 3.7.1.

πολλάκις. A clausula occurs at 4.11.2: ἄλλον εὐτρεπίζεται νύμφιον. (- x x - x -/x)

Heliiodorus sometimes places attributive adjectives before the noun rather than after it: e.g., Ἰνδικῶν . . . ἀγωγίμων (4.16.6). In the case of multiple adjectives, attributive adjectives may be placed before and after the noun as in τελεστικόν τι μέλος καὶ καταγγελτικόν τῆς θυσίας (3.1.5); σεμνόν τι θέαμα καὶ περίβλεπτον (4.3.1). Further instances may be found at 3.4.6; 3.6.1; 4.12.1; 4.19.7. Variation between attributive adjectives and genitive nouns in a series of attributes is also noticeable, as in Ἰνδικῶν καὶ Αἰθιοπικῶν καὶ τῶν ἐκ Φοινίκης ἀγωγίμων (4.16.6). Predicative adjectives are also commonly placed before the noun, as in: κυανῆ τῇ βαφῇ (3.3.2); ἀπὸ γυμνῆς τῆς κεφαλῆς (3.3.5); ἐφ' ύγρου τοῦ πάθους (3.10.5); κατ' ἄκρον τὸ στάδιον (4.1.2); ψιθυροῖς τοῖς χεῖλεσιν (4.5.3); ἐπὶ νεαρῶ τῷ πάθει (4.19.8). Participles are used in the same position: μεταβαινούσας αἰεὶ ταῖς παρθένους (3.3.1); μεσεύοντα τὸν ἀρχιθέωρον (3.3.2). An attributive adjective with the article may follow a noun which would not normally have an article: e.g., ὑπὲρ ὧμον τὸν δεξιόν (3.4.6); ἐπ' οἶκον τὸν ἴδιον (3.6.1); ; ἀπὸ δακρύων τῶν ἐπί σοι (4.8.6); συμβολῆς τῆς φανερωτέρας (4.12.1); θεῶν τῶν πατρῶων (4.19.7). An attributive participle may have the same position: e.g., ἐδεσμάτων τῶν ἐνεμψυχωμένων (3.11.2).

Personal pronouns are often fronted: e.g., πολλά με τοῦ Θεαγένους καὶ θερμότερα ἦ κατὰ τὴν προϋπάρχουσαν γνώσιν κατασπασαμένου (3.11.4); τὴν πρώτην μοι καὶ γνησίαν, ὡς ἴστε, θυγατέρα ταῖς νυμφικαῖς λαμπάσι συναπέσβεσε, τὴν μητέρα μοι τὴν ἐκείνης ἐπὶ νεαρῶ τῷ πάθει συναπήγαγεν, ἐμὲ τῆς ἐνεγκούσης ἐξήλασεν (4.19.8). Subordinating conjunctions may likewise be moved up in the syntactic order: e.g., σὺ δ' ὅτι μὴ ἔστι μοι πατὴρ ἀλλὰ νομίζεται Χαρικλῆς, ἵκετεῦώ λέγε πόθεν ἐγνώρισας (4.11.3). Interrogative pronouns may be postponed: e.g., τὸν δρασμὸν ἡγωνίων ὅπως μὲν λήσομεν (3.15.3); τοῦτο μὲν ὅπως εἴση τοῖς ἐξῆς (3.16.5). Demonstrative pronouns may be used to further define a noun: e.g., βοηθείας καὶ ταύτης ταχείας ἀποτυχόντα (3.17.3); ὀχλεῖται γὰρ ὑπὸ δυνάμεων, ἅς αὐτὸς κατέπεμψα, καὶ τούτων οὐκ ἐλαχίστων (4.7.12).

Heliiodorus frequently uses a chiasmic word-order, e.g., Ὁ μὲν ἀριθμὸς τοὺς ἐφήβους εἰς πεντήκοντα συνέταπτεν, ἐμέριζε δὲ πέντε καὶ εἴκοσιν ἐκατέρωθεν μεσεύοντα τὸν ἀρχιθέωρον δορυφοροῦντας (3.3.2, description); χλαμῦς δὲ λευκὴ περόνη χρυσοῦ πρὸς τοῖς στέρνοισι ἐσφήκωτο τὴν εἰς ἄκρον πέζαν κυανῆ τῇ βαφῇ κεκυκλωμένη (3.3.2); τῆς δὲ χλαμῦδος τὰς ἄκρας τοῖς νώτοις τοῦ ἵππου καὶ μηροῖς ἐπιβάλλουσα (3.3.6); Εἶπες ἂν καὶ τὸν ἵππον αὐτὸν συνιέναι τῆς ὠραιότητος τοῦ δεσπότη καὶ ὡς καλὸν κάλλιστον φέρειν τὸν ἡνίοχον αἰσθάνεσθαι (3.3.7); χιτῶνα δὲ ἀλουργὸν ποδήρη χρυσαῖς ἀκτίσι κατάπαστον (3.4.2); ἀψάμενοί τε λύχνον πρότερον καὶ τὰ κοιταῖα τοῖς νυχίοις θεοῖς ἐπισπείσαντες

(3.4.11); ὑπέθηκέ τε τὸ λαμπάδιον καὶ τὸν βωμὸν ἀνήψεν (3.6.1, *parative*); θιγόντες μὲν οὐδαμῶς τῶν καμνόντων ἀλλ' οὐδὲ εὐνής οὐδὲ τραπέζης τῆς αὐτῆς μετασχόντες ἀέρος δὲ μόνον ταύτου κοινωνήσαντες (3.7.4, *with parallelism*); τῇ γὰρ τούτου γαμετῆ τελούσῃ τινὰ πάτριον ἀγιστεῖαν καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἱερὸν καθευδούσῃ (3.14.2, *parative*); κόρη ἀλλ' ἐσφάδαζεν ἢ βάσις καὶ οἱ πόδες ἔσκαιρον (4.3.3); Ἡ γὰρ τῶν ἐρωτικῶν ἀντίβλεψις ὑπόμνησις τοῦ πάσχοντος γίνεται καὶ ἀναφλέγει τὴν διάνοιαν ἢ θεὰ καθάπερ ὕλη πυρὶ γινομένη (4.4.4); τροφή γὰρ νόσων ἢ σιωπῆ, τὸ δὲ ἐκλαλούμενον εὐπαραμύθητον (4.5.7); οὐχ ὄρας ὡς κυλοιδιᾶ μὲν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ τὸ βλέμμα διέρριπται καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ὠχριᾶ (4.7.7, *description*); μεταστησάμενος οὖν τοὺς παρόντας καὶ μηδένα διοχλεῖν ἐπιστείλας (4.10.1, *with variatio*); παρεγγυήσας τὰ τε ἐκείνοις ῥητέα καὶ αὐτῷ πρακτέα καὶ τὸ παρ' ἐμοῦ δοθησόμενον τοῦ καιροῦ καὶ τῆς ὥρας ἐνδόσιμον ἐπιτηρεῖν ἐπιστείλας (4.16.2, *with variatio*).

Hyperbaton

Hyperbaton is very common in Heliodorus:²¹⁵ verbs separating adjective and noun—τὸν ὄλον ἐπετέτραπτο μελωδεῖν ὕμνον (3.2.2); κάλλιστον φέρειν τὸν ἠνίοχον (3.3.7); θυμὸν ἔχε ἀγαθόν (3.4.10); ὁ πάτριος διαγινώσκει νόμος (3.5.3); πᾶν ἀφαναίνει καὶ λυμαίνεται τὸ ὑποπίπτον (3.8.2); βάσκανος εἶδεν ὀφθαλμός (3.11.1); εἰ μή τινος θείας καὶ δαιμονίας ὡς ἀληθῶς μετέσχε καταβολῆς (3.15.1); ἕως τὸ Ξαρικλείας αὐτὸν διήλεγξε κάλλος (3.17.4); ἡμμένον πυρφοροῦσα λαμπάδιον (4.1.2); πρὸς μίαν τὸν νοῦν ἡσχόλει τὴν παρατήρησιν (4.1.3); τοσοῦτον παρέφθη τὸν Ἀρκάδα ὀργυιῶν (4.4.1); ὅτι πολλοὺς ἐώρων περὶ αὐτὸν ἐπτοημένους (4.5.5); ἀπαραίτητον ἔχει πρὸς γυναῖκα ἴγυγα (4.15.2); εὐφημον ἔχωμεν στόμα (4.15.2); εἰ μίαν ἐνδείητε πρὸς παρσκευὴν ἡμέραν (4.16.9); χρηστὰς ὑποθέμενος τὰς ἐλπίδας (4.18.3); τῶν φιλότατων κεκενωμένη μοι συνομίλων (4.19.6): verbs separating adjective from adjective—ἐπει δὲ φιλήκοός τις εἶναι μοι φαίνη καὶ καλῶν ἀκουσμάτων ἀκόρεστος (3.4.11); ἀνέραστον ἀποβιδῶναι καὶ ἄγονον (4.7.13): verbs separating pronoun and noun—ὁ σὸς ἐπέστησε λόγος (3.1.1); τοσοῦτοις ἐμπομπεύσασα δήμοις (3.7.2); ταύτην δέχου τὴν φιλοτησίαν (3.11.3); ὅτῳ διήσει τρόπῳ (3.15.3); καὶ τινὰ προσάγων ἴασιν (3.18.3); εἰς βούλησιν ἤκει τὴν ἐμήν (4.7.9); ὅπερ καὶ ἀκοὴν λάθοι τὴν ἐμήν (4.8.8); τινὰ σκοπὸν ἔχει τὸ πλάσμα καὶ τινὰ τρόπον (4.13.4); ταυτηνὶ τίνῳ τὴν δίκην (4.19.3); ταύτην συγκεκληκέναι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν (4.19.6); τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐμποιεῖ παρασκευῆς (4.20.2): verbs separating genitive noun and noun—δὲ τὸ Θεαγένους ὑπερβάλλοι κάλλος (3.3.8); ὁ μοιρῶν ὑπαγορεύει

²¹⁵ Mazal (1954, 65-85) discusses hyperbaton fully, and remarks (p. 68) that hyperbaton is 'eine bei Heliodor überaus häufig auftretende Erscheinung'

θεσμός (3.11.5); τὸ λειπόμενον ἐταλαιπώρου τῆς νυκτός (3.15.3); ἐκ χειρὸς ἀφεθέντα τοῦ Πυθίου (4.14.2); τὴν Γοργοῦς θεασαμένη κεφαλὴν (4.7.11); τὴν ἐπὶ τάδε σπουδάσας ἄφιξιν (4.13.1): adjective separating genitive noun from noun—ἀκοῆς κρείττονα πάσης (3.3.1); θορύβου τε πλήρη καὶ ὄδυρμου (4.19.1): noun or pronoun separating adjective and noun—ἐπὶ τὰ καιριώτερα σε τῆς ἀφηγήσεως (3.1.2); τοιοῦτο καὶ τοῖς δεξαμένοις πάθος ἐγκατέσπειρεν (3.7.3); ῥαθυμοτέραν αὐτοῖς τὴν περείαν ἐμποιεῖ (4.20.2): noun or pronoun separating noun from noun—τοῖς νότοις τοῦ ἵππου καὶ μηροῖς (3.3.6); τὸ πρᾶγμα πρὸς ὑπόμνησιν με τῶν λυπούντων ἄγον (3.4.11); τὴν δὲ κορωνίδα τῆς πομπῆς καὶ ὀφθαλμόν (3.6.3); ἐκεῖθεν ἡ ἀρχὴ Θεαγένει τῆς ἀσεβείας ἐξήρθη (4.21.1); ἐπὶ τὰ Λοκρῶν ὄρη καὶ Οἰταίων (4.18.1): separation of noun object from its governing infinitive—Ταῦτα μὲν ἡμεῖς, ἐπεὶ δὲ τὰς κύλικας ἔδει περιάγεσθαι (3.11.2); ὑφηγουμένῳ τὰ δέοντα πείθεσθαι πράττειν (3.17.5).

Prolepsis

The normal order of words in phrases is sometimes distorted by bringing one element forward: e.g., τὴν δῶδα ὀλκότερον ἢ μὲν ἐνεχειρίζεν ὁ δὲ ὑπεδέχετο (3.5.5); περὶ θεῶν τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων εἴ τί ποτε διαπορήσειεν (3.6.2); ὥσπερ καὶ τὴν σελήνην εἰ διαπρέπει τῶν ἄλλων ἀστέρων ἠρώτας (3.6.3); ὁ τοῦτο πάσχων εἰτῶ ὀρνέῳ προσβλέποι (3.8.1); Καὶ ὄφρων δὲ ὁ καλούμενος βασιλίσκος (3.8.2); ὅτι καὶ πνεύματι μόνον καὶ βλέμματι πᾶν ἀφαναίνει καὶ λυμαίνεται τὸ ὑποπίπτον ἴσως ἀκήκοας (3.8.2); τοῦ χρησμοῦ τὰ τελευταῖα τί ἄρα βούλοιο (3.11.4); Τοὺς μὲν δὴ βεβήλους κἄν διαλάθοιεν τὴν δὲ σοφοῦ γνῶσιν οὐκ ἂν διαφύγοιεν (3.13.2); ἠνιώμην δέ, ὁ Χαρικλῆς ὅτι στερήσεται τῆς θυγατρὸς ἐννοῶν (3.15.3); τὸν δρασμὸν ἠγωνίων ὅπως μὲν λήσομεν ὅποι δὲ τραπῶμεν (3.15.3); ταῦτα . . . ὡς ἀνέγων (4.9.1); σὺ δ' ὅτι μὴ ἔστι μοι πατὴρ ἀλλὰ νομίζεται Χαρικλῆς, ἵκετεύω λέγε πόθεν ἐγνώρισας (4.11.3); ταῦτα ὡς εἶπεν (4.15.1).

Parenthesis

The clearest instances of parenthesis in books 3 and 4 involve quotations: e.g.,

Ἰχνια γὰρ μετόπισθεν

ὡς ἐκεῖνός που λέγει

ποδῶν ἠδὲ κνημάων

ρεῖ^ε ἔγνων ἀπιόντος, ἀρίγνωτοι δὲ θεοὶ περ (3.12.2),

and

ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς

δεινῶ δέ οἱ ὄσσε φάανθεν

εἰπών, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος τὸ
ἴχνια γὰρ μετόπισθε ποδῶν ἠδὲ κνημιάων
ῥεῖ' ἔγνων ἀπιόντος,

οἶον ῥέοντος ἐν τῇ πορείᾳ (3.13.3).

The effect of interrupting the quotations is to soften their artificiality. A similar effect is obtained by Knemon's interruption of Kalasiris' literary description of the procession in honour of Neoptolemus (3.1.1; 3.2.3). Heliodorus makes frequent use of parenthesis in books 3 and 4 to convey the impression of spontaneous and naturalistic conversation: e.g., καὶ παρέδραμεν ἢ τῶν παρόντων ὄψις καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἵππαρχον—ἦν δὲ τὸ μέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν Θεαγένης—ἅπας ἐπέστρεψεν (3.3.4); ὁσάκις δὴ μοι κατὰ τὸν νεῶν ἐνέτυχεν οὐχ ὡς ἄν τις ἐκ παρόδου—τοῦτο δὴ τὸ λεγόμενον—ἀλλὰ καὶ συνέθυσσα οὐκ ὀλιγάκις (3.6.2); ὥστε οὐδὲ σιωπᾶν ἐκαρτέρησεν ἀλλ' ἠρέμα πρὸς με—καθῆστο δέ μου πλησίον ἐξεπίτηδες—«Αὕτη ἐκείνη» ἔφη «Χαρίκλεια» (4.1.3); οὐδὲν κωλύει καὶ πρὸς δαίμονα—φασί—μάχεσθαι (4.19.3).

Isocolia/ Anisocolia

In Heliodorus isocolia is almost always accompanied by rhyming word-endings (see homoioteleuton or rhyme below) and the effect is to convey the impression of measured lines of verse—the reader feels, particularly in the 'purple patches', that prose has become poetry.²¹⁶ This is a very characteristic feature of Heliodorus' style and only a few examples from books three and four in addition to those cited by Mazal can be given here: ἵππεὺς μὲν καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ ὀπίτης τυγχάνων / [13] καὶ δόρυ μελίαν χαλκόστομον ἐπισείων / [14] τὸ δὲ κράνος οὐχ ὑπελθὼν / [8] ἀλλ' ἀπὸ γυμνῆς τῆς κεφαλῆς πομπεύων / [12] (3.3.5); οὕτω μὲν περιβλέπτους οὕτω δὲ εὐδαιμονιζομένους [17] καὶ τὴν μὲν ἀνδράσι τὸν δὲ γυναιξίν εὐχὴν γινομένους [17], 3.4.8; πολλῆς μὲν βουλῆς ὥστε πρεπόντως ἀνυσθῆναι [14] πολλῆς δὲ διασκευῆς ὥστε ἀσφαλῶς πραχθῆναι [15] δεόμενον (4.6.5); Καὶ ἅμα ὑπεμίμησκον τὸν χρησμὸν [11] καὶ ὃ τι βούλοιο ἔφραζον [9], 4.13.3. Heliodorus often increases the length of the second of two cola: e.g., Ἡ δὲ ἵππος Θετταλικὴ μὲν πάσα [11] καὶ τῶν ἐκεῖθεν πεδίων τὸ ἐλεύθερον βλέπουσα [16], 3.3.3; Τὴν γὰρ πρὸς θάτερον αὐτῶν συζυγίαν ἴσα καὶ ἀθανασίαν ἦγον [22], πλὴν ὅσον τὸν μὲν νεανίαν οἱ ἐγγώριοι τὴν κόρην δὲ οἱ Θετταλοὶ πλέον ἐθαύμαζον [28], 3.4.8.²¹⁷ Alternatively, he frames a shorter colon with two longer

²¹⁶ Mazal (1954, 144) deals with isocolic sentence structures under the heading 'Expressive symmetrie'.

²¹⁷ Mazal (1954, 161-176).

cola: τὴν μὲν κόμην ἡρέμα κατὰ τοῦ ἀυχένου διαξαίνουσα [18] καὶ τοῦ μετώπου τοὺς βοστρύχους παραστέλλουσα [14] τῆς δὲ χλαμύδος τὰς ἄκρας τοῖς νώτοις τοῦ ἵππου καὶ μηροῖς ἐπιβάλλουσα [22], 3.3.6; τοὺς δὲ ἀυχένας ὑπὸ τοὺς μαζοὺς παραμείψας [14] καὶ εἰς βρόχον σκολιὸν διαπλέξας [10] καὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς διολισθήσαι τοῦ βρόχου συγχωρήσας [17], 3.4.3; ὥσπερ ἐν συναισθήσει γινόμενος [11], καὶ ἑαυτὸν ἀνακαλούμενος [10] καὶ πρὸς πᾶσαν μεταβολὴν ῥαδίως ὑποφερόμενος [17], 3.10.4. A full colometric study of Heliodorus' text would be worthwhile, but falls outside of the scope of this thesis.

Polysyndeton

Polysyndetic sentences tend to occur when the narrative is driving forward to some dramatic climax, when a lot of actions are taking place in a short space of time, as in 4.3.1.²¹⁸ A rather better illustration of this occurs when the generals in Delphi announce a special assembly to mobilise the population against the Thessalians, who had supposedly kidnapped Charikleia (4.19.5):²¹⁹

[1] Ἐγίνετο ταῦτα [2a] καὶ οἱ τε στρατηγοὶ σύγκλητον ἐκκλησίαν ἐκήρυττον [2b] σάλπιγγι τὸ κήρυγμα πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ἐπισημαίνοντες [3] καὶ ὁ δῆμος αὐτίκα παρήν [4] καὶ τὸ θέατρον ἐγίνετο νυκτερινὸν βουλευτήριον, [5a] ὃ τε Χαρικλῆς εἰς μέσους παρελθὼν [5b] πρὸς οἰμωγὴν τε ἀθρόον ἐκίει τὸ πλῆθος [5c] καὶ μόνον ὀφθεῖς, [5d] ἐσθῆτά [τε] μέλαιναν ἀμπεχόμενος, [5e] καὶ κόνιν τοῦ τε προσώπου καὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς καταχεάμενος [5f] τοιάδε ἔλεγεν.

Here the sentence jumps rapidly from a resumptive statement of the preceding actions [1], to two equal cola describing the actions of the generals [2a-b], to the reaction of the people [3], to a comment on the setting of these events [4], and, finally, to a number of unequal cola (in the active, passive and middle voice), relating how the appearance of Charikles aroused the pity of the assembly [5a-f]. Another example is the chase scene (4.21.3). The long and complex account of the 'jealous eye' by Kalasiris is also given polysyndetic treatment (3.7.3), as are his reflections on the vagaries of human existence (4.9.1, containing two μέν . . . δέ constructions and a number of καί coordinates).

Polysyndetic sentences in Heliodorus also convey an atmosphere of immediacy and informality. When Kalasiris runs into an excited Charikles after the procession (3.6.2) the language is fragmented by dialogue, parenthesis and polysyndeton:

Περιεργότερος τοίνυν ἐξ ὧν ἠκηκόειν τε καὶ ἐωράκειν γεγονῶς ἐντυγχάνω τῷ Χαρικλεῖ τοῦτο σπουδάσας· καὶ ὅς « εἶδες » ἠρώτα « τὸ ἀγλαΐσμα τὸ ἐμόν τε καὶ Δελφῶν, τὴν Χαρίκλειαν; » « Οὐ νῦν πρῶτον » ἔφην, « ἀλλὰ καὶ πρότερον

²¹⁸ Mazal (1954, 143) gives a full analysis of the polysyndetic periodic sentence (4.3.1).

²¹⁹ For RL's excision of τε in this sentence see commentary *ad loc.*

πολλάκις, ὅσάκις δὴ μοι κατὰ τὸν νεὼν ἐνέτυχεν οὐχ ὥς ἂν τις ἐκ παρόδου—
τοῦτο δὴ τὸ λεγόμενον—ἀλλὰ καὶ συνέθυσσα οὐκ ὀλιγάκις καὶ περὶ θεῶν τε
καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων εἴ τί ποτε διαπορήσειεν ἠρώτησέ τε καὶ ἔμαθε. »

Asyndeton

Verbal asyndeton is used deliberately to convey the impression of the many emotions and worries crowding in on Kalasiris (3.15.3):

Ἔχαιρον, εὐρηκέναι τι τῶν οὐ προσδοκωμένων ἐλπίζων καὶ εἰς τὴν
ἐνεγκοῦσαν ἐπανήξειν προσδοκῶν ἠνιώμην δέ, ὁ Χαρικλῆς ὅτι στερήσεται τῆς
θυγατρὸς ἐννοῶν ἠπόρουν, ὅτῳ δεήσει τρόπῳ τοὺς νέους συναγαγεῖν καὶ
κατασκευάσαι τὴν ἔξοδον συμφρονῶν τὸν δρασμὸν ἠγωνίων ὅπως μὲν λήσομεν
ὅποι δὲ τραπῶμεν καὶ πότερον διὰ γῆς ἢ θαλαττεύοντες.

Noun asyndeton occurs in the main clause: e.g., τότε ὥσπερ ὑφ' ἐνὶ συνθήματι βόες ἄρνες
αἶγες ἱερεύοντο (3.5.2). Asyndeton may also occur in the subordinate clauses: e.g., εἰ καὶ
τίνα χρῆ μεταθέειν, εἰ τίς ὁ τὸν βαρὺν τοῦτον ἐπενεγκῶν πόλεμον ἐγινώσκομεν (4.19.3). In
this example asyndeton is combined with anaphora.

Polyptoton

Heliodorus may repeat a word (especially pronouns) in the same or a different case: e.g.,
Σφῆξε . . . ξένους καὶ ἀπόλιδας ἰκέτας πάντων ἀλλοτριωθέντας, ἴν' ἐκ πάντων μόνους
ἀλλήλους κερδήσωσι (4.18.2)

Paronomasia

Paronomasia in phrases such as καλλίζωνοί τινες καὶ βαθύζωνοι (3.2.1); περσέπολιν Τρώων,
ῥυσίπολιν Δαναῶν (3.2.4 [the verse hymn to Thetis]); ἔφερε τε καὶ ἐφέρετο γαυρούμενος
(3.3.7); καλὸν κάλλιστον (3.3.7); ἐπιφοιτῶντες . . . ἀποφοιτῶντες (3.13.1); ἐάλωκεν ἡ
δυσάλωτος (4.7.1); ἃ καὶ πάσχειν αἰσχρὸν καὶ ἐκλαλεῖν αἰσχρότερον (4.10.2); ὑπεθέμην . . .
ὑπερθέμενος (4.15.4).²²⁰

Word-play

Heliodorus enjoys playing with words of similar sound, even when the meanings of the
words are completely unrelated: e.g., ὅτε (sc. ἐλάμβανεν), φίλε Κνήμων, καὶ ὅτι θεῖον ἡ
ψυχὴ καὶ συγγενὲς ἄνωθεν τοῖς ἔργοις ἐπιστούμεθα (3.5.4). In other cases, the play on
words underlines the significance of an event: e.g., ἀλλήλους ἐώρων οἱ νέοι καὶ ἤρων
(3.5.4), where Theagenes and Charikleia fall in love at first sight (love and sight are

²²⁰ Mazal (1954, 305).

intimately connected in the romance). Cf. also πρὸς τῆς ὀχλικῆς ἀηδίας (3.6.4) and ἄλγημα διοχλεῖν ἔλεγεν (3.7.1); ποτιμώτερον τὸ συμπόσιον ἀπεργαζόμενος (3.10.3); ἴχνια γὰρ μετόπισθε ποδῶν ἠδὲ κνημῶν / ῥεῖ' ἔγνων ἀπιόντος—οἶον ῥέοντος ἐν τῇ πορείᾳ (3.13.3); οὐ γὰρ ἄρπαγμα τὸ πράγμα (4.6.5). In addition to these verbal puns, Kalasiris makes a facetious etymological pun on the name Ὅμηρος, which he says derives from the fact that the poet was born with a patch of hair on his thigh (ὁ μηρός).

Alliteration

The *figura etymologica* is used for alliterative effect in κανᾶ . . . κانهφοροῦσαι (3.2.1); Ἐπεὶ δὲ φιλήκοός τις εἶναι μοι φαίνεται καὶ καλῶν ἀκουσμάτων ἀκόρεστος (3.4.11); πάσχων οἶμαι τὸ τῶν πολλῶν πάθος (3.16.2); νοσῶ γὰρ οὐ βασκανίαν, ἀλλ' ἐτέραν τινά, ὡς ἔοικε, νόσον (4.5.6). Besides these striking instances there are many cases of triple alliteration, e.g.: ἐκεκίνητο δὲ ἡ Χαρίκλεια πρὸς πᾶσαν ὑπερβολὴν καὶ εἶδον ἐκ πολλοῦ παρατηρῶν παντοίας μεταβαλλομένην ιδέας (3.4.2, expressing the excitement of Charikleia during the race of Theagenes and Ormenos); καὶ ὁ τεχνησάμενος εἰς ἐκείνην τὸ πᾶν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ τέχνης κατέκλεισεν, οὔτε πρότερόν τι τοιοῦτον χαλκευσάμενος οὔτε αὔθις δυνησόμενος (3.4.2, conveying a metallic sound).

Anaphora

Syntactic anaphora: καὶ τὴν δῶδα ὀλκότερον ἢ μὲν ἐνεχειρίζεν [7] ὁ δὲ ὑπεδέχετο [7] (3.5.5); ῥοιοὶ μὲν ὀφθαλμίας ῥοιοὶ δὲ τῆς ἐκ λοιμῶν καταστάσεως ἀνεπλήσθησαν (3.7.4); ἄρτι μὲν κατηφῆς τε καὶ ὡς περ ἐπ' ἐνοίας ἄρτι δὲ ἀθρόον ἐπὶ τὸ φαιδρότερον ἑαυτὸν μεταπλάττων (3.10.4); ἀλλὰ πολλῆς μὲν βουλῆς ὡς τε πρεπόντως ἀνυσθῆναι πολλῆς δὲ διασκευῆς ὡς τε ἀσφαλῶς πραχθῆναι δεόμενον (4.6.5); τοῦτο σοφία, τοῦτο φιλία (4.7.1); ἀλλὰ σὺν πολλαῖς μὲν γυναιξὶ τῶν ἐπισήμων σὺν πολλαῖς δὲ παρθένους τῶν τὰ ἄλλα σωφρόνων (4.10.5); Χαρίκλεια μοι βίος ἦν, ἐλπίς καὶ διαδοχὴ τοῦ γένους, Χαρίκλεια μόνη παραψυχὴ καὶ ὡς εἰπεῖν ἄγκυρα (4.19.9).

Antithesis

Ἐπειτα ὡς περ καταιδεσθέντες τὸ γεγονός ἐπυρρίασαν, καὶ αὔθις, τοῦ πάθους οἶμαι καὶ τὴν καρδίαν ἐπιδραμόντος, ὠχρίασαν (3.5.6); διὸ καὶ πρὸς μέθην ὁ ἐρῶν καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐρᾶν ὁ μεθῶν ἐπίφορος (3.10.5); Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἦλθον οὗ κατηγόμεν ἄυπνος τὰ πρῶτα διήγον ἐπὶ τῆς εὐνῆς ἄνω καὶ κάτω τὴν περὶ τῶν νέων φροντίδα στρέφων καὶ τοῦ χρησιμοῦ τὰ τελευταῖα τί ἄρα βούλοιτο ἀνιχνεύων (3.11.4); εἰς ἄλλο μὲν ζῶον ἐπ' ἐλάχιστον εἰς ἀνθρώπους δὲ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἑαυτοὺς εἰδοποιούσι (3.13.1); Τῆ δὲ ὑστεραία ὁ μὲν Πυθίων ἀγῶν ἔληγεν ὁ δὲ τῶν

νέων ἐπήκμαζεν (4.1.1); εἶλωκεν ἢ δυσάλωτος καὶ νενίκηται ἢ δυσκαταμάχητος (4.7.1); ἡδονῆς δὲ ἅμα καὶ λύπης ἐνεπλήσθη καὶ πάθος τι καινότερον ὑπέστην ὁμοῦ δακρῶν καὶ χαίρων (4.9.1); Πολλαὶ δὲ γυναῖκες ἀνδρειότερον τῆς φύσεως ἐφρόνησαν (4.21.3, oxymoron).

Homoioteleuton

Heliodorus regularly makes use of rich rhyming patterns; often these involve participial endings, such as -μενος, -ων, -ουσα, and their oblique case forms. Rhymes range from simple jingles, such as ἀναπειθεσθαι καὶ συμπαρέπεσθαι (3.3.1) and ἀδόμενος καὶ ζητούμενος (4.13.3) to complex verbal sound sequences, such as in the description of Theagenes: προσέβαλλε δὲ τι χάριτος τοῖς γινομένοις καὶ ἀνέμου λιγεῖα ῥιπή, μείλιχον γὰρ ἐπέπνει τὴν μὲν κόμην ἡρέμα κατὰ τοῦ ἀνχένος διαξαίνουσα καὶ τοῦ μετώπου τοὺς βοστρύχους παραστέλλουσα τῆς δὲ χλαμύδος τὰς ἄκρας τοῖς νώτοις τοῦ ἵππου καὶ μηροῖς ἐπιβάλλουσα (3.3.6). The same applies to the description of the girdle of Charikleia: εἶπες ἂν τοὺς ὄφεις οὐ δοκεῖν ἔρπειν ἀλλ' ἔρπειν, οὐχ ὑπὸ βλοσυρῶ καὶ ἀπνηεῖ τῷ βλέμματι φοβερούς ἀλλ' ὑγρῶ κώματι διαρροέμενους ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ τὰ στέρνα τῆς κόρης ἡμέρου κατευναζομένους (3.4.4). The moment at which Theagenes and Charikleia meet is given elaborate and intertwining rhythms: ὁμοῦ τε γὰρ ἀλλήλους έώρων οἱ νέοι καὶ ἡρών, [16] / ὥσπερ τῆς ψυχῆς / ἐκ πρώτης ἐντεύξεως τὸ ὅμοιον ἐπιγνούσης [15] / καὶ πρὸς τὸ κατ' ἀξίαν οἰκεῖον προσδραμούσης [14] (3.5.4, with *isocolia*); πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ἄθροον τι καὶ ἐπτοημένον ἔστησαν καὶ τὴν δάδα ὀλκότερον ἢ μὲν ἐνεχειρίζεν ὁ δὲ ὑπεδέχετο, τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀτενεῖς ἐπὶ πολὺ κατ' ἀλλήλων πήξαντες ὥσπερ εἴ που γνωρίζοντες ἢ ιδόντες πρότερον ταῖς μνήμαις ἀναπεμπάζοντες; εἶτα ἐμειδίασαν βραχὺ τι καὶ κλεπτόμενον καὶ μόνη τῇ διαχύσει τοῦ βλέμματος ἐλεγχόμενον (3.5.5). The comparison between the higher and lower forms of Egyptian wisdom is also elaborately patterned: ἢ μὲν γὰρ τις ἐστὶ δημώδης καὶ ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι χαμαὶ ἐρχομένη [21], εἰδώλων θεραπείαινα καὶ περὶ σώματα νεκρῶν εἰλουμένη [19] (3.16.3, with *isocolia*); πράξεων ἀθεμίτων εὐρέτις [10] καὶ ἡδονῶν ἀκολάστων ὑπηρετις [12] (3.16.3, with *isocolia*).²²¹

Similes

The majority of the similes in books 3 and 4 are conventional or borrowed from Heliodorus' models—nevertheless they add vivid colour to the narrative. They include the following:²²² 3.3.3 (the Thessalian horsemen are compared to athletes in competition);

²²¹ Cf. Mazal (1954, 316-321).

²²² Mazal (1954, 278-288) and Scobie (1973, 1-18) discuss Heliodorus' use of similes. Scobie (p. 1)

3.4.6 (the light emanating from Charikleia's eyes is more powerful than that emitted by torches); 3.8.1 (the plover attracts the 'eye of envy' to itself like a flux); 3.8.1 (the plover avoids the sight of those afflicted by the 'eye of envy' as it would a wound); 3.10.1 (Kalasiris and Charikles who have been invited to a feast are compared to those called up for a war); 3.10.5 (the thoughts of a lover resemble those of a drunk); 3.11.3 (when Theagenes heard that Kalasiris was Egyptian he resembled a man who has stumbled over treasure); 3.17.2, 4.17.1 (Kalasiris and the Phoenician dancers resemble men possessed); 3.19.1 (the fire of Charikleia's gaze is extinguished as if by water); 4.3.1 (Theagenes in the foot race resembles Achilles in combat with the river Scamander); 4.4.1 (Theagenes runs towards Charikleia like an arrow towards a target); 4.5.3 (Kalasiris chants spells as if he were part of a stage performance); 4.7.11 (Charikleia puts her hands around her throat like a noose); 4.7.11 (Charikleia looks at Alkamenes as if she had seen a Gorgon); 4.19.2 (the people of Delphi are compared to the deaf). Scobie omits 4.4.4 (the sight of a lover is like fuel to a fire); 4.20.1 (Hegesias compares the tears of Charikles to floods), which RL and Koraes condemn for bad taste. RL infer that Heliodorus was attempting to imitate Homer *Il.* 16.3, δάκρυα θερμὰ χέων ὡς τε κρήνη μελάνυδρος (Patroklos); *Od.* 19.207, τηκομένης δ' ἄρα τῆς ποταμοὶ πλήθουσι ῥέοντες (Penelope). The comparison is certainly extended too far, but this may have been done deliberately by Heliodorus to convey something of the macho toughness of Hegesias.

Metaphors

In general, Heliodorus' style is highly metaphorical. A large number of metaphors are concerned with the theatre.²²³ Knemon's words to Kalasiris serve as an example: ἐμὲ γοῦν οὐπω θεατὴν ὁ σὸς ἐπέστησε λόγος . . . ὁμοῦ τε ἀνοίξας καὶ κλείσας τὸ θέατρον . . . ἐκ παρόδου θεωρός (3.1.1). Other metaphors concern music—Heliodorus uses the word ἐνδόσιμον in both its literal meaning 'key note' (3.2.2; 4.3.1; 5.14.2) and in a metaphorical sense for the signal to depart from Delphi (4.16.2). Another musical or theatrical metaphor is to be found in μηδὲ χορήγει τῷ λυποῦντι μέγεθος σιωπῶσα (4.5.7), where χορήγει literally means 'supply a chorus' but here 'indulge'. Mazal (1954, 288) comments that fire

points out that the *Ethiopian Story* contains the greatest number of similes of the five romances, but that the *Life of Apollonius* by Philostratus contains more. For other similes in the romance, see the note on 4.4.1.5 below.

²²³ Cf. Walden (1895, 1-43); Neimke (1889, 1-11) and Paulsen (1992, 21-39). Miscellaneous metaphors are catalogued by Mazal (1954, 234-277) and Feuillâtre (1966, 74-93).

metaphors are frequently (and very conventionally) used to describe erotic feelings: e.g., 3.17.3 φλέγεσθαι ‘burning’, ‘on fire’; 4.4.4 ἀναφλέγει ‘set on fire’, cf. 4.18.5 Ἀναφλέγεται ‘set alight’. The onset of love is strongly linked to perception in the *Ethiopian Story* and the metaphors reflect this: a sharp glance is described as ‘shiny’: e.g., Ἑλλάδος ἀστεροπᾶν ‘the lightning-bolt of Greece’ (3.2.4); κατέλαμψεν ‘shone’ (3.3.4); ὑπ’ ἀστραπῆς ‘by lightning’ (3.3.4); and the glance of the eyes may be ‘fiery’: e.g., 3.11.2 διάπυρον ‘fiery’; 3.19.1 τὸ φλέγον τοῦ βλέμματος ‘the fire of her gaze’.

Love is also compared with warfare: e.g., 4.1.1 ἀγωνοθετούντος . . . καὶ βραβεύοντος Ἔρωτος καὶ δι’ ἀθλητῶν δύο τούτων καὶ μόνων οὗς ἐξεύξατο μέγιστον ἀγώνων τὸν ἴδιον ἀποφῆναι φιλονεικήσαντος ‘Eros was the organiser and referee of this competition, I suppose, and he was keen to show, through these two contestants alone, whom he had matched together, that his was the most important event’; 4.17.3 τὸν ἐρωτικὸν τοῦτον πόλεμον ‘this war of love’; 3.7.5 εἰστοξεύοντα ‘shoot arrows’; 4.11.1 πολέμιον ‘opponent, enemy’. The imagery of war leads naturally to the use of slavery as a metaphor of a person in love and at the mercy of fate: e.g., 4.4.4 ἤττητο . . . καὶ δεδούλωτο ‘was defeated and enslaved’, cf. δεδούλωτο (3.19.1), cf. also 4.11.2 ἐάλωκεν ‘taken prisoner’; 4.18.2 αἰχμάλωτα ‘captive’; 4.18.2 τύχης . . . ἀγώγιμα σώματα ‘bodies led in slavery to fate’; 3.16.3 θεράπεινα ‘slave’;

Grief is likened to a flood or storm: 4.19.9 ἄγκυρα ‘anchor’, cf. also 2.17.1, 6.7.3; 4.20.1 κλύδων ‘wave’, ‘flood’, cf. also 2.3.4; 3.15.3; 5.16.2; 7.12.1; 4.20.1 ρεύμασι ‘floods’, cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 599, Soph. *Oid. Tyr.* 1527. Others fear to sink in this deluge of emotion: e.g., 4.18.3 ἐβάπτιζον ‘submerged’, cf. also 4.20.1 συμβαπτιζώμεθα ‘submerged’. Storm and sea imagery is used for the violent passions of love: e.g., 3.5.6 τῆς ψυχῆς τὸν σάλον ‘the storm in their souls’, cf. 3.10.5 σαλευούσης ‘bob about’. Water imagery is also used to convey erotic feelings; e.g. 3.3.7 κυμαίνων ‘swelling’—a marine metaphor which is extended by γαληνόν ‘calm’ later in the same sentence; 3.4.5 ἐπεκόμεινε ‘fell in waves’; 3.4.4 ὑγρῷ κόματι διαρροεμένους ‘spent in a stream of languor’, cf. 3.10.5 ἔρωτι διαβρόχους ‘wet with love’. Metaphors of wind or water may also indicate mental confusion: e.g., 3.10.4 ἠνεμωμένος; 4.19.1 συρρεόντων ‘running together’; 4.9.1 διαχαιομένης ‘mixed, confused’.

The following instances are to be found in books 3 and 4: 3.3.2 συνέταπτεν ‘constituted’; 3.3.7 ταλαντεύων ‘balancing’; 3.3.8 τὴν νικητήριον ἀνδρείας τε καὶ κάλλους ψῆφον ‘the winning vote for manliness and beauty’; 3.4.5 ῥοδοειδῆ ‘rosy’; 3.4.9 ἀνεπτέρωσας ‘set me on the wing’; 3.5.5 κλεπτόμενον ‘secretly’; 3.5.6 ἐπιδραμόντος

‘rushing to’, cf. 3.14.1 παραδραμεῖν ‘run past’; 4.13.5 σύντρεχε ‘run together with, go along with’; 4.16.4, παραδραμεῖν ‘run past’; 4.15.1 τείνει ‘tends’; 3.6.3 ‘ὄφθαλμός ‘eye’, ‘darling’, cf. ὄφθαλμῶν ‘eyes’, ‘darling’ (4.19.8); 3.7.5 ἀπορροίας ‘effluxes’; 3.10.2 ὑποβεβρεγμένος ‘soaked’; 3.11.4 ἀνιχνεύων ‘tracking’; 3.13.1 τὸν νοῦν . . ἀνακινήσας ‘directed my mind’, cf. also 3.18.4, λόγους . . . κινήσαι ‘direct words at’; 4.12.1 τὸ φρόνημα διανιστάσα ‘raising her thoughts’; 3.14.3 κροτησάντων ‘knock’, ‘forge’; 3.18.1 ἀποθύει ‘offer’; 3.19.1 ἄνθος ‘bloom’; 4.2.1 στέφανον ‘crown’; 4.3.1 ἀσθμαίνων ‘breathing’; 4.3.3 ὑποτέμνων ‘cutting short’; 4.4.3 τίς οὕτως ἀδαμάντινος ἢ σιδηροῦς τὴν καρδίαν ‘who is there so adamantine and steely of heart’; 4.5.1 λύσις ‘release’; 4.5.4 πλανᾶσθαί ‘wander’; 4.5.7 τροφή γὰρ νόσων ἢ σιωπή ‘silence is the food of illnesses’; 4.6.5 ἄρπαγμα ποιεῖσθαι ‘to make a snatch’; 4.6.7 θαλαμεύσει ‘take into a bridal chamber’; ἐπιτύμβια καὶ μητρὸς ἐπικήδεια δάκρυα ‘(the writing will be) funereal tears of your mother over your grave’; 4.11.2 ἐπέτεινα ‘stretched’; 4.15.2 ἴυγγα ‘spell’; 4.15.3 τὴν πανήγυριν ‘celebration’; 4.17.4 ἐμβροντσήαντες ‘thundering’; 4.17.5 βαρύν τινα πάταγον ‘a deep crashing’, cf. 3.10.4 βύθιον ἐπιστένων ‘sighing deeply’; 4.18.2 καινοτουμένην ‘cutting a new vein’; 4.18.5 προμάχου ‘champion’; 4.18.6 προὔποτέμεται ‘cut away from under before’, ‘summarily undermined’; 4.19.9 κωμάζειν ‘sport with’; 4.19.9 Χαρίκλειά μοι βίος ἦν ‘Charikleia was my life’.

Occasionally the imagery has become weakened: cf., e.g., περιεστοιχίσαστο ‘encircled with nets’, ‘surrounded’ (3.5.2), cf. 4.19.1; μνώμενος ‘being mindful of’, ‘being aware’ (3.14.4); πυρφοροῦσα λαμπάδιον ‘holding up a lighted torch’ (4.1.2); ἀγῶνας ἀναδησάμενος ‘having won victories’ (4.2.1); ἐκθειάζων ‘deify’ ‘raise’ (4.12.1); ἐπάγην ‘I stuck’ ‘I was transfixed’ (4.8.2), cf. 4.13.3; τοῦ μεσεύοντος ‘standing between’ ‘intervening’ (4.14.2).

Irony

While irony is a figure of thought rather than a figure of language, it is most convenient to deal with it briefly here. Heliodorus frequently deploys irony in his narrative (cf. appendix 2 on the word ἀντίθεος). A clear instance of sarcasm occurs when Charikles comments on Kalasiris’ suggestion that Charikleia was suffering from the ‘jealous eye’: Γελάσας οὖν εἰρωνικὸν «καὶ σὺ γὰρ» εἶπεν «ὡς ὁ πολὺς ὄχλος εἶναί τινα βασκανίαν ἐπίστευσας» (3.7.2); cf. also 10.14.6 (Sisimithres to Hydaspes); 10.31.4 (the Ethiopian giant to Theagenes). Charikles comments ironically on the person who invites them to the banquet of Theagenes: ὡς λίαν ἀπροσδιόνυσος καὶ ταῦτα ὑποβεβρεγμένος (3.10.2); the performance of

Kalasis in exorcising Charikleia is also ironic (4.5.4); finally, the simplicity of the Egyptian priest's offerings are referred to ironically: κάπειδῆ τοῦ λιβανωτοῦ λαβῶν ἀπέθυσσα καὶ ὕδατος ἔσπεισα, θαυμάζουσι μὲν ἐώκεσαν τὸ πολυτελές τῶν ἐμῶν θυμάτων (4.16.4).

Situational irony is widespread. The discussion of the therapeutic powers of the plover is clearly ironic—the bird is able to cure those who suffer from the ‘jealous eye’ (inflicted by a hostile gaze) but avoids the sight of such people to avoid being infected itself (3.8.1). Charikles’ concern that Kalasis should induce his daughter to be more disposed to love is also supremely ironical (2.23.5; 3.9.1), since she has already fallen in love with Theagenes, with whom she will elope from her father’s care. It is also ironic that it is Charikles who instructs the leader of the Thessalian delegation (Theagenes) to take the torch from the acolyte (his daughter) to kindle the altar fire (3.5.3), since it is on this occasion that the two fall in love. Charikles is also concerned that Charikleia will not be able to show the torch to the runners in the footrace (3.18.2)—an action that will bring his daughter closer to the man who will take her away from him. Kalasis’ interpretation of Charikles’ dream is ironic too (4.15.1).

Conclusion

The features of Heliodorus’ style discussed above may be seen at work in his description of Theagenes’ horse (3.3.7), which is here reproduced colometrically:

1. Εἶπεσ ἄν καὶ τὸν ἵππον αὐτὸν συνιέναι τῆς ὠραιότητος τοῦ δεσπότου (23)
2. καὶ ὡς καλὸν κάλλιστον φέρειν τὸν ἡνίοχον αἰσθάνεσθαι, (18)
3. οὕτω τὸν ἀρχένα κυμαίνων (9)
4. καὶ εἰς ὀρθὸν οὔς τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐγείρων (12)
5. καὶ σοβαρὰν τὴν ὄφρυν κατὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐπιδινεύων (18)
6. ἔφερε τε καὶ ἐφέρετο γαυρούμενος, εὐήνιά τε προποδίζων (22)
7. καὶ ἐφ’ ἐκάτερον ὦμον ἑαυτὸν ἐν μέρει ταλαντεύων (19)
8. ἄκραν τε τὴν ὀπλὴν τῆ γῆ λεπτὸν ἐπικροτῶν (14)
9. εἰς γαληνὸν κίνημα τὸ βῆμα κατερρύθμιζεν. (15)

There are a number of points that deserve mention here: cola increase in length (3-6) and then decrease (7-9) to convey an impression of the motion of the horse (a tantivy in 6, but a walk in 9); the number of polysyllabic words increases in 6, suggesting rapidity, whereas shorter words predominate in 3 and 9; plosive consonants reproduce the clipping of the animal’s hooves in 7-8 and the rapid gallop in 6, but nasals suggest calm, measured movement in 3 and 9; the harmony between horse and rider is expressed by repetition of

word-elements in καλὸν κάλλιστον (2), ἔφερε τε καὶ ἐφέρετο (6), and κίνημα τὸ βῆμα (9); and, finally, the rhythm of the pair is put across by means of rhymes, such as -ον, -ων and ημα. It is characteristic of Heliodorus that these effects are achieved through the use of participles (7 in all, as opposed to just two finite verbs) and prepositional phrases (5).

This example should give some idea of the exuberance of Heliodorus' style. The artificial word order, the careful colometry and elaborate sentence structure, the antithesis and word-play, the use of alliteration and rhyme, when taken in conjunction with the colourful use of simile and metaphor, may best be described as euphuistic, a term later coined after the speech of John Lyly's character, Euphues.²²⁴ This style is not unique to Heliodorus, but may nevertheless have contributed indirectly to the striving for poetic effects in later prose.

A NOTE ON THE MANUSCRIPTS AND EDITIONS

Dörrie (1935, 89-109), Colonna and RL use different *sigla* to refer to the MSS. A comparative table of the most important of these is given below.²²⁵

MANUSCRIPT	DATE	RL	Colonna	Dörrie
<i>Vaticanus 157</i>	<i>Saec. XI</i>	V	V	V
<i>Hiersolymitanus S. Cruc. 157</i>	<i>Saec. XI in.</i>	J	J	H
<i>Marcianus 409</i>	<i>Saec. XI-XII</i>	Z	Z	E
<i>Marcianus Gr. 410</i>	<i>Saec. XIII</i>	X	D	E'
<i>Vaticanus 1390</i>	<i>Saec. XIII-XIV</i>	C	C	Z
<i>Vindobonensis 130</i>	<i>Saec. XIV ex.</i>	B	S	K
<i>Monacensis 157</i>	<i>Saec. XV in.</i>	M	M	v ₃
<i>Laurentianus Plut. LXX 36</i>	<i>1485/6</i>	F	L	D
<i>Palatinus 125</i>	<i>Saec. XV</i>	P	P	m ₂
<i>Parisini 2904, 2906, 2907</i>	<i>Saec. XV-XVI</i>	Δ	F, G, H	P ₁ , P ₂ , P ₃
<i>Parisinus Gr. 2905</i>	<i>Saec. XV ex.</i>	Q1	R	M
<i>Vindobonensis 116</i>	<i>Saec. XVI</i>	A	<i>a</i>	g ₂
<i>Taurinensis B, III, 29</i>	<i>Saec. XVI</i>	T	T	T

Dörrie (1935, 89-109) presents a bipartite stemma (p. 89, summarised in conclusion on p. 109) going back to a 9th century archetype shared with Achilles Tatius and Longus.

²²⁴ John Lyly, *Euphues: the Anatomy of Wit* (1578), *Euphues and his England* (1580).

²²⁵ A full table is given in Birchall (1996, 6).

He labels one branch of the stemma the *familia major*, consisting on the one hand of two MSS (HE) and on the other a *stirps Laurentiana* (TDMv₃). The other branch, the *familia minor* consists of V on the one hand and a *stirps Campana* (the Parisian codices).

RL (1935, xxiv-xlvi) eliminate all but nine of the approximately 22 MSS of the romance of Heliodorus (A, T, Δ [Parisini D1, D2, D3], V, Z, C, M, B, P). Of these they concentrate on six earlier than the sixteenth century (V, Z, C, M, B, P), which were grouped into two families β (BCPZ) and γ (VM) with an archetype α.²²⁶ The editors note internal disagreements between C, Z and BP on the one hand and between M and V on the other (their stemma is given on p. xxxviii).²²⁷

Colonna (1938, v-1) gives detailed descriptions of the extant manuscripts of Heliodorus. In constructing a stemma (given on p. lix) he distinguishes between a *familia Vaticana* (γ) and a *familia Veneta* (δ) with an archetype (α). For the first, *Vaticanus Graecus 157* (V) was the most important exemplar (followed by M), while the second rested on *Venetus Marcianus Graecus 409* and *410* (Z). He also distinguishes a third *familia contaminata* (ε) of which C is the most important and from which a *recensio docta* (ω) of the more modern manuscripts derived.

All three editors agree on the importance of V and the γ family, although Dorrie makes M (his v₃) relate to this group only through contamination. C also occupies a place of special importance in all three stemmata, although Colonna believes that this manuscript, which RL relied on extensively, contains numerous unnecessary corrections, arising from a desire to improve the author's Greek, which was clearly idiosyncratic and, in places, inconsistent.²²⁸ My sympathies lie with Colonna in this regard. Colonna stands

²²⁶ Cf. also Rattenbury (1925, 179) who omits Z. Rattenbury concludes his study with the words (p. 181): 'BCP are inferior members of a good family, while MV, and especially V, are good members of an inferior one.'

²²⁷ RL remark that the text of the romance is generally sound (p. lx) but that it has suffered at the hands of editors who wished to normalise the unusual Greek of the author (p. lxi)—a fault of which they are occasionally guilty themselves. The tendency to normalise the text is best illustrated by the suggested emendations of Naber (1873, 145-169; 313-353)—most of which have been ignored by later editors. On the other hand, some of the emendations proposed by RL are convincing (cf. 3.15.1, τὸ ἠνγμένον on the basis of Amyot's translation).

²²⁸ Colonna leans towards conservatism in his treatment of the text (wisely, given the oddities of Heliodorus' vocabulary and style) and he usually resists the temptation to correct the unusual language of the *Ethiopian Story*. His 1987 edition departs to some extent from his earlier

alone in making Z a member of a separate family descended from the archetype, whereas RL and Dörrie put this MS in the second family (RL's β , Dörrie's *familia major*), but there is no doubt about the importance of this MS. In general, judging by the number of manuscripts that survive from the 11th to the 13th centuries the romances were also much read—Heliodorus being the most popular of the three—and it is likely that the manuscript tradition of Heliodorus is more reliable than those of the other romances,²²⁹ but there is still clearly much disagreement about the stemmatics of Heliodorus' text and due caution should be exercised in using this evidence to decide on the text.

In this commentary I have relied mainly on the Budé text, supplemented by Colonna's two editions.²³⁰ The few cases in which I depart from their readings are discussed in the commentary.

conservative approach and in numerous instances (discussed in my commentary) he now follows the readings of RL.

²²⁹ Dörrie (1935, 102).

²³⁰ Mazal (1966, 191) concludes that, of all the editions of Heliodorus from Vincentius Obsopoeus (1534) to Rattenbury and Lumb (1935-1938), Colonna (1938) and RL provide the basic tools for future advances in the textual criticism of Heliodorus.

BOOK THREE

THE PROCESSION

Kalasisiris begins his description but is interrupted by Knemon (1)

3.1.1 Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ πόμπη: Heliodorus consistently tries to make his narrative run on from one book to the next. In this case, Kalasisiris' account of the excitement of the people of Delphi over the forthcoming procession in honour of Neoptolemus at the end of book 2 (2.36.2) provides a bridge to the description of this event at the beginning of book 3. Sometimes book divisions separate μέν . . . δέ . . . constructions: cf. 4.1.1 below and note. In some cases the narrative context at the end of one book is continued for a few sentences at the beginning of the next before taking a decisive turn (the clearest examples can be found at the beginning of books 2, 5, 6, 7, and 10). Occasionally resumptive expressions are used: e.g., Ἡ μὲν δὴ νῆσος ᾧδε ἐπυρπολεῖτο, 2.1.1; Ἡ μὲν δὴ πόλις ἡ Δελφῶν ἐν τούτοις ἦν, 5.1.1; Ὁ δὲ Καλάσιρις καὶ ἡ Χαρίκλεια παρὰ τοσοῦτον ἐλθόντες κινδύνου, 7.1.1; and, most clearly, Τὰ μὲν δὴ κατὰ Σύνην ἐπὶ τοσόνδε πραχθέντα εἰρήσθω, 10.1.1. This recalls the technique of Homer: e.g., Ὡς ὁ μὲν ἔνθα καθεῦθε πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς, *Od.* 6.1. These cases suggest that Heliodorus wished to preserve some continuity between the books to allow the reader to pick up the narrative before moving on. Continuity is weakest at the beginning of books 4 and 9 (although the μέν . . . δέ . . . construction continues over these breaks), and 8 (mention of Oroondates preserves continuity here). Cf. Morgan (1979 at 9.1.1); Hefti (1950, 122: 'inhaltlich bilden die einzelnen Bücher keine in sich abgeschlossenen Einheiten.')

The description of an encounter between lovers during a procession at a festival is a favourite set-piece in the ancient Greek romances. For example, Xenophon of Ephesus (1.2) describes the procession of Ephesian girls and ephebes from the city to the temple of Artemis. The participants dress in their best clothes, as it is the custom for the young people to find their life partners at the festival. Xenophon describes Antheia (whose costume resembles that of Artemis) and Habrokomes as deities; the beauty of the young man and the young woman are such that the crowd immediately proclaim them a perfect match. The similarity between this description and that of Heliodorus is striking, although the latter is clearly more literary and, of course, he sets the encounter between the hero

and the heroine at an ἐναγισμός rather than a ἑορτή. Other references to festivals occur in Xenophon (3.2.3, Hippothous meets Hyperanthes at an all-night festival; 5.1.5, Aegialeus meets Thelxinoe on a similar occasion; 5.11.2, Antheia leaves a lock of her hair for Habrokomes at the temple of Helios during a festival); Chariton (1.1, Chaereas and Kallirhoe meet at a festival of Aphrodite; 3.2.15, the wedding of Kallirhoe and Dionysius becomes a public festival—an inversion of the normal pattern; and 6.2.3-4, the Persian king decrees a festival to avoid making a decision in the court case between Chaereas and Dionysius—again a perversion of the convention). There are no true public festivals in Longus (2.31, a sacrifice to Pan; 3.10, a sacrifice to Dionysus; 4.37.2, the wedding festival is attended by the Nymphs) and the motif is parodied in Ach. Tat. (2.15, the sacrifice in honour of Herakles; 4.18.3, Kleitophon's irreverent anecdote on drinking the water of the Nile during a festival to the river; 5.2, the torchlight procession during the festival of Serapis—no love encounter; 6.3.2, the festival of Artemis—a problem for the lovers because of the drunks roving the agora all night long). Cf. Kerényi (1962², 55 n. 48).

The procession that Heliodorus describes in book 3 took place during the four-yearly Pythian Games, when a mission of the Thessalian Ainianes came to Delphi to sacrifice to the spirit of Neoptolemus, the son of Achilles (2.34.3). The celebration was probably held on the first day of the festival (Fontenrose 1988, 127). Although the rise of the holy men in late antiquity was providing a serious challenge to the authority of the great games, they retained some of their importance: for example, in the third century Olympian Games were established in Alexandria, Capitoline Games in Oxyrynchus and Pythian Games in Panopolis (Lane Fox 1986, 572-585; Brown 1971b, 150).

The sacrifice to Neoptolemus was held in Delphi, because, according to legend, he had been killed in Delphi by Apollo in revenge for the murder of Priam at Troy (*Paean* 6.98-120 [Bowra]; cf. Paus. 4.17.4 [the murder took place at the altar of Apollo and became a proverbial case of poetic justice]). The details of this story vary: some say that the hero was killed by the priest of Apollo (Paus. 10.24.4) at the command of the Pythian priestess (Paus. 1.14.1) while intervening in a quarrel over sacrificial meats during his visit to Delphi to dedicate the spoils of the Trojan War (*Nem.* 7.34-47 [Bowra]). This version is very similar to that of the death of Aesop at Delphi (Wiechers 1961).

Pausanias attributes the annual sacrifice to Neoptolemus (10.24.5) to the gratitude of the people of Delphi for the help that Neoptolemus gave them in repulsing the forces of the Gauls under Brennus in 279/8 B.C. despite the fact that he was an enemy of theirs (1.4.4; 10.23.3). However, this cannot be correct since Pausanias himself acknowledges

that the tomb was there earlier than the third century B.C., and describes the fifth century painting by Polygnotus depicting Neoptolemus' part in the destruction of Troy, which he saw above the tomb of the hero (10.25). The story of Neoptolemus' part in the defence of Delphi was probably invented to explain the persistence of the cult of Neoptolemus in Delphi, which had existed there since Mycenaean times (Woodbury 1979, 98), despite the hostility towards the hero shown in Pindar's account of his death. The remains of the rectangular Mycenaean enclosure with a tomb outside it can still be identified at the site (Defradas [1954, 147]). The Pythian Games may, in fact, have originated in the funeral games held in honour of Neoptolemus (cf. the discussion of ἐναγισμός below) just as the Panathenaic Games in Athens began as funeral games of the great families (Kyle 1987). See also Catherine Morgan (1990, 208-209), who does not mention Neoptolemus; Yiannakis (1990, 23-30); Delcourt (1981, 151-52 [on the association between the name Pyrrhus and the fire cult]); and Parke and Wormell (1966, 1.315-318).

The persistence of the worship of Neoptolemus at Delphi may be better explained by the fact that the people of Delphi were grateful to the Thessalians for establishing the oracle as the most significant religious centre in Greece during the First Sacred War in the seventh century BC (Woodbury 1979, 101, 108). As a result of this, an oracle ordained that one of his line should inhabit the grove, preside over the festival and safeguard the laws of hospitality (*Nem.* 7.44-48; Strabo 9.3.9). Thessaly had been closely connected with the oracle of Delphi from early times and sculptures of six generations of a Thessalian family survive at the site and are known as the Daochos group (Fontenrose 1988: 131 and n. 31). While the progenitors represented by the nine statues went back as far as the sixth century B.C., the whole group was an offering of the Thessalian Daochos II from Pharsalus, dedicated around 335 B.C. Only six statues are now extant. Catherine Morgan (1990, 141-142) remarks on the relative lack of Thessalian monumental dedications at Delphi but concludes that 'one should not underestimate the significance of Thessalian participation throughout the life of the sanctuary' (p. 142).

The Thessalian Ainianes would have played an important role in upholding the oracle concerning Neoptolemus. They are mentioned in the catalogue of ships in the *Iliad* (2.749-750) as a people who lived around Dodona and may have formed part of the original Hellenes of this area. Homer also mentions that Achilles' home was Phthia in Thessaly (*Il.* 1.155: cf. *Hld.* 2.34.2) and Thucydides (1.3.3) calls the people of Phthiotis the 'first Hellenes'. Aristotle (*Met.* 352a33) identified 'ancient Hellas' with Dodona in Epirus, the region adjacent to Thessaly. Woodbury (p. 128) therefore finds it reasonable to 'lend

credence to the report, though we find it in a romance of the third Christian century' (i.e. in the *Ethiopian Story*), that the Ainianes claimed to be the first Hellenes, that their land was Phthia, that Achilles was one of their own and that all Thessalians acknowledged that they (the Ainianes) were most closely related to Neoptolemus. The position of the Ainianes on the Amphictyonic council was considerably weakened during the Roman Empire (Paus. 10.8.2-5; Pouilloux 1983: 271) and Heliodorus' references to this tribe therefore appear to derive from a desire to include archaic detail. Strabo (9.5.22) and Plutarch (207C) provide further incidental information about the tribe.

Euripides (*Andromache* 994-1008; 1070-1165; *Orestes* 1653-1659) gives a different account of Neoptolemus' death from Pindar. According to this version, Orestes was aggrieved that Menelaus had given his daughter, Hermione, in marriage to Neoptolemus rather than to himself as had been previously agreed, and murdered his rival. The story has overtones of ritual murder and human sacrifice (Henrichs 1981, 214). Heliodorus is clearly following Euripides' account of Neoptolemus' death since he mentions Orestes (2.34.3), but he omits the motive for the murder and does not exploit the romantic context of the incident. Heliodorus' inspiration, however, may also have been Philostratus' account of the Thessalian ἐναγίσματα to Achilles at Troy (*Her.* 741 [Olearius]), which fourteen envoys performed in accordance to an oracle from Dodona (see following note).

The reference to the legend has the effect of strengthening the associations Theagenes and Achilles (cf. 3.3.4; 3.3.5 below, and the notes on these passages). This link is maintained throughout the romance; Theagenes' feat of wrestling a runaway bull to the ground, which Heliodorus describes in book 10.30, is in keeping with his Thessalian origins, since bull-wrestling was a custom of the region (Robert 1982, 151-162). However, there is no need to think that this lends additional credence to the story that Heliodorus later became a bishop of Triikka in Thessaly (Morgan 1979, *ad loc.*).

ὁ σύμπας ἐναγισμὸς ἐτελέσθη: ἐναγισμὸς is defined by Hesychius as follows, <ἐναγίζειν>· τὸ χοῶς ἐπιφέρειν, ἢ θύειν τοῖς κατοικομένοις ἢ διὰ πυρὸς δαπανᾶν ἢ φονεύειν. <Ἄγος> γὰρ τὸ μίασμα. <ἐναγίσματα>· ὀλοκαυτώματα (Hsch. *ad loc.*). Burkert (1983, 9 n. 41) draws the primary distinction between ἐναγίζειν (for Chthonian heroes and the dead) and θύειν (for the Olympian gods). Examples of ἐναγισμοί are: the gymnastic and equestrian funeral games instituted by the people of Agylla on behalf of the Phocaeans who had been stoned to death by the Carthaginians and Etruscans (Hdt. 1.167.9-17); Alexander's 'sacrifice' of the entire people of Cossa (including the young) to assuage his grief for the dead Hephaestion (Plut. *Alex.* 72.4.1-4); and the purification of Delphi by the emperor Julian in

362 (Amm. Marc. 22.12.8).

Heliodorus' model was probably Philostratus, who dwells particularly on the ἐναγίσματα that were instituted in honour of Achilles by the Thessalians in his *Heroicus* (e.g., 739 [the Thessalians sang hymns to Achilles during the annual ἐναγίσματα in his honour]; 741 [the annual rite in memory of Achilles was instituted as a result of an oracle from Dodona that required those Thessalians who had sailed to Troy to sacrifice to Achilles as if he were both a hero and a god]; 742 [during Alexander's invasion of Persia the Thessalians maintained their customary ἐναγισμός to Achilles]; 743 [Alexander spared Phthia because of their commemoration of Achilles despite Achilles' anger at the Thessalians for their reduction of the scale of the ἐναγίσματα]; 744 [the vow of Achilles to send something from Thetis against the Thessalians]; 745 [the destruction of the Thessalians by Achilles and Thetis]). It seems clear that Heliodorus was aware of the cult of Achilles in the *Heroicus* and that his account of the ἐναγισμός of Neoptolemus owes much to Philostratus' description of the ritual commemoration of Achilles in Thessaly. There are further resemblances between the *Heroicus* and the *Ethiopian Story*: for example, both involve the sacrifice of a young princess in a remote country. Of course, there is also a close relationship between Heliodorus' romance and the *Life of Apollonius* of Philostratus (Anderson 1986: 241-257, 276, 289 n. 3); and Philostratus generally (Phillimore 1912, 106; *contra* Feuillâtre 1966, 128-132).

Heliodorus' reference to the ἐναγισμός indicates that he wished to emphasise that Theagenes observes the rites in honour of his country's ancestors, Neoptolemus and Achilles, whose ἐναγίσματα feature so prominently in the *Heroicus*. In this way the ties between Theagenes and Achilles (see below) are strengthened. The word also carries the connotation of purification which is important for the spiritual character of the love of the two young people (cf. θεωρός, 3.1.2 below, and note). The fact that such ceremonies featured sacrifices which are finally abolished at the conclusion of the romance, is nevertheless inconsistent, at least with the views of Kalasiris and Sisimithres (cf. 3.1.3 below, and note).

«Καὶ μὴν οὐκ ἐτελέσθη πάτερ» ὑπολαβὼν ὁ Κνήμων: This is not the first time that Knemon has interrupted the narrative (see 2.24.4) nor will it be the last (5.16.3). Various interpretations of these interruptions have been put forward:

(1) Paulsen (1992, 25; Woronoff 1987, 34)—Knemon here acts as proxy to the readers of the novel and gives expression to their reactions to the narrative. It is clear, though, that Knemon's reactions are in keeping with his impulsive nature, which is also evident in his

overzealous desire to trap his stepmother in adultery (1.12.2), his overreaction on hearing the name of Thisbe unexpectedly at the house of Nausikles (5.2.4), and his precipitate marriage to Nausikleia (6.8.2). Knemon is therefore not merely the porte-parole of the reader here.

(2) Morgan (1991, 97)—Knemon's interruptions often hold the reader up by introducing irrelevancies (cf. also 3.12.1; 3.14.1 below, and notes) and thus increase tension in the narrative. However, at 2.24.4 Knemon actually brings Kalasiris back to the main narrative and the ancient reader would no doubt have delighted in the exuberant rhetorical descriptions (3.4.2 below and note), digressions (see 5 [Hefti] below; 3.14.1 below and note) and story-telling (see comments on 4 [Winkler] below) that Knemon insists on.

(3) Futre Pinheiro (1991b, 70) and Romberg (1962, 33)—the interplay between a narrator, a listener and a spatio-temporal setting constitutes an 'oral-epic situation' or '*Rahmen-situation*' (narrative 'frame'); Knemon's interruptions make the narrative revert to this 'frame' (for similar reversions, cf. 2.32.3; 3.2.3; 3.33.8; 2.35.5; 3.5.4; 3.5.7). This theoretical statement of the facts does not explain why Knemon interrupts the narrative so often in book 3.

(4) Winkler (1982, 142)—Knemon's impulsiveness also makes him a gullible audience from whom a discerning reader would distance himself, since he is taken in by Kalasiris' pretence of passing over the central event of the procession—the encounter between Theagenes and Charikleia. Knemon's outburst certainly shows the delight he has in listening to stories (see also 1.14.4; 2.23.4; 2.24.4; 5.1.4; Dubel [1990] 102)—a feeling shared by others in the romance (e.g. Theagenes and Charikleia, 1.9.1). Indeed the enjoyment of storytelling pervades the entire work: cf. also 4.4.3 below, and note; Fusillo (1988, 27). Nevertheless, Knemon is not an uncritical audience: at times he is capable of irony (cf. 3.12.3 below and note), has an enquiring mind (3.14.1) and is capable of forming his own judgement (3.15.1). Note also that Theagenes plays a similar role as interlocutor earlier (1.14.2).

(5) Hefti (1950, 44-45)—Knemon's insistence on detail is a crafty ('schlau', p. 45) device by Heliodorus that enabled him to indulge fully in rhetorical set pieces. However, Morgan (1991, 97) notes that other audiences besides Knemon ask the learned and wise Kalasiris to expand on points of interest (e.g., 2.28.1, the Nile floods), that Kalasiris provokes his audience into demanding expansions of the narrative and that Heliodorus' own asides parallel the excursuses of the Egyptian priests. Kalasiris also launches into a long explanation of the 'eye of envy' without much solicitation at all from his audience (3.7.2).

Moreover, the description of the festival does further the action, because Theagenes and Charikleia meet during the ceremony.

The views discussed above do not adequately reflect the dramatic character of Knemon's interruptions. The interchange between Knemon and Kalasiris here may also owe something to the literary influence of the Platonic dialogue which Arieti (1991, 3) suggests had a close affinity to drama. Book 3 contains many allusions to Plato (cf., e.g., 3.1.1, ὡς περ κατόπιν ἑορτῆς ἦκοντα, below, and note) and Morgan (1991, 98) notes the similarity between Platonic dialogue and the interchange between audience and narrator in fiction. No doubt Knemon's interruptions have a number of simultaneous literary effects: the reader is drawn into the story, tension is increased, space is found for descriptive digressions, and dramatic dialogue makes it possible for Heliodorus to deploy irony and subtlety to his narrative.

ὁ Κνήμων: The name Knemon is not common. It occurs as the name of a character in Menander's *Dyskolos*; in Lucian's *Dialogi Mortuorum* (18); and as a correspondent in Aelian's Ἀγροικικὰ Ἐπιστολαί (13, 14, and 15). Cf. Bowie (1995, 270-272). Knemon himself tells his story as a tragedy in books 1 & 2, as can be inferred from the reference to the *Hippolytus* of Euripides (1.10.1) but the other characters and the reader are meant to view him as a clown. There is certainly a playful dig at Knemon in the pun on his name (3.12.2). Knemon's panic at what he thought was the ghost of Thisbe, for example, cannot be taken as anything other than comic (5.3). Cf. Paulsen (1992, 82-141); Levin (1992, 501); Futre Pinheiro (1991, 73); Anderson (1982, 36); Sandy (1982a, 56-7), 'a kind of Sancho Panza' (p. 56).

πάτερ: this was also the title used by Lucius for the priest of Isis (*parentem*, Apul. *Met.* 11.25; Merkelbach 1962, 238) and Kalasiris certainly plays the part of a spiritual father to Theagenes, Charikleia and (to a lesser extent) Knemon (cf. 4.2.2; 4.5.6 below, and notes). However, from Homer to the 3rd century AD this word was used as a respectful way of addressing an elder person (*Od.* 7.28 ξεῖνε πάτερ [Athena as a little girl to Odysseus]; *POxy.* 1296.15 [3rd c. AD]; LSJ III) and no special significance should be attached to it here.

οὐπω θεατὴν ὁ σὸς ἐπέστησε λόγος: Heliodorus makes much use of theatre imagery (see Paulsen 1992 *passim*; Bartsch 1989, 110, 131; Walden 1895, 1-43; Neimke 1889, 1-11). The characters in the romance often mention their role as spectators (2.11.1; 3.2.3; 4.3.4; 6.14.5; 8.9.21) and, occasionally, as actors in the drama of Fate (cf., e.g., 7.8.2). The prevalence of theatre metaphors has been attributed to the need for a mystic atmosphere

(Merkelbach 1962, 242 n. 2), a desire to increase the grandeur of the narrative (Wolff 1912, 181-191), and to the author's attention to detail (Feuillâtre 1966, 23) but these views do not take account of the fact that Heliodorus prefers to dramatise rather than simply relate his narrative or that drama is used in a meta-literary way to refer to the script of the romance that destiny directs (cf., e.g., 7.8.2; Paulsen 1992 *passim*). The dramatic character of Heliodorus' romance was very influential in the Renaissance; the story was turned into a play *Los hijos de la fortuna* (*Children of Fortune*) by the Spanish playwright Pedro Calderón de la Barca (1600-1681) and was much admired by Miguel de Cervantes (1547-1616), William Shakespeare (1564-1616), and Jean Baptiste Racine (1639-1699). On these authors see respectively Rallo Grus (1983, 561-577); Cascardi (1991, 279-293), Stump (1983, 211-246); and Collinet (1988, 399-415).

Knemon's statement here implies that Kalasiris should make use of the rhetorical techniques of ἐνάργεια and φαντασία in his description, as the textbooks prescribed (ἐνάργεια, Demetr. *Eloc.* 209-220; Dion. Hal. *Lysias* 7; Theon *Progymn.* p. 119 l. 38, ἀρεταὶ δὲ ἐκφράσεως αἶδε, σαφήνεια μὲν μάλιστα καὶ ἐνάργεια τοῦ σχεδὸν ὀρᾶσθαι τὰ ἀπαγγελλόμενα; Apsines *Ars Rhetorica* p. 398 l. 11; φαντασία, Longinus *Subl.* 15.1; cf. Walker [1993b, 353-377]; Watson [1988] *passim*; [1994, 4765-4810]). Knemon may be referring specifically to Plutarch's account of the graphic nature of Thucydides's style (οἷον θεατὴν ποιῆσαι τὸν ἀκροατὴν, *Mor.* 347a). Earlier Knemon judged that Kalasiris' description of Delphi was detailed and accurate (2.26.3) and later he exclaimed that the old priest's word-picture of Theagenes and Charikleia was so lifelike that he thought he could actually see them (3.4.7 below, and note).

ἠττημένον τῆς ἀκροάσεως: cf. the words of Cleon, attacking the Athenian passion for listening to speeches (Thuc. 3.38, ἀπλῶς τε ἀκοῆς ἡδονῇ ἡσώμενοι). The phrase is modelled on expressions such as πικροῦ δ' ἔρωτος ἡσσηθήσομαι (Eur. *Hipp.* 727) and means 'to be enslaved by' (cf. 3.1.2 below and note).

αὐτοπτῆσαι σπεύδοντα: these words lend a sense of immediacy and excitement to the narrative. Αὐτοπτῆσαι is a non-Attic verb, though not coined by Heliodorus as Naber (1873, 155) suggests. Cf. LSJ *s.v.* αὐτοπτέω.

ὥσπερ κατόπιν ἐορτῆς ἤκοντα, τὸ τοῦ λόγου: the expression was proverbial: cf. Plato *Gorg.* 447a3, 'Ἄλλ' ἢ, τὸ λεγόμενον, κατόπιν ἐορτῆς ἤκομεν καὶ ὑστεροῦμεν; cf. Makarios 3.98 (Leutsch & Schneidewin), 'Εορτῆς κατόπιν ἡδύσματα φέρων, ἐπὶ τῶν τινος ὑστεριζόντων. Heliodorus made much use of proverbs: cf., e.g., 1.15.8, 2.24.4, 3.1.1, 3.6.2, 3.10.1, 3.10.2, 4.8.6, 4.19.3, 5.19.1, 7.10.5.

τὴν πανήγυριν: the word means ‘national festival’ (Xen. *Hell.* 7.4.28). Πανηγύρεις are listed by Nicolaus as a possible subject for *ekphrasis* (3.492 [Spengel]). Similarly, ἑορταί are listed as χρόνοι (‘periods of time’) suitable for description by Hermogenes and Theon (2.16, 118 [Spengel]). *Ekphrasis* has been much studied recently: cf., e.g., Aygon (1994, 41-56 [typology]); Fowler (1991, 25-35 [theoretical discussion of description versus narrative]); Bartsch (1989, 3-39, esp. 12 and note 12, 31 n. 32, 109-10 [on the different categories of *ekphrasis* in the *Ethiopian Story*]). Homer provides the model for descriptions of works of art in his account of the shield made for Achilles by Hephaistos (Hom. *Il.* 18.478-607), which has most recently been discussed by Simon (1995, 123-142), Becker (1995), Stanley (1993), but later Greek rhetoricians broadened the term considerably: Ἐκφρασις ἐστὶ λόγος περιηγηματικὸς ἐναργῶς ὑπ’ ὄψιν ἄγων τὸ δηλούμενον. γίνεται δὲ ἔκφρασις προσώπων τε καὶ πραγμάτων καὶ τόπων καὶ χρόνων (Theon *Prog.* 118.7; cf. Hermog. *Prog.* 10.3). Hermogenes notes that descriptions add solemnity to style (Hermog. *Id.* p. 244 [Rabe]). Heliodorus uses the technique in moderation as Lucian (*Hist. Conscr.* 57) advised (cf. Wolff [1912, 177]; Hefti [1950, 127-129]) but the restraint of Heliodorus should not be exaggerated; there is an elaborate description of a giraffe in book 10.27 and, as Bartsch notes, the description of the festival is ‘unrivalled for sheer length and detail’ (1989, 12)—the descriptions of Theagenes and Charikleia are particularly careful and detailed. Moreover, the bedroom scene (4.8) and the beach scene (5.26, 1.1) have been used in a number of later paintings (Stechow 1953, 144-152; Wolff 1912, 186-187; cf. Oeftering 1901, 167 and Dunlop 1876, 1.36 for the statement that Raphael painted the meeting between Heliodorus’ hero and heroine and other scenes in the *Ethiopian Story*).

ὁμοῦ τε ἀνοίξας καὶ λύσας τὸ θέατρον: For theatre imagery in the novel generally, see 3.1.1 above and note; other significant usages of θέατρον in Heliodorus can be found at 1.1.6, 4.1.2, 4.19.5, 4.21.2, 5.14.3, 7.6.4, and 9.5.3. The theatrical imagery is particularly appropriate to Delphi, since Strabo described the rocky ridge on which the oracle and city were sited as θεατροειδές ‘theatrical’ (Strabo 9.3.3).

RL restore λύσας (mAT) for κλείσας (M, edd.) which was clearly introduced as the antonym of ἀνοίξας, but λύω is the standard term for dissolving an assembly (LSJ⁹ s.v. λύω II) and is similarly used of the theatre: cf., e.g., John Chrysostom: μετὰ . . . τὸ λυθῆναι τὸ θέατρον, Vol. 48 p. 771 ln. 19; τοῦ θεάτρου λυθέντος, Vol. 48 p. 986 ln. 53; ἐπειδὴν . . . λυθῆ τὸ θέατρον, Vol. 48 p. 1035 ln. 11, 23, 35. Similarly, ἀνοίγνυμι is the standard term for ‘opening’ the theatre (or gymnasium: cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. ἀνοίγνυμι): e.g., ταχὺ δὲ τῶν πυλῶν

ἀνοιχθεισῶν, εἰσελθόντες οἱ δισχίλιοι κατελάβοντο τὴν τοῦ θεάτρου στεφάνην, Polybius 7.18.4; Ἀφροδίτη μὲν γὰρ κοινωνήσας θεάτρά τε ἀνοίγνυσι καὶ συμποσίων καὶ θιάσων ἔξαρχος γίγνεται, Aristides Dionysos 30.17; Ἀνοίγει ποτὲ καὶ θεάτρα φωνῆς χελιδῶν μετὰ χειμῶνα, Himerius Or. 45.2 (metaphorical); Ἀνοίγειν, ᾧ παῖδες, ὥρα τὸ θέατρον, Himerius Or. 69.2. The act of opening may refer specifically to gates leading into the theatre (see the passage of Polybius above) or to the use of curtains, which were lowered at the beginning of the performance and raised at the end. The stage curtain (*aulaeum*) may have been introduced from the court of Attalus of Pergamum in 133 B.C. (Donatus *De Com.* 12.3); Cicero certainly refers to the raising of a curtain at the end of a mime in 58 B.C. (*Pro Cael.* 65). Stage curtains may have been introduced either because mimes did not signal their endings or because of the introduction of painted scenery in 99 B.C. (Val. Max. 2.4). The curtain was later dropped at the end of a performance as in modern theatres (Amm. Marcell. 16.6.3; 28.6.29)—Knemon’s terminology (λύσας) implies the latter (Beare 1968, 267-274). The practice was common in the later Roman Empire and is attested at Syracuse, Fiesole, Arles, Lyon, Vaison, Orange, Timgad, Dugga and Athens (Bieber 1961: 179-180, 203-206 and figs. 324, 656, 671, 673, 676, 687, 719, 724, 831).

3.1.2 ὁ Καλάσιρις: the name Kalasiris refers to the long linen gowns with tassels which Egyptians wore (Ἐνδεδύκασι δὲ κιθῶνας λινέους περὶ τὰ σκέλεα θυσανωτούς, τοὺς καλέουσι καλασίρις, Hdt. 2.81; Cratinus fr. 30; Philostratus *Imag.* 2.31.1). Lucius wore such a linen garment after his initiation (Apul. *Met.* 11.14.5, *linTEAM . . . laciniAM*). The word is also found as the name of a kind of Egyptian soldier (Hdt. 2.164, Οἱ δὲ μάχιμοι αὐτῶν καλέονται μὲν Καλασίριες); a region of Egypt (Steph. Byz. ad Καλάσιρις, μοῖρα Αἰγύπτου); and a personal name (Herodian *Part.* p. 183 l. 8).

Heliodorus probably chose the name because of its association with Egyptian religion. Kalasiris is in this respect similar to the original holy men, such as Pythagoras, who derived their wisdom, according to Ammianus Marcellinus, from Egypt (22.16.17-22). A parallel case is that of the priest Paapis in Antonius Diogenes’ *Wonders Beyond Thule*, who was driven away from Egypt to Tyre where he caused much harm to Dercyllis and her family (109a). This parallel is strengthened by Photius’ observation (*Bib.* 166.111b.34 [Bekker]) that the work of Diogenes was the root and source of the story of the adventures of Theagenes and Charikleia, the *Onos* of Lucius, and the *True History* of Lucian (for qualifications of this strong statement, see Jones 1986, 53-54; Stephens & Winkler 1995, 109-110). Heliodorus’ Egyptian priest has also been linked by Kerényi (1962², 253-154 and n. 123) to the famous Egyptian king Nektanebo who seduced the mother of Alexander,

Olympias, in the *Alexander Romance* (Sandy 1982b: 147, 151-153) and who features in a 2nd century B.C. Egyptian papyrus translated into Greek, the *Dream of Nektanebo* (Tait 1994, 214), although this tale is political rather than religious in character (Stephens & Winkler 1995, 15). Nevertheless, Kalasiris is clearly portrayed as a repository of Egyptian wisdom in his discussion of the cause of the flooding of the Nile (2.28; cf. Hdt. 2.19-27) and in his argument that Homer was an Egyptian (3.14 below, and note). Heliodorus' own interest in Egypt is apparent in his account of the *Neiloa* (9.9), where he speaks in his own voice.

The character of Kalasiris should therefore be seen as a specifically Egyptian wise man and more generally as one of the ubiquitous holy men of antiquity, such as Apollonius of Tyana, Peregrinus Proteus, Alexander of Abonouteichos, Apuleius of Madaura, and Maximus of Ephesus. See Ronnet (1995, 66)—both Apollonius and Kalasiris have long hair like priests (2.21; 7.7; cf. VA 1.8); Futre Pinheiro (1991b, 77); Brown (1971b, 80-101); Merkelbach (1962, 242 n. 4); Goethals (1959, 292); Rohde (1914³, 438 [410]). At times, Kalasiris is a self-confessed charlatan (3.17) rather than a miracle-worker like Apollonius (cf., e.g., VA 6.3) and the three priests in the *Ethiopian Story*, Charikles, Kalasiris, Sisimithres, can be ranked in degree of holiness, with Kalasiris holding the middle position (Szepessy 1957, 252-253). Consequently, the allegorical interpretation of the romance by Philip (ll. 109-119; Tarán 1992, 225) must be judged to be a distortion. According to this treatise, the name Kalasiris is derived from the phrase ὁ πρὸς τὰ καλὰ σώρων ('he who leads to beauty'), since the Egyptian priest is the one who leads the soul, Charikleia, over the salt sea (which represents matter) to divine knowledge despite the opposition of strife (the pirate Trachinos). But although Kalasiris has a sincere respect for the higher forms of religion (cf. 3.16.3 and note) and is a complex mixture of deceit and religiosity (Sandy 1982a 65-74; 1982b, 142-154; Winkler 1982, *passim*) he certainly is not the 'true hero' of the story (Anderson 1993a, 185)—after all, he only participates in about half of the action (2.21-7.11) and Charikleia is obviously the main focus of interest. It is, moreover, vital to see that Kalasiris is given his own, limited story within the larger and more significant narrative. Failure to recognise the autonomy of his part in the drama is the cause of much critical confusion over his motives (cf. 4.13.1 below, and note).

καὶ τοιούτοις: Hemsterhuys suggests καὶ τούτοις ('and with matters like this') since Kalasiris has already departed from the main narrative to describe the procession, but RL point out that καί here means 'even' ('I do not at all want to trouble you with matters that are irrelevant even to subjects of this kind'). Heliodorus does occasionally use τοιοῦτος to

mean ‘something like this’ or ‘events of this kind’ in a loosely additive sense as here: cf., e.g., γίνεται τι τοιοῦτον, 1.10.1, 4.1.1; κέρδος δὲ ὡς ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις, 2.24.7; καὶ ἄλλων δὴ τοιούτων, 2.23.5, and while the expression καὶ τοιούτοις is vague, it is in keeping with the relaxed banter between Kalasiris and Knemon at this point.

τὰ καιριώτερα . . . τῆς ἀφηγήσεως: = ‘the essential facts of my story’. Kalasiris’ comment here should be read together with his earlier declaration that he wanted to present his story in a logical order, including essential information about what has gone before (2.24.5; 2.26.1) and his later statement that he will give only necessary information (3.10.3). These passages suggest an awareness of a theory of narrative. However, Hefti (1950, 45) rejected the idea that Heliodorus was putting forward ‘eine rhetorische Romantheorie’ in passages of this kind, on the grounds that they lack sufficient literary terminology. The only literary term in the present passage is ἀφηγήσις—it is also used by Herodotus (2.70; 3.125) and Dionysius of Halicarnassos (2.7), among others, for a historical account of events, although it is less common than διηγήσις (cf., e.g., Aelius Theon *Progymnasmata* p. 78 l. 22; Ach. Tat. 8.4.4). Achilles Tatius also uses the term δράμα (1.9.1) and the final sentence of the *Ethiopian Story* describes the work as a σύνταγμα (10.41.4). The present passage is hardly a theoretical discussion of the importance of plausible and coherent narrative—the contrast between Kalasiris as a careful and precise narrator and Knemon as an impulsive and petulant audience is of greater significance (Winkler 1982, 145). There may be some irony for the reader in Kalasiris’ words here, since Heliodorus frequently diverges from his narrative to include symbolic description and paradoxographical discussions in his work.

ὧν ἐπεζητήεις: for Knemon’s requests to Kalasiris to relate his history, cf. 2.21.5; 2.22.5; 2.24.4.

ἐκ παρόδου θεωρός: cf. 3.6.2 below, and note. The translations of this phrase ‘a casual spectator’ (Lamb 1961); ‘a ringside spectator’ (Hadas 1957); ‘your interest in incidental spectacle’ (Morgan 1989c), all suggest a secular meaning for θεωρός. The *Suda* attests this reading of the phrase (*ad* Νικόλαος: . . . ὅπου δ’ ἐναριστῶν, ὅπου δὲ πλείους ἐνδημεῖν ἡμέρας, ἐνίους δὲ τόπους ἐκ παρόδου θεωρεῖν . . .). Cf. also 3.6.2 below, where ἐκ παρόδου (‘in passing’) is described as a proverb for casual acquaintance. Yet Hesychius (*ad loc.*) notes the religious meaning ‘envoy to an oracle’ θεωροῦς δὲ ἐκάλουν τοὺς τοῖς θεοῖς τὰς ἀπαρχὰς ἀπάγοντας, and the *Suda* provides a parallel case of a certain Amuris, sent to Delphi as an envoy (*ad* Ἄμυρις: . . . θεωρὸς γὰρ ὑπὸ Συβαριτῶν πεμφθεὶς εἰς Δελφούς). Furthermore, Heliodorus normally reserves the word for solemn, quasi-religious situations

(6.14.2; 6.15.4, Charikleia is a witness of the necromancy of the witch of Bessa; 8.9.10, Arsakes witnesses the execution of Charikleia from the walls of Memphis; 9.20.2, Hydaspes witnesses the battle between the Ethiopian and Persian armies; 10.4.5, Charikleia is present not as a witness of the sacrifice to Helios and Selene but as the victim). By way of contrast θεατής simply means ‘spectator’ in Heliodorus (2.11.1; 3.1.1; 3.2.3; 6.14.5; 4.3.4; 8.9.21). Kalasiris’ choice of θεωρός therefore stands in contrast to Knemon’s θεατήν (3.1.1). This usage is more appropriate to the context of the sacrifice to the spirit of Neoptolemus (ἡ θεωρία 2.34.3). Philostratus refers to the delegation sent to Troy from Thessaly to honour of Achilles as θεωρούς (*Her.* 741). θεωρός may also refer proleptically to the story of the love of Theagenes and Charikleia, which Kalasiris is about to relate. Thus Knemon, and through him, the reader, are invited to experience vicariously the spiritual significance of the meeting of Theagenes and Charikleia. This, at least, is the interpretation of Philip, who views the *Ethiopian Story* as ‘the wine of contemplation’ (τὸν οἶνον τῆς θεωρίας, l. 38), which teaches the reader philosophical truths allegorically (Tarán 1992, 216).

Ἄττικὸς ὄν: cf. 2.27.3 for the fascination stories about Egypt held for the Greeks at Delphi. These words, like those of Kalasiris (3.15.1 below, and note) and Knemon (4.4.3 below, and note) may be taken to refer to Heliodorus’ own narrative (Sandy 1982a, 25). Heliodorus certainly does refer to his own narrative in a metaliterary way at times (cf. 4.8.1 and note) but in this instance the effect is more probably to emphasise Knemon’s voracious and uncritical appetite for stories.

The Athenian love of stories was well-known (cf. εἰώθατε θεαταὶ λόγων γίνεσθαι, Thuc. 3.38.4 [cf. 3.1.1 above and note]; Οἱ μὲν Ἄττικοὶ περίεργοι ταῖς λαλιαῖς, ὑπουλοὶ, συκοφαντάδεις, παρατηρηταὶ τῶν ξενικῶν βίων . . . Οἱ δὲ εἰλικρινεῖς Ἀθηναῖοι δριμεῖς τῶν τεχνῶν ἀκροαταὶ καὶ θεαταὶ συνεχεῖς, Dicaearchus fr. 59.4.2-4, 8-9 [Müller]; Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ πάντες καὶ οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες ξένοι εἰς οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἠδὲκαίρου ἢ λέγειν τι ἢ ἀκούειν τι καινότερον, *Acts* 17.21; «μόνοι γὰρ ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀκούετε τὴν πολυπραγμοσύνην τῶν Ἀθηναίων; δῆμός ἐστι λάλος καὶ φιλόδικος», Char. 1.1.6). This trait saved the lives of many soldiers after their capture at Syracuse in 413 BC (ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ δι’ Εὐριπίδην ἐσώθησαν, Plut. *Nic.* 29.2.5). The use of this kind of literary stereotype suggests that Heliodorus knew Athens only from books (Kowarna 1959, 75).

Knemon is consistently characterised as a young Athenian, of good family (cf. 1.9.1; 1.13.1; 2.7.3; 2.26.3; 6.2.3; 6.7.9). A number of details are added to the narrative to comply with this identity, even at the expense of chronology: 1.10.1 (Demainete is filled

with passion on seeing Knemon at the Panathenaic festival); 1.16.3 (Thisbe arranges to meet Aristippos at the monument to Epicurus—a well known anachronism in the work); 1.13.4 (the assembly proposes that Knemon be thrown into the pit of execution, near the Akropolis); 1.17.5 (Demainete commits suicide in the pit in the Akademia, where the polemarchs sacrifice to the Heroes: cf. *Ath. Const.* 58; Paus. 1.29.15). Thisbe likewise is Athenian (2.10.4; 2.24.1; 2.8.2) and Knemon refers to his life as an Athenian tragedy (2.11.2)—a striking instance of Heliodorus' metaliterary imagination.

τὴν πομπὴν ὀνομαστὴν ἐν ὀλίγαις γενομένην: 'a procession famous as few others are'. This phrase is potentially ambiguous (as the various translations show); it could refer to the procession as an institution or this particular enactment of it. The following expression (αὐτῆς τε ἕνεκεν καὶ τῶν ἐξ αὐτῆς ἀποβάντων) makes it clear that the latter interpretation is to be preferred.

αὐτῆς τε ἕνεκεν καὶ τῶν ἐξ αὐτῆς ἀποβάντων: Kalasiris justifies his digression to describe the procession on the grounds that it explains how Theagenes and Charikleia meet during the ceremony and thus advances the plot.

διαθήσομαι: Koraes (1804-1806 *ad loc.*) links this word with διαθέσεις 'graphic representations' (cf. *Ath.* 5.26.3-7 [Kaibel], ἐφαπτίδες . . . τινὲς μὲν εἰκόνας ἔχουσαι . . . αἱ δὲ μυθικὰς διαθέσεις; *Plut. Demetr.* 22.4.1-22.5.1, τὴν περὶ τὸν Ἰάλυσον διάθεσιν). Naber (1873, 334) suggests διηγῆσομαι for διαθήσομαι but this normalisation is unnecessary since Knemon had requested Kalasiris to give a graphic description of the procession (see 3.1.1 above and note).

Kalasiris resumes his description of the procession

3.1.3 Ἦγεῖτο μὲν ἑκατόμβη: ἡγεῖτο is the conventional word for describing a procession. Cf. Iamblichos *Bab. fr.* 1.8 (Stephens & Winkler 1995, 224), Ἦγοῦνται δ' ἱππεῖς σκηπτοῦχοι; *Xen. Cyr.* 8.3.16, ἡγεῖτο δ' αὐτῶν Χρυσάντας.

Philostratus (*Her.* 741.14 [Olearius]) talks of the sacrifice of a white bull to the dead Achilles as a god and a black bull to him as a hero, whereas Pindar (*Nem.* 7.47) mentions a mass of victims (πολυθύτοις). Heliodorus has followed the earlier tradition in order to make the ceremony more grandiose. The elaborate account of the sacrifice of these animals may owe something to Julian's attempt to revive blood sacrifice (*Amm. Marc.* 22.12.6 [362 AD]), which had been banned by Christian emperors, despite the debate on this question within neoPlatonic circles (Bradbury 1995, 331-356). However, the sacrifice of hecatombs is a Homeric idea (see 3.1.4 below and note) and Heliodorus is clearly using epic vocabulary in his description (see below on καλλιζῶνοί, for example).

τῶν τελουμένων ἀνδρῶν: Heliodorus uses the future middle τελουμένων here and the future passive (with passive sense) τελεσθησομένων at the conclusion of the novel, τῶν ἐπὶ τῷ γάμῳ μυστικωτέρων . . . τελεσθησομένων (10.41.3), although the future passive is normally used with middle sense (cf. Theophrast. *Char.* 16.11a).

ἀνδρῶν ἀγροικότερων βίον τε καὶ στολὴν ἐφελκομένων: Ἀγροικότερων is the emendation of Koraes (followed by RL) for ἀγροικότερον, which Colonna (1987b, 1938) retains with the codices. On the reading of Koraes, ἐφελκομένων is used absolutely (with the object ἑκατόμβην understood) and βίον τε καὶ στολὴν are accusatives of respect after ἀγροικότερων. The verb ἐφέλω is used in the required sense of leading animals (admittedly not without an expressed object) by Herodotus (ἵππον ἐπέλκουσαν, 5.12). This seems easier than taking ἐφελκομένων (middle used as active) in a metaphorical sense in this context, as ἀγροικότερον would require.

ζῶμα ἐκάστω χιτῶνα λευκόν: Colonna (1987b, 1938) reads ζῶμα on the strength of the codices and Ach. Tat. 3.21.2 (to which add 1.1.7; 5.3.6). The form ζῶμα is attested in the 5th-4th century BC as a medical term ('bandage') in Hippoc. *Art.* 14.41, and in Strabo 7.2.3. RL refer to 5.33.1, where the reading of the codices is ζῶματος, which is the more frequent and the more regular form: cf., e.g., Hom. *Il.* 4.187; Soph. *El.* 452; Long. 1.4.2. Hesychius uses both forms (for ζῶμα *s.v.* στέλλα) but ζῶμα more frequently (*s.v.* ζῶμα). Ζῶμα is also the form attested in the 2nd/3rd century (Clem. Al. *Paed.* 2.12 [124.2.5]) but in the fourth century ζῶμα is used: cf., e.g., Basil of Caesaria *Ep.* 2.6. In view of the uncertainty of the date of Heliodorus, there do not appear to be firm enough grounds to emend the text.

πέλεκυν δίστομον: this unusual expression seems to come from Euripides (*fr.* 530.5-6, πελέκεως δὲ δίστομον / γένυν ἔπαλλ' Ἀγκαῖος), particularly because of the use of the verb ἔπαλλ' which Heliodorus has replaced with ἐπεκράδαινεν (cf. the following note), but cf. Hsch. ἄξινη (Xen. *Cyr.* 6.2.34, used of a tree-felling axe) δίστομος πέλεκυς. The word πέλεκυς is used of a double-headed battle-axe in the Classical period (Hdt. 7.135) but in Homer (*Il.* 17.520, *Od.* 3.442) and in Minoan religion the double-headed axe was a sacrificial instrument and a cult object that symbolised the power to kill and was often used as a votive gift (Nilsson 1971, 194-235; Burkert 1985, 38). For the anthropological significance of the πέλεκυς in the ox-sacrifice at the Panathenaic festival: cf. Burkert (1983, 136-143). Here the word is used in the Homeric sense, since 3.5.2 suggests that the axes were used in the simultaneous slaughter of the holocaust.

ἐπεκράδαινεν 'wave about, flourish': an extremely rare word. Cf. ταῖς ἐλπίσιν ἐπικρα-

δαίνεσθαι (Greg. Nyss. *Contra Fatum* 50.21-2 [McDonough]); ἐνεργείας μεστός ὁ ἐπικραδαίνων τὸ δόρυ (*Schol. in Hom. ad Il.* 10.369). The scholiast refers to the line δουρὶ δ' ἐπαΐσσων προσέφη κρατερὸς Διομήδης showing that he glosses ἐπαΐσσων with ἐπικραδαίνων. Cf. Morgan (1979, at 10.31.6).

3.1.4 Οἱ βόες μέλανες πάντες: black victims were considered appropriate to a sacrifice to a dead hero, white to the gods (Philostr. *Her.* 741). Circe, for example, put a black ram and ewe on board Odysseus' ship as suitable victims with which to summon the dead, τόφρα δ' ἄρ' οἰχομένη Κίρκη παρὰ νηϊ μελαίνῃ / ἄρνειὸν κατέδησεν οἶν θῆλύν τε μέλαιναν (*Hom. Od.* 10.571-2). Plutarch provides evidence for the use of a black bull, Σμυρναῖοι τὸ παλαιὸν Αἰολεῖς ὄντες θύουσι Βουβρώστει ταῦρον μέλανα (*Quaest. Conv.* 694a11-b2 [Stephanus]). On the religious significance of black and white in Greek thought: cf. Radke (1936) *passim* (a work I have not seen). Here black victims are offered to the hero Neoptolemus.

τὸν αὐχένα σφριγῶντες: Longus uses σφριγῶντες of the sexually frustrated lovers, Daphnis and Chloe, οἱ δέ, νέοι καὶ σφριγῶντες καὶ πολλὸν ἤδη χρόνον ἔρωτα ζητοῦντες, ἐξεκάνοντο πρὸς τὰ ἀκούσματα (3.13.3) and σφριγῶντα for Daphnis' erection in the episode in which he is seduced by Lykainion (3.18.4). The word is chiefly used as a present participle and often in an adjectival sense collocating with νέος (cf., e.g., E. *Andr.* 196, Long. 3.13.3, Plut. *Mor.* 734e4). The word generally connotes youthful vigour: cf. Plato *Leg.* 840b2; Arist. *Clouds* 799; Philostr. *Gym.* 58.13: *Suda* (s.v. Σφριγῶν) νεάζων, αὐξων, σφύζων, βράζων, εὐσωματῶν, ἀκμάζων, ἀνθῶν. ὡς δ' εὐχροεῖς, ὡς δὲ σφριγᾶ τὸ σῶμά σου, κἄν ταῦρον ἄγχοις. The description of the oxen is generally reminiscent of Achilles Tatius, τὸ μὲν γὰρ μέγεθος πάνυ μέγας, τὸν αὐχένα παχύς, τὸν νῶτον πλατύς, τὴν γαστέρα πολὺς (2.15.3); βαδίζει δὲ ταῦρος ὑψαυχενῶν καὶ ὥσπερ ἐπιδεικνύμενος ὅτι τῶν ἄλλων βοῶν ἐστὶ βασιλεύς (2.15.4). Koraes accuses Heliodorus of juvenile sophistry here but the description lends an atmosphere of animal vitality to the scene which is entirely in keeping with the sensuality of the encounter between Theagenes and Charikleia.

The predominantly adjectival use of σφριγῶντες, as well as the close resemblance of this passage to Ach. Tat. 2.15.3 quoted above, suggest that αὐχένα here is an accusative of respect.

τὸ μὲν κέρασ ἀπέριττον καὶ ἀδιάστροφον ὀξύνοντες ὁ μὲν ἐπίχρυσον ὁ δὲ ἀνθινοῖς στεφάνοις διάπλοκον: Another Homeric touch (Feuillâtre 1966, 50). The gilding of the horns of cattle is attested to by Homer in Nestor's words to Athene (*Od.* 3.382-4):

‘σοὶ δ’ αὖ ἐγὼ ῥέξω βοῦν ἦνιν εὐρυμέτωπον,
ἀδμήτην, ἦν οὐ πω ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἦγαγεν ἀνήρ·

τήν τοι ἐγὼ ῥέξω χρυσὸν κέρασιν περιχεύας.’

‘Ο μὲν . . . ὁ δὲ . . . in the Heliodorus passage means ‘some . . . others . . .’ rather than ‘the one . . . the other . . .’ (as Hadas *ad loc.* translates).

Notice the use of polysyllabic words beginning with the alpha privative (cf. also ἄχραντον καὶ ἀκήρατον καὶ ἀδιάφθορον ὀνομάζουσα, 2.33.5) repeated in close proximity (ἀπέριπτον καὶ ἀδιάστροφον) and the repetition of the prefix δια. Complex vocabulary and a striving for rhyme are characteristic of Heliodorus’ prose.

σιμοὶ τὴν κνήμην: Herodotus describes the ponies of Sigynnae as σιμοί, (5.9.7-10). The word is properly used of the nose: cf. the evil horse in Plato’s charioteer simile (*Phaedr.* 253e1-5); the hippopotamus (Hdt. 2.71.4); dogs (Xen. Cyn. 4.1.2), and goats (Theocr. 8.50). Simos is a name given to satyrs on Greek vases and Sime is the name of a woman on a funerary plaque fragment by Exekias (Berlin F1814; *ABV* 146.22). Strabo mentions Simos as the name of a poet who invented a genre of erotic poetry, which was named after him, Σίμος ὁ μελοποιὸς παραφθείρας καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν τῶν προτέρων μελοποιῶν ἀγωγὴν καὶ τὴν σιμφδιαν εἰσαγαγὼν (14.1.41). A similar discussion is given in Ath. 14.620d-e. Morgan (1979, at 10.31.3) notes that Heliodorus also uses σιμός to describe how Theagenes flexes his shoulders before his bout with the Ethiopian giant. The phrase means ‘with stubby, muscular legs’ (κνήμη refers to the lower leg between knee and ankle: cf. LSJ *ad loc.*) but the words also add connotations of sexual exuberance to the scene which reinforce the erotic character of the encounter.

ὁ δὲ ἀριθμὸς ἀκριβῶς ἑκατόμβη καὶ εἰς ἀλήθειαν τὸ ὄνομα πληροῦντες: a ‘hecatomb’ meant ‘a sacrifice of a hundred cattle’ but the number, in fact, varied. Homer used the word readily and favoured the plural of this word, στήσα νέας καὶ ἔρεξα τεληέσσας ἑκατόμβας. (*Od.* 4.582), though the singular is also commonly found, e.g. ἐς Χρῦσῃν ἴκανεν ἄγων ἱερὴν ἑκατόμβην (*Il.* 1.431).

3.1.5 ἄλλων ἱερείων διάφορον πλῆθος: cf. 3.5.2 where cattle, lambs and goats are mentioned specifically. Heliodorus’ description is detailed only in part. Particular highlights are brought out against a broadly undifferentiated background. Cf. 3.10.3, where Heliodorus passes over the details of the banquet of Theagenes (*praeteritio*) but focuses on the melancholy disposition of the hero.

The procession of Thessalian maidens

3.2.1 καλλιζωνοὶ τινες καὶ βαθύζωνοι: cf. Homer *Il.* 7.139, ἄνδρες κίκλησκον καλλιζωνοὶ τε γυναῖκες; *Od.* 23.147, ἀνδρῶν παιζόντων καλλιζώνων τε γυναικῶν; *Il.* 9.594, τέκνα δὲ τ’ ἄλλοι ἄγουσι βαθυζώνους τε γυναῖκας; *Od.* 3.154, βαθυζώνους τε γυναῖκας. Heliodorus

combines the two words (which never occur together as a phrase in Homer) for homoioteleuton. For metrical reasons Homer prefers εὔζωνοι in his formulae (cf. *Il.* 1.429; 6.467; 9.366; 9.590; 9.667; 23.261; 23.760) to the polysyllabic καλλι- and βαθυ- compounds, which Heliodorus does not avoid. Βαθύκολπος (together with many other compounds of βαθύ-) appears to refer to puffed out clothing rather like βαθύζωνος ‘deep-girdled’ (Nawratil 1959, 167). The choice of -ζωνοι as the second element of the compound may point to the following description of Charikleia’s ζώνη.

ώραίων πλήρεις: ώραίος is related to ὀπώρα ‘the fruits of autumn’, as can be seen from Hesychius, <ώραιοπώλας>· ὁ τὴν ἀκμὴν πωλήσας. ὀπωροπώλης. ταριχοπώλης. Cf. Philostratus *Her.* 675.22 (Olearius); Ach. Tat. 1.15.4. Heliodorus normally restricts this word to human beauty, particularly the beauty of nubile young people (2.22.1, Nausikleia; 3.3.7, Theagenes; 4.8.8 [cf. 10.16.9], Charikleia; 7.2.2, Thyamis; 7.8.2, Theagenes and Charikleia; 10.3.1, Charikleia). This usage is common in the romances: e.g., X. Eph. 2.3.1, Manto; Long. 3.31.3, Chloe; *Hist. Alex.* 8.3.1 (recensio F).

αἱ δὲ κανᾶ πεμμάτων τε καὶ θυμιαμάτων κανηφοροῦσαι τὸν τόπον εὐωδία κατέπνεον: the offering of cakes, flowers and fruits and the use of incense was customary in processions and sacrifices for the dead (Feuillâtre 1966, 51). For the fragrant scent of flowers and incense wafted on a gentle breeze at the sacrifice sent to Tyre by the people of Sidon: cf. Ach. Tat. (2.15.1-4), τὰ θυμιάματα, κασσία καὶ λιβανωτὸς καὶ κρόκος· τὰ ἄνθη, νάρκισσος καὶ ρόδα καὶ μυρρίναι· ἡ δὲ τῶν ἀνθέων ἀναπνοὴ πρὸς τὴν τῶν θυμιαμάτων ἤριζεν ὁδμήν. τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἀναπεμπόμενον εἰς τὸν ἀέρα τὴν ὁδμήν ἐκεράννυε, καὶ ἦν ἄνεμος ἡδονῆς. Heliodorus is more restrained than Achilles Tatius here.

3.2.2 ὡς ἂν βαδίζειν τε ἅμα καὶ χορεύειν αὐταῖς ἐγγίνοιντο: the people of Thessaly attached great importance to dancing, according to Lucian, who notes that they called their leaders προορχηστήρες ‘dance leaders’, and inscribed honorific titles on the statues of their best dancers (*De Salt.* 14.1-8). He also notes that Neoptolemus invented the Pyrrhic dance (cf. 3.10.2 below, and note).

RL identify the dance with the γέρανος, ‘the crane’, on the basis of a report by Plutarch of information given in his source Dicaearchus (*Thes.* 21.1-3) according to whom this dance was first performed by Theseus on the island of Delos, where he stopped after he had escaped from Crete with Ariadne. The dance represented the convolutions of the labyrinth and was performed around an altar made of left-hand horns. On this occasion Theseus was said to have put on games for which the palm was first awarded as a prize. According to Plutarch, the γέρανος was still performed in his own day by the people of

Delos (*loc. cit.*). Lucian only mentions the γέρανος in passing as a famous early form of dancing, the roots from which the flower and mature fruits of the art developed later (*De Salt.* 34).

The identification between the γέρανος and the dance performed during the procession for Neoptolemus appears to rest on the windings and turnings performed by the dancers (the name γέρανος may be derived from a root (**ger-*) meaning ‘to wind’ (*OCD s.v.* ‘Dancing’). Plutarch uses the words παραλλάξεις καὶ ἀνελίξεις to express these movements, whereas Heliodorus has only ἐγκάρσιον ‘oblique’, which Hesychius glosses as πλάγιος ‘transverse, sideways, sloping’. The *Suda* uses the word of the transverse benches of a ship (*s.v.* ἐγκαινίδες) and the diagonal of a geometrical half-rhombus (*s.v.* ἔμβολον). There are other differences between the γέρανος and the dance under discussion: the former is nocturnal and performed by unmarried young men while the latter is diurnal and executed by young girls. In addition, there is no thematic connection between the exploits of Theseus and those of Neoptolemus. Furthermore, the dancers would have difficulty in carrying out intricate movements with baskets on their heads and there is no mention of a singing choir accompanying the dancing choir as in the present passage (Feuillâtre 1966, 52 and n. 5). Feuillâtre describes the dance as ‘une combinaison entre la danse hyporchématique et la marche processionnelle.’ The hyporcheme is mentioned by Athenaeus as a dance closely related to the κόρδαξ (*Deip.* 14.630ε) in which the chorus sings as it dances, and which is danced by men as well as women (*loc. cit.* 14.631c-d; cf. also *Deip.* 1.20d-21a; 21e-22d; 14.628c-631e.) Clearly what is required is a dance suited to the theme of the marriage of Peleus and Thetis which forms the subject of the hymn (3.2.2). For modern studies of Greek dancing in antiquity, see Lonsdale (1993), Mullen (1982) and Lawler (1964).

Heliodorus mentions dancing quite often (cf. 3.10.3 below and note, 4.17.1, 4.19.8, 5.15.3, 6.8.3, 6.15.3 and 10.38.3), perhaps because of the close relationship between dancing and drama. According to Lucian, tragedy, comedy and satyr plays have their distinctive forms of dance, ἡ ἐμμέλεια, ὁ κόρδαξ, ἡ σίκιννις, respectively (*De Salt.* 26) and pantomime was a form of narrative dance which shared the same subject matter as tragedies, except that they were more sophisticated and complex (*op. cit.* 31.1-4). Pantomime and narrative fiction are closely related in that they are genres which are unrestricted in form and in that they take ἔρωξ as their main theme. Lucian claims that pantomime included a wide range of educational material; musical, poetical and philosophical (*op. cit.* 35.5-10) and emphasises the part erotic adventures play in it (*op. cit.*

59.5-6). The close relationship between the dancing and drama should be borne in mind in view of Heliodorus' interest in the theatre (cf. 3.1.1, 3.1.1, 4.5.3 above and notes) and his taste for spectacle and colour.

τὸ ἐνδόσιμον . . . ὑπεσήμαινεν: ἐνδόσιμον is used of a trumpet note giving the signal for the start of a foot-race (4.3.1, metaphorical at 4.16.2) and of a flute melody played to sheep (5.14.2). Cf. also Arist. *Rhet.* 1414b; Suidas, Hesch. *s.v.* ἐνδόσιμος. This sense of the word is reinforced by the accompanying verb ὑπεσήμαινεν: cf. *Suda*, <Σημασία:> φανέρωσις διὰ σάλπιγγος and Athenaeus' description of the procession through Alexandria during the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, προεκάθητο δ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῷ τραχήλῳ τοῦ ἐλέφαντος Σατυρίσκος πεντάπηχυσ ἐστεφανωμένος πίτυος στεφάνῳ χρυσῷ, τῇ δεξιᾷ χειρὶ αἰγείῳ κέρατι χρυσῷ σημαίνων (5.31.21-25 [Kaibel]). However, ἐνδόσιμον may also refer to the 'theme' of a speech (Arist. *Rhet.* 1415a; LSJ⁹ *s.v.* ἐνδόσιμος) and Heliodorus uses it to mean 'the starting point of a plan, an idea' (5.21.1, cf. 9.4.2 where the people of Syene make a channel as a starting point for the waters of the Nile in case the dyke holding back the river should break). Here one chorus provides the theme for a second chorus who are to sing the whole song. Perhaps Heliodorus had an antiphonal choral ode in mind.

Knemon interrupts (2) to ask for an account of the hymn

3.2.3 Μετὰ ταύτας: RL understand κόρας as the noun to be supplied with the feminine demonstrative pronoun following Hirschig's emendation, but Colonna (1987b, 1938) retains τούτους and understands χορούς as the antecedent with the majority of the MSS. Hirschig's suggestion is therefore unnecessary.

«Τί Κνήμων» ἔφη ὁ Κνήμων: on the reversion to the narrative frame: cf. 3.1.1 above, and note; Hefti (1950, 46). Knemon's demand to hear as well as to visualise the spectacle is finally realised when he claims to actually see Theagenes and Charikleia on the basis of Kalasiris' description (3.4.7; cf. Morgan 1991, 98).

Boissonade (1806, p. 313) notes the parallel in Philostratus (*Her.* 663.23 [Olearius]), Φ. Παρέλθωμεν, ἡδὲ γὰρ που ἀναπνεῖ τῶν φυτῶν. Ἄ. Τί λέγεις ἡδύ;

The hymn to Thetis

3.2.4 Hymns were, of course, regularly sung at religious festivals in Greece: cf. *Syl.* 3.695.25; Furley (1993, 26; 31-38); Russell (1990b, 199-219); Bremer (1981, 193-215); Reardon (1971, 143-148). The hymn to Thetis appears best taken as a genealogical hymn in terms of the classification of the third or fourth century rhetorician Menander (*Men. Rhet.* 338-339: cf. Russell & Wilson 1981, 19-21). Menander points out that genealogical

hymns overlap with the mythological type and suggests that they are more suited to poetry than to prose and should be kept brief. Heliodorus therefore appears to be following convention in the composition of this poem. This is entirely suited to his purpose here which is to prepare for the entrance of his hero, Theagenes—himself a descendant of Thetis—with a poem celebrating his ancestral line (cf. 3.3.5 below, and note). Menander's discussion of fictitious hymns concerns hymns which are original and inventive, such as the Agathon's hymn to Eros, for whom no hymn had yet been composed (177a7-8), in Plato's *Symposium* (197c-e). Heliodorus' hymn is not of this type, since Thetis was a familiar goddess and a traditional poetic subject (cf., e.g., Pind. *Pyth.* 3.92; *Anth. Pal.* 5.48; 5.94; 7.1; 7.2; 7.142; 9.385; 9.470; 9.771; 10.15; 14.116; 16.15; Cat. 64.31-32). The writing of hymns to deities also constituted a sub-genre in sacred rhetoric and poetic hymns were often composed, especially by Aristides: cf., e.g., Aelius Aristides *Or* 38.7; Anderson (1993a, 80); Reardon (1971, 264); Bowie (1989, 214-229), noting Caracalla's admiration for the citharode Mesomedes, who sang a poem on Troy during the emperor's visit to that city in 214 AD. For the prose hymns of Aelius Aristides: cf. Russell (1990b, 199-219). The hymn is an exception to the relative lack of poetry in Heliodorus and the romances in general (Kerényi 1962², 238), although short quotations, such as part of a fragment of Euripides (fr. 449), χαίροντας καὶ εὐφημοῦντας ἐκπέμπειν is quoted in the *Ethiopian Story* (7.11.9; cf. also Seneca *Apocolocyntosis* 4.2).

Philostratus also has a version of the Thessalian hymn to Thetis in the *Heroicus* (741.23-742.5 [De Lannoy] with scansion). The *Heroicus* is a fictitious dialogue between a Phoenician and a vine-dresser in the Thracian Chersonese, who states that he has accurate information about what actually happened at Troy through the ghost of Protesilaus, the first Greek to die in the war (cf. Anderson 1986, 241-57). In the course of the discussion, the vine-dresser explains the original nature of the embassy of 14 that was sent to Achilles from Thessaly every year of the war in compliance with an oracle from Dodona in terms of which they were to sacrifice a white bull to him both as a god and a black one as a fallen mortal. The embassy sailed to Troy at night and sang the following hymn to Thetis before making land:

Θέτι κυανέα, Θέτι Πηλεία,
τὸν μέγαν ἃ τέκες υἱὸν Ἀχιλλέα, τοῦ
θνατὰ μὲν ὅσον φύσις ἤνεγκεν,
Τροία λάχε, σᾶς δ' ὅσον ἀθανάτου
γενεᾶς παῖς ἔσπασε, Πόντος ἔχει.
βαῖνε πρὸς αἰπὸν τόνδε κολωνόν

μετ' Ἀχιλλέως ἔμπυρα . . .
βαῖν' ἀδάκρυτος μετὰ Θεσσαλίας,
Θέτι κυανέα, Θέτι Πηλεία.

Both hymns are genealogical hymns, which show ring-composition, beginning and ending with the same line in each case. In terms of content, the two hymns both refer to the fact that Thetis belonged to the sea (εἰναλίοιο, ἄλος [Hld.], κυανέα, Πόντος ἔχει [Phil.]); her immortality (ἄθανάταν . . . κόραν [Hld.], ἀθανάτου γενεᾶς [Phil.]); her giving birth to Achilles (ἐξέτεκεν λαγόνων [Hld.], τέκες [Phil.]); the destruction of Troy (περσέπολιν Τρώων [Hld.], Τροία . . . λάχε [Phil.]); invoke favour of a hero (ιλήκοις [Hld.], βαῖν' [Phil.]); and mention the sacrifice (δέχνυσο . . . τάνδε θυηπολίην [Hld.], ἔμπυρα [Phil.]). The similarity in content and vocabulary is striking for poems of such short length and one was clearly influenced by the other. In view of the metrical innovation of Heliodorus (see below) and the extent of the influence of Philostratus on Heliodorus, the latter probably made use of the former. Alternatively, both derive from a common source (possibly an actual Delphic hymn, though I know of no evidence for this).

Heliodorus made use of elegiac pentameters for his hymn rather than the more usual (though irregular) anapaests of Philostratus (De Lannoy 1981, 166-175), perhaps because of the movements of the dance (cf. RL *ad loc.*) and the solemnity of the rite. The substitution of spondees for dactyls in line 10 draw attention to the name Neoptolemus. The use of pentameters is unusual in Greek poetry of the Late Empire (Feuillâtre 1966, 52); the change of metre from anapaests to pentameters may suggest that Heliodorus was attempting to upstage his model Philostratus (Bowie 1989, 214-221). This argument is somewhat weakened by the inconsistency with which Heliodorus deploys the Doric dialect in his hymn (note, for example, Παφίην), but the hymn is lexically more complex than the Philostratus piece and contains rare words (ἀγλαΐαν, ιλήκοις), compounds (χρυσοέθειρα, δουρομανῆ, περσέπολιν, ῥυσίπολιν) and metaphors (ἀστεροπᾶν).

A further argument suggesting that Heliodorus was the borrower here, can be seen in the context in which Philostratus' hymn is set. In the *Heroicus*, the vine-dresser explains to his Phoenician interlocutor that the Thessalians later failed to observe the custom of sacrificing to Achilles, and that, although the cult was revived in times of drought and again during Xerxes' invasion of Greece, the spirit of Achilles threatened to send 'an evil thing' against Thessaly from the sea (where he was living on an island with Helen of Troy!). The vine-dresser concludes by stating that the 'evil' that Achilles sent against Thessaly was the secret of the murex shell that enabled man to grow rich from dying

clothes. Whether or not the entire story was invented by Philostratus, it appears to be an aetiology for the ἐνάγισμός, or ceremony of purification to the spirits of the dead (see below). Heliodorus uses this aetiology to buttress the religious tone of the encounter between Theagenes and Charikleia—it is important for the sanctity of the love between his hero and heroine that it should occur at an ἐνάγισμός rather than at a ἑορτή. Indirect reference to the Thessalian religious ceremony in honour of Achilles also further substantiates the connection between Theagenes and that hero. Thus it makes good sense for Heliodorus to use Philostratus and very little sense the other way around.

Heliodorus' hymn was included in the *Anthologia Palatina* (9.485), whereas Philostratus' version was not (although another poem attributed to a Philostratus is found in the Planudean Appendix [16.110]). The anthology also contains a couplet on the pantarb stone from the romance (8.11.2; *AP* 9.490) but not the following couplet concerning the liberation of Theagenes and Charikleia from Arsake's power (8.11.3) or the oracle given to Kalasiris (2.35.5). Evidently the hymn and the pantarb couplet were considered to be easily detachable from their context and able to stand alone in the collection. Heliodorus' poem may have been anthologised in the fourth-century collection, composed in the 380s (Cameron 1993b, 90-96). Ausonius made use of this collection in composing his *Epitaphia* (epitaphs on Trojan heroes) and this would increase the likelihood that the hymn to Thetis was part of this anthology, since it is a supplication to the dead hero of the Trojan War, Neoptolemus. The earlier collection by Diogenian (who flourished during the reign of Hadrian) would appear to be too early for Heliodorus. However, it is also possible, given the popularity of the romance among the Byzantine scholars (see 4.17.5 below and note), that the hymn was put into the later anthology of Constantine Cephalas (c. 900 AD).

Τὸν Θέτιν ἀεῖδω: A conventional poetic opening (cf., e.g., *Homeric Hymn to Hera* 1, Ἥρην ἀεῖδω χρυσόθρονον, ἣν τέκε Ἑρείη; *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* 1; *Homeric Hymn to Artemis* 1; Eur. *Her.* 681). The cult of Thetis was centred appropriately in Thessaly. The hymn to Thetis creates the expectation of a love-encounter in the mind of the reader, since her marriage with Peleus is often taken as the model of blissful love with an undertone of tragic consequences. Cf. Chariton 1.1.16—the marriage of Chaereas and Kallirhoe was like that of Peleus and Thetis as the poets describe it; 2.3.8, where the author describes the love of immortals for mortals as a theme for poets and historians; 6.3.4; Pindar (*Isthm.* 8.27-40)—the story of the love of Zeus and Poseidon for Thetis; *Iliad* (18.34-147)—Thetis' account of the birth of Achilles and her prophecy of his imminent death. Cf. also Pindar *Pyth.* 3.92-105; Catullus 64.19-49. Philostratus (*Her.* 729-738 [Olearius]) tells how Peleus

slept with Thetis without knowing she was a goddess. On learning that she was divine he was afraid and wished to flee but Thetis persuaded him to stay by citing the union of Eos with Tithonos, Aphrodite with Anchises and Selene with Endymion.

Νηρέος ἀθανάτων εἰναλίιο κόραν: Νηρέος for Νηρέως for the sake of the metre. The line recalls Homer *Il.* 1.538, 'Αργυρόπεζα Θέτις, θυγάτηρ ἄλιιο γέροντος. Thetis is listed as one of the daughters of Nereus by, e.g., Herodotus (7.191) and Apollodorus (*Bib.* 1.11.4). In line 4 of this hymn Thetis is described as τὰν ἀλὸς ἀγλαΐαν.

τὰν Διὸς ἐννεσίη Πηλεΐ γημαμέναν: Thetis was married to Peleus with the consent (ἐννεσίη) of Zeus, since he feared the prophecy that she would bear a son stronger than his father (Pind. *Isthm.* 8.34-38). The use of the singular (ἐννεσίη) is a solecism—the plural is the normal epic idiom (cf. Hom. *Il.* 5.894, LSJ⁹ s.v. ἐνεσία).

τὰν ἀλὸς ἀγλαΐαν: ἀγλαΐα is Homeric (cf., e.g., *Od.* 15.78); cf. also ἀγλάισμα (3.6.2 below, and note).

Παφίην: Paphos is a city on Cyprus, in which there was a famous temple of Aphrodite Anadyomene. The adjective therefore strictly belongs to Aphrodite (cf. *Anth. Pal.* 5.94) and the description of Thetis as 'our Aphrodite' is a little catachrestic, but understandable in the sense that Thetis emerged from the foam of the sea to lie with Peleus (cf. Hom. *Il.* 18.402f.; Pindar *Nem.* 4.62; Apollod. 3.13.5). Similarly, the unusual epithet χρυσοέθειρα (the Homeric epithet for Thetis is ἠὺκόμος, καλλιπλόκαμος, τανύπεπλος or ἀργυρόπεζα) is only used of Aphrodite elsewhere (Ibycus fr. 1a.9; S151.9). It is hard to see how the use of Παφίην here means that Theagenes was of mystic descent (cf. Merkelbach 1962, 240 n. 2). The associations between Thetis and Aphrodite in the hymn rather serve to strengthen the erotic prelude to the meeting between Theagenes and Charikleia.

The mixture of Ionic and Doric forms in ἀμετέραν Παφίην indicates that Heliodorus was unfamiliar with poetry (cf. Colonna 1967, 250).

δουρομανῆ: RL prefer this form (cf. *Anth. Pal.* 9.553.4-5 [δουρομανῆς]) with VMΦΑ rather than δοριμανῆ (cf. Eur. *Supp.* 485 [δοριμανῆς]) with BPΖΠ. The Ionic form would be δουρι- (cf. δουρικλυτός, Hom. *Il.* 5.45; δουρικλειτός, Hom. *Il.* 5.55) and so Colonna (1938) and Bekker (1855) read δουριμανῆ, although this variant does not occur in the MSS. Compounds of δουρι- (Ion. δουρι-) occur more frequently than those using δουρο- (cf. LSJ⁹ *ad loc.*) but this does not necessarily mean that Heliodorus would have used this form. In such a doubtful case, the more poetic form (δουρομανῆς) should be retained.

δῖον Ἀχιλλῆα, τοῦ κλέος οὐράνιον: Koraes appropriately quotes Pindar on the fame of Achilles, οὐδ' ἔστιν οὕτω βάρβαρος / οὔτε παλίγγλωστος πόλις, // ἄτις οὐ Πηλέος ἄτει κλέος

ἦ- / ρωος . . . (*Isthm.* 6.24-25).

Πύρρα τέκεν παῖδα Νεοπτόλεμον: this filiation of Neoptolemus, who is usually said to have been the son of Achilles and Deidameia (*OCD s.v.* Neoptolemus), is unique (Feuillâtre 1966, 52). The name Pyrrha is, of course, simply the feminine form of Pyrrhus. περσέπολιν Τρώων, ῥυσίπολιν Δαναῶν: cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2.263-267; 2.469-558; Pausanias (10.26.4) describes a painting by Polygnotos in Delphi showing Neoptolemus in the act of killing Astynooos after having killed Elastos. Περσέπολιν was the epithet of Pallas Athena (Lamprocl. 1; Callim. *Dian.* 5.43) but ῥυσίπολιν (from ἐρύω ‘deliver’) is also used of the goddess (*Il.* 6.305; *Sept.* 129; cf. also the scholion on this passage οἱ περὶ σωτηρίας πόλεως τὰς χεῖρας ἀνέχοντες ῥυσίπολιν καὶ ἐρυσίπολιν Ἀθηνᾶν ἐπεκαλοῦντο). Heliodorus’ playful juxtaposition of these antithetical epithets is typical of his fondness for striking verbal effects. Neoptolemus cannot be said to have saved any Greek cities, although his presence at Troy was necessary for the capture of the city (Soph. *Phil.* 114-115, 345-347; *Od.* 11.508-509).

εὐμενέων: RL read εὐμενέων ‘favorablement’, although ὑμεναίων is found in the majority of the MSS. (except for CZII) and is more common, e.g. Ach. Tat. 3.10.5, ἀντὶ δὲ ὑμεναίων τίς σοι τὸν θρήνον ἄδει. However, ‘singing the marriage song’ makes no sense in this context and εὐμενέων finds a precedent in the Orphic Hymns: εὐμενέων ἐπαρωγὸς ἐπέλθοις μυστιπόλοισιν (48.6); and Gregory Nazianzenus: σοί γ’ εὐμενέων (*Carmina Dogmatica* p. 408.3).

θυηπολίην: ‘act of sacrifice’: cf. Ap. Rhod. 4.702, ῥέζε θυηπολίην; Ach. Tat. 2.14.1, κεῖθι θυηπολίην σε φέρειν κέλομαι Ἡρακλεῖ; Orph. *Hymn.* Preface 1, Μάνθανε δῆ, Μουσαῖε, θυηπολίην περισέμνην.

3.3.1 ὥσπερ ὑπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὴν ᾄδην ἠχοῦς ἐφελκομένους: The description is very vivid (Feuillâtre 1966, 23). Charikleia’s excitement during Theagenes’ race with Ormenos conveys even greater emotional intensity (4.3.3). Other examples of such scenes occur at 4.1-4; 5.26; 7.5-8; and the ‘happy ending’ (10.41). Cf. Wolff (1912, 177), who labels Heliodorus’ technique of conveying the emotional effect of his descriptions on the spectators ‘pathetic optics’, which, together with the ‘hieratic epiphany’ of Charikleia (3.4.6 below, and note) constitute ‘ensemble scenes’.

ἕως κατόπιν ἐφήβων ἱππικὸν καὶ ὁ τούτων ἱππαρχὸς ἐκλάμπας: There is a general similarity between this passage and Plutarch’s description of the entrance of ephebes in military dress into a theatre, paying respect to their leader (*Philopoemen* 11.2.1-11.2.6; Koraes *ad loc.*). Cf. also Chariton (6.4.2) and Iamblichos (fr. 1)— further similarities

between the description of the king and that of Theagenes (3.3.5) will be pointed out in the notes which follow. However, Stephens & Winkler (1995, 222) deny the resemblance between Iamblichos' description of the procession of the Babylonian king and Heliodorus' account of the ride of the Thessalian youths and no doubt such scenes were generic. For festival-processions as a motif in the ancient Greek romances, cf. 3.1.1 above, and note.

ἀκοῆς κρείττονα πάσης τὴν τῶν καλῶν θεῶν ἀπέδειξεν: Heliodorus includes a high degree of visual description in his narrative: cf. the description of Charikleia's ζώνη (3.4.2) below, and note. Scenes such as the opening scene at the Heracleotic mouth of the Nile (1.1.1-1.2.3) are presented as spectacles. Sight is given a special role in engendering the love between Theagenes and Charikleia (cf., e.g., 3.5.4, 4.2.3 below, and the notes on these passages). For preference for sight over hearing in erotic matters is also made by Xenophon in his anecdote that Socrates had said that the beauty of Theodote was better judged by actually seeing her rather than hearing a report (*Mem.* 3.11.1: cf. *Ath.* 13.588d)—though here the subject is male beauty. The comparison between the efficacy of sight and hearing is implicit also in Philostratus (*Ep.* 41, Οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ξύμβουλοι τοῦ ἔρῶν, σὺ δ' ἀκοὴν σπάσας ἔρῶς Ἴωνικοῦ μειρακίου οἰκῶν Κόρινθον). Philostratus extends the comparison to suggest that the Corinthian man in love with an Ionian boy as a result of a report of him has developed a third eye, the eye of the mind, or imagination.

Kalasiris describes the cavalry of ephebes

3.3.2 Ὁ μὲν ἀριθμός: ἀριθμός is the subject of συνέταπτεν and ἐμέριζε—an unusual construction, which draws attention to the large number of riders in the procession. The passage could be glossed as follows: the large number of riders meant that they could make up a formation of 50, with 25 on each side to guard their leader, who rode in the middle of the group.

ὑπὲρ ἀστραγάλων: the conjecture of RL on the basis of C. The other MSS and Colonna (1987b, 1938) read ἀστράγαλον 'over the ankle'. Synecdoche is also found at 3.3.5 (χρυσός).

χλαμύς δὲ λευκῆ: Philostratus remarks that the χλαμύς was a Thessalian garment (*Her.* 674.3 [Olearius]; *VA* 3.25; 4.16), which was usually worn by the military (*VA* 5.38; Themistius 109c4 [Harduin]).

πέζαν: Hesychius (*ad loc.*) <πέζα>· ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ ῥυμοῦ· διὰ τὸ πρὸς τῷ πῆδῳ . . . , ὅθεν καὶ πέζα ἱματίου λέγεται ἢ ὠα, ἢ πρὸς τῷ πῆδῳ τὰ κατώτατα μέρη. The synonym ὠα is derived from οἷς by Koraes, who explains that Greek cloaks were often given woollen borders. Hesychius (*ad loc.*) <ὠα>· τοῦ προβάτου ἢ μηλωτή. Ὡαὶ δὲ τῶν ἱματίων, καὶ τὸ λῶμα τοῦ

ἐνδύματος, καὶ τὸ περιστόμιον τοῦ ἱματίου.

3.3.3 Ἡ δὲ ἵππος Θεσσαλικὴ μὲν πᾶσα: Athenaeus cites a proverb that rates Thessalian horses as excellent:

ἵππον Θεσσαλικὴν Λακεδαιμονίην τε γυναῖκα,

ἄνδρας δ' οἱ πίνουσιν ὕδωρ καλῆς Ἀρεθούσης (278e).

The proverbial nature of the verses is apparent from the comment on another proverbial expression in the *Suda*: <Υμεῖς, ὦ Μεγαρεῖς, οὔτε τρίτοι οὔτε τέταρτοι.> χρησιμοῦ κομμάτιόν ἐστι παροιμιαζόμενον οὕτως: ἵππον Θεσσαλικὴν Λακεδαιμονίαν τε γυναῖκα, ἄνδρας δ', οἱ πίνουσιν ὕδωρ καλῆς Ἀρεθούσης. Cf. E. Leutsch & F.G. Schneidewin, who refer to Makarios (6.87: παρὰ μὲν πεδίον, παρὰ δ' ἵππος: τουτό φασι τὸν Θεσσαλὸν τύραννον εἰπεῖν προκαλούμενον Βοιωτοὺς εἰς πόλεμον). Leutsch & Schneidewin have a lengthy note on this expression in order to substantiate its proverbial nature. Pouilloux's (1983, 275) argument that second century AD Thessalian coins featuring Achilles on horseback suggest that Heliodorus' account of the religious ceremony in honour of Neoptolemus reflects the attempts of the people of Hypata to restore their ancestral religion (p. 283) and that the *Ethiopian Story* could not have been written later than the 2nd or 3rd century AD (p. 286), is too large a claim to make on such slight evidence.

διαπτύουσα: Philostratus similarly describes Nesaia, the horse on which the Persian lady Rhodogoune rode into battle against the Armenians, Ἀβρῶς τὸν χαλινὸν διαπτύοι (*Imagines* 2.5). The detail is more conventional than realistic, as Nesaian (or Nisaian) horses were famous: cf. 9.19.1 (Oroondates), 8.29.1 (Achaimenes); Iamblichos *Bab. fr.* 1.16 (Stephens & Winkler); Hdt. 3.106; 7.40; 9.20; Arist. *HA* 632a31; Polyb. 30.25.6; Herod. 3.106. These were the royal horses of Persia, Strabo 11.13.7; 11.14.9; Char. 6.4.2; Feuillâtre (1966, 28); Kowarna (1959, 67-68). The impression is one of the youth, beauty, courage and nobility of Theagenes. There may also be a hint of the unruly horse in Plato's analogy between the soul and a chariot drawn by a black and a white horse (*Phaedr.* 254e), although Theagenes' horse is more of an amalgam of Plato's two horses and obeys the commands of his rider (see following note). The reader may infer that Theagenes is able to exercise self-control in his relationship with Charikleia.

ὡς δὲ τὸν νοῦν ὑφηγούμενον τοῦ ἀναβάτου φέρειν ἠνείχετο: Ὡς (the reading of mAT) is part of the contrast ὅσα μὲν δεσπότην . . . ὡς δὲ νοῦν and is clearly preferable to πρὸς with the accusative (the reading of Z) in this instance. There may be an echo of Aeschylus in these lines (cf. χαλινὸν δ' οὐκ ἐπίσταται φέρειν / πρὶν αἱματηρὸν ἐξαφρίζεσθαι μένος, *Ag.* 1066-67); Heliodorus' use of προσαφρίζουσα is particularly close to ἐξαφρίζεσθαι. At any

rate the parallel points to the fact that χαλινόν is the object of ἠρνεῖτο and φέρειν ἠνείχετο and that it is modified by the phrases ὅσα μὲν δεσπότην and ὡς δὲ τὸν νοῦν ὑφηγούμενον τοῦ ἀναβάτου. The hyperbaton in the last phrase is characteristic of Heliodorus (see introduction on style). The translations are generally wrong here (e.g. ‘they suffered themselves to be guided by the rider’s intent’ [Lamb]); ‘they nevertheless heeded the will of their riders’ [Hadas] as opposed to ‘they nevertheless grudgingly tolerated it [sc. the bit] as the instrument of their rider’s guiding mind’).

φαλάροις δὲ καὶ προμετωπιδίους ἀργυροῖς καὶ ἐπιχρύσοις ἐξησκημένη: Cf. also προμετωπιδίους, 9.15.4 (the Persian cataphracts). According to Baumgarten (1932, 26) the word προμετωπιδίους is a borrowing from Xenophon (cf. Xen. *Cyr.* 6.4.1; 7.1.2; 8.3.16; *Anab.* 1.8.7; *Hipp.* 12.8) but there do not appear to be convincing grounds for claiming a debt (cf. also, e.g., Hdt. 7.70). Neimke (1889, 49) more appropriately refers to Achilles Tatius 1.14.2, ἐκαλλώπιζον δὲ καὶ τὸ πονηρὸν θηρίον προστερνιδίους, προμετωπιδίους, φαλάροις ἀργυροῖς, χρυσαῖς ἠνίαϊς. Chariton also uses the word (6.4.2, χρύσειον ἔχοντι χαλινόν, χρύσεια δὲ φάλαρα καὶ προμετωπίδια καὶ προστερνίδια), as does Iamblichos *Bab.* fr. 1.16-19, τῶν μὲν τὸν πολεμικὸν τρόπον ἐσκευασμένων προμετωπιδίους τε καὶ στερνιδίους καὶ παραπλευριδίου καὶ παραμηρίδια τοῖς ἵππευσι περικεῖται. The word therefore appears to be relatively commonplace.

Theagenes and his horse

3.3.4 ἦν δὲ τὸ μέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν Θεαγένης: Hesychius (*s.v.* μέλημα) οὔτινος ἄν τις φροντίζοι, ἀγάπημα, referring to Theocr. *Id.* 14.2, ΘΥ. τί δέ τοι τὸ μέλημα; also Aristophanes, ὦ χρυσοδαίδαλον ἐμὸν μέλημα (*Ekkli.* 973a); Sappho, μέλημα τῶμον (fr. 163.1); Lucian, ὦ μέλημα (*Rhet. praecept.* 14.1-3).

On the name Theagenes, see appendix 1.

τοσοῦτον ἡμᾶς ὀφθεῖς κατέλαμψεν: for the conventional dazzling brightness of romantic beauty, cf. Char. 5.3.9; Jax (1933, 168).

3.3.5 ἵππεὺς μὲν: this sentence strains after stylistic effects such as isocolia with rhyme, synecdoche, personification, and hyperbaton (see introduction under these headings). It is not surprising, therefore, that linguistic expression seems forced. Note in particular τὸ δὲ κράνος οὐχ ὑπελθών, which would be easier with a preposition before the noun; and ἀπὸ γυμνῆς κεφαλῆς πομπέων (‘taking part in the procession bare-headed’) in which the preposition performs a quasi-adverbial function (LSJ⁹ *s.v.* ἀπό III.6 refers to ‘half adverbial usages’ such as ἀπὸ σπουδῆς ‘in earnest’).

δόρυ μελίαν χαλκόστομον: Wifstrand (1944-45, 31), quite rightly excises δόρυ as a gloss of μελίαν, which is a substantive in Homer but here appears to be considered adjectival—a solecism not found elsewhere in Greek to my knowledge.

The ash spear alludes to the weapon carried by Achilles, which was given to him by the Centaur Chiron and is mentioned by Homer (*Il.* 16.143-4; 19.390-391):

Πηλιάδα μελίην, τὴν πατρὶ φίλω πόρε Χείρων
Πηλίου ἐκ κορυφῆς.

Theagenes himself (according to Charikles) argued that he was a descendant of Achilles, since the Homeric name for the homeland of Achilles, Phthia, was the name used for the coastal region of Thessaly (2.34.2). He also claims that his ancestor Menesthios had been one of Achilles' companions at Troy (2.34.6). Lastly, the people of Thessaly had renounced their claim to officiate during the ceremony of propitiation for Neoptolemus in favour of his people, the Ainianes. Charikles characteristically accepts his claim but on grounds of his impressive physique rather than on the arguments he adduces (cf. 2.34.4-8). Cf. also Philostratus *Her.* 730.8 (Olearius), ἦν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ μελία μικρὰ τετμημένη ὑπὸ τοῦ Χείρωνος καὶ ἐφκει ψελλιζομένῳ ἐς τὰ πολεμικά; *ibid.* 732.13, ἠρόμην τὸν Πρωτεσίλεων καὶ περὶ τῆς μελίας, ὅ τι ἦν τὸ περὶ αὐτὴν θαῦμα, καὶ φησι μῆκος μὲν εἶναι τῆ μελία, ὃ μὴ ἄλλη αἰχμῆ, εὐθὺ δὲ τὸ ξύλον καὶ οὕτω τι ἐρρωμένον, ὡς μὴ ἂν κλασθῆναι, τὸ δὲ στόμα τῆς αἰχμῆς ἀδάμαντός τε εἶναι καὶ παντὸς διεκπαίειν, τὸν δὲ στύρακα ἐκ τοῦ ἐπὶ θάτερα ὀρειχάλκου ἐμβεβλήσθαι, ἵνα πᾶσα δὴ ἀστράπτουσα ἐμπίπτοι. The romances have a tendency to model their heroes on the glorious figures of epic (Morgan 1993, 223; Rohde 1914³, 166 [155 n. 4]). Much of the scene is conventional as the notes show and Kerényi (1962², 102 n. 30) goes too far in suggesting that this description of Theagenes represents 'eine abgeschwächte Form der Apotheose'.

φοινικοβαφῆ χλαμύδα καθειμένος, ἧς τὰ μὲν ἄλλα χρυσὸς ἐποίκιλλε: these are royal colours. Cf. Iamblichos *Bab.* fr. 1 (Stephens & Winkler), ἐξ ἴσου γὰρ ὁ χρυσὸς ὕφονται τῆ πορφύρα.

τοὺς Λαπίθας ἐπὶ τοὺς Κενταύρους ὀπλίζων: According to the legend, Perithous, the Lapith king, invited the wild centaurs to his wedding but they were unused to wine, became drunk and attempted to rape the Lapith women (Homer *Od.* 21.295-310; Hesiod *Scut.* 178-190). The tale was also popular in fiction: cf., e.g., Lollianos *Phoin.* B.1 verso 14-15 (a cup is decorated with the motif); Apuleius *Met.* 4.8 (a robber's banquet turns into a riot similar to that between the Lapiths and Centaurs); and in the visual arts: it appeared on the gable of the temple of Zeus at Olympia, in the temple of Theseus (Paus. 1.17.2),

on the Parthenon metopes on the south side, and on the shield of Athena within the Parthenon (Paus. 1.28.2). Apollo and Artemis feature prominently in the frieze illustrating the battle of the Lapiths and Centaurs on the temple of Apollo at Bassae (now in the British Museum). The theme of these representations of the myth is the struggle between order and wildness, human against beast. The motif is therefore suited to Theagenes' mission to the oracle of Apollo at Delphi. Mention of the myth here emphasises the impression of control of animal wildness that is also conveyed by the description of Theagenes' control of his horse (cf. 3.3.7 below, and note). The reference to the Centaurs here is picked up in the description of Theagenes' horse galloping alongside the runaway bull as a 'hippotaur' in the final book (10.29.1). Theagenes' contest with the runaway bull, like the struggle between the Lapith Pirithous and the Centaurs, also occurs on his wedding-day (Bartsch 1989, 148). Finally, the Lapiths were a Thessalian tribe (the Lapith king, Perithous, ruled at Larisa) and the allusion to their battle with the Centaurs reinforces the connection between Theagenes and that region of Greece.

ἡ περόνη δὲ Ἀθηναίων ἠλεκτρίνην ἔστρεψε τὴν Γοργοῦς κεφαλὴν εἰς θώρακα προασπίζουσαν: In the *Odyssey* (19.225-231), the disguised Odysseus describes to Penelope the purple mantle of the hero, pinned with a gold brooch depicting a hound bringing down a fawn. Penelope recognises the brooch as the one she had pinned her husband's cloak with on his departure for Troy (*Od.* 19.256-257). The description Odysseus gives of himself is somewhat erotic (19.232-235), and certainly the anecdote evokes the loving relationship between the two; as such it is appropriate to the present context. There appears to be a general resemblance between Heliodorus' description of the Thessalian cavalry and the famous frieze on the Parthenon, showing young men riding in procession in similar dress. This must have been a common sight in antiquity, however, and need not be taken to suggest that Heliodorus was familiar with the sights of Athens.

The Gorgon was depicted in monuments at Delphi (*LIMC s.v.* 'Gorgon' 251; Feuillâtre 1966, 53) but there are also literary echoes; Pindar refers to the myth in his *Pythian Odes* (10.68-74; 12.12-14), and in Euripides' *Ion*, which is set in Delphi, the representation of Athena with her armour showing the Gorgo resembles the aegis-like cloth by which Ion recognises his mother, Creusa (1417-1421):

Κρ. σκέψασθ'. ὃ παῖς ποτ' οἶσ' ὑφασμ' ὑφην' ἐγὼ . . .

Ιω. ποῖόν τι, πολλὰ παρθένων ὑφάσματα.

Κρ. οὐ τέλος, οἶον δ' ἐκδίδαγμα κερκίδος.

Ιω. μορφήν ἔχον τίν'; ὥς με μὴ ταύτη λάβης.

Κρ. Γοργῶ μὲν ἐν μέσοισιν ἡτρίοις πέπλων.

However, the myth was popular in antiquity and not primarily associated with the oracle. In Heliodorus the Gorgon is referred to conventionally an object of horror (4.7.11 [Charikleia views Alkamenes as a Gorgon]) but also in its adjectival form to refer to a stark, sometimes sexually attractive, gaze (1.21.3, 2.31.1 [Charikleia], 7.10.4 [Theagenes]). Representations of Gorgo were used as an apotropaic talisman in antiquity and thus are related to the subliminal preoccupation with erotic vision in the romance that is expressed most clearly in Kalasiris' exposition of the 'eye of evil' (3.7-8). The Gorgon was famously killed by Perseus, the ancestor of the royal house of Meroë, to which Charikleia belonged.

3.3.6 Προσέβαλλε δέ τι χάριτος τοῖς γινομένοις καὶ ἀνέμου λιγεῖα ῥιπή: Cf. the rather different winds in Homer *Il.* 5.525-6, ζαχρειῶν ἀνέμων, οἳ τε νέφεα σκίοεντα / πνοιῆσιν λιγυρῆσι διασκιδνᾶσιν ἀέντες; and Philostratus' description of Achilles (*Her.* 733.11 [Olearius], τὴν μὲν δὴ κόμην ἀμφιλαφῆ αὐτῷ φησιν εἶναι καὶ χρυσοῦ ἠδίω καὶ εὐσχήμονα, ὄπη καὶ ὄπως κινοίη αὐτὴν ἢ ἄνεμος ἢ αὐτός). The gentle breeze in Heliodorus suggests the idyllic zephyrs of Longus 1.23.2, Εἴκασεν ἄν τις . . . τοὺς ἀνέμους συρίττειν ταῖς πίτυσιν ἐμπνέοντας.

3.3.7 Εἶπες ἄν καὶ τὸν ἵππον αὐτὸν συνιέναι τῆς ὠραιότητος τοῦ δεσπότη: cf. Iamblichos *Bab.* fr. 1.38-41: ὁ δὲ [sc. ἵππος] ἐπὶ τὸ σοβαρώτερον πεπαιδευμένος οὐκ εἰς γαστέρα καθιεται, ἀλλ' εἰς γόνατα πίπτει, ἵνα δοκῆ τὸν ἵππεά δέχεσθαι καὶ προσκυνεῖν. There may also be a reminiscence of the intelligent horses of Achilles, who mourn for the fallen Patroklos (*Il.* 17.423-440; Feuillâtre 1966, 109).

τὸν ἀρχένα κυμαίνων: cf. 3.4.5; 6.9.2 (a particularly striking usage), and Philostratus *Her.* 688 (Olearius); *VA* 3.8; *Ach. Tat.* 1.12.4, ὁ δὲ ἵππος . . . τοῖς νότοις ἐκυμαίνεται; *Ach. Tat.* 2.15.4, βαδίζει δὲ ταῦρος ὑψαυχενῶν καὶ ὥσπερ ἐπιδεικνύμενος ὅτι τῶν ἄλλων βοῶν ἐστὶ βασιλεύς (Neimke 1889, 50). Whitmarsh (personal communication) points out the overall similarity between this passage and the description of Theagenes at 2.35.1. (ὀρθὸς τὸν ἀρχένα καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ μετώπου τὴν κόμην πρὸς τὸ ὀρθιον ἀναχαιτίζων, ἡ ρίς ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ θυμοῦ καὶ οἱ μυκτῆρες ἐλευθέρως τὸν ἀέρα εἰσπνέοντες, ὀφθαλμὸς οὐπω μὲν χαροπὸς χαροπώτερον δὲ μελαινόμενος σοβαρόν τε ἅμα καὶ οὐκ ἀνέραστον βλέπων, οἷον θαλάσσης ἀπὸ κύματος εἰς γαλήνην ἄρτι λεαινομένης), but cf. also the good horse in Plato's charioteer analogy (*Phaedr.* 253d) who is: τό τε εἶδος ὀρθός . . . and . . . ὑψαύχην.

εἰς ὀρθὸν οὖς: cf. Sophocles *El.* 25-8, ὥσπερ γὰρ ἵππος εὐγενής, κὰν ἦ γέρον, / ἐν τοῖσι δεινοῖς θυμὸν οὐκ ἀπώλεσεν, / ἀλλ' ὀρθὸν οὖς ἴστησιν, ὡσαύτως δὲ σὺ / ἡμᾶς τ' ὀτρύνεις καὐτὸς ἐν πρώτοις ἔπη. Cf. also Homer's comparison of Paris with a mettlesome horse (6.506-11) and Plato *Phaedr.* 253d.

εὐήνιά τε προποδίζων: Theagenes' control over his horse recalls Plato's description of the good horse in his myth of the charioteer (*Phaedrus* 247b, εὐήνια ὄντα ῥαδίως πορεύεται; 253d): cf. 3.5.4, below, and note. There is possibly a contrast between Theagenes' control of his horse here and the horses of the other epebes (τὸν γὰρ χαλινὸν . . . διαπτύουσα, 3.3.3) as well as with the reckless flight of the Thessalian youths from Delphi (4.17.5-6) or of Achaimenes from Memphis (8.29.1). The passage is clearly sewn on to the garment of Heliodorus' description as a decorative purple patch (cf. Horace *Ars Poetica* 14); this sentence is analysed colometrically in the introduction in the section on Heliodorus' style. Iamblichos *Bab.* fr. 1.29-41 provides an instructive parallel, indicating that such descriptions were evidently virtuoso set-pieces similar to the *Euphues* of John Lyly (Wolff 1912, 231). For the stylistic extravagance of Heliodorus' description of the horse's movements, cf. Chalk (1962, 170: 'Heliodorus' own prodigy'); Thorlacius (1823, 5: *auctor sophisticam hic illic se prodit verborum ambagibus, floribus anxie quaesitis*).

3.3.8 γυναῖκες δημῳδεις: cf. Longus (2.2.1), Οἶον οὖν εἰκὸς ἐν ἑορτῇ Διονύσου καὶ οἴνου γενέσει αἱ μὲν γυναῖκες ἐκ τῶν πλησίον ἀγρῶν εἰς ἐπικουρίαν κεκλημέναι τῷ Δάφνιδι τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐπέβαλλον καὶ ἐπήνουν ὡς ὅμοιον τῷ Διονύσῳ τὸ κάλλος. Morgan translates the phrase as 'women of the lower orders', Lamb 'women of the common folk', Hadas 'the women of the street'. The *Greek Anthology* 7.345.6, οὐκ ἦν ἐς ἄνδρας μάχλος οὐδὲ δημῳδης, provides support for the translation of Hadas. Koraes supports this reading and refers to the use of δημῖος in Hesychius, <Δημίασι πύλαις> κοιναῖς, ἐπεὶ προεστήκεσαν ἐν ταῖς πύλαις αἱ πόρναι. ὁ δὲ Ἀντίπατρος τὸ γυναικεῖον μῦθον δημῳσίον ἔφη. οἱ δὲ τὰς Κεραμεικὰς πύλας: πρὸς γὰρ αὐτάς φασιν ἐστάναι τὰς πόρναις. Cf. also 3.3.8 below, and note.

A weaker translation 'common women' would be in line with the prevalent contempt in the novel for what is common or vulgar. Charikleia expresses the view that desire is common and debasing (6.9.4: οὐ γὰρ με δημῳδης οὐδὲ νεωτερίζουσά τις ἐπιθυμία πρὸς ταῦτα ἐξάγει τὴν ἀθλίαν ἀλλὰ καθαρὸς τε καὶ σωφρονῶν ἀπειράτου μὲν ἀλλ' ἔμοιγε ἀνδρὸς πόθος). Her opinions are shared by Kalasiris (2.26.1, ἀνδρῶν τε σοφῶν ἐργαστήριον θορύβου τε δημῳδους ἐκτός; 3.16.3, Ἡ μὲν [σοφία] γὰρ τις ἐστὶ δημῳδης καὶ ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι χαμαὶ ἐρχομένη; 4.16.5, δημῳδες γὰρ οἶμαι καὶ τῶν ἀγροικωτέρων σπονδῶν καὶ τραπέζης κοινωνήσαντας μὴ οὐχὶ καὶ τὴν περὶ ἀλλήλων γνῶσιν ἔχοντας ἀπελθεῖν; 5.16.3, ὡς ἅπαν μουσικῆς ὄργανον εἰς τὸ συμπόσιον παρακεκληκῶς ἐκείνων μὲν τὸ παρὸν ὑπερορᾶς καὶ τοῖς δημῳδεστέροις ἐκχωρεῖς). These attitudes may reflect the social prejudices of Heliodorus as a member of the élite of Emesa (Baslez 1990, 115-128). However, Baslez does not pay

sufficient attention to the author's complex attitude to legitimacy in the romance and his cosmopolitan world view (Létoublon 1993, 126-136).

τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς πάθος ἐγκρατεία κρύπτειν ἀδύνατοι: for ἐγκρατεία as the characteristic of σωφροσύνη, cf. Arist. *Nic. Eth.* 1145a.

μήλοις: Throwing or giving an apple, the symbol of Aphrodite, was a declaration of love, cf. Long. 1.24.3: Ἦδη ποτὲ καὶ μήλοις ἀλλήλους ἔβαλον; Long. 3.25.2: ἡ τάχα μικρὸν ὕστερον νέμουσα τὴν παρθενίαν ἀπολέσει καὶ ἄνδρα ποιήσεταιί τινα τῶν ποιμένων ἐπὶ μήλοις ἢ ρόδοις; Long. 3.33.4: Μία μηλέα τετρώγητο καὶ οὔτε καρπὸν εἶχεν οὔτε φύλλον· γυμνοὶ πάντες ἦσαν οἱ κλάδοι· καὶ ἓν μῆλον ἐπέττετο ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἄκροις ἀκρότατον, μέγα καὶ καλὸν καὶ τῶν πολλῶν τὴν εὐανθίαν ἐνίκα μόνον· ἔδεισεν ὁ τρυγῶν ἀνελθεῖν, ἠμέλησε καθελεῖν· τάχα δὲ καὶ ἐφυλάττετο τὸ καλὸν μῆλον ἐρωτικῶς ποιμένι. Cf. Sappho 105 LP. *Anth. Pal.* 5.79-80; Theocritus 5.88, 6.6-7; Verg. *Ecl.* 3.64; Philostratus *Imagines* 1.6. A papyrus fragment of Callimachus (fr. 67 [Pfeiffer]) tells the story of how Akontios deceived Kydippe into reading a marriage vow written on an apple in the temple of Artemis, thus committing her to marry him. In Aristophanes (*Nub.* 996-7) throwing an apple is the action of a prostitute: μηδ' εἰς ὄρχηστρίδος εἰσάπτειν, ἵνα μὴ πρὸς ταῦτα κεχηνώς / μῆλω βληθεῖς ὑπὸ πορνιδίου τῆς εὐκλείας ἀποθραυσθῆς. Cf. Rohde (1914³, 49 [46 n. 3]), refers to Strabo (15.3.17) for the Persian custom that a bridegroom should eat an apple before entering the bridal chamber and connects the motif to the folktale theme of the quest for golden apples. Cf. also the myth of Atalanta (Apollod. 3.9.2). This motif has given rise to some far-fetched ideas: Faraone (1990, 219-238), for example, suggests that apples were used as an aphrodisiac and Gerber (1978, 203-4) finds a resemblance between apples and female breasts. Cf. Rehm (1994, 17 and n. 25).

Charikleia

3.4.1 Ἦμος δ' ἠριγένεια φάνη ροδοδάκτυλος ἠώς: A common Homeric formula (the whole line occurs twice in the *Iliad* [1.477; 24.788] and twenty times in the *Odyssey* [2.1; 3.404; 3.491; 4.306; 4.431; 4.576; 5.228; 8.1; 9.152; 9.170; 9.307; 9.437; 9.560; 10.187; 12.8; 12.316; 13.18; 15.189; 17.1; 19.428]—variations on the line occur a further three times in the *Iliad* and twice in the *Odyssey*). The quotation is appropriate for Charikleia, who is a distant descendant of Eos. The line is alluded to also by Apuleius (*Met.* 3.1) and the epithet ροδοδάκτυλος attracted discussion by the Homeric lexicographers and commentators who sought to differentiate it from κροκόπεπλος (Porphyry *Homeric Questions on the Iliad* 8.1.35; Scholia in Hom. *ad loc.*; *Suda ad ἠλέκτωρ*; Apollonius the Sophist *ad ἠώς*; as well as Aristides Quintilianus *De Musica* 2.9.54).

The use of the epic formula makes the appearance of the heroine an epic event (Paulsen 1992, 158) and Kalasiris is cast as the ‘singer’ of the prose epic as well as being a character in the epic in his own right (cf. 2.21.5; 2.22.4). At the same time, the transposition of material from heroic myth to the world of the late Roman Empire produces ‘heterodiegetic’ effects (Fusillo 1989, 30). Here the Homeric formulaic line serves to strengthen the solar imagery associated with Charikleia in contrast with the image of Herakles quoted above. Where Herakles is a grim ghost in the underworld, Charikleia is associated with life and sunlight.

τοῦ νεῶ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος: a cult of Artemis existed at Delphi, although little is known about it (Feuillâtre 1966, 49) and Heliodorus has greatly exaggerated its importance (Rougemont 1987, 93-99). Heliodorus was probably more interested in developing the associations between Charikleia and Artemis than in historical veracity (cf. 3.4.6 below, and note).

ἡ καλὴ καὶ σοφὴ Χαρίκλεια: for the conventional use of καλή: cf. Jax (1933, 161 and nn. 12 and 31; 3.17.4, κάλλος, and frequently in the romances). Charikleia has a spiritual beauty but note also the erotic nature of the description of her ζώνη (3.4.2 below and note). Walter Stephens (1994, 69-70) seriously misrepresents Charikleia as ‘stereotypically feminine’ and ‘passive, even quietistic’. Charikleia is able to manipulate other people easily (Sandy 1982a, 61-65) and Egger (1994, 272) describes her as ‘the genre’s most assertive and active heroine’. Johne (1988, 12-15) shows that Charikleia is more active and tragic than the passive, comic heroines of Menander.

At the same time, Charikleia is portrayed as a female sophist, an Aspasia or Hypatia (1.21.3; 2.33.5; 2.33.7; 3.6.2; 3.19.3; 5.26.2; 6.8.1). Dzielska (1995) now provides a valuable discussion of the literary legend surrounding Hypatia, her circle of disciples, and her life and brutal death and also (pp. 117-119) mentions other learned women of late antiquity, such as Sosipatra (cf. Eunapius *Vit. Soph.* 6.9-6.10) and Asclepigeneia (*PRLE* 2.159). See now also the full-length monograph of Cloke (1995) on the role of Christian women in the Late Roman Empire and Brock (1985, 168-172) on the prominence given to women in the poetry of Ephrem, the Syrian saint.

The story of Charikleia is central to the narrative—the destinies of all the other characters depend on hers as she herself says (10.12.4). For the importance of Charikleia in the *Aithiopika*, see Johne (1996) 194-196; (1987) 30-33; Pernot (1987) 43-51; Hani (1978) 268-273. In the Byzantine period, the romance was known as the *Charikleia*, see the testimonia in Colonna (1938), e.g. *Test.* II (Maximus Confessor). The central role of Charikleia in the romance resembles that of Odysseus in Homer and Charikleia is likened to the

wily hero of early epic on a number of occasions: she gives Thyamis a false account of her identity (1.22.2) as Odysseus did to Eumaios (*Od.* 14.192-359); she bears a mark on her arm (10.15.2) as Odysseus had on his thigh (*Od.* 19.386-475); she disguises herself as a beggar (6.11.4) as Odysseus did (*Od.* 13.429-438); and hears the prophecies of the dead (7.1.1: cf. *Od.* 11). More generally, her return to Ethiopia resembles the νόστος of Odysseus and, of course, the opening *in medias res* recalls the *Odyssey*. However, Charikleia is not the only character to be identified with Odysseus; Kalasiris also resembles the Greek hero in his disguise (6.11.4), his ten year's wandering (7.8.2), and in hearing the prophecies of the dead (7.1.1). Most significantly, he arouses the anger of Odysseus, for which he is punished, as Odysseus was for blinding Poseidon's son, Polyphemus (5.22). Cf. Hefti (1950, 99-100); Keyes (1922, 43). Nevertheless, the story of Odysseus was given an allegorical interpretation by the later neoPlatonists, who read his escape from Circe as the flight of the soul from the material world (Tarán 1992, 216). In this sense, it is Charikleia, as the symbol of the soul, who should be identified most closely with the wily Greek, since it is she who escapes finally to Ethiopia.

According to the philosopher Philip (ll. 82-84), the name Charikleia, being composed of two elements χάρις and κλέος, represents the soul united with the body but later on the basis of the numerical value of the name (777, which he breaks down into 700, signifying the perfect mind; 70, indicating the soul; and 7, the body) he goes further and claims that the name indicates a Platonic triad of νοῦς, ψυχή and σῶμα—mind, soul and body (ll. 79-92). This departs from the romance itself, which only points out the composite nature of the name (2.35.5), but is important for Philip's allegorical reading of the text, in which Charikleia's travels from Ethiopia to Greece represent the progress of the soul from ignorance to knowledge (ll. 92-131). In Greece, she lives the practical life of chastity under the guidance of Charikles, but when she sees Theagenes she forgets everything but contemplation of true being, and is drawn upwards by desire to regain her earlier noble state (ll. 98-109). This analysis owes a lot to Diotima's account of the 'ladder of love' (Plato *Symp.* 210a-212a) but also to Philo (*De Opificio Mundi* 69; Tarán 1992, 216-228). The reader should remember, however, that Heliodorus was interested in the numerical representation of names, since he also notes that the name of the Nile, Νεῖλος, when it is calculated as a number, makes a total of 365—the number of days in a year. This is significant because every year the Nile brought fresh silt to the land of Egypt and was therefore worshipped as Horus, the provider of grain and life (9.22.5). None of the other names, however, appear to have any numerical significance.

The characterisation of Charikleia is therefore complex: while her eroticism (3.4), intelligence (4.5.3), chastity (4.18.5) and humanity (1.2.7; 3.19; 4.7.11; 4.13.5; 6.8.3-5) are clear, there are also indications in the text of allegorical coding of her persona and repeated signs of her quasi-divine status (1.2.6; 2.31.1; 8.9.12; 10.9.3).

The name Charikleia ('famous for her grace') is rare, though it is attested in the historical record (it occurs on a Euboean and an Eretrian inscription; see *LGPN* 1, *s.v.* 'Charikleia'; cf. also the *Suda s.v.* 'Charikleia'). In fiction it is otherwise only found in Lucian (*Tox.* 12-18), where Charikleia is the wife of Demonax, an eminent Ephesian, who seduces Deinias and ruins him. Feuillâtre (1966, 134) regarded the use of the name by Lucian to be part of a general mockery of the romance by the satirist. The later date for Heliodorus would make this impossible, of course. But if the late date for Heliodorus is correct, why did he use this particular name? It is possible that Heliodorus wanted to portray his heroine as passionate and sensual as well as virginal and chaste (cf. below, 3.4.4 and note). However, the etymology of her name and the strongly symbolic description which Heliodorus lavishes on his heroine make it unlikely that any reader would entertain the idea that Charikleia would be the subject of a lurid tale. Photius (*Bib.* 73.50a.20 [Bekker]) notes that Charikleia and Theagenes are σώφρονες ἀλλήλων ἐρασταί. The story of Charikleia in Lucian influenced Heliodorus as little as the story of Charikles in Achilles Tatius (1.7-12) and Lucian (*Am.* 10.3) affected his portrayal of the character of the priest of Apollo: cf. below 3.5.3, and note.

τότε δτι καὶ Θεαγένην ἡττηθῆναι . . . ἐπαγωγότερον: A somewhat conventional idea; in Achilles Tatius the superiority of female beauty over that of the male was debated explicitly (2.36-38), whereas Xenophon of Ephesus makes Antheia and Habrokomes equals in beauty (1.2). Jax (1933, 160-178) gives a full account of the usual description of female beauty in the romances.

The word ἀκραϊφνές suggests virginity: cf. 1.2.9 and Birchall's note (1996, *ad loc.*). 3.4.2 Ἦγετο μὲν γὰρ ἐφ' ἀρμαμάξης ἀπὸ συνωρίδος λευκῆς βοῶν ἡνιοχουμένη: at the conclusion of the romance Sisimithres, Charikleia and Persinna are also drawn in a carriage pulled by white oxen (10.41.3). Heliodorus was evidently at pains to signal the connection between the events at Delphi and events at Meroë. Merkelbach (1962, 241 n. 1) notes that oxen have worldly associations (Porphyry *On the cave of the nymphs* 18). But why, if Charikleia represents the soul escaping from the world (*ibid.* p. 246), should she be associated with oxen at the triumphant conclusion to the work?

In the procession in honour of Artemis at Patras, the virgin priestess (ἡ ἱερωμένη

παρθένος) rode last in the procession in a chariot drawn by yoked deer (Paus. 7.18.12; cf. Feuillâtre 1966, 54). It is unclear from Heliodorus' narrative, however, why Charikleia, as an acolyte, was singled out for such high honour.

χιτῶνα δὲ ἀλουργὸν ποδήρη χρυσαῖς ἀκτίσι κατάπαστον: cf. 1.2.5, χρυσοῦφοῦς δὲ τῆς ἐσθῆτος πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον ἀνταυγαζούσης; 5.31.2, καὶ ἰδὼν τὴν Χαρίκλειαν δάφνης τε φέρουσαν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς στέφανον καὶ χρυσοῦφει στολῆ καταυγάζουσαν; 10.9.3, ἐνέδου τε τὸν ἐκ Δελφῶν ἱερὸν χιτῶνα, ἐκ πηριδίου τινὸς ὃ ἐπέφερετο προκομίσασα, χρυσοῦφῆ τε ὄντα καὶ ἀκτίσι κατάπαστον. The description of Charikleia's dress reinforces the solar imagery that is associated with her in the romance (cf. 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 below and notes). Charikleia herself is frequently described as radiant, e.g. 2.16.3 (the eyes of Charikleia); 7.7.7 (Theagenes recognises Charikleia); 10.9.3 (Charikleia on the gridiron at Meroë). Kerényi (1962², 144) argues that such descriptions of Charikleia reveal the heroine in a divine light and invite comparison between her and Isis. Despite the religious atmosphere of these epiphanies (cf. 3.4.6 below, and note), however, it is not clear how the sun imagery in these descriptions can be reconciled with Isiac iconography. On the other hand, Woronoff's view (1987, 33) that Heliodorus merely creates an impression of grandeur by means of his account of magnificent costumes such as this, does not explain the recurrent use of sun imagery in these passages or their similarity with the 'epiphany' scenes. There can be no doubt that Charikleia is associated with sun imagery in the *Ethiopian Story* and this must be connected with the enigma of her birth (see introduction on the central paradox of the work).

ζώνην δὲ ἐπεβέβλητο τοῖς στέρνοις: Houston (1947², 57; fig. 58a, b; 59a, b) illustrates the kind of cincture described by Heliodorus here. Cf. also Hopes (1841 [repr. 1962], 183); Losfeld (1991, 239). Picard (1930, 182) notes the symbolic nature of gilded cinctures on statues of goddesses; for the Isiac knot cf. 3.4.3 below and note.

The description of Charikleia's breastband is a form of ἐκφράσις ('literary description': cf. 3.1.1 above, and note). The use of *ekphraseis* such as the present one (3.4.3-3.4.4), the description of the ring presented to Nausikles by Kalasiris (5.14) and the giraffe presented to Hydaspes by the Auxumite ambassadors (10.27) reinforce the optical splendour of the narrative (cf. 3.3.1 above, and note). The question of the literary importance of this particular description arises; the ἐκφράσις may function as a focusing device, underlining the importance of Charikleia in the narrative (Dubel 1990, 103). However, the description could also be allegorical; Lucian (*Herod.* 4-6) describes an allegorical painting by Aëtion in which Alexander faces a choice between love of Roxane and

love of war (his account of how Aëtion won the hand of the daughter of the Steward of the Olympic Games on displaying this painting provides a subtle narrative frame to his description of the work itself). Philostratus describes an allegorical statue of Tantalus holding a cup, which is interpreted to be the cup of friendship (*Apoll.* 3.25, 3.32) and also a statue of Milo, whose wreath, for example, is interpreted as a symbol of temperance (*Apoll.* 4.28). Callistratus describes a bronze statue of Καῖρός ‘Opportunity’ (Ἐκφράσεις 6), which depicted this abstraction as a charming winged boy. Onians (1979, 95-118) argues that visual allegory was an especially Phoenician interest—an interesting claim in view of Heliodorus’ origins. However, it is not clear what the description of Charikleia represents in allegorical terms—there is certainly no hint of her spiritual significance in the description of the ζωνή. The theme was to some extent conventional (cf. 3.4.3 below, and note). It seems best to take the description of Charikleia’s ζωνή as a means of characterising the heroine; the ἐκφράσις of intertwined snakes gives the reader an idea of her latent sensuality.

καὶ ὁ τεχνησάμενος . . . δυνησόμενος: These words closely resemble the last two lines of Homer’s description of the baldric of Herakles (*Od.* 11.612-14). Heliodorus’ description also bears a close resemblance to that of the Homeric scholiast here (ὁ κατασκευάσας ἐκεῖνον τὸν τελαμῶνα ἄλλον τοιοῦτον οὐκ ἐτεχνήσατο ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ τεχνήσεται . . . εἰς ἐκεῖνον γὰρ τὸ πᾶν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ τέχνης κατέκλεισεν, 11.613; cf. Colonna 1967, 250). Heliodorus was most probably echoing the words of the scholiast rather than the reverse, since otherwise the scholiast would have referred to the romance in his note, but the value of the resemblance between the two descriptions for determining the date of the *Ethiopian Story* is slight. The scholia provide two interpretations of the Homeric passage: (1) that the artist had used up all his art on his creation; (2) that the creative powers of the artist were unlimited but that the creation itself was unique (suggested by the phrase ὃς κείνον τελαμῶνα ἐῆ ἐγκάτθετο τέχνη, *Od.* 11.614). The ambiguity derives from τεχνησάμενος, which could mean ‘designed’, corresponding to (1) or ‘created’, producing (2). Heliodorus’ text corresponds to (1).

The reference to Homer alerts the reader to the importance of the following description and, together with the formula of closure (3.4.5), marks it off from the narrative. In Heliodorus the reference to the craftsman occurs at the beginning of the description and not at the end as it does in Homer. This suggests that the description of the breastband should be read in the light of the Homeric passage. A general comparison between the two passages reveals the following intertextual effects (a detailed exposition

of these will be found in the notes below). (1) Contrast. The description of the ghost of Herakles scattering the dead spirits around him stands in stark contrast with that of Charikleia here: in general, Charikleia is passive, peaceful, and feminine where Herakles is aggressive, warlike and masculine. (2) 'Raising'. By signalling a literary allusion so overtly Heliodorus raises the description of Charikleia to a more abstract, meta-literary plane. This is in keeping with the complex literary texture of the work. (3) Self-conscious artistry. The echo of Homer also serves to alert the reader to the fact that the description of the breastband which follows is itself an artistic creation. The breastband which Heliodorus describes is the invention of Heliodorus himself. His comments about the artistry of the work therefore apply to his own. The passage in Homer raises questions about the ethics and efficacy of art, which remain latent. The poet expresses the wish that the artist will not make another similar baldric again (613-614). The purport of this wish is unclear: is it a statement of pacifism, or does it mean that the work is inimitable and unique? Heliodorus chooses the latter alternative.

The codices have ἦν ὁ τεχνησάμενος εἰς ἐκείνην, which has been variously emended. Koraes and Rattenbury would insert εἰς before ἦν, omitting εἰς ἐκείνην from the text. Lumb replaces ἦν by καί and retains εἰς ἐκείνην, which does less violence to the text. RL's text here follows the conjecture of Lumb. Colonna (1938; 1940, 40; 1987) persistently retains the reading of the codices, suggesting that the meaning here is *quam qui scite confecerat, in ipsam incluserat*. Colonna points out that εἰς ἐκείνην . . . κατέκλεισεν echoes the text of the Homeric scholiast and it seems best to retain the prepositional phrase. However, the redundant use of relative and demonstrative pronouns in such close proximity to one another is intolerable and Lumb's reading should therefore be retained.

3.4.3 Δυοῖν γὰρ δρακόντων: Lucian (*How to write history* 19) satirises frigid descriptions of girdles with intertwined snakes and Heliodorus' description is by no means original. He must, for example, have been aware of Homer's description of the armour of Agamemnon, which features three snakes made of coloured enamel in the likeness of a rainbow, Zeus's portent to humankind, κυάνεοι δὲ δράκοντες ὀρωρέχατο προτὶ δειρῆν / τρεῖς ἐκάτερθ' ἴρισιν εὐικότες, ἅς τε Κρονίων / ἐν νέφει στήριξε, τέρας μερόπων ἀνθρώπων (*Il.* 11.26-8). There is also a stronger echo of Hesiod's description of the Gorgons on the shield of Herakles, ἐπὶ δὲ ζώνησι δράκοντε δοιῶ / ἀπηρωεῦντ' ἐπικυρτώοντε κάρηνα / λίχμαζον δ' ἄρα τῷ γε, μένει δ' ἐχάρασσον ὀδόντας / ἄγρια δερκομένω ἐπὶ δὲ δεινοῖσι καρῆνοισι / Γοργεῖοις ἐδονεῖτο μέγας φόβος (*Sc.* 233-7). The reference to Hesiod's *Scutum* would reinforce the impression

of the virginal nature of Charikleia, as the poem relates how Alkmene, the mother of Herakles, imposes celibacy on Amphitryon until he avenges the murder of her brothers (Hes. *Sc.* 14-19). The poem takes its title from the elaborate description of the shield of Herakles (139-320) which is modelled on the famous shield of Achilles (*Il.* 18.478-609). Both Homer (*Il.* 11.26-8) and Hesiod emphasise the ferocity of the snakes (and thus of the owners of the armour) but Heliodorus chooses to describe how the snakes are lulled to sleep in Charikleia's bosom. There may be a suggestion that Charikleia, as the acolyte of Artemis, resembles the goddess in respect of her power over wild animals. Snakes featured as an attribute of Artemis: for example, the statue of Artemis at Lykosoura holds a torch in one hand and two snakes in the other (Paus. 8.37.4) and on the frieze of the temple of Apollo at Bassae, depicting the battle of the Lapiths and Centaurs, the figure of Artemis in a chariot wears a double baldric on which the head of a serpent can be seen. Artemis is frequently shown with a ζώνη crossing over and under her breasts (cf., e.g., *LIMC s.v.* 'Artemis' 639, 856, 882 [with torch]). Occasionally, the goddess has the hide of a deer crossed over her breasts (cf., e.g., *LIMC s.v.* 'Artemis' 931).

Thirdly, in Euripides' eponymous play *Ion* recognises his mother, Creusa, by three ἀναγνωρίσματα: a piece of cloth, fringed with serpents, resembling an aegis with a Gorgon in the centre; a necklace consisting of gold snakes; and a wreath of olive (*Ion* 1417-1436). The cloak of Theagenes with its Gorgon emblem resembles this material (cf. note on 3.3.5 above) and Charikleia wears a wreath of laurel (3.4.5). The necklace is described as follows,

Κρ. δράκοντες ἀρχαῖόν τι παγχρύσῳ γένει
δῶρημ' Ἀθάνας, ἥ τέκν' ἐντρέφειν λέγει . . .

Ἐριχθονίου γε τοῦ πάλαι μιμήματα. (1427-29).

There is a clear thematic resemblance between the *Ion* and the *Ethiopian Story* since both concern illegitimate children resulting from the intervention of the gods. The children serve as acolytes in the temple of Apollo at Delphi and are finally recognised by the ἀναγνωρίσματα woven by their loving mothers. As in the case of the serpent necklace given to *Ion*, the girdle of Charikleia may have been intended to have an apotropaic effect against the 'eye of envy' (ironically in the light of Kalasiris' fabrication to Charikles that his daughter had been afflicted with this condition: cf. 3.7-8 below). The description of the girdle of Charikleia therefore evokes subtle literary associations that deepen the characterisation of the heroine.

With regard to the grammatical form δράκόντων, it is noticeable that Heliodorus

uses the dual number freely (14 times): 3.5.6; 3.13.2; 3.14.3; 4.10.4; 5.27.7; 6.11.3; 6.11.4; 6.11.4; 8.16.6; 10.5.1; 10.6.5; 10.27.3; 10.30.5; 10.31.3; cf. Fritsch (1901, 10). In the present instance, the archaism reinforces the heroic atmosphere of the encounter between Theagenes and Charikleia.

τὰ μὲν οὐραῖα . . . ὑπὸ τοὺς μαζοὺς παραμείψας . . . καὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς διολισθηῖσαι τοῦ βρόχου συγχωρήσας: Heliodorus uses the form μαζός (rather than μαστός), following Homer and Herodotus. The change from στέρνα introduces a feminine and maternal element into the description. Διολισθηῖσαι ‘slip through’ is rare and mostly late (e.g., *Phil. Imag.* 2.17.14), though it does occur in Plato (e.g., *Lys.* 216d1). Hesychius uses this form as a gloss on ἐκπερδικίσαι ‘escape like a partridge’ (*Ar. Av.* 768). It is not difficult to see an erotic undertone to the description here. Readers of Homer will be aware of associations with the seductive and alluring girdle which Aphrodite gave to Hera (*Il.* 14.214-217). Heliodorus achieves this erotic effect indirectly—he avoids a full physical description of his heroine (Jax 1933, 170). It should also be remembered that Photius (*Bib.* 94.73b.24 [Bekker]) ranks Heliodorus, Iamblichos and Achilles Tatius on a descending scale of decency.

Eros is consistently associated with serpent imagery; Sappho (fr. 130 L-P) describes him as ‘creeping’ (ὄρπετον) and in Apuleius the god is *vipereum* (4.33.1). Alternatively, the knot of intertwined snakes may be Isiac (Feuillâtre 1966, 55; Merkelbach 1962, 240). Isis is commonly represented with her dress tied in a knot under her breasts (cf., e.g. *LIMC s.v.* ‘Isis’ 47, 304) and was also commonly assimilated to the snake god, Thermouthis—in this form she was known as Isis-Thermouthis. In her manifestation as Isis-Thermouthis, the goddess is represented as a serpent and often her coils are intertwined with those of Sarapis-Agathodaimon (cf., e.g., *LIMC s.v.* ‘Isis’ 354, 359). Doubtless Heliodorus was familiar with such representations of the goddess, since he shows knowledge of the myth of Isis and Osiris (9.9.4-5). Finally, Macrobius (*Sat.* 1.19.16) states that intertwined snakes symbolise genesis. According to him, four deities preside over birth; Genius (whose symbol is the Sun), Fortune (the Moon), Love (intertwined snakes) and Necessity (a knot). Macrobius adds (1.20.1) that serpents resemble the sun (1) in that they appear to be reborn when sloughing their skin just as the sun is reborn daily when it rises and (2) in respect of their keen sight (he derives the word δρόκων from δέρεταιν). It is unclear to what extent Heliodorus was aware of these associations of Charikleia’s girdle of snakes, but his description must have suggested a variety of rather imprecise religious associations to his readers.

κατὰ τῶν μεταφρένων: the Homeric word for 'back' (*Il.* 5.40; *Od.* 8.528) used freely by Heliodorus (7.6.4; 10.31.3; 10.32.2).

3.4.4 Εἶπες ἄν τοὺς ὄφεις οὐ δοκεῖν ἔρπειν ἀλλ' ἔρπειν: Heliodorus' descriptions, even of inanimate objects, are animated rather than static (Bartsch 1989, 123; Feuillâtre 1966, 24); here the snakes are described as actually, not apparently, moving, just as the figures on the shield of Achilles are said to be moving (cf., e.g. *Il.* 18.492-496).

The invocation of the reader in Εἶπες ἄν draws attention to the subjectivity of the act of interpretation of a work of art (Dubel 1990, 105) and provides a balance to the objective way in which the breastband is described in terms of the material and the artistry with which it was made (3.4.4).

οὐχ ὑπὸ βλοσυρῷ καὶ ἀπηνεῖ τῷ βλέμματι: Βλοσυρός occurs twice in the *Scutum* of Hesiod: to describe wildness and savagery of Strife, ἐπὶ δὲ βλοσυροῖο μετώπου / δεινὴ Ἔρις πεπότητο (Hes. *Sc.* 147 [Φόβος]); and of lions, Βλοσυροῖσι λέοντες (*ib.* 175). Homer uses the term of Ajax going into battle, τοῖος ἄρ' Αἴας ὦρτο πελώριος ἔρκος Ἀχαιῶν / μειδιῶν βλοσυροῖσι προσώπασι (*Il.* 7.213-4); of the terrifying Gorgon, τῇ δ' ἐπὶ μὲν Γοργῷ βλοσυρῶπις ἐστεφάνωτο / δεινὸν δερκομένη, περὶ δὲ Δειμὸς τε Φόβος τε (*Il.* 11.36-7; cf. Hes. *Sc.* 147); and of Hector in full fury, τὸ δὲ οἱ ὄσσε / λαμπέσθην βλοσυρήσιν ὑπ' ὀφρύσιν (*Il.* 15.608). In his commentary on the *Iliad*, Eustathius connects the word with vision and offers an etymology, ἐκ τοίνυν τοῦ τοιούτου δρῶ ρήματος τὸ ὑπόδρα, ὡς τῆς ὄψεως μὴ κατὰ φύσιν ἐχούσης τοῖς ὀργιζομένοις, ἀλλὰ πως παρατιθεμένης καὶ ὑποβαλλομένης: ὅθεν καὶ βλοσυρός λέγεται ὁ τὸ βλέμμα ὑποσύρων, ὁποῖόν τι καὶ οἱ φύσει τὰς ὄψεις διεστραμμένοι πάσχουσι: πλὴν οὗτοι μὲν ὑποβλέπειν λέγονται καὶ ὑπόδρα βλέπειν: ἐκεῖνοι δὲ παραβλέπειν, ὅθεν καὶ παραβλῶπες ὀνομάζονται (Eust. 1.109.15). This interpretation is similar to that of Hesychius, who uses the word as a gloss on σιπαλή 'ugly' or ἐπάργεμος 'blind': 'σιπαλή. ἐπάργεμος. βλοσυρά. δεινή. τουτέστι λεύκας ἐπὶ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἔχουσα. Eustathius makes it clear that the term also covers the emotional state of the subject, Τὸ δὲ βλοσυρόν δηλοῖ μὲν δεινότητα προσώπου, ἐξ οὗ καὶ βλοσυρῶπις . . . ἐτυμολογεῖται δὲ παρὰ τὸ τὸ βλέμμα ὑποσύρειν. Οἱ δὲ παλαιοὶ βλοσυρόν φασι καὶ τὸ σεμνόν (Eust. 2.445.2). The word is also used to describe intense emotion in Aelian *Var. Hist.* 12.21 (Morgan 1979, at 10.27.2).

The word βλοσυρῷ also connotes masculinity, particularly in women, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ζητητέον μὴ μόνον γενναίους τε καὶ βλοσυροὺς τὰ ἦθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἃ τῆδε τῇ παιδείᾳ τῆς φύσεως πρόσφορα ἐκτέον αὐτοῖς (Pl. *Resp.* 535b3); ΣΩ. Εἶτα, ὦ καταγέλαστε, οὐκ ἀκήκοας ὡς ἐγὼ εἰμι ὑδὲ μαίας μάλα γενναίας τε καὶ βλοσυράς, Φαιναρέτης (Pl. *Tht.* 149a); Βλοσυρωτάτη τὸ εἶδος (Dio 62.2, with reference to Boudicca). Heliodorus'

aggressively alliterative phrase βλοσυρῶ . . . βλέμματι reinforces this connotation.

Ἄπηνῆς ('rough', 'cruel', 'harsh') is Homeric, οἷος κείνου θυμὸς ὑπερφίαλος καὶ ἀπηνῆς (*Il.* 15.95) and late, Καὶ ἐπεὶ πλησίον ἦσαν τῶν θυρῶν, ἦδον σκληρᾶ καὶ ἀπηνεῖ τῆ φωνῆ, καθάπερ τριαίναις γῆν ἀναρρηγνύντες, οὐχ ὑμέναιον ἄδοντες. (Long. 4.40.2 [the wedding-song for Daphnis and Chloe]).

The use of the words βλοσυρός and ἀπηνῆς suggest a contrast between the hostile gaze of those who cast the 'eye of envy' (cf. 3.7.3 below, and notes) and the intimate gaze of the snakes on Charikleia's girdle here. This underlines the irony of Kalasiris' deception of Charikles (3.7-8 below).

ἀλλ' ὑγρῶ κώματι διαρρεομένους ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ τὰ στέρνα τῆς κόρης ἡμέρου κατευναζομένους: the description is clearly erotic. Underdowne translates: '[the snakes] seemed as though they had been wantonly a sleeper'. Ὑγρός 'moist, languid' has strong connotations of erotic desire, ὑγρὸς τὸ εἶδος [Eros] (Pl. *Symp.* 196a3); ὑγρὸν βλέμμα (Anacreont. 15.21); τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν δὲ τὸ ὑγρὸν ἅμα τῷ φαιδρῷ καὶ κεχαρισμένῳ (Luc. *Im.* 6.7). The phrase ὑγρῶ κώματι is unparalleled, though based on ἀβληχρῶ δ' ἐπὶ κώματι (A.R. 2.205); ἀπαλῶι κώματι (Pl. *Ep.* 19.6). Homer describes the seduction of Zeus by Hera with similar vocabulary: . . . ἐπεὶ αὐτῷ ἐγὼ μαλακὸν περὶ κῶμ' ἐκάλυψα / Ἥρη δ' ἐν φιλότῃ παρήπαφεν εὐνηθῆναι (*Il.* 14.359-360; cf. Naber 1873, 147). The Orphic *Argonautica* has a line which closely parallels this passage, κῶμα δ' ἄφαρ κατέμαρψε πελωρίου ὄσσε δράκοντος (*Arg.* 1013). However, the variant reading κοιμήματι, though rare, would reinforce the erotic tone of the description (cf. Ἴὼ ματρῶαι λέκτρων ἄται κοιμή-/ματ<ά τ'> αὐτογέννητ' / ἐμῷ πατρὶ δυσμόρου ματρός, Soph. *Ant.* 863-5). Koraes suggests that κοιμήματι, the reading of the earliest manuscript V which M observed as a variant in the MSS, is a gloss for κώματι but κοιμήματι would suit the erotic associations of the passage, since it is frequently used of sexual intercourse (Hom. *Il.* 6.246; *Od.* 8.295; Hdt. 3.68). The use of κώματι may reflect the Bowdlerisation of the text in the same way as Cataudella (1976, 157-161) suggests happened at 4.4.3. Κοιμήματι is clearly better suited to lie next to ὑγρῶ than κώματι. In this regard, it is noticeable that Amyot omits τὰ στέρνα along with PVMA (although he translates them as 'l'estomach'; cf. Sandy 1984-1985, 18). The words are retained by CBZT.

Διαρρεῖσθαι carries the meaning 'be debauched', 'act in a debauched manner' καὶ γάρ τοι Συβαρίταις πᾶσιν ἔργον ἦν τρυφᾶν καὶ τῷ βίῳ διαρρεῖν (Ael. *VH.* 9.24; Luc. *D. Mort.* 11.4) and the word gives the description a sensual tone (Feuillâtre 1966, 96). Ἴμερος is the normal word for sexual desire and is used in personifications, πᾶρ δ' αὐτῆς Χάριτες

τε καὶ Ἴμερος οἰκί' ἔχουσιν (Hes. *Th.* 64). Ἴμερος also occurs in association with κατευνάζω in the love-making scene between Paris and Helen in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 3.443-449). The Heliodoran passage resembles this passage in respect of the strong contrast between love and war. In Homer there is an explicit contrast between Paris and Helen making love and Menelaus raging through the battle lines in search of battle with Paris. In Heliodorus the contrast is implicit and intertextual.

The sensuality of the description of the breastband adds a further dimension to the character of the chaste Charikleia, who is here shown to be erotic and seductive (Dubel 1990, 110). Elsewhere too Heliodorus has emphasised Charikleia's human (as opposed to divine) nature: cf. 1.2.6-7; 1.7.2; Charikleia's despair during the wedding feast of Knemon (6.8.3-6.9.5, where Charikleia's torn tunic exposes her breasts 6.9.2) and especially the words of Kalasiris, οὐκ ἐννοήσεις ἄνθρωπος οὕσα, πρᾶγμα ἀστάθμητον καὶ ὀξείας ῥοπᾶς ἐφ' ἐκότερα λαμβάνον; (6.9.3).

The passage raises more general questions concerning the readership of the novel. Elsom (1992, 212-230) suggests that 'the ancient romances embody a structure common to romance and pornography, that of the exposure of a woman to the public gaze' (p. 213); and Montague (1992, 231-249) argues that Longus' novel is 'a form of female erotica' (p. 233). There is certainly an element of voyeurism in the description of Charikleia here, as indeed there is when Trachinos peeps at Charikleia on the suggestion of Kalasiris (5.31). The description of Charikleia here is more complex, since the reader must remember that it is given to Knemon, who was also an ardent lover, having had sexual relationships with Thisbe (1.11.3) and Arsinoë (1.15.6). Kalasiris could therefore be playing with his susceptibilities here. Knemon is often characterised as a gullible audience and morally rather a weak character (Winkler 1982, 143). However, since Kalasiris does not at this stage know the history of Knemon and since erotic descriptions of the heroine occur elsewhere in the work (cf., e.g., 6.9.2), it is equally probable that the extraordinary combination of sensual and religious associations in the description is designed to deepen the characterisation of the heroine, who emerges from this passage as a remarkable and complex figure; she is at once chaste and sensuous, spiritual and physical. Where Heliodorus does describe Trachinos spying on Charikleia in a voyeuristic way (5.31.2), he emphasises her sacred Delphic robe and her resemblance to Artemis. Even the description of Achaimenes gazing at Charikleia through a keyhole and wondering what she would look like when not in mourning cannot be described as overtly erotic (7.15.3). Heiserman (1977, 77) has noted this ambivalence: 'A fantasy of erotic power . . . is in conflict with, and

therefore sanctioned by, a fantasy of moral power'. For the comment of Photius on the relative decency of Heliodorus: cf. 3.4.3 above, and note. In fact, Heliodorus is unusual in not giving a detailed physical description of his heroine—his aim in not doing so was to enhance the impression of her beauty, as Homer did in the case of Helen (Morgan 1979, at 10.9.3). For Heliodorus, Charikleia's beauty was a composite of many attributes which make up a symbolic complex. Cf. 1.2.1; 1.2.5; 2.31.1; 2.33.3; 3.19.1; 4.1.2; 5.31.2; 6.9.1; 6.11.4 (in disguise); 7.7.6 (in disguise); 8.9.13; 10.9.3; 10.41.3. Descriptions of the other heroines of Greek romance are: Char. 1.1.2; 2.2.2; 2.4.2; 3.8.6; 4.1.8; 5.3.9; 6.4.5; 6.7.1: Xenophon 1.2.6: Ach. Tat. 1.4.1; 5.13.1 (Melite); 6.6-7: Long. 1.17.2; 1.32.1; 4.32.1. The description of Theagenes (3.3.4) is more explicit than that of Charikleia, much as that of Daphnis is more detailed than that of Chloe (1.13.1).

Naber (1873, 317) suggests ὑπό for ἀπό in the phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ τὰ στέρνα but there is no support for this reading in the MSS. Similar confusion over these prepositions occurs at 1.8.4: cf. Birchall (1996, *ad loc.*).

ὁ γὰρ χρυσὸς ὑπὸ τῆς τέχνης ἐμελαίνεται: the text here resembles Homer *Il.* 18.548-9, ἦ δὲ μελαίνειτ' ὄπισθεν, ἀρηρομένη δὲ ἔωκει, / χρυσεῖη περ ἑοῦσα: τὸ δὴ περὶ θαῦμα τέτυκτο, in so far as both authors mention how the skill of the artists was apparent from the way in which they blackened the gold medium of the work to convey a more realistic effect. The reference to the technique of the artist draws attention to the breastband as an artistic creation and, by extension, to the text as fiction. There may a deliberate contrast between nature and art in the reference to the material, gold, and the artistic working of it (Dubel 1990, 106).

τὸ μέλαν εἰσκραθέν: εἰσκραθέν is a *hapax* which RL cleverly emend to τὸ μελανθὲς κραθέν. Colonna initially (1938) adopted the reading of Z, τὸ μέλαν συγκραθέν but later (1987b) reverted to the reading of the codices, τὸ μέλαν εἰσκραθέν which appears to be a natural and plausible formation, since Heliodorus appears to be rather fond of compounds with εἰσ-: cf., e.g., εἰσδύεται (3.7.3), εἰστοξεύοντα (3.7.5), εἰσκαλεῖν (3.16.2); εἰστήκειν (4.9.3); εἰσπεπραγμένην (4.19.7).

ἐπιδείξεται: The only case of a subjunctive in secondary sequence in a final clause introduced by ἵνα in the *Ethiopian Story* (Barber 1962, 253-254)—an indication of the care Heliodorus usually takes to write Attic Greek.

3.4.5 Τοιαύτη μὲν ἢ ζώνη τῆς κόρης: These words constitute a closing formula which serves to mark the description off from the narrative, thus weakening its dramatic function and turning it into an ornamental example of ring composition.

ἡ κόμη: cf. the description of Rhodogoune by Philostratus, which emphasises her shining blonde hair (*Imag.* 2.5.4, καὶ τὸ μὲν ἀνειλημμένον τῶν τριχῶν αἰδοῖ κεκόσμηται τὸ ἀγέρωχον κολαζούση, τὸ δὲ ἄνετον βακχεύει αὐτὴν καὶ ῥώννυσι. καὶ ξανθὸν μὲν καὶ χρυσοῦ πέρα τὸ ἀτακτοῦν τῆς κόμης, τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ θάτερα κείμενον ἔχει τι καὶ ἐς αὐγὴν παραλλάττον ὑπὸ τοῦ τετάχθαι). Such hair, especially if unbound, was a conventional element in the description of beautiful women in antiquity (Jax 1933, 166).

δάφνης ἀπαλοὶ κλῶνες: the wreath of laurel associates Charikleia generally with Delphi and the oracle of Apollo (cf. 1.2.2).

ἠλιῶσαν: Where Herakles looks ‘like the sombre darkness’, ὁ δ’ ἐρεμνῆ νυκτὶ εἰοικώς (*Od.* 11.606), Charikleia is radiant: her hair shines like the sun and her eyes blaze brighter than any torch. Merkelbach (1962, 240 n. 5) observes the appropriateness of this rare word for his view that the novel is a cult text in honour of Helios, but cf. *Phil. Imag.* 1 proem 2.14, καὶ ξανθὴν κόμην . . . καὶ πυρσὴν καὶ ἠλιῶσαν. Sun imagery is not unprecedented in Greek literature but its persistence in the description of Charikleia is highly unusual. There is more to such descriptions therefore than Wolff’s ‘hieratic epiphanies’ (1912, 180) in which the wandering sun-god surprises his enemies and worshippers by an unexpected and dazzling appearance. Not least remarkable is the application of this sun imagery to the heroine of a romance.

ἔξω τοῦ πρέποντος: propriety (τὸ πρέπον) is an important virtue in the *Ethiopian Story* and is most evident when it is transgressed: Demainete’s kisses (1.9.3) and Arsake’s behaviour towards Theagenes (8.3.6, 8.4.2, 8.5.3) are both described as improper. Thyamis challenges the impropriety of Arsake’s behaviour in an extended discussion that resembles a rhetorical debate. Likewise, Theagenes’ impetuosity is deemed improper by Kalasiris (4.6.5). By way of contrast, Charikleia acknowledges that it is improper for women to speak in a company of men (1.21.3)—although she then proceeds to break the convention. Merely to confess to love is deemed improper by Kalasiris (4.10.4 below and note) and Charikleia feels intense shame at having to admit to it (4.11.1). Persinna attributes her pleas in defence of Theagenes to a passion improper for a girl (10.29.4). Kalasiris treats Charikleia with respect proper to her station (4.13.1). Propriety in the *Ethiopian Story* therefore appears to have both moral and class connotations. For class-consciousness in the romance: cf. 3.3.8 above, 4.2.1, 4.10.3, below and notes.

3.4.6 Ἔφερε δὲ τῇ λαιῶ μὲν τόξον ἐπίχρυσον ὑπὲρ ὤμων τὸν δεξιὸν τῆς φαρέτρας ἀπηρτημένης: Throughout the novel Charikleia is assimilated to Artemis as beautiful young girls usually are in the romances (Jax 1933, 164). The comparison goes back to

Homer *Od.* 6.151-152: Ἄρτεμιδί σε ἐγὼ γε, Διὸς κούρη μέγαλοιο, / εἶδός τε μέγεθός τε φῦν τ' ἄγχιστα εἴσκω. However, there is some point to the comparison in the case of Charikleia: as a young girl in Delphi she devoted herself to Artemis to the despair of her father Charikles (cf. 2.33.4, παρθενεύειν τὸν πάντα βίον διατείνεται καὶ τῇ Ἄρτεμιδι ζάκορον ἑαυτὴν ἐπιδοῦσα θήραις τὰ πολλὰ σχολάζει καὶ ἀσκεῖ τοξείαν). The comparison is repeated: cf. 1.2.1-2, where Charikleia is described as a goddess, crowned with laurel and carrying a bow and quiver; 5.5.4; 6.11.4; 6.14.1. Charikleia also puts her bow and arrows to deadly use when the heroine strikes pirates down indiscriminately on the beach (5.32.5), as Apollo and Artemis struck down the children of Niobe (Apollod. 3.45-47). Throughout the romance Artemis and Apollo direct the affairs of Charikleia and Theagenes: cf. below 3.11.5, and note.

τῇ θατέρα δὲ λαμπάδιον ἡμμένον καὶ οὕτως ἔχουσα πλεον ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σέλας ἢ τῶν δάδων ἀπηύραζεν: the torch was a sign of Artemis, according to Plutarch *Luc.* 24.4.3-42.5.1: χαράγματα φέρουσαι τῆς θεοῦ λαμπάδα. Cf. also 4.1.2 below, and note; Callimachus' hymn to Artemis (116-119); Paus. 10.37.1.

Knemon interrupts (3), thinking he could actually see Theagenes and Charikleia

3.4.7 «Οὔτοι ἐκεῖνοι Χαρίκλεια καὶ Θεαγένης» ἀνεβόησεν ὁ Κνήμων. Knemon's interruption of the narrative at this point has attracted much critical comment:

(1) In narratological terms, Futre Pinheiro (1991b, 75) observes that the return to the narrative 'frame' emphasises the differences between the happiness of the narrated past in Delphi and the sorrows and uncertainties of the narrative present in Chemmis and reminds the reader how far the narrative has progressed (cf. 3.4.9; 3.12-16 below).

(2) Hefti (1950, 46-47) points out that both narrative layers are unresolved and that this brings about a polar tension ('polare Spannung') in the reader.

(3) Anderson (1982, 36) reads Knemon's outburst as comic: 'Heliodorus not only treats his narrative as a game, but allows his characters to do likewise'. Knemon does show himself to be impressionable rather than knowing (cf. 3.1.1; 4.4.2 and notes; Winkler 1982, 143: Knemon 'seems to illustrate the comedy of misreading') and there is certainly something ludicrous in Knemon's behaviour, much like the Roman recruit who ruined a dramatic performance of Nero's in the belief that he was really in a miserable condition dressed in rags and not merely playing the part of Hercules (Suet. *Nero* 21).

(4) Bartsch (1989, 120-122) disagrees with this view, observing that Theagenes and Charikleia respond in an equally enthusiastic way to the narrative of Knemon (1.9.1; 1.14.2) and suggesting that the effect of the minutely detailed description is to make both

the reader and the secondary audience (Knemon) feel that he or she is a spectator.

Not all of the interruptions of Knemon are this impulsive—only his outburst at 4.3.4, where he asks Kalasiris to accelerate his narrative, is similar but at 3.1.1 and 3.2.3 he slows the pace of the story by asking Kalasiris to elaborate on his description; at 3.12.3 he asks for further explanation of how the gods may be recognised, and Kalasiris finally brings his account to an end at 5.1.4, when Knemon notes the noise of Nausikles' arrival in the background. These interruptions therefore serve a variety of functions, pacing the narrative and breaking up Kalasiris' lengthy account of events at Delphi with stretches of dialogue (cf., e.g., 3.2.3, 3.12.3). In this particular instance, the exclamation of Knemon and Kalasiris' assumption that Theagenes and Charikleia were actually present, sharply juxtapose a highly literary vignette with the run of the narrative. The effect is similar to the description of the amethyst ring given to Nausikles by Kalasiris in payment for Charikleia (5.13.2); the artist who had incised a pastoral scene on the stone had left one corner of the amethyst uncut to represent a rock (5.14).

Note the hiatus in οὗτοι ἐκείνοι (Reeve 1971, 520) and compare also 4.1.3, 5.8.3, 10.13.5, αὐτή ἐκείνη.

οὕτως ἐναργῶς τε καὶ οὐδ' οἶδα ἰδῶν ἢ παρὰ σοῦ διήγησις ὑπέδειξεν: cf. 3.1.1 above, and note, for Heliodorus' use of the rhetorical technique ἐνάργεια.

3.4.8 εἰ τοιούτους εἶδες οἴους αὐτοὺς κατ' ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν ἢ Ἑλλάς τε καὶ ὁ ἥλιος ἐθεάσατο: These words in the narrative frame betray a close connection with the narrative proper (Hefti 1950, 47), but this is not a fault so much as such a skilful lead into the resumption of the narrative. Morgan (1991, 99-100) adduces this passage in support of his argument that Heliodorus uses the audiences of his narrative to 'reflect and form the reader's own responses' to the text (p. 99). There is no doubt that the use of the second person commands the assent of Knemon and (indirectly) the reader, but admiring crowds were in any case conventional in descriptions of beauty (Jax 1933, 165).

Festivals were usually attended by large crowds, many of whom were seeking to arrange marriages for their children (X. Eph. 1.2.3). Such occasions were often the first time that young people met each other, since nubile girls were rarely seen in public (Char. 1.1.4). It was also at a festival that Demainete first fell in love with Knemon (1.10.1-2). Chariton (1.1.11), Xenophon (1.7.1), and Longus (4.38) show that marriages were important to the community at large as indeed they were in New Comedy (cf. Feuillâtre (1966, 122).

One of the reasons why Heliodorus chose Delphi as the setting for the encounter

between Theagenes and Charikleia was because it was considered to be the centre of the civilised world (Paus. 10.16.2; Pind. *Pyth.* 4.6; cf. the introduction above on *Openings*). To a limited extent this reveals a Hellenocentric attitude (Kuch 1989c, 80-86)—cf. also in this regard 1.19.2; 1.25.5; 1.30.6; 2.10.4; 2.12.5; 5.7.1; 5.7.3; 5.8.5; 6.14.4; 7.21.4; 7.25.4; 7.29.1. But note that barbarians are said to be capable of compassion also, 1.4.3; 5.7.3; 8.9.4 and the centrifugal movement of the plot from Delphi suggests that this statement should not be construed as necessarily a statement of philhellenism. Instead, Heliodorus is universalising his story here as can be seen also at 4.1.1; 4.3.2. The reference to the sun serves a similar purpose (see the introduction for discussion of references to Helios in the work.)

Τὴν γὰρ πρὸς θάτερον αὐτῶν συζυγίαν ἴσα καὶ ἀθανασίαν ἦγον: 'Αθανασία occurs also at 8.11.10 (Theagenes asks whether the pantarbe stone confers immortality). Συζυγία means 'permanent love relationships' in Plutarch (*Mor.* 770c) but can also mean 'copulation' (cf. *AP* 5.221, 11.139). The combination of these two concepts is unique and suits the emphasis on marriage in the romance. By contrast Chariton writes that Kallirhoe would have preferred a single day with Chaereas to marriage with Zeus or immortality (6.7.12, Καλλιρόη δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Διὸς οὐκ ἂν ἠσπάσατο γάμους, οὐδὲ ἀθανασίαν προετίμησεν ἂν ἡμέρας μιᾶς τῆς μετὰ Χαιρέου): cf. also *Cat.* 70.2; 72.2. For a discussion of the place of the romances in the history of sexuality: cf. Goldhill (1995); Konstan (1994).

ξένη γὰρ ὄψις: a commonplace: cf. *Plut. Mar.* 16.3-4.

Kalasis asks Knemon where Theagenes and Charikleia are

3.4.9 ὦ τῆς ἡδείας ἀπάτης: For the paradox, cf. ἡδεῖα δὲ καὶ ἡ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀπάτη (Philostr. *Imag.* 862 [Olearius]).

ἐσπέρας οὔσης ἤδη καὶ νυκτὸς: Knemon is so involved in the story as to be unaware of the passage of time (Winkler 1982, 143). Cf. 4.4.2. The reader is again made aware of the narrative context and the separation of narrative and narrated time is accentuated. It may not be by chance that the description of the encounter between the lovers takes place at night, since folktales were regularly told then (Hefti 1950, 47; cf. the story of Psyche, *Apul. Met.* 3.27; the story of Knemon, 1.9-18).

3.4.10 θυμὸν ἔχε ἀγαθόν: a common expression in Heliodorus (1.19.2; 8.15.3), possibly borrowed from Herodotus (e.g., 1.120.14).

τι κῶλυμα γέγονε καὶ βράδιον: Heliodorus often uses γέγονεν to mean 'is'; cf., e.g., 1.13.2, 6.2.1, 7.10.1, 10.34.3.

μὴ τὸ πᾶν τοῦ μισθοῦ κομισάμενος: cf. 2.23.4, where Knemon promised to tell Kalasis

of the whereabouts of Theagenes and Charikleia in return for the story of their background. The mention of pay suggests the mercenary side of Knemon's character, which reveals itself more clearly when Nausikles offers him his daughter in marriage, together with a sizeable dowry (6.8.2). There may also be an allusion to professional tellers of tales (cf. Pliny *Ep.* 2.20.2; 9.33.1; Scobie 1969, 9-29).

3.4.11 καὶ τὰ κοιταῖα τοῖς νυχίοις θεοῖς ἐπισπείσαντες: the practice of pouring libations to the gods (particularly Hermes) before going to sleep is Homeric (cf. *Od.* 7.136-8):

εὗρε δὲ Φαιήκων ἡγήτορας ἠδὲ μέδοντας
σπένδοντας δεπέσσιν ἐνσκόπῳ Ἀργεῖφόντῃ,
ᾧ πυμάτῳ σπένδεσκον, ὅτε μνησαῖατο κοίτου.

Athenaeus provides an explanation that Hermes is the patron-god of sleep, ἔσπενδον δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν δειπνῶν ἀναλύοντες καὶ τὰς σπονδὰς ἐποιοῦντο Ἑρμῆ καὶ οὐχ ὡς ὕστερον Διὶ τελείῳ. δοκεῖ γὰρ Ἑρμῆς ὕπνου προστάτης εἶναι (Ath. 1.18.7-9 [Kaibel]). This function of Hermes is mentioned in the Homeric Hymn to Hermes (13-16):

καὶ τότ' ἐγείνατο παῖδα πολύτροπον, αἰμυλομήτην,
ληιστήρ', ἐλατήρα βοῶν, ἡγήτορ' ὄνειρων,
νυκτὸς ὀπωπητήρα, πυληδόκον, ὃς τάχ' ἔμελλεν
ἀμφανέειν κλυτὰ ἔργα μετ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν.

A fragment of Strattis makes the connection between Hermes and the wine itself, Ἑρμῆς, ὃν ἔλκουσ' οἱ μὲν ἐκ προχοιδίου (fr. 22.1). Cf. Athenaeus, καὶ Ἑρμῆς δ' εἶδος πόσεως παρὰ Στράττιδι (1.58.19 [Kaibel]). Kalasiris later comments on the compatibility between Hermes and Dionysus, words and wine (5.16.4). Plutarch makes Solon observe this ritual but follows a different Homeric text in which the libation is made to Poseidon (*Od.* 3.333), Ὑπολαβῶν δ' ὁ Σόλων «οὐκοῦν,» ἔφη, «καὶ τῷ σοφωτάτῳ πιστευτέον Ὅμηρῳ

νύξ δ' ἤδη τελέθει· ἀγαθὸν καὶ νυκτὶ πιθέσθαι

σπείσαντες οἷν Μούσαις καὶ Ποσειδῶνι καὶ Ἀμφιτρίτῃ διαλύωμεν εἰ δοκεῖ τὸ συμπόσιον.» (*Mor.* 164d3-7)

3.5.1 ἄλλους τε τῶν θεῶν καὶ τὸν Ἑρμῆν . . . ἰκέτευε: For Hermes see the previous note. Hermes was often invoked as the bringer of dreams in the *Odyssey* (cf., e.g., 7.136-138 quoted above; Eustath. Vol. 1, p. 269, ll. 35-45 [Stallbaum]; Messer 1918, 4). A papyrus in the British Museum (no. 121) ll. 665-685; 739-749, describes magical incantations to Hermes by lamplight to obtain a favourable vision in sleep. In the *Ethiopian Story* Hermes is described as a δαίμων who fathered Homer on the wife of an Egyptian high-priest (3.14.2 below and note). Hermes also appears in the romance as the god of profit

cultivated by Nausikles (5.13.2, 5.15.2, 6.7.1); the god of words, Hermes Logios (5.16.5); and the god of the gymnasium (10.31.5). His presence is also indicated in the 'stroke of luck' (ἔρμαιον) which occurs from time to time (7.20.2, 8.9.4, 9.17.3) but these are indiscriminate and do not favour the lovers consistently, although they agree to use the statues of Hermes at cross-roads, should they be separated, to tell each other which way they were travelling (5.5.1). For Hermes generally, see Kerényi (1976) *passim*.

The encounter between Theagenes and Charikleia

3.5.2 ὠλόλυξαν μὲν αἱ γυναῖκες ἠλάλαξαν δὲ οἱ ἄνδρες: the former was conventionally the cry of women, the latter of men: cf. Ach. Tat., ὀλολυγμὸς γυναικῶν, ἀλαλαγμὸς ἀνδρῶν (3.2.8). *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, Αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες . . . ὠλόλυξαν (35.1-2). Polyaeus, οἱ μὲν ἠλάλαξαν . . . (*Strat.* 1.2.1). The ululation of women was in origin part of religious ritual. Hesychius (*ad loc.*), <ὀλολυγή> φωνὴ γυναικῶν, ἦν ποιοῦνται ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς εὐχόμεναι. Cf. Homer, αἱ δ' ὀλολυγῆ πᾶσαι Ἀθήνη χειρᾶς ἀνέσχον (*Il.* 6.301; cf. Poll. 1.29, ὀλολύξαι καὶ ὀλολυγῆ χρήσασθαι ἐπὶ γυναικῶν); . . . λῦσεν δὲ βοὸς μένος· αἱ δ' ὀλόλυξαν / θυγατέρες τε νοοὶ τε καὶ αἰδοίη παράκοιτις / Νέστορος, Εὐρυδικῆ, πρέσβα Κλυμένοιο θυγατρῶν. (*Od.* 3.450-3). Also *Od.* 4.767 (Penelope in prayer to Athena); *Od.* 22.408, 411 (Eurykleia in triumph over the suitors). There is a close parallel to the present passage in Aeschylus, in which Eteokles asks a chorus of women to raise a sacred ululation to salute the fall of the victims in his sacrifice (*Sept.* 268-269). Herodotus believed that the practice originated among African women, Δοκέει δ' ἔμοιγε καὶ ἡ ὀλολυγῆ ἐπὶ ἰροῖσι ἐνθαῦτα πρῶτον γενέσθαι· κάρτα γὰρ ταύτῃ χρέωνται αἱ Αἰβυσσοὶ καὶ χρέωνται καλῶς (4.189). Ululation is common in African and Middle Eastern society today, mainly among women as an expression of communal emotion. In South Africa, for example, ululation accompanies communal dances of protest such as the *toyitoyi*. In the ancient world, the cry could also have overtones of mourning (cf. *Il.* 6.301; Hesch. *s.v.* ὀλολυγή, ποιὰ φωνὴ λυπηρά, ὀδύνην καρδίας ἀσήμῳ τινὶ φθόγγῳ παριστῶσα). Cf. also the women of Elis who beat their breasts in lamentation for Achilles when the sun went down on the first day of the games (Paus. 6.23.3). Both usages are appropriate in the context of the ἐναγισμὸς to Neoptolemus.

The male cry was one of triumph, <ἀλαλαγμὸς> ἐπινίκιος ὕμνος ἢ εὐφημος βοή (Hesch. *ad loc.*). A fragment of Aeschylus appears to use the cry together with the cult name of Dionysus Ἰακχος (fr. 451c30 [Radt]). Herodotus uses the word to describe the supernatural cry that emanated from the temple of Apollo at Delphi and routed the Persian army, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ [ἱεροῦ] τῆς Προνηΐης νηοῦ βοή τε καὶ ἀλαλαγμὸς ἐγένετο (8.37.17-18). Plutarch records a fragment of Metrodoros, οἱ δ' εὐθὺς ἠλάλαξαν, ἐν δ' ἐκίρνατο / οἶνος·

(*Mor.* 1098c5-6). The cry was used in battle charges, οὐκ ἀτάκτοις οὐδὲ μανιώδεσι φερόμενοι δρόμοις οὐδ' ἄναρθρον ἀλαλαγμὸν ἰέντες . . . (*Plut. Mar.* 19.4.3-4).

In the Heliodorus passage the phrase was probably chosen for reasons of onomatopoeia and word-play: cf. Sophocles, ΧΟ. Ἄνολολύξεται δόμος ἐφεστίοι- / σιν ἀλαλαῖς (*Trach.* 205-6).

τὸ μνήμα τοῦ Νεοπτολέμου τρίτον περιεστοιχίσσατο ἢ πομπή καὶ τρίτον οἱ ἔφηβοι τὴν ἵππον περιήλασαν: the triple circuit of a tomb was conventional; similar rhythmic courses were performed by Achilles around the pyre of Patroklos (*Il.* 23.13) and by the Thessalians during their sacrifice to Achilles according to Philostratus (*Her.* 19.24). This suggests that RL are justified in adding τρίτον before περιεστοιχίσσατο here on the basis of C.

τότε ὡσπερ ὑφ' ἐνὶ συνθήματι βόες ἄρνες αἰγες ἱερεύοντο: cf. 3.1.5, where Heliodorus mentions 'a varied mass of other victims'. As was usual at Greek sacrifices, a feast followed in which the flesh of the victims was consumed.

3.5.3 φορτώσαντες: Heliodorus has used the φορτώ rather than φορτίζω as a denominative verb from φόρτος 'load'. This form is also found in Hesychius as a gloss on βῦσαι, <βῦσαι> ἐπιθεῖναι. φορτῶσαι. κρύψαι; The lexicographer uses φορτίσαι as a gloss on ζαφορήσαι 'be fertile', <ζαφορήσαι> μεγάλως φορτίσαι. Koraes (*ad loc.*) suggests that the -ώω forms are late or dialectal.

καὶ τὰ νενομισμένα τῶν ἱερείων ἄκρα πάντα ἐπιθέντες: Ἄκρα 'extremities, limbs' also occurs in Lucian, χειρῶν ἄκρα (*Imag.* 6.6) but may here mean 'prize', κοῦροι ἐριδμαίνουσι φιλήματος ἄκρα φέρεσθαι. (*Theocr. Id.* 12.31). The sense here could therefore be 'choice bits'. Heliodorus uses a similar phrase in book 10, καὶ τὸ διακοπήσεσθαι τὰ τελεώτερα νομιζόμενα τῶν ἱερείων συμβάλλειν παρέχοντες (10.39.2). The use of the perfect participle νενομισμένα here lays emphasis on the traditional nature of the sacrifice, whereas at 10.39.2 Sisimithres is referring to a current practice that will be discontinued. Similar expressions can be found in Athenaeus, καὶ τᾶλλα τὰ πρὸς τὴν ἄρτυσιν τῶν ἱερείων ἄρμόττοντα (4.31.8 [Kaibel]) and in Fronto, τὰ σπλάγχνα τὰ τῶν ἱερείων (*Ep.* 5.5.3).

The technicalities and ethics of blood sacrifices are given detailed treatment in the novel. Cf., e.g., Thyamis' apparent sacrifice of Charikleia (1.31.1-2); the ἐναγισμός to Neoptolemus at Delphi (3.1-6); Kalasiris' frugal libations with the Phoenicians (4.16.4); the sacrifice of Trachinos' pirates after their shipwreck (5.27-28); the rites of the old woman of Bessa (6.14.3-4); the intended sacrifice of Theagenes and Charikleia (book 10 *passim* especially 10.4.5 [the exclusion of women]; 10.9.6-7 [the opposition of Sisimithres and the gymnosophists; 10.39.1-3 [the opposition of the gods to the sacrifice]). This

suggests an awareness of the controversy over blood-sacrifice in late antiquity (cf. Ferguson 1980, 1151-89). The contrast between the holocaust at Delphi, the preference of Kalasiris for bloodless sacrifice and the final abolition of human sacrifice in Ethiopia, shows a development of the theme of sacrifice in the course of the romance that is associated with the spiritual progression in the work (see the section on the *Ethiopian Story* as a religious text in the introduction).

ὁ δὲ Χαρικλῆς: Charikles appears for the first time in this book as an authority on religious practice in Delphi (cf. 3.5.3 below, and note). He is too engrossed in delivering the prayer to notice the encounter between his daughter and Theagenes (3.5.7) and attributes the loss of his daughter to his own transgressions (4.19.3). Heiserman (1977, 192) describes him as ‘dean of the academy at Delphi, who believes in magic and cannot understand love’; Anderson (1982, 35-36) also views him as the butt of the humour in books 2-4; and a similar line is taken by Levin (1992, 499-506). There is no doubt that he is shown to be the dupe of Kalasiris (cf. 4.15.1 below, and note) but Heliodorus also allows him a tragic dimension by revealing that his daughter had died in a fire on her wedding day and that his wife had passed away in shock soon after (2.29.4).

A certain Charikles, son of Laophon, from Aigina, to whom the people of Delphi awarded signal honours, is mentioned in an inscription there (FD 3.4.149.1-5). Other men with this name occur at Delphi, such as the son of Theodorus (FD 3.2.7.2.4; 3.2.24.6; 3.4.35.5 etc.) and even a son of Theogenes (3.2.12.3.14)!

Various other historical figures bore the name Charikles—most famously a member of the 30 (Andoc. *De Myst.* 36.1; 101.6; Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.33-37; *Hell.* 2.3.2; Thuc. 7.26.3; Plut. 483E7; *Suda ad loc.*). But Charikles is also the name of the boyfriend of Kleinias, whose desire to escape from an arranged marriage leads to Kleinias’ diatribe on the female sex (Ach. Tat. 1.8). Eventually, the young man came to a gruesome death under the hooves of Kleinias’ horse (*ibid.* 1.11-12). Cf. also Lucian *Amores* (10.3; 11.13; 13.11; 14.20; 17.2; 18.11; 29.2). None of these personages appear to have been Heliodorus’ model for his characterisation of the Delphic priest. Theophrastos’ description of the superstitious man (*Char.* 16) appears to come closest to his character, but omits his sheer obtuseness.

The name Charikles is best taken as back-formation from Charikleia, whose name is significant and appropriate to her character, just as Chryses in the *Iliad* is the father of Chryseis (although of course the morphological derivation is in the opposite direction). The parallel between Chryses, also a priest of Apollo, who is deprived of his daughter Chryseis by Agamemnon in the *Iliad* on the one hand, and Charikles who loses Charikleia

to Theagenes, on the other, is noteworthy but probably coincidental. However, the close connection between the names of father and daughter here does suggest the close relationship between the two (cf. 4.18.8-9).

«τὸν βωμὸν δὲ ὁ τῆς θεωρίας ἄρχων ἀπέτω παρὰ τῆς ζακόρου τὴν δῶδα κομισάμενος . . . »: ironically Charikles arranges the encounter which will lead to the elopement of his daughter.

The switch to direct speech is abrupt. The effect is to suggest that Charikles is quoting the liturgy of the sacrifice and thus to underline his authority as the priest of Apollo at Delphi (see 3.5.3 above and note). The use of the imperative form ἀπέτω and religious terms such as θεωρία, ζακόρος and δῶς suggests official language. The quotation of what purports to be the regulations pertaining to the sacrifice also adds authenticity to the description of the procession. Direct speech is used in legal and religious contexts, where the wording of the original statement is important.

παρὰ τῆς ζακόρου: the same term ζακόρος as is found in inscriptions (*Syl.* 3.708.25; Feuillâtre 1966, 64). However, the term is common in Menander (cf., e.g., fr 112.1; fr. 257.1; fr. 686.1) and is found also in Chariton (3.6.4); Lucian (*Am.* 15.13); Plutarch (272F [Stephanus]); and Synesios (*Aegyptii sive de Providentia* 1.6.26).

τοῦτο γὰρ ἔθος ὁ πατριος διαγινώσκει νόμος: There is no evidence in the historical record for the custom that a female acolyte should hand a torch to the male leader of the Thessalian envoys (cf. Feuillâtre 1966, 57). This detail appears to have been invented by Heliodorus in order to bring his hero and heroine together at the most sacred moment of the religious ceremony of purification. However, Heliodorus goes to some lengths to make his invention seem realistic. He mentions that Charikleia had chosen the life of an acolyte of Artemis out of a love of chastity (2.33.4). Moreover, he also makes Hegesias propose the abolition of this custom at the height of the emergency brought about by the elopement of Charikleia and Theagenes (4.21.1). Hegesias' proposal is implausible under the circumstances and may have been mentioned precisely to account for the usual practice (i.e. that no acolyte was present).

A number of scholars have suggested that Heliodorus has good knowledge of Delphi and the religious ceremonies conducted there (Feuillâtre 1966, 45-67; Pouilloux 1983, 259-286; 1984, 691-703; Kowarna 1959, 77) but most of Heliodorus' description is literary in character as is abundantly evident from the numerous parallels between his text and other literary works mentioned in the notes above. Furthermore, Heliodorus' choice of Delphi as a location for the meeting of his lovers was based on the ideological importance

of the site in the literary tradition (see the section on *Openings* in the introduction). In any case, realism appears to be less important in this case than irony and characterisation; the irony lies in the fact that Charikles is responsible for arranging the encounter between his daughter and the man who would take her away from him. Charikles later refers to another ‘tradition’ that the acolyte hold the torch and judge the games (3.18.2); Kalasiris’ reference to this custom is more equivocating—he suggests that Charikleia appeared at the games either because of this or because she wanted to see Theagenes again (4.1.2). Charikles is shown to be concerned about the niceties of religious ritual whereas Kalasiris is a shrewder and more cynical judge of human motivation.

3.5.4 *δτι θεῖον ἢ ψυχῆ*: the phrase is reminiscent of Plato *Phaedr.* 249c, *πρὸς γὰρ ἐκείνοις ἀεὶ ἐστὶν μνήμη κατὰ δύναμιν, πρὸς οἷσπερ θεὸς ὧν θεῖός ἐστιν*; *Phaedr.* 251a, *προσορῶν ὡς θεὸν σέβεται*. On the sacramental nature of the relationship between Charikleia and Theagenes see the 3.5.4 below, and note.

ὁμοῦ τε γὰρ ἀλλήλους ἐώρων οἱ νέοι καὶ ἥρων: cf. 4.6.4. For the theme of love at first sight in Hellenistic and Latin poetry: cf., e.g., Theokr. 2.82; Ap. Rhod. 3.275; Prop. 1.1-2; in Roman comedy: cf. Ter. *Eun.* 83-4; *Haut.* 773-4; Plaut. *Rud.* 43-4; and in the romances: cf. X. Eph. 1.3-4; Ach. Tat. 6.6; Long. 1.17; Char. 5.5 (quoting *Il.* 3.146, Helen on the walls of Troy; Létoublon (1993, 137-145); Jax (1936, 46; 1933, 163). Heliodorus may also have been aware of the story of Zariadres and Odates, who fell in love with one another in their dreams, though they had never actually seen one another. When they meet they instantly recognise each other and elope, thus avoiding the marriage which had been arranged for Odates (Ath. 13.575; first noted by Rohde 1914³, 47-52 [45-49]; cf. Kerényi 1962², 254 n. 124).

The play on *ἐώρων* / *ἥρων* was commonplace since the time of Agathon (fr. 29 [Nauck], *ἐκ τοῦ γὰρ ἐσορᾶν γίγνεται ἀνθρώποις ἐρᾶν*). Cf. also Philostratus (*Ep.* 52, *Ὀὐ τὸ ἐρᾶν νόσος, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ ἐρᾶν, εἰ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρᾶν τὸ ἐρᾶν τυφλοὶ οἱ μὴ ἐρῶντες*). In the *Life of Apollonius*, the gymnosophist, Thespesion, teaches that the wise man must avoid desire which enters through the eyes (*VA* 6.10, *ὡς ἀπόχρη τῷ σοφῷ βρώσεώς τε καθαρῶ εἶναι, ὀπόση ἔμπνουσ, ἡμέρου τε, ὃς φοιτᾷ δι’ ὀμμάτων*). The idea goes back to Plato *Phaedr.* 255c and is one of a number to references to this dialogue. Walker (1993a, 132-148) gives a full discussion of *ἔρωσ* and the eye in Philostratus, which suggests a close similarity between this author and Heliodorus. Both, for example, compare the eye of the beloved to a hunting net in which the lover is trapped (Phil. *Ep.* 11, *Ποσάκις σοὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀνέφρα, ἵνα ἀπέλθῃς, ὥσπερ οἱ τὰ δίκτυα ἀναπτύσσοντες τοῖς θηρίοις ἐς ἐξουσίαν τοῦ*

φυγεῖν; *Aith.* 2.25.1, οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἐντυχόντα μὴ ἠλωκέναι, οὕτως ἄφυκτόν τινα καὶ ἀπρόσμαχον ἑταιρίας σαγήνην ἐκ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐπεσύρετο), although the metaphor of the sexual hunt is to some extent conventional (cf., e.g., Xenophon's account of Socrates' conversation with the courtesan Theodote, *Mem.* 3.11) and is a theme in Euripides' *Hippolytus* (e.g., 212-215). However, the theme of love and vision is not merely a commonplace in the *Ethiopian Story*; the close connection between ἐρᾶν and ὄρᾶν is also borne out by Kalasiris' discourse on the 'eye of envy' (3.7.3-3.8.2), and the curious conception of Charikleia (4.8.5; 10.14.7-10.15.1). The idea that love enters the soul through the eyes is also mentioned below (3.7.5 and note).

ὥσπερ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐκ πρώτης ἐντεύξεως τὸ ὅμοιον ἐπιγνούσης καὶ πρὸς τὸ κατ' ἀξίαν οἰκεῖον προσδραμούσης: in Plato's *Symposium* both Aristophanes (192a) and Agathon (195b) say that love is the attraction of like (τὸ ὅμοιον) with like (cf. Plato *Parm.* 132d5-7: Εἰ οὖν τι, ἔφη, ἔοικεν τῷ εἶδει, οἷόν τε ἐκεῖνο τὸ εἶδος μὴ ὅμοιον εἶναι τῷ εἰκασθέντι, καθ' ὅσον αὐτῷ ἀφωμοιώθη; ἢ ἔστι τις μηχανὴ τὸ ὅμοιον μὴ ὁμοίῳ ὅμοιον εἶναι;) There is a further verbal echo with the *Symposium* in the phrase τὸ οἰκεῖον, since Aristophanes concludes his speech (193d) with the statement that Love brings us into our own in the present (ὅς ἔν τε τῷ παρόντι ἡμᾶς πλεῖστα ὀνίνησιν εἰς τὸ οἰκεῖον ἄγων) and gives us hope that we will attain the blessed life in future. Diotima (205e) also points out that everyone regards goodness as a personal quality of his own (τὸ μὲν ἀγαθὸν οἰκεῖον καλεῖ). The phrase κατ' ἀξίαν is also Platonic (cf. *Phaedr.* 247c) and used to express the ineffability of the heavenly Forms, but the expression τὸ κατ' ἀξίαν οἰκεῖον is unusual and suggests that the love of Theagenes and Charikleia is the attraction of like to like on the basis of merit. The myth of Aristophanes in the *Symposium*, that love is the unification of two halves of a separated whole, is also recalled when Theagenes and Charikleia are reunited after being separated during the battle between the pirates (2.6.3)—they embrace so tightly that they seem to fuse into one. For the mutual respect that characterises the love of Theagenes and Charikleia, cf. also 4.11.2; 5.5.2; 5.15.3. In this respect they are contrasted with the infatuation of the lover of Isias (6.3.2), for example, (cf. Morgan *op. cit.*, 107).

3.5.5 καὶ τὴν δῶδα ὀλκότερον ἢ μὲν ἐνεχείριζεν ὁ δὲ ὑπεδέχετο: 'Ολκότερον occurs here only, though Clement of Rome has ὀλκότερα 'heavier' (*Hom.* 9.15.5, ἀξιώσατε αὐτὰ (sc. τὰ ξόανα) ὀλκότερα γενέσθαι ἢ κουφότερα). The word suggests that the torch feels immensely heavy to the lovers and therefore is transferred from one to the other very slowly. Cf. the description of the ponderous Ethiopian giant: καὶ σοβαρὸν περισκοπῶν ὀλκά τε βαίνων (10.30.8). The description is detailed and realistic (Feuillâtre 1966, 44) but is overlaid with

intertextual allusions. Plato uses the word to describe how knowledge draws the soul towards the truth (*Rep.* 521d; 527b) and Plotinus describes how Love attracts the soul towards the One (*Enn.* 3.5.3). In the same vein, Merkelbach (1962, 241) refers to the role of the Erotes, who draw souls towards their home, in the hymns of Proklos (2.5; 7.34-36) and the role of Eros in the Chaldaean oracles (25 [Kroll]).

ἐπτοημένον ἔστησαν: cf. Plato *Symp.* 206d, πολλή ἡ πτοίησις γέγονε περὶ τὸ καλόν.

ταῖς μνήμαϊς ἀναπεμπάζοντες: the idea recalls Plato's discussion of ἀνάμνησις in the *Phaedrus* 254b5-7, ἰδόντος δὲ τοῦ ἡνιόχου ἡ μνήμη πρὸς τὴν τοῦ κάλλους φύσιν ἠνέχθη, καὶ πάλιν εἶδεν αὐτὴν μετὰ σωφροσύνης ἐν ἀγνῷ βάρῳ βεβῶσαν (for ἀνάμνησις, see also *Phaedr.* 249c; *Meno* 81a-d). The Plato passage extols beauty as a statue on a base of chastity. This is highly appropriate to the chaste love of Theagenes and Charikleia (cf. 4.8.7 below and note). There is a similar account of how association with a beautiful person invokes the memory of previously engendered virtues in the *Symposium* (209c). Here physical and spiritual procreation are contrasted. The discussion proceeds to the doctrine of the 'ladder of love' that has the attainment of immortality as its final rung (*Symp.* 210a-212a).

There are further similarities between the present passage and the *Phaedrus*. Theagenes is described in total control of his horse in the cavalry parade (3.3.7, and note above), and at the conclusion of the romance, Theagenes and Hydaspes ride into Meroë to the accompaniment of flute and pipe in a chariot drawn by horses (while Charikleia and Sisimithres ride in a carriage pulled by white oxen)—a possible allusion to the charioteer myth in the *Phaedrus* (10.41.3). Like the temperate lover in the *Phaedrus* (256a-b), Theagenes and Charikleia receive terrestrial happiness through their self-control at the conclusion of the romance, although exactly what the symbolic value of the crowns they wear in the final scene may be, is obscure (Feuillâtre 1966, 127). The lovers meet for the first time during a religious festival at Delphi and their marriage is finally proclaimed at a religious ceremony in Ethiopia. Their love is therefore sacramental and the polar opposite of the profane love of Demainete for Knemon (Morgan 1989b, 110).

Ἀναπεμπάζομαι 'count over, think over' is middle in Classical Greek but active later (see LSJ⁹ s. v. ἀναπεμπάζομαι). Cf. also ἀναπεμπάζουσα, 7.4.2.

μόνη τῇ διαχύσει τοῦ βλέμματος ἐλεγχόμενον: cf. Euripides *Iph. Aul.* 1128, σύγχυσιν ἔχοντες καὶ ταραγμὸν ὀμμάτων.

3.5.6 καὶ ἀπλῶς μυρίον εἶδος ἐν ὀλίγῳ τῷ χρόνῳ τὰς ὄψεις ἀμφοῖν ἐπεπλανήθη: for the hyperbole: cf. Καὶ μυρίον εἶδος ὁ δαίμων ἐπὶ μικροῦ τοῦ χωρίου διεσκεύαστο (1.1.6).

3.5.7 ἄλλον πρὸς ἄλλην χρεῖαν τε καὶ διάνοιαν ὄντας: πρὸς is followed by the dative at 2.27.2 (πρὸς ἱεροῖς ἦν) and 4.17.1 (πρὸς αὐλοῖς . . . ὄντας; cf. Richards 1906, 111) but note also the similar thought at 9.12.2 (πρὸς θεραπείαν . . . ὄντας); Plut. *Nic.* 5. The accusative appears to suggest deeper engagement in the action than the dative in these two passages and should not be replaced.

ἐλάνθανε δὲ καὶ τὸν Χαρικλέα: Charikles is depicted as an unbelievably obtuse but doting father, who is so deeply involved in religious ceremony that he does not observe the rapture of his daughter on meeting Theagenes (cf. 3.5.3 above, and note). Previously, Charikles had been left in ignorance of the origins of his adoptive daughter by the sudden disappearance of her foster father, Sisimithres (2.32.2). The Delphic priest thus acts as a foil for the knowledgeable (e.g., 4.12.3) and observant (e.g. 3.5.7) Kalasiris.

τὴν πάτριον εὐχὴν καὶ ἐπίκλησιν καταγγέλλοντα: The correspondence between Charikles' religious duties here and the evidence of inscriptions and literature for the responsibilities of the priest of Apollo at Delphi (*Syl.* 3.672.60; 2.671.20; Aesch. *Choeph.* 476; cf. Feuillâtre 1966, 63) is rather tenuous.

ἐγὼ δὲ πρὸς μίαν τὴν παρατήρησιν τῶν νέων ἡσχολούμην: Kalasiris' close observation of the behaviour of the lovers is paralleled by that of Antonius Polemo (*SPG* 1.286-291; Anderson 1993a, 64-65) but there are specific reasons for his interest—the mandate of Persinna (4.12.3) and the oracle (2.35.5). This comment suggests that Kalasiris had come to Delphi to find Persinna's daughter rather than to escape the attentions of Rhodopis (cf. 4.13.1; cf. Futre Pinheiro 1991b, 79).

πρὸς ὑπόνοιαν τῶν ἐσομένων ἀπὸ τῶν ὀνομάτων κεκινημένος: Kalasiris' suspicions are aroused by the fact that the words χάριν and κλέος in the first line of the oracle refer to Charikleia and the phrase θεᾶς γενέτην in the second refers to Theagenes.

In Heliodorus the word ὑπόνοια is used to refer to 'suspicion of a specific crime' such as murder, poisoning, theft etc. (cf., e.g., 1.10.4; 1.14.1; 6.2.3; 7.6.3; 8.9.19; 9.24.7). Elsewhere it is used when characters attempt to make sense of the events in which they participate, i.e. to read the plot (cf., e.g., 1.9.3; 1.26.6; 5.2.5; 5.11.1; 5.12.1; 5.30.3). The present usage belongs in this category; Kalasiris is attempting to read the future (note the ambiguity of τῶν ἐσομένων—for Kalasiris this refers to what the future holds, for the reader of the romance it refers to how the plot will unfold). The efforts of the characters to map or construe their lives is analogous to the reader's attempts to interpret the story and is the counterpart to the author's enigmatic construction of the plot. This usage leads to the sense of a 'deeper, allegorical understanding' (cf. Xen. *Symp.* 3.6; Plat. *Rep.* 378d; Plut.

19e); cf. 9.9.5 (τὰς ἐγκατεσπαρμένους τούτοις ὑπονοίας ‘the deeper meanings hidden in these stories’)—a passage in the author’s own voice, which refers to the allegorical explanation of the Egyptian belief in the divinity of the Nile. Also, at the concluding scenes of the romance (10.38.3), Heliodorus wonders whether the Ethiopian crowd guessed what was happening or whether ‘they came to a deeper understanding of the truth through the agency of the divine force which had staged all these events (καὶ ἐξ ὀρμῆς θείας ἢ σύμπαντα ταῦτα ἐσκηνογράφησεν εἰς ὑπόνοιαν τῶν ἀληθῶν ἐλθόντες).

‘Ἄλλ’ οὐδὲ ἀκριβῶς οὐδὲν ἔτι τῶν ἐξῆς χρησθέντων συνέβαλλον: Kalasiris continues to ponder the meaning of the oracle (3.11.4; 4.4.5) despite the fact that: (a) Persinna had asked him to find her daughter to bring her back to Ethiopia by Persinna (4.12.2-3); (b) Charikles had told him how he was entrusted with the care of a young girl by the Ethiopian ambassador in Katadoupoi (2.30.1-2.33.8); (c) the oracle had mentioned ‘the black land of the Sun’ (ἡελίου πρὸς χθόνα κυανέην) that could only refer to Egypt or Ethiopia (cf. Plut. *De Isidi et Osiridi* 361c [quoting Empedocles]); (d) he suspected that the oracle was referring to Charikleia (3.5.7); and (e) he knew the name Charikleia (2.35.2—the name could in any case be inferred from the name Charikles) and had seen her often during sacrifices (2.35.3). The notion that Kalasiris only gradually realises his role as the agent of fate (Futre Pinheiro 1991b, 79) is therefore rather implausible but the reader must assume that Kalasiris’ claim not to understand the oracle is true (Winkler 1982, 137-139) if only because Kalasiris states that the truth of dreams and oracles depends on their outcome (3.36.1; Hefti 1950, 48). Kalasiris’ suspicions are finally confirmed by the swathing band of Persinna (4.8). Cf. 4.5.1 below, and note.

Charikles notes the fulfilment of the oracle at the end of the novel, where the last three lines are repeated (10.41.2).

3.6.1 Ἐπεὶ δὲ ὀψέ ποτε καὶ ὥσπερ βιαίως τῆς κόρης ἀποσπώμενος: in all probability, a reminiscence of Aristophanes’ description of lovers clinging to one another in Plato’s *Symposium* (192b-c) as in the close embrace of Theagenes and Charikleia (2.6).

ἐλέλυτο μὲν ἡ πομπὴ πρὸς εὐωχίαν τῶν Θετταλῶν τραπέντων: cf. Athenaeus, τὰς δ’ εὐωχίας ἐκάλουν οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀχῆς, ἣ ἐστὶ τροφή, ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ ταῦτα εὖ ἔχειν (8.64.35 [Kaibel]; Morgan 1979, at 9.10.2).

Τραπέντων should be middle here (Naber 1873, 152): cf. also ἐκτραπήναι active (4.16.7) but also middle (4.4.5; 4.6.3; 4.15.2); and οἰμῶξει (4.6.7) but οἰμῶζεται (5.29.4).

ἐφειστρίδα λευκὴν: cf. also 6.9.2. RL note that this word means ‘philosopher’s mantle’ in Athenaeus, κόμιζέ μοι ἐπὶ τὸ γυμνάσιον τὰς βλαύτας (‘slippers’) τὰς ἀφορήτους καὶ τὴν

ἔφεστρίδα τὴν ἄχρηστον (8.64.35 [Kaibel]); cf. Apul. *Flor.* 7 (*pallium accipere*). As such the clothing would be appropriate to the philosophical Charikleia (cf. 3.4.1 and note). It was clearly an exceptional item; Moeris (p. 139 [Pierson]) and Pollux (7.61) felt that the word needed explanation. The mantle may have been worn for warmth; at least Xenophon *Symp.* 4.38 describes it as an exterior covering for warmth as a roof is to a house, χιτῶνες οἱ τοίχοι μοι δοκοῦσιν εἶναι, πάνυ δὲ παχεῖαι ἔφεστρίδες οἱ ὄροφοι (Baumgarten 1932, 11). Cf. Agathias, quoted in the *Suda*, where the clothing is worn as a shawl by women and as a military cloak by soldiers, <Ἐφεστρίς:> χλανίς. Ἀγαθίας· γύναια δὲ πολλὰ διαπληκτιζόμενα καὶ τὰς ἔφεστρίδας περιρρηγνύοντα ἀνὰ τοὺς προμαχεῶνας ἐφοίτα. καὶ αὐθις οὐκ ἐπιφερόμεθα χρημάτων περιουσίαν, πλὴν γε δὴ στρατιωτικὴν ἔφεστρίδα, ἣν γε δὴ καὶ περιβεβλήμεθα (*ad loc.*). This passage suggests that the cloak may also have been costly as in the dress of Lysias, the Epicurean philosopher from Tarsus, who dressed in a splendid gown and golden wreath (Ath. 5.54.5-9 [Kaibel], ἐξ ἱματίου τύραννος ἦν, πορφυροῦν μὲν μεσόλευκον χιτῶνα ἐνδεδυκώς, γλαμύδα δὲ ἔφεστρίδα περιβεβλημένος πολυτελεῖ καὶ ὑποδύμενος λευκὰς Λακωνικὰς, στέφανον δάφνης χρυσοῦν ἐστεμμένος, καὶ διανέμων τὰ τῶν πλουσίων τοῖς πένησι, πολλοὺς φονεύων τῶν οὐ διδόντων.) In the *Anthologia Graeca*, the ἔφεστρίς is the golden veil of Aphrodite (*Anth. Graec.* 9.153, πῆ Παφίης ἀλάβαστρα καὶ ἡ πάγχρυσος ἔφεστρίς).

The detail of Charikleia's dress confirms that she is well-educated and well-off but it is fanciful to speculate on the significance of the white colour of her cloak (Feuillâtre 1966, 55) or to try to connect her attire with that of Leukippe (Ach. Tat. 6.1, cross-dressing Kleitophon to prevent detection!) or Daphnis (Long. 4.23.2) and Chloe (Long. 4.32.1) as Merkelbach (1962, 248 n. 1) does.

σὺν ὀλίγαις ταῖς συνήθεσιν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐν τῷ περιβόλῳ τοῦ νεῶ καταγωγὴν ὄρμησεν: It is difficult to retain the reading of the codices here (σὺν ὀλίγοις τοῖς συνήθεσιν), as Colonna (1987b, 1938) wishes to do. It seems unlikely that Charikleia would have been permitted to go to her lodgings with male companions, particularly in view of her own highly developed sense of modesty (cf., e.g., 4.18.4) and especially as they are companions with whom she habitually associated and with whom she was probably living (cf. LSJ συνήθης) perhaps as fellow-initiates (Feuillâtre 1966, 65). It is therefore better to read ὀλίγαις with Jackson and RL.

σὺν τῷ νομιζομένῳ πατρὶ: for νομιζόμενος, cf. 4.3.4 and note.

τῆς ἀγιστείας ἔνεκεν παντοίως ἑαυτὴν χωρίζουσα: the chastity of the heroine is underlined throughout the novel (cf. 4.8.7 and note) but here the seclusion of Charikleia

may be due to the normal requirement for acolytes of Artemis (Paus. 8.13.1; 7.26.5; 8.18.12).

CHARIKLEIA

Kalasisir meets Charikles and they discuss Charikleia

3.6.2 καὶ ὃς «εἶδες» ἠρώτα «τὸ ἀγλαΐσμα τὸ ἐμόν τε καὶ Δελφῶν, τὴν Χαρίκλειαν;» The word ἀγλαΐσμα is used to describe a virgin daughter in Euripides (*Hel.* 282-3) and a rose in Achilles Tatius (2.1.3, γῆς ἐστὶ κόσμος, φυτῶν ἀγλαΐσμα). Charikles is shown, with a great deal of psychological realism, to be childishly proud of his daughter and not at all like the stereotypical father of the comic tradition. Kalasisir shrewdly reinforces Charikles' pride (3.6.3) with a view to further winning his confidence; the characterisation of Charikles is thus dependent on the exigencies of the plot rather than vice versa (Hefti 1950, 49).

ἔφην: Kalasisir participates in the diegetic universe as well as the metadiegetic one (Futre Pinheiro 1991b, 78). In other words, he is a participant in the story he is narrating.

οὐχ ὡς ἂν τις ἐκ παρόδου—τοῦτο δὴ τὸ λεγόμενον: For the proverbial expression ἐκ παρόδου: cf. *Suda*, ὅπου δ' ἐναριστᾶν, ὅπου δὲ πλείους ἐνδημεῖν ἡμέρας, ἐνίους δὲ τόπους ἐκ παρόδου θεωρεῖν (*s. v.* <Νικόλαος>). For Heliodorus' use of proverbs, see 3.1.1 above, and note.

περὶ θεῶν τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων εἴ τί ποτε διαπορήσειεν ἠρώτησέ τε καὶ ἔμαθε: Charikleia leads the life of a female intellectual: cf. 3.4.1 and note; Egger (1988, 61).

3.6.3 ὦ γὰθέ: Colonna (1987b, 1938) omits the name Καλάσιρι along with all the MSS except C. The usage of Heliodorus varies evenly between including (3.6.3; 3.7.2; 5.1.6; 5.12.1; 5.15.1; 5.6.1; 6.2.1) and omitting names (4.16.3; 6.1.4; 6.8.6; 7.5.4) in this context.

ὥσπερ καὶ τὴν σελήνην εἰ διαπρέπει τῶν ἄλλων ἀστέρων ἠρώτας: Cf. Sappho: ἄστερες μὲν ἀμφὶ κάλαν σελάνναν / ἄψ ἀπυκρύπτοισι φάεννον εἶδος (fr. 34.1); Leonidas of Tarentum: Ἄστρα μὲν ἡμαύρωσε καὶ ἱερὰ κύκλα σελήνης / ἄξονα δινήσας ἔμπυρος ἥελιος (Greek Anthology 9.24.1-2). This later became a *topos*: cf., e.g., Hor. *Od.* 1.12.47. The comparison is apposite, however, since Charikleia later becomes the priestess of Selene in Ethiopia (10.41.1). Compare the description of Charikleia as a shining, resplendent figure at the start of the Pythian Games (4.1:2).

τὴν δὲ κορωνίδα τῆς πομπῆς καὶ ὀφθαλμόν: ὀφθαλμός here means 'focus of attention' or 'most prized possession'. Cf. 2.16.4; 4.19.8 below, and note, and the Latin *pupillus*. Cf.

Pindar: Σικελίας τ' ἔσαν / ὄφθαλμός (*OI.* 2.9-10); Ποθέω στρατιᾶς ὄφθαλμὸν ἐμᾶς (*OI.* 6.16); Aeschylus: λαμπρὰ δὲ πανσέληνος ἐν μέσῳ σάκει, / πρέσβιστον ἄστρον, νυκτὸς ὄφθαλμός, πρέπει (*Sept.* 389-390); Achilles Tatius: ὄφθαλμός ἀνθέων (2.1.2). For an interesting discussion of κορώνης cf. Morgan (1979, at 10.39.2).

3.6.4 ὁ σκοπὸς ἐκ τῶν ἀληθῶν ἠνύετο: Kalasiris achieves his first aim but his ultimate intentions are hidden from the reader, who is not told why Kalasiris wanted to win the confidence of Charikles (Hefti 1950: 48, 75). For σκοπός as the aim or end of life, cf. 6.3.2 (the lover of Isias); Plato *Gorg.* 507d. Σκοπός is also a technical term in neoPlatonic literary exegesis (cf. Coulter 1976, 77). For Heliodorus' use of the word: see 4.4.1 (Charikleia is the σκοπός of the foot-race); 4.13.4 (Charikleia asks Kalasiris what the point of her deception is); 6.4.2 (Charikleia and Kalasiris head for Thyamis' village); 10.191 (Charikleia works towards her goal). Other characters too are goal-directed in the *Ethiopian Story*, however (cf. 5.8.4; 5.15.1; 5.20.3; 6.6.3; 7.5.2; 7.5.4; 7.19.6; 7.26.7; 9.3.6; 9.5.3) and too much should not be read into the use of this word.

συμπρομήθητι: The only other occurrence of this form is Philostr. *VA* 4.30.4.

μή τι πρὸς τῆς ὀχλικῆς ἀηδίας ἐπιτέτριπται: cf. 3.3.8 and note. Ὀχλος and its derivatives are often used by Heliodorus as a contemptuous way of referring to the common people. Cf. e.g. 1.3.1 παρενοχλεῖτε, 1.8.1 ὀχλησόντων, 1.9.4 ἐνοχλεῖν, 3.7.2 ὀχλος, etc. Cf. δημῶδης above (3.3.8) and note.

ἐνεδεικνύμην δὲ ὡς ἀσχολίας ἄλλης προϋργιαίτερον τίθεμαι τὸ κατ' αὐτόν: cf. Pindar *Isthm.* 1.1, πρᾶγμα καὶ ἀσχολίας ὑπέρτερον / θήσομαι (Wifstrand 1944-45, 31).

Kalasiris and Charikles find Charikleia unwell

3.7.1 καὶ τοὺς ὄφθαλμοὺς τῷ ἔρωτι διαβρόχους: cf. Lucian, describing the infatuation of Deinias with a very different Charikleia: ἐπεὶ ἦσθετο πονηρῶς ἔχοντα καὶ διάβροχον ἤδη τῷ ἔρωτι καὶ τακερὸν γεγεννημένον (*Tox.* 15.9). Heliodorus carefully signposts the real cause of Charikleia's distress.

τῆς κεφαλῆς ἄλγημα διοχλεῖν ἔλεγεν: cf. 4.7.6, where the doctor Akesinos finds nothing medically wrong with Charikleia.

3.7.2 «Μὴ θαύμαζε» εἶπον «εἰ τοσοῦτοις ἐμπομπεύσασα δήμοις ὄφθαλμὸν τινα βάσκανον ἐπεσπάσατο»: The 'evil eye' (or, to avoid anachronistic connotations of evil, the 'eye of envy' [cf. 3.7.2 below, and note]) is also attested in antiquity by Hesiod *Th.* 222; Pindar *Nem.* 4.39; Aesch. *Ag.* 469-470, 947; Aristophanes *Fr.* 347; Theocritus 6.39; Callimachus *Ep.* 21.4; Apollonius of Rhodes (*Medea*), 4.1669-1672; the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problemata inedita* (3.52); Vergil *Ecl.* 3.103; Ovid *Met.* 7.366 (the Telchines);

Pliny *HN* 7.16.1-18.8; Aulus Gellius *NA* 9.4.7.1-9.7; Plutarch *Quaest. Conv.* 680c1-683b2; Stobaeus 3.38.10; Pseudo-Alexander of Aphrodisias 2.53; Basil of Caesarea *On Envy*; Nonnus *Dionysiaca* 31.73-74; and Michael Psellus *De Omnifaria Doctrina* 109(82). Most of these authors view it as a form of magic or witchcraft and this is certainly how it appears in the relevant magical amulets and Egyptian papyri (Walcot 1978, 85-86). Walcot rightly places the phenomenon within the general context of envy in Greek culture and also notes (pp. 86-88) evidence for the belief in the gospels (*Mark* 7.22). Plutarch discusses sexual envy in his essay on curiosity (*Mor.* 515-523). Koraes condemns such discussions as idle talk but belief in the ability of certain people to inflict harm through eye-contact (a special case of envy) is almost universal and is well known to modern anthropology. In the heyday of the study of Germanic folklore, Otto Jahn (1855), whose work has recently been discussed by Schlesier (1991, 234-255), made an extensive study of the evidence for the belief in the 'eye of envy' in the art and literature of antiquity. His work has recently (1996) been emulated by Rakoczy's comprehensive monograph on the subject in Greek literature.

Traditionally, Heliodorus' use of the 'eye of envy' motif is attributed to the taste for paradoxography and *Büchergelehrsamkeit* displayed by the writers of the Second Sophistic and Byzantium (Rommel 1923, 59-63). There are clearly similarities between Heliodorus and the passage of Plutarch mentioned above (Capelle 1953, 166-180). Capelle argues that, since Plutarch does not mention the basilisk (as Heliodorus does), Heliodorus and Plutarch were using a common source, probably Phylarchus (in the case of Plutarch perhaps via the *Symposiaca* of Didymus: cf. Rohde 1914³, 486 [456 n. 2]), since Plutarch refers to Phylarchus (680d11) in the context of the discussion of βασκανία and the name appears a little before Aelian's discussion of the χαραδριός (17.5.1; cf. 3.8.1 below, and note). Pliny (*HN* 7.17) likewise attributes the story to Phylarchus. The discussion may go back beyond Phylarchus to Democritus whom Plutarch mentions at the end of his discussion (683a7) where the Democritean term εἶδωλα is used by Gaius, although the general explanation that Plutarch gives for the 'eye of envy' is not a simple variant of the theory of Democritus, since Plutarch uses the term ἀπόρροιαί (681A) for the emanations, or 'influences', that originate within the body rather than εἶδωλα to refer to the images that are shed from the surface of objects (Rakoczy 1996, 191 n. 708, 195 n. 725).

The view that Heliodorus is presenting a learned account of the 'eye of envy' has recently been challenged by Dickie (1991, 17-29), according to whom Heliodorus composed a light-hearted, tongue-in-cheek pastiche of Plutarch, using elements of Galen's

theory of contagion (7.279 [Kühn]), to show that Kalasiris is having fun at Charikles' expense by producing an absurd hotch-potch of scientific accounts of phenomena analogous to the 'eye of envy'. Levin (1992, 499-506, esp. p. 500); and Anderson (1993a, 206) similarly regard the passage as a light-hearted spoof.

There is no doubt that Heliodorus' account of the phenomenon echoes the wording of Plutarch in places (as the notes below show) and it is therefore probable that he was aware of this discussion of the matter. On the other hand, there are also clearly important differences between Kalasiris' account, in which the contagion is transmitted through the medium of air (περικεχυμένος ἀήρ, 3.7.3; 'a kind of "malaria"', Rakoczy 1996, 208) and that in Plutarch where the explanation is essentially given in terms of Democritean effluxes (Dickie 1991, 25-7). It is quite another matter, however, to argue that Heliodorus deliberately reworked this material in such a way that his readers would be aware that Kalasiris was not serious about it. The two versions are actually not inherently inconsistent since effluxes must be transmitted through air to affect the patient and in any case it is unlikely that the reader of the romance would pick up the technical differences between the sources of Kalasiris' account and on this basis judge that Kalasiris was making up a 'a pastiche, garbled to the point of incoherence, of what we find in Plutarch' (Dickie 1991, 28). Dickie's argument that Kalasiris' account 'regards βασκανία as a disease' (p. 27) actually greatly adds to the credibility of his account, since Kalasiris has to explain the manifest illness of Charikleia (μαλακία, 3.7.2; πάθει, 3.19.1; νόσος, 4.5.4) for which Charikles later summons a physician, Akesinos (4.7). Moreover, the idea that love enters the soul through the eyes is again an appropriate application of a romantic commonplace (3.7.5 below, and note), making use of some of Plutarch's vocabulary, to the present context. The introduction of this motif greatly increases the irony of the passage (3.7.5 below, and note).

There appears to be no convincing reason why Heliodorus' account should not be viewed as a complex, compound version of a well-known and widely discussed phenomenon (see sources above). Heliodorus' account does not depend exclusively on Plutarch (Rakoczy 1996, 192-196, and above) and it is by no means unlikely either that Heliodorus read geographical and ethnographical writers. For example, Strabo records that the wives of the Red Sea Troglodytes, whom Heliodorus mentions (9.16.2; for the spelling, cf. Morgan 1979 *ad loc.*), wore amulets against the 'eye of envy', στιβίζονται δ' ἐπιμελῶς [ὄσ] αἱ γυναῖκες, περικεινται δὲ τοῖς τραχήλοις κογχία ἀντὶ βασκανίων (16.4.17.4-6). Since Heliodorus also refers to the Blemmyes (9.16.3) and other Red Sea tribes (e.g. 9.19.2) and

since the ultimate source for his description of Meroë (10.5.1-2) may have been Agatharchides by way of Artemidoros (Diodor. 1.33.2), whose explanation for the Nile flood is also used by Heliodorus (Diod. Sic. 1.41.4-9: cf., Hld. 2.28.1-5), it is possible that Heliodorus used Artemidoros quite extensively as a source for the ethnography of the Red Sea area and may also have used Phylarchus, Didymus or some other ethnographical work for his explanation of the superstition. The author's evident knowledge of alibinism (see introduction) also suggests knowledge of this kind of literature. Furthermore, belief in the 'eye of envy' appears to be strong in the Near East; Thomsen (1992, 27) points out that the belief originated and was developed further here under the influence of Chaldaean magic. There was considerable interest in the 'eye of envy' in Syria and Palestine from the third century onwards (Bonner 1950, 99): Brown (1971b, 114) notes that Syrian ascetics were often suspected of the 'eye of envy' and that exorcism was one of the most important tasks that holy men in Syria were called upon to perform (p. 123; cf. 3.18.3; 3.19.3) and St. Ephrem contrasts the eye darkened by sin with the luminous eye of virtue (Brock 1985, 71-84). In the fourth century, Basil of Caesarea's Christian homily *On Envy* makes extensive reference to the 'eye' and advocates Christian virtue as the way to overcome it (Limberis 1991, 163-184; esp. 175-180). At times Basil's homily bears a verbal resemblance to Plutarch (Limberis 1991, 177) or his source. It is quite possible therefore, that Heliodorus, who in all probability lived in Syria at this time, had a wider knowledge of the phenomenon than Dickie suggests—in addition to the material presented here, Heliodorus also shows knowledge of how the 'eye of envy' was exorcised (4.5.2); he describes Theagenes' apotropaic amulet depicting a Gorgon (3.3.5) and gives an account of how the eye of Kronos (Saturn) exerted a baneful effect on the house of Kalasiris (2.24.6). Significantly, these passages are independent of the narrative of the supposed afflictions of Charikleia (the present passage) and Theagenes (3.11.1) and therefore suggest that Heliodorus had a wide interest in the subject (just as he appears to have had a wide interest in magic). Moreover, the phenomenon is related to the eroticisation of vision in the romance (see introduction)—a characteristic concern of Heliodorus. Envy in general also plays a significant part in the romance (Walcot 1978, 84-85).

Discussion of the sources used by Heliodorus, however, does not adequately explain the narratological reasons for the inclusion of this passage or its literary subtlety and ironic depth. The narratological function of the digression was to allay the suspicions of Charikles concerning the condition of his daughter (and so could not have been garbled and incoherent without undermining this strategy) and to enable Kalasiris to bring the

lovers together through his role as exorcist and magician (Hefti 1950, 49-50; Bartsch 1989, 154-155). In this case Kalasiris claims to be explaining Charikleia's illness, but in fact he is hoping to win Charikles' confidence, while at the same time including a paradoxographical *topos* of the kind so popular with the educated readers of the day. Fuchs (1996, 175) argues that Charikles is the victim of a *Trugrede* ('speech of deception') here, and that it is Charikles, rather than Charikleia (who would normally be the one to be deceived because of her opposition to love), who is the target of the trick, since it is he who opposes the match. By means of the doctrine of the 'eye of envy' Kalasiris is able to distract Charikles' attention from the love-sickness of his foster-daughter while at the same time hinting ironically at the true cause of her 'illness'. However, it is not entirely clear that Charikles would not have gone along with the marriage of Charikleia and Theagenes if he had been asked (cf. his admiration for his lineage 2.34; Sandy [1982, 144]) since the match between Charikleia and Alkamenes appears to be subordinate to his desire to see his daughter married (2.33.7; 3.9.1). Nevertheless, Charikles is certainly taken in by Kalasiris' explanation of the evil eye and, ironically, even applies the theory to Theagenes, without reflecting on a possible connection between the two (3.11.1). Charikles is open to suggestion because he was convinced that his daughter would never fall in love (2.33.4) and because he had already lost a wife and daughter through the malice of fate (2.29.4). For further instances of irony deployed at Charikles' expense see the notes 4.7.1 (Charikles discovers that Charikleia is in love); 4.15.1 and Appendix 1 (Charikles' dream).

The narratological function of this passage should not be stressed too much, however, since such excursions are a feature of Heliodorus' ambivalence. Kalasiris has described to Knemon (and the reader) the encounter between Theagenes and Charikleia in spiritual, Platonic terms and now tells Charikles that it was a common case of the 'eye of envy', explaining what happened in the language of materialism. This dichotomy between the spiritual gaze of the lovers' (3.5.4) and Kalasiris' representation of it to Charikles as malevolent erotic gaze (the present passage) deliberately undercuts the romanticism of the former passage (cf. Winkler 1982, 128, who deals with the excursus as an amphiboly: for this term, see appendix 3). The incident also important for the characterisation of Charikles and Kalasiris (Yatromanolakis 1988, 203).

Of course, envy has always followed in the train of ideal beauty ever since Strife ('Ερις) threw the apple of discord among the Olympian goddesses (Hyg. 92). The romances show this clearly; in Chariton envy is personified as a maleficent power (βάσκανος δαίμων, 1.1.16; 3.2.17; 6.2.11) or becomes an attribute of Fate (Τύχη βάσκανε, 1.14.7; 4.1.2; 5.6.8).

In Achilles Tatius it is the jealousy of Eros which starts his troubles (ἔρωσ βάσκανος 2.34.1) and Melite calls Kleitophon an ‘sorcerer of beauty’ (κόλλους βάσκανε 5.25.8). The ‘eye of envy’ is furthermore closely linked with sexuality as the Latin term *fascinatio* (cf. *fascinum* = *membrum virile*: cf. Varro *L.L.* 7.97) shows (*fascinum* is etymologically connected with βάσκανος). The modern psychoanalyst, Jacques Lacan (1979, 67-119), makes much of the importance of the ‘gaze’ (*le regard*) in human psychological development, and clearly, while the the topos is deployed for narratological effect here, vision and its connection with sexuality is a recurrent theme in the romance.

Γελάσας οὖν εἰρωνικόν: the scepticism of Charikles (not otherwise a noticeable trait of his character) is an indication that Heliodorus’ account of the ‘eye of envy’ is structurally similar to that of Plutarch, where Mestrius Florus has to convince his disbelieving guests of the scientific truth of the ‘eye of envy’ also.

ὡς ὁ πολλὸς ὄχλος εἶναι τινα βασκανίαν ἐπίστευσας: It is noticeable that, although Charikles at first rejects the doctrine of the ‘eye of envy’ as a vulgar superstition, he later accepts it (3.9.1, 3.18.3), tells Charikleia that this is what ails her (3.19.2) and even attributes the same condition to Theagenes (3.11.1). By way of contrast, Charikleia rejects Kalasiris’ attempt to convince her that this is in fact what her problem is (4.5.4, 4.5.6). In all of these descriptions, there is no suggestion that the condition is the result of an evil power. Instead, it is portrayed as a disease, as is Phaedra’s infatuation for Hippolytus in Euripides’ play (cf., e.g., *Hipp.* 269; 4.7.4 below, and note).

Heliodorus also uses the word βασκανία metaphorically to refer to the jealous malice of fate (ὁ δαίμων): cf. ὦ τῆς ὀμότητος καὶ τῆς ἀρρήτου τοῦ δαίμονος βασκανίας (2.1.3); Ἔγνωσ οὖν μὴ ἐνδιατρίβειν τοῖς Καταδούποις μὴ δὴ τις καὶ δαίμονος βασκανία τῆς δευτέρας με θυγατρὸς στερήσειε (2.33.2). The sense is close to Herodian (2.4.5, ἐβάσκηνε πάντα καὶ ἀνέτρεψε πονηρὰ τύχη). LSJ quote Plato *Phaedo* 95b (μὴ τις ἡμῖν βασκανία περιτρέψη τὸν λόγον) for the sense of βασκανία as ‘malign influence’, though the meaning here could equally be ‘unforeseen event’.

Kalasiris explains the effect of the ‘eye of envy’

3.7.3 πάθος ἐγκατέσπειρεν: cf. Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* 681a7, θαυμαστήν τινα διασπείρει δύναμιν. The aorists are gnomic so that the use of the subjunctive in this sentence is regular in primary sequence (Barber 1962, 238-239).

ὥστε ὁπότ’ ἂν σὺν φθόνῳ τις ἴδῃ τὰ καλά: for a similar expression, cf. Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* 681b1-2, ὥστε . . . ὅταν ἐμβλέπη τοῖς καλοῖς.

τὸ περιέχον τε δυσμενοῦς ποιότητος ἀνέπλησε: δυσμενής carries the sense ‘hostile, ill-

willed' but in Heliodorus ὀφθαλμός βάσκανος does not carry any connotation of evil.

RL read ἀνέπλησε for the ἐνέπλησε of the codices on the doubtful basis of 3.7.4 (ἀνεπλήσθησαν [ἐνεπλήσθησαν C]). However, ἐμπίμπλημι is the more normal word and one that Heliodorus uses at 3.11.3 (ἡδονῆς . . . ἐνεπλήσθη), 4.9.1 (λύπης ἐνεπλήσθη [ἀνεπλήσθη P]), and 10.27.4 (ταράχου . . . ἐνέπλησε). Nevertheless, ἀναπίμπλημι is the word used by Thucydides in his well-known description of the effects of the plague on the people of Athens (ἕτερος ἀφ' ἐτέρου θεραπείας ἀναπιμπλάμενοι ὥσπερ τὰ πρόβατα ἔθνησκον, 2.51) and generally carries the connotation of defilement or infection that is required both here and at 4.7.4 (cf. LSJ⁹ *ad loc.*). The text of RL should therefore be retained in both cases.

νόσος ἐγένετο πολλοῖς ὁ φθόνος: Socrates also depicts the lover as under a spell and ill (*Phaedr.* 252b). Cf. also Plutarch (*Demetr.* 38), Pseudo-Lucian (*Dea Syria* 17-18) and Aristainetos (1.13).

3.7.4 σκόπησον: a non-Attic aorist (Naber 1873, 153): cf. also διολισθήσαι (3.4.3).

ἀνεπλήσθησαν: For the text see 3.7.3 above and note.

The analogy between falling in love and contracting an eye-infection is made by Plato (*Phaedr.* 255d). Kalasiris extends and reverses the order of the analogy: suffering the eye of envy is like contracting an eye-infection, or falling in love. The change in the order of presentation of Plato's famous comparison has the effect of undercutting the solemnity of the original, as is appropriate to the present context.

3.7.5 Τεκμηριούτω δέ σοι τὸν λόγον εἴπερ ἄλλο τι καὶ ἢ τῶν ἐρώτων γένεσις: The irony is palpable: Kalasiris uses the analogy of love to prove that Charikleia is suffering from the effects of the 'eye of envy' in order to distract Charikles' attention from the fact that his daughter is in love with Theagenes.

οἷς τὰ ὀρώμενα τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐνδίδωσι οἷον ὑπὴνεμα διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τὰ πάθη ταῖς ψυχαῖς εἰστοξεύοντα: Ὑπὴνεμα 'swift as the wind, driven by the wind' is used of runners: cf., Greek Anthology, Λάδας τὸ στάδιον εἴθ' ἤλατο, εἴτε διέπτῃ, / οὐδὲ φράσαι δυνατὸν δαιμόνιον τὸ τάχος. / Οἷος ἔης φεύγων τὸν ὑπὴνεμον, ἔμπνοε Λάδα . . . (16.54.1-3); of words: cf. Themistius, οὐ γὰρ ὑπόπτεροι αὐτῆς οἱ λόγοι οὐδὲ κοῦφοι καὶ ὑπὴνεμοι, ἀλλὰ σχολαῖοι τε καὶ βραδεῖς (περὶ τῆς Βασιλέως φιληκοῖας 220c6 [Harduin]); but ὑπὴνέμιος could also be used of desire: cf. Dio Chrysostom, φέρε δὴ ποῖόν τι πλάττωμεν τό τε σχῆμα καὶ εἶδος τοῦ φιλοτίμου δαίμονος; ἢ δῆλον ὅτι πτερωτόν τε καὶ ὑπὴνέμιον κατὰ τὸ ἦθος αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἅμα τοῖς πνεύμασι φερόμενον (*Or.* 4.117.1-4). More commonly the meaning is 'sheltered from the wind' e.g. Theophrastus, ἀλλὰ μέχρι τοῦ ἄνθους ἀφικν-

εἶσθαι, τὰς δ' ἐν τοῖς ὑπηνέμοις εὐαυξεῖς τε καὶ πολυκάρπους γίνεσθαι (*CP* 3.6.9.9-11); Hesch. <ὑπηνέμους>· σκεπηνοῦς 'sheltered'.

The idea that love enters the soul through the eyes is found most famously in Plato *Phaedr.* 255c (τὸ τοῦ κάλλους ῥεῦμα πάλιν εἰς τὸν καλὸν διὰ τῶν ὀμμάτων ἰόν, ἧ πέφυκεν ἐπὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἰέναι ἀφικόμενον) and also in Achilles Tatius (1.4.4, κάλλος γὰρ ὀξύτερον τιτρώσκει βέλους καὶ διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν καταρρεῖ; Neimke 1889, 48); cf. also Ach. Tat. 5.13.4, ἡ δὲ τῆς θεᾶς ἡδονὴ διὰ τῶν ὀμμάτων εἰσρέουσα τοῖς στέρνοις ἐγκάθεται; and Ath. 13.564b-e, who provides a range of quotations to emphasise this idea. The idea that love can be shot into the soul like an arrow from a bow is found also in Aeschylus (*Ag.* 742) and Euripides (*Troad.* 255, ἐτόξευσ' αὐτὸν ἔρωσ). Lucian *De Domo* 20 shows that belief in the extraordinary power of visual impressions was widespread during the period of the Second Sophistic (Bartsch 1989, 166). The metaphor is an extension of the comparison between love and war (4.1.1 below, and note). Cf. also the theme of love at first sight mentioned above 3.5.4 and note.

πολυκίνητόν τε καὶ θερμότατον οὔσα ἡ ὄψις: cf. Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* 681a6, πολυκίνητος γὰρ ἡ ὄψις. The similarity in wording is striking and strongly suggests that Heliodorus was aware of Plutarch's text (cf. 3.7.2 above, and note).

δεκτικώτερα πρὸς τὰς ἀπορροίας: cf. Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* 681a4-5, ἐνδελεχῶς ἐκπέμπει τινὰς ἀπορροίας. Metaphors of liquidity and flux are common in the *Ethiopian Story* (Feuillâtre 1966, 76; introduction): for example, Kalasiris is overwhelmed by a flood of emotion on reading Persinna's band (4.9.1), but here the word is clearly technical.

τὰς μεταβάσεις ἐρώτων: cf. the similar sentiment in Chariton 4.7.6, οἷα γὰρ πεπαιδευμένος ἐνεθυμείτο ὅτι φιλόκαινός ἐστιν ὁ Ἔρωσ.

τῷ κατ' αὐτὴν ἐμπύρῳ πνεύματι: cf. Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* 681a, πνεύματος ἀγῆν ἀφιέντος πυρώδη.

3.8.1 βίβλοις ἱεραῖς: Kalasiris lays claim to superior knowledge through his study of sacred scripture. Earlier too he had told the intellectuals of Delphi that his knowledge of the Nile was derived from the study of holy books (2.28.2). The knowledge he refers to there was probably astrological (cf. 3.16.3-5 on the higher and lower forms of Egyptian wisdom) but knowledge of the 'eye of envy' was quite commonplace as the accounts of Plutarch and Aelian (cf. the note on the *χαραδριός* below) at the very least (see 3.7.2 above and note) show. Kalasiris' claim to superior knowledge is part of his deception of Charikles (4.6.2; 4.7.2) and Theagenes (3.17.1-5).

ἀνάγραπτον: Cf. also 4.7.13; 4.8.7; 8.11.8. Barber (1962, 359) strangely regards this as an

example of an alpha-privative formation.

χαραδριός: Koraes condemns the discussion of this bird as idle talk and notes that it is not well-known to modern ornithologists but Thompson (1936, 311-314) identifies the bird as the Stone Curlew or Norfolk Plover. The Greek name derives from its habitat in dry riverbeds (χαράδρη = 'cleft, ravine'): cf. Aristotle *Hist. Anim.* 615a: Τὰς δ' οἰκήσεις οἱ μὲν περὶ τὰς χαράδρας καὶ χηραμοὺς ποιοῦνται καὶ πέτρας, οἷον ὁ καλούμενος χαραδριός; Schol. in Aristoph. *Av.* 266, αἱ χαράδραι τρόπον τινὰ διὰ τῶν ρευμάτων μελωδίας ποιοῦνται, χαραδριὸν μιμούμενος). Other authors stated that the bird inhabited marshes (cf. Herodian *Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας* 603.19 [Lentz]), rivers (Aristoph. *Av.* 1141), or the sea (Arist. *Hist. Anim.* 593b; Aristoph. *Gramm. Hist. Anim. epit.* 1.23.4-5; *Suda s.v.* ἡμερινά). The bird appeared mainly at night and had the reputation of being shy (Arist. *Hist. Anim.* 614b; Anton. Lib. 15); it was pale coloured and mute (Arist. *Hist. Anim.* 615a; *Fragmenta Zoica* 352.1-3 [Rose]); because of its omnivorous diet and constant feeding, the plover became proverbial for a gross gluttony (Cf. Aristotle *Hist. Anim.* 593b, παμφάγον γὰρ ἐστίν; Plato *Gorg.* 494b, Χαραδριοῦ τινα αὐτὸν σὺ βίον λέγεις; and the scholiast on this passage, χαραδριὸς ὄρνις τις ὃς ἅμα τῷ ἐσθίειν ἐκκρίνει).

Perhaps because of its great ingestive powers, yellow legs and large yellow eye (Thompson, p. 311), the bird was thought to be able to cure jaundice if the infected person were only to look at the bird. It was therefore sold under covers, in order to prevent the sick from being cured without payment (proverbial in Aristoph. *Av.* 266; Schol. in Plat. *Gorg.* 494b, εἰς ὃν ἀποβλέψαντες, ὡς λόγος, οἱ ἰκτεριῶντες ῥῆον ἀπαλλάττονται: ὅθεν καὶ ἐγκρύπτουσιν αὐτὸν οἱ πιπράσκοντες, ἵνα μὴ προῖκα ὠφελῶνται οἱ κάμνοντες; Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* 681c7-c81d6; Aelian *Hist. Anim.* 17.13.1-6; Hipponax *apud* Suidas *s.v.* Χαραδριός)! The humour in the discussion of the plover is unmistakable (Anderson 1982, 37). The anti-social behaviour of the bird gave rise to the belief, referred to by Heliodorus here, that it avoided infection by closing its eyes and turning away from those who sought to look it in the eye (cf. also Plat. *Symp.* 681c; Plut. *loc. cit.*; Aelian *loc. cit.*). According to Aelian (*Var. Hist.* 1.15), the male pigeon spits on his chicks to protect them from the eye (an interesting connection with beliefs in the 'eye of envy'). The belief that this bird could cure βασκανία probably arose because of its prominent yellow eyes. This lore found a ready readership in the medieval bestiaries (Thompson 1936, 313).

προσβλέποι . . . τὸ δὲ φεύγει: RL indicate a lacuna in the text after προσβλέποι because δέ does not normally stand in an apodosis (although they note Ael. *H.A.* 17.13) and the emendation of Toup and Koraes, τόδε, is not tolerable. RL suggest that a verb similar to

θεραπεύεται is required in the apodosis and they suggest εἶ ἔχει. However, Wifstrand (1944-45, 31) notes that τὸ δέ occurs commonly at the beginning of a sentence in Aelian (e.g., 2.11.5, τὸ δὲ νῦν ἔχον ἕοικα ἐρεῖν περί τε εὐμουσίας). Colonna (1987b) retains the text of the codices but punctuates with a colon rather than a comma as in his 1938 edition. The translators render what they construe the general meaning of the text to be but Heliodorus may well have deliberately written an anacoluthon here; the syntax is intended to echo the sense of the passage and breaks off as the bird abruptly turns away to avoid the gaze of a jaundiced patient. For Heliodorus' use of anacoluthon see the section on language and style in the introduction.

ὥσπερ ρεῦμα: cf. Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* 681d, ὥσπερ ρεῦμα. Other echoes of Plutarch are: ἰκτερικῶν (Plut.), ἰκτεριῶντας (Hld.); ἐμβλέποντες (Plut.), προσβλέποι (Hld.); ἔλκειν καὶ δέξεσθαι (Plut.), ἔλκειν καὶ μετασπᾶν (Hld.); ὥσπερ ὑπὸ πληγῆς τιτρώσκομενοι (Plut.), καθάπερ τρώσιν (Hld.).

ὄρασις: non-Attic for ὄψις (Naber 1873, 155).

3.8.2 ὁ καλούμενος βασιλίσκος: Plutarch does not mention the basilisk, which is described by Aelian (*De Natura Animalium* 2.5.7; 3.31.1) as well as Pliny (*HN* 8.77.3-79.5), who says that the basilisk, like the 'catoblepas', causes any human being who looks into its eyes to expire immediately and that the creature is also capable of withering crops and vegetation and breaking rocks by merely breathing on them. Nevertheless, this monster is in turn vulnerable to the offensive odour of polecats.

εἰ δέ τινες . . . οὐχ ὁ βούλονται δρῶσιν ἀλλ' ὁ πεφύκασιν: This materialist argument is found also in Plutarch's discussion: ὁ πεφύκασιν οὐχ ὁ βούλονται ποιοῦσιν (682d1-5).

Kalasis and Charikles resume their discussion of Charikleia

3.9.1 ἀπόρημα 'problem'. A philosophical term: cf., e.g., Iamblichus: Τίθημι δὴ οὖν ἐρωτῶντά σε οὐκ ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἀπόρημα, διὰ τί, ἐν οὐρανῷ κατοικούντων τῶν θεῶν μόνως, χθονίων καὶ ὑποχθονίων εἰσὶ παρὰ τοῖς θεουργικοῖς κλήσεις: (*De Myst.* 1.9.1-4). For the deployment of philosophical material by the sophists, cf. Anderson (1993b, 133-143).

μισόλεκτρος: Ἄπαξ λεγόμενον. Charikleia is the only romance heroine who is initially opposed to love (Hefti 1950, 41, 60).

καὶ δηλὸν ὡς καὶ ταύτην διαλύσαι βουλήσῃ φίλος τε ὢν καὶ τὰ πάντα σοφός: cf. 3.19.2; 4.6.2; Winkler (1982, 129). Charikles assumes that Kalasis is proficient in the lower form of Egyptian wisdom, magic, and that he will be able to cure Charikleia of the 'eye of envy' just as he thought he could make her fall in love through magic (2.33.6). For the comparison between magic and astrology, cf. 3.16.3 below and note. Theagenes had a

similar belief in Kalasiris' magic powers (3.17.3) but this was not shared by Charikleia (4.5.4 below and note). The irony that Charikles is urging Kalasiris on a course of action that will result in the disappearance of Charikleia pervades books 3 & 4. For the use of magical spells to constrain the object of desire, see Winkler (1990, 71-98).

THEAGENES

Kalasiris and Charikles are invited to Theagenes' feast

3.10.1 ὥσπερ ἐπὶ μάχην ἢ πόλεμον ἀλλ' οὐκ εὐωχίαν κληθέντες: Proverbial: cf. Plato (*Gorg.* 447a):

ΚΑΛ. Πολέμου καὶ μάχης φασὶ χρῆναι, ὦ Σώκρατες, οὕτω μεταλαγχάνειν.

ΣΩ. Ἄλλ' ἦ, τὸ λεγόμενον, κατόπιν ἐορτῆς ἤκομεν καὶ ὑστεροῦμεν;

For Heliodorus' use of proverbs, see 3.1.1 above, and note.

τις ἐσπουδασμένος: the change of scene to a banquet hosted by Theagenes is made through a nameless person. Heliodorus uses this device also at 2.34.1 (the invitation to the ἐναγισμός); 6.3.1 (the lover of Isias). Kalasiris comes late to the symposium as Socrates does to Plato's dialogue by that name (175c), because he is absorbed in his discussion with Charikles.

Δεῦρ' ἴτε: cf. Homer (*Il.* 3.130): δεῦρ' ἴθι νύμφα φίλη, ἵνα θέσκελα ἔργα ἴδῃαι; Aristophanes (*Ecccl.* 882): Μοῦσαι, δεῦρ' ἴτ' ἐπὶ τοῦμόν στόμα.

3.10.2 « οὗτος » ἔφη « τὴν ἀπὸ ξύλου κλήσιν ἤκει φέρων »: Modelled on the proverb found in Herodotus: ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ ὅτι δεσπότης ἔφησας εἶναι ἐμός, κλαίειν λέγω. Τοῦτό ἐστι ἡ ἀπὸ Σκυθέων ῥῆσις (4.127.17-19). That this is proverbial is evident from Diogenes Laertius' words on the collection of proverbs by Anacharsis the Scythian: παρέσχε δὲ καὶ ἀφορμὴν παροιμίας διὰ τὸ παρρησιασθῆς εἶναι, τὴν ἀπὸ Σκυθῶν ῥῆσιν (1.101.5-7). Cf. Leutsch & Schneidewin (Diogenianus 3.40: Ἐύλω ἐφέλκειν, κόνειον πιεῖν ἢ προδόντα τὴν ναῦν ὅτι τάχιστα τῶν κακῶν ἀπαλλαγῆναι: ἐπὶ ζημίας κείνται καὶ προστιμήματος, and note).

ὥς λίαν ἀπροσδιόνυσος: Heliodorus makes the pun in the word ἀπροσδιόνυσος explicit, whereas in Lucian (*Bacch.* 6.3-6) it is latent. In Plato's *Symposium* (174b) Socrates similarly makes a play on words which derive from a proverb (cf. the note above). Ἄπροσδιόνυσος occurs quite frequently in the sense 'irrelevant' or 'uninspired' in a literary context: cf. Cicero *Att.* 16.13.1; Plutarch *Quaest. Conv.* 612e7-9; 671e10-f1; Athenaeus 15.12.5 (Kaibel); 11.85.39-41 (Kaibel); Athenaeus 2.24.4.3-5; Aristides

Συμβουλευτικός *περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν μωμῶδεῖν* 511.6-12 [Jebb]; Damascius *In Phaed.* 14.3-5; Eusebius *Praep. Evang.* 3.13.18; Lucian *Bacch.* 5.1-2; *Herm.* 55.13-14; Plut. *Aetia Romana et Graeca* 286d6; 388e5-8; *Quaest. Conv.* 615a4-9; Polybius 39.2.3.1-3; Strabo 8.6.23.15-17.

The word is related to the proverb οὐδὲν πρὸς Διόνυσον or τὶ τοῦτο πρὸς Διόνυσον: cf. Leutsch & Schneidewin (Zenobius 5.40). According to Zenobius, the saying originated in the jeers of the audience when poets departed from the practice of beginning plays with a dithyrambic chorus to Dionysus, substituting instead descriptions of centaurs. To overcome the criticisms of their audiences poets brought satyrs into their plays so that it seemed that they had not forgotten Dionysus. Cf. also Diogenianus (7.18), App. (4.82). The *Suda* traces the incident to a play by Epigenes of Sikyon. The *Suda* also records that Theaitetos, in a work on proverbs, said that Parrasios (a similar story is also told of Koroibos) had taken part in an art competition in Corinth to depict Dionysus most beautifully but had left the god himself out of his painting. Those who viewed the paintings then coined the expression τί πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον; ‘What has this got to do with Dionysus?’

καὶ ταῦτα: this phrase is the equivalent of καίπερ (Koraes). Heliodorus may have derived this usage from his use demonstrative pronouns to further define nouns: e.g., βοηθείας καὶ ταύτης ταχείας ἀποτυχόντα (3.17.3); ὀχλεῖται γὰρ ὑπὸ δυνάμεων, ἅς αὐτὸς κατέπεμψα, καὶ τούτων οὐκ ἐλαχίστων (4.7.12).

The feast of Theagenes

3.10.3 Τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄλλα τῆς εὐωχίας τί ἂν λέγων ἐνοχλοῖην: this time, Knemon does not object to the abbreviation of Kalasiris’ narrative. Kalasiris passes over the description of choruses and dances to what it is necessary to Knemon to know and pleasant for Kalasiris to relate.

τὰς ἀνλητρίδας: cf. Plutarch (*The E at Delphi* 394b) for the confusion between the religious and secular use of flute music. Here the flute-girls provide the musical accompaniment for a party (cf. Arsinoe 1.15.6, 2.8.5; the party of Nausikles, 5.16.2) and playing the flute appears to be used metaphorically for aesthetic expression in the description of the shepherd on the ring Kalasiris gives to Nausikles (5.14.2). However, flute music also accompanies sacrifices, festivals and religious processions: 3.1.5 (the procession at Delphi); 4.16.3, 4.17.1 (the Phoenician sacrifice to Herakles); 7.8.5 (the restoration of Kalasiris to the temple of Isis); 10.41.3 (the final procession).

πυρρίχιον ὄρησιν: cf. 3.2.2 above, and note. The dance here is entirely appropriate to the

festival in honour of Neoptolemus: cf. Lucian *De Salt.* 9.1-7, where the preeminent skill of Neoptolemus in the dance is said to have led to the development of the dance called Pyrrhic in his honour, and the entry in Hesychius (*s.v.* πυρρίχιζειν), where the Pyrrhic dance is described as a short dance in armour (τὴν ἐνόπλιον ὄρχησιν καὶ σύντονον) named after Pyrrhichos of Crete (cf. Strabo 10.3.8; 10.4.16), or from its fiery nature (ἀπὸ τοῦ διάπυρον εἶναι) after Pyrrhus, the son of Achilles, who, according to Archilochos, first performed the dance after the murder of Eurypylos. The dance gave rise to the metrical ‘Pyrrhic foot’ (πυρρίχιος πούς). Other references are less relevant: according to Aristophanes (*fr.* 519) the dance was first performed around the pyre (πυρά) of Patroklos. Pouilloux (1983, 279) considers this dance to be out of place at a banquet, on the grounds that it was military (Xen. *Anab.* 6.1.12), but the character of the dance is not entirely clear: Euripides describes it as being carried out in a crisis (*Andr.* 1135-1136), but Plato (*Laws* 816b) regards it as educational, while in Aristophanes (*Frogs* 153) the dance is one which is learnt by disreputable characters such as Kinesias in the underworld. Athenaeus (14.28.18-24 [Kaibel]) states that there are three kinds of dance in dramatic poetry: tragic, comic and satyric, and also three kinds of dance in lyric poetry: pyrrhic, that performed at gymnastic festivals (γυμνοπαιδική) and the dance in choral hymns to Apollo (ὑπορχηματική). He adds that the pyrrhic dance resembles the satyric in being fast, but that its true character is military, since it was performed in armour. In another passage (14.29.20-26 [Kaibel]; 14.630f-631b [Gulick]) he says that the pyrrhic dance is Dionysiac in nature, since it begins gently and the dancers carry thyrsi, narthex wands and lamps as they enact the story of Dionysus in India and the humiliation of Pentheus. The Dionysian character of the dance would make it appropriate for a banquet (cf. Xen. *Symp.* 9.1).

3.10.4 τὸ ὄμμα ἠνεμωμένος: ἠνεμωμένος means ‘filled with wind’, ‘blown about in the wind’ or, in a medical sense, ‘swollen’ (LSJ⁹ *s.v.* ἀνεμόομαι). The construction in Lucian’s description of the liar’s ghostly statue is similar (*Philopseud.* 18.20-22; *Bacch.* 2.17, ἠνεμωμένον τοῦ πάγωνος τὰς τρίχας). A poem in the Greek Anthology shows the connection with a storm (13.12.2, βρόμος τε δεινὸς ἠνεμωμένης ἀλός). Heliodorus’s transference of the word to the eyes is unusual but the *Suda* states that the word was used of those in love by Aelian (*s.v.* ‘Ἠνεμῶσθαι, τὸ περὶ ἔρωτα ἐπτοῆσθαι. Αἰλιανός· καὶ ἐδόκει περὶ τὴν ἄνθρωπον ἀκρατῶς ἠνεμῶσθαι. Cf. Aelian *De Hist. Anim.* 7.17.6, οἱ γήμαντες περὶ τὰς νέας ἠνέμωνται; also used of plain excitement (*De Hist. Anim.* 11.7.2-3, καὶ πολλοὶ θηραταὶ περὶ τὴν ἄγραν αὐτῶν ἠνέμωνται). The metaphorical meaning of the word is therefore entirely appropriate to the context.

ἐπὶ τὸ φαιδρότερον: cf. Baumgarten (1932, 82, who cites Xen. *Cyr.* 4.2; 11.6.6) but see 3.3.3 above, and note; φαιδρός occurs commonly in the Atticist writers.

3.10.5 Διάνοια γὰρ ἐρῶντος ὁμοίων τι καὶ μεθύοντος: the comparison between the lover and the inebriate was commonplace: cf. also Alcaeus (fr. 346 [Lobel-Page]); Kallimachos *AP* 12.118.3-4; Meleager *AP* 12.119.1-4; Rufinos *AP* 5.93; Catullus 45.11 (*ebrios ocellos*); Maehler (1990, 11: ‘hier, bei Heliodor, ist Allegorie durch Psychologie ersetzt’); Feuillâtre (1966, 27: such *sententiae* are part of the ‘allure grave, dogmatique, parfois un peu pédante’ of Heliodorus’ narrative style but ‘on est loin des tribulations de l’âme dan le *Phèdre*’ [p. 126]). Plutarch (*Quaest. Conv.* 622d8-e2) notes that both inebriate and lover become heated, giggly and relaxed, and both are moved to compose poems, like Aeschylus who wrote when drunk; cf. *Quaest. Conv.* 652d4 for the moral. Achilles Tatius (1.6.1, Kleitophon remarks that the sight of Leukippe is intoxicating; later Kleitophon is overwhelmed by the combined assault of the violent and deranging gods of Love and Wine, for (he explains) wine is the food of love (2.3.3, οἶνος γὰρ ἔρωτος τροφή); later, the slave Satyros who serves wine to the lovers, exchanges the wine-cups of Leukippe and Kleitophon, which enables the hero to steal a vicarious kiss (2.9.1). For Philostratus’ use of the theme, cf. Walker (1993a, 140-143).

ἐφ’ ὑγροῦ τοῦ πάθους σαλευούσης: Underdowne (1587) translates: ‘For the minde as wel of a lover, as of a dronken man is flexible, and can tarie in no certaine state, as though they bothe swimmmed in a moiste affection. And for that cause a lover wil soone be dronke, and a dronken man soone in love.’ For the metaphor of flux, cf. Feuillâtre (1966, 76-78 and note 13); 3.10.2 above, and note. Heliodorus uses the noun form σάλος also (3.5.6).

ἐπίφορος: Naber (1873, 335) suggests εὐεπίφορος but there is no MSS support for this reading.

3.11.1 Ὡς δὲ καὶ χάσμησ ἀδημονούσης ἀνάπλεως ἐφαίνετο . . . ὥστε καὶ τὸν Χαρικλέα καθεωρακότα τὸ ἀνώμαλον . . . : Χάσμη, ἀδημονέω and ἀνώματος are medical terms. Cf. (Hipp. *De morb. pop.* 2.3.1.6-8, χάσμη; Hipp. *De virg. morb.* 1.32-3, ἀδημονέω; Galen 1.627.14-16, ἀνώματος). Ἀνάπλεως here means ‘full’ but can also mean ‘surfeited, infected’ (Pl. *Rep.* 516e3-6).

ὥστε καὶ τὸν Χαρικλέα καθεωρακότα τὸ ἀνώμαλον ἡσυχῇ πρὸς με εἰπεῖν «Ἄλλ’ ἢ καὶ τοῦτον βάσκανος εἶδεν ὀφθαλμός»: Various attempts have been made to emend ἄλλ’ ἢ after καθεωρακότα (VMPZT): Koraes reads δὴ, Naber (1873, 335) suggests δηλαδή, Struve αὐτοῦ. Richards (1906, 111) retains the words ἄλλ’ ἢ (which are omitted in C) in line with Ἄλλ’ ἢ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔοικα τῶν πολλῶν εἶναι (3.12.3) but suggests that they be transferred

from line 3, after καθεωρακότα, to line 4, before καὶ τοῦτον. RL follows the transposition of Richards but suggests ἄλλ' ἢ in both places. Colonna (1987b, 38) following the logic but not the letter of his 1938 text (which omits οὐδέν), suggests οὐδέν ἄλλ' ἢ τὸ ἀνώμαλον, which appears to be right. Denniston (*GP* 26-27) discusses the various explanations of ἄλλ' ἢ: (i) 'nothing other than' (οὐδέν ἄλλ' ἢ or sometimes οὐδέν ἄλλο ἢ); (ii) 'except' (ἄλλ' ἢ where ἄλλο would be ungrammatical); (iii) 'except that' (ἄλλ' ἢ followed by a clause); (iv) 'merely' (ἄλλ' ἢ as 'an exception to an implied generalisation', p. 27). All of these require a preceding negative, of course, but this is easily supplied and conforms with Heliodorus' usage (cf. οὐδέν ἄλλ' ἢ, 4.20.2, 9.22.6). This reading is also suited to the meaning of the passage: 'it was quite clear (κατάδηλος) even (καί) to the others present that he was not well, so that even (καί) Charikles, who merely (or 'nothing other than') noticed his distress . . .' The important point is that Charikles observed that Theagenes was upset but was entirely unaware of its cause. The plot demands that Charikles should not realise what was about to happen (cf. 4.8.1 below and note). RL's ἄλλ' ἢ is used only in questions (*GP* p. 28) and if this reading is introduced the text should be punctuated with question marks after ὀφθαλμός (3.11.1) and after εἶναι (3.12.3). The following points can be made against RL's text: (i) it requires a drastic rearrangement of the word order; (ii) it obscures the important point of Charikles' superficial diagnosis of Theagenes' symptoms; and (iii) it is overly influenced by the problem of ἄλλ' ἢ (3.12.3), which may indeed be better taken as ἄλλ' ἢ.

Hefti (1950, 51) finds Charikles' inability to link the condition of Theagenes with that of Charikleia hardly credible, but it is in keeping with his lack of percipience generally (cf. 3.5.3 above and note).

3.11.2 προέπινεν ὁ Θεαγένης καὶ ἄκων ἐκάστω φιλοτησίαν: cf. Ach. Tat.: καὶ ὁ Διώνυσος ἐπαινεῖ τῆς φιλοφροσύνης τὸν ποιμένα καὶ αὐτῷ προτείνει κύλικα φιλοτησίαν (2.2.4); Neimke (1889, 49).

ὄξύ τε καὶ διάπυρον ἐνείδεν: cf. 4.7.11, ὄξύ τι καὶ μέγα ἀνέκραγε. Feuillâtre (1966, 109) suggests an allusion to Achilles glaring at his shining armour (*Il.* 19.17), but a more apposite reference would surely be Achilles' glare at Agamemnon (*Il.* 1.148). Neimke (1889, 19) notes a possible similarity in Euripides *Or.* 1530, ὄξυν βοῆς. According to him, the number of Heliodoran echoes of Euripides' plays may be listed as follows: *Hekuba* (11); *Medea* (9); *Hippolytos* (8); *Orestes* (6); *Phoenissai* (4); *Ion* (4); *Alkestis* (4); *Andromache* (3); *Bacchae* (3); *Iphigenia at Aulis* (3); *Hercules* (2); *Suppliants* (2); *Cyclops* (1); *Elektra* (1); and the *Heraklidai* (1). Such borrowings from Euripides are in

keeping with the theatrical and dramatic character of Heliodorus' narrative and are typical of the highly allusive, metaliterary character of this text.

ἐνεψυχομένων: the reading of RL (followed by Colonna [1987b]) for ἐμψυχομένων (MCZ) and ἐψυχομένων (VBPAT; Bekker, Colonna [1938], who cites ἐμψυχομένων in his apparatus [δC] as if from ἐμψύχω 'cool'—the variants are abbreviated in RL but ἐμψυχομένων is clearly wrong). Naber (1873, 335) stands alone in suggesting ἐμψύχων. Two questions need to be addressed here: whether the compound or the simple form of the verb is to be preferred, and what the form of the perfect participle passive should be. The *TLG* shows that the simple verb is significantly more frequent in the perfect passive with the meaning 'animated, endowed with soul' (a common Christian usage, but cf. σῶμα ἐψυχομένον, Plot. 2.3.9) than the compound form, which is not found with the 'reduplicating' epsilon (*GG* §523) and may have arisen through confusion about the form of the perfect passive participle (particularly in view of the virtually homonymous ψύχω): cf., e.g., σάρκα ἐψυχομένην (John Chrysostom, Vol. 52 p. 802 ln. 30 MPG), φύσιν . . . ἐψυχομένην (Phot. *Bibl. Cod.* 230 p. 272b4 [Bekker]); σάρκα ἐμψυχομένην (Athanasius, Vol. 28 p. 1405 ln. 15). It seems best, therefore, to retain ἐψυχομένων here; the confusion may have been worsened by the use of the compound aorist active participle ἐνανθρωπήσασαν by Sisimithres (2.31.1, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν μοι θεμιτὸν ἐν κινδύνῳ ψυχὴν ἅπαξ ἐνανθρωπήσασαν παριδεῖν) but this is not close enough to overturn the statistical evidence for ἐψυχομένων. Ἐνανθρωπεῖν is also used by Christian writers: cf. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάσαν ἀνεδέξατο ὕβριν ἐνανθρωπήσας, Eus. *Dem. Evang.* 4.6.10; Cataudella (1975, 161-190, esp. 172-174).

Morgan (1979, at 10.9.6) has a full discussion of the ancient philosophical and religious debate about sacrifice (cf. also 3.1.3 above, and note) and argues against Merkelbach's view that Heliodorus could not have opposed blood sacrifice in the fourth century and that he therefore belonged to an earlier date. The terminology (τῶν ἐψυχομένων) suggests Christian influence and therefore the later date.

«Μεμφίτης ἐστὶν» εἶπεν «Αἰγύπτιος καὶ προφήτης τῆς Ἰσιδος.» Theagenes and Kalasiris had already been introduced to one another at the house of Charikles (2.35.2, Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡμᾶς τὰ εἰωθότα ἠσπάσατο καὶ τῶν ἀμοιβαίων ἔτυχεν) and that Charikles' introduction here should have been unnecessary (Hefti 1950, 51-2). However, the initial introductions were vague and the information given about Kalasiris here serves to awaken Theagenes' interest in Kalasiris and to establish some common ground between the two men. The abbreviated symposium also shows the similar predicament of the two lovers.

3.11.3 Ὁ δὲ Θεαγένης ὡς τὸν Αἰγύπτιον καὶ τὸν προφήτην ἤκουσεν, ἡδονῆς τε ἀθρόον ἐνεπλήσθη: in this passage and two others (3.16.2 and 3.17.3), Theagenes appears to suffer under the common delusion that there was only one kind of Egyptian wisdom, namely magic, and that Kalasiris would be able to work some love spells on Charikleia (Winkler 1982, 129). The reputation of Egyptian priests for wisdom was widespread and frequently abused. Sandy (1982b, 146) notes the verb αἰγυπτιάζω to denote Egyptian trickery (Ar. *Th.* 922) and the appeal of Charikles to Kalasiris to use Egyptian magic on his daughter (2.33.6, Σοφίαν τινὰ καὶ ἕγγα κίνησον ἐπ' αὐτὴν Αἰγυπτίαν). Cf. the note on Kalasiris above (3.1.2).

Kalasiris does not explain why Theagenes thought that the only course open to him was magic, which was normally resorted to only in cases of thwarted love, but the first encounter between the two emphasised the fact that they loved each other reciprocally—they somehow recognised each other and shared secret knowledge (3.5.5). It is true that Theagenes only learns that Charikleia has declared her love for him later (4.6.5) and that Charikles plans to marry Charikleia to Alkamenes (4.6.6), but parental opposition was not a factor in bringing Theagenes to Kalasiris.

The other romances show that the marriage of the lovers could be brought about in a number of ways: in the case of Chariton, the assembly demands that Chaereas and Kallirhoe marry, even though they belong to opposed factions in the city (1.1.11); similarly, Xenophon has Habrokomes and Antheia married after their fathers consult the oracle of Apollo at Kolophon (1.7.1); likewise, Longus brings about the union of Daphnis and Chloe after their fathers recognise them as their lost children (4.36.2); lastly and untypically, Achilles Tatius opts for elopement (2.30), which is also the course taken by Kalasiris. It would therefore appear as if Heliodorus has made Theagenes seek the aid of magic primarily in order to enable Kalasiris to manage the outcome of their love.

καλὲ Θεάγενης, ἐμοὶ καὶ πάλαι οἶσα πρὸς σε: cf. the ironic contradiction of these words in 3.11.4, πολλά με τοῦ Θεαγένους καὶ θερμότερα ἢ κατὰ τὴν προϋπάρχουσαν γνῶσιν κατασπασαμένου. Kalasiris first hears of Theagenes from Charikles a few days before this (2.34.4) but in the sense that Theagenes is part of his destiny, however, Kalasiris has known him for a long time. The hidden meaning in Kalasiris' words remain obscure for the reader until an explanation of his purpose in coming to Delphi is given at 4.13.1.

KALASIRIS

Kalasisir receives a vision from Apollo and Artemis

3.11.5 Ἦδη δὲ μεσοῦσης τῆς νυκτός: the visual appearance of a god or a messenger of the gods at night is a stereotype of Greek literature (cf., e.g., Hdt. 6.107). Significant dreams appear to Thyamis and Kalasisir (1.18; 5.22). Artemis may be the goddess who appears to Theano in a dream in the romance fragment which bears that name (Stephens & Winkler 1995, 441). Double dreams are even more significant (cf. 9.25 & 10.3; Morgan 1979 *ad loc.*; Kerényi 1962², 166; Björck 1946, 311). In this case a similar dream occurs different individuals, Kalasisir and Charikles (3.11-12, 18).

The dream in the *Clementine Recognitions* is similar to this: in both works a parent (Clement's mother in the *Recognitions*, Kalasisir, the spiritual father of the lovers, in the *Ethiopian Story*) is instructed in a dream to leave their present abode with their charges—a dream which precipitates the action of the romance (Bartsch 1989, 101: the dream serves as a 'mover'; Weinstock 1934: 49, 51).

ὄρω τὸν Ἀπόλλω καὶ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν: for the guiding influence of Apollo (who represents the sun god, Helios: cf. 10.36.3, Ἀπόλλωνα, τὸν αὐτὸν ὄντα καὶ Ἥλιον) and Artemis on Theagenes and Charikleia, see Rohde (1914³, 463 [434 n. 6]). Apollo guides Kalasisir through the oracle he receives (2.35.5), the present visitation, (indirectly) through Charikles' dream (4.14.2), and through the providential encounter with Phoenician sailors (4.16.3). Weinstock (1934, 49) argues that the dream absolves Kalasisir of all blame for the deception of Charikles, but Heliodorus implicitly acknowledges that an injustice has been done to the Delphic priest in the dénouement of the work when he appears before Hydaspes to air his grievances (10.36-38). The recognition of Charikleia as the natural daughter of Hydaspes solves the dispute and Charikles joins the final procession (10.41.3). ὡς ὄμην, εἶ γε ὄμην ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀληθῶς ἑώρων: Plato mentions the close connection between dreams and waking life (cf., e.g., *Tim.* 71a; Hanson [1980] 1399). Words used for visions such as θεωρία and εἶδωλα show that the Greeks thought of dreams as essentially visual events (Björck 1946, 312-314).

ώρα σοι ἔλεγον εἰς τὴν ἐνεγκοῦσαν ἐπανήκειν: Mayor (1886a, 174-176) observes that the word ἐνεγκοῦσα (cf. in books 3 & 4, 3.11.5; 3.14.4; 3.15.3; 3.16.5 (twice); 4.9.2; 4.12.3; 4.19.7; 4.19.8) is characteristic of Heliodorus and Barber (1962, 338) accepts without comment LSJ's statement that Heliodorus was the first to use this expression. However,

Heliodoros is not alone in his fondness for the expression—it occurs commonly in the work of the fourth century rhetorician and sophist Libanius (e.g., *Ep.* 282.3; 534.2; 872.2; 947.4; 950.2). Wifstrand (1944-1945, 39-40) also notes that this expression was used by Marcus Aurelius (4.48) but that it was only in the fourth century that the word came to mean ‘place of origin’ (e.g., in Menander 393.31 [Spengel]; Basil *In mart. Gordium* 493B; Synesios *ep.* 73, 94, 103). This appears to support the fourth century date for Heliodoros.

Αὐτός τε οὖν ἐξιθι καὶ τούσδε ὑποδεξάμενος ἄγε, συνεμπόρους ἴσα τε παισὶ ποιούμενος: in an unpublished paper delivered at Groningen in 1994, Hansen noted the similarity between the instructions given to Kalasiris in this dream and those given to Mattidia in the *Clementine Recognitions* (*Hom.* 12.15.3, Γύναι, ἐξαυτῆς ἅμα τοῖς διδύμοις σου τέκνοις ἐπὶ χρόνον τινά, μέχρις ὅτε μηνύσω ἐπανελθεῖν σε ἐνταῦθα, ἔκβηθι τὴν πόλιν . . . ; cf. Weinstock 1934, 49).

ὅποι τε καὶ ὅπως τοῖς θεοῖς φίλον: Koraes emended ὅπη to ὅποι, but Philostratus *Her.* 733, ὅπη καὶ ὅπως κινοίη provides support for the MSS reading.

3.12.1 μὴ ὄναρ ἦν ἢ ὄψις ἀλλ’ ὕπαρ ἐνδειξάμενοι: cf. *Hom. Od.* 19.547; 20.90; *Verg. Aen.* 6.893-96 and the commentary of Norden (*ad loc.*). The expression was used very often (cf., e.g., *Plato Rep.* 476c-d; *Theaet.* 158b6; *Phaedr.* 277d10; *Phil.* 36e5). By the time of Julian it had been taken up in a proverb (*Ep.* 108.2, Ἡ μὲν παροιμία φησὶν: ἐμοὶ σὺ διηγεῖ τοῦμὸν ὄναρ, ἐγὼ δὲ ἔοικα σοὶ τὸ σὸν ὕπαρ ἀφηγεῖσθαι). The idea that dreams emanate from ‘gates of sleep’ was also a commonplace in antiquity (Hanson 1980, 1398; Björck 1946, 307).

συνίην: Colonna’s (1938) reading συνίην, as opposed to his earlier (and RL’s) συνίειν, is the form found at 1.12.4 and 1.25.6 and in VMBT.

ταῦτα μὲν ἔφη ᾧ πάτερ . . . : Another intervention by Knemon that has the effect of distancing the reader from him (Winkler 1982, 142; Futre Pinheiro 1991b, 75-6). By switching from narrated time to narrative time, Knemon controls the narrative and acts as a moderator in a similar way to the chorus of a tragedy.

εἰς τίνα γῆν παραπέμπεσθαι τοὺς νέους τοῖς θεοῖς φίλον ἠπόρουν: Kalasiris’ refusal to consider Ethiopia as the destination of the lovers is unexpected and creates tension in the reader (Hefti 1950, 52).

αὐτός τε ἔγνωσ ἐρεῖς τε πρὸς ἡμᾶς: The future tense expresses volition here. Cf. also δεήσει (4.6.7); ἔσται (4.8.8).

Knemon interrupts (4) to ask about visions and visitations

On epiphanies of gods and goddesses in the novels, the *New Testament* and the courts of the emperors, cf. Lane Fox (1986, 137-141).

3.12.2 οἱ πολλοὶ δὲ τὸ αἶνιγμα παρατρέχουσιν: Kalasiris' interpretation of Homer here 'reveals many of the hallmarks of the philosophical patterns of *explication de texte*' (Sandy (1982b, 157). Proclus (*In R.* 1.85.26-86.5) exemplifies the later tradition in which Homer was ransacked for deeper, hidden meanings. For this tradition in the fourth century, cf. Porphyry *On the Cave of the Nymphs*; Lamberton in Lamberton & Keaney (1992) 115-32. The recognition of two levels of meaning in the text invites the reader to interpret the romance allegorically and insists on exegesis (Lamberton 1986, 151). Such exegesis is not entirely alien to the romance since Heliodorus discusses the Isiac doctrine of the allegorical significance of the Nile (9.9.5) and Knemon comments on the enigmatic stance of Homer (3.15.1): cf. the discussion in Porphyry *On the Worship of Statues* (Eus. *PE* 3.11.51 [Mras]), Plutarch (*Mor.* 363d) and Philo's *Life of Moses* 2.195.

However, the present passage trivialises and parodies such readings by focusing on a literary debating point rather than on the significance of the message itself. Kalasiris here makes use of theological dogma to portray himself as knowledgeable and wise, in order to make fun of Knemon (cf. Sandy 1982a, 65-74; 1982b, 144). The byplay between Kalasiris and Knemon diverts the reader's attention from a rare and brief revelation of the will of the gods. Heliodorus does not give the entire game away at this point.

ἴχνια γὰρ μετόπισθε ποδῶν ἢδὲ κνημῶν / ῥεῖ ἔγνων ἀπιόντος· ἀρίγνωτοι δὲ θεοὶ περ: In the *Odyssey* there is a metrical formula for humans following in the footsteps of the gods (2.406, 3.30, 5.193); the idea probably originates with a hunter tracking his prey (*Il.* 18.321; *Od.* 7.38). The characteristic mode of locomotion of the gods was entirely conventional by the time of Vergil: cf., e.g., *Aen.* 1.405, *vera incessu patuit dea*. The present quotation is taken from the *Iliad* (13.71-72): here Ajax, the son of Oileos, tells Ajax, the son of Telamon, that he had recognised Poseidon in the figure of Kalchas from the way he walked. The passage is noted by commentators such as the third century philosopher, Porphyry (*Homeric Questions* 3.396-7) and the twelfth century commentator, Eustathius, speculates that the footprints of the gods would have differed from those of humans in some way, by the interval between them, for example, or by the speed with which they were made, but is puzzled by the inclusion of κνημῶν (*Commentaries on Homer's Iliad*, Vol. 3 p. 441). Indeed, the obscurity of κνημῶν in this context may have been what initially attracted interest in the passage. For aerial locomotion as a divine characteristic, see 3.13.2 below and note.

Knemon does not pick up the fact that Kalasiris is here teasing him with the pun on his name (Sandy 1982a, 67). There is a parallel to this kind of banter in Plato (*Crat.* 384C),

where Socrates suggests to Hermogenes that Prodikos had been mocking him (Hermogenes) when he had said that people would not call him by his name, by implying that he was unsuccessful at making money and therefore not a true ‘son of Hermes’ as his name suggested (playing on Ἑρμοῦ and γένος). Thus Heliodorus invites the reader to cast Kalasiris into the role of Socrates and Knemon into the part of young and enthusiastic disciple, eager for knowledge. Cf. 3.1.1 above, and the note on Knemon’s interruption of Kalasiris there. Urbane and witty use of Homeric passages was characteristic of the Second Sophistic (Anderson 1993b, 174-176).

Knemon (5) asks Kalasiris to explain the text of Homer

3.12.3 Ἄλλ’ ἦ: RL’s text appears to be right here (cf. 3.11.1 above and note). However, this reading would be easier if a question mark were introduced after εἶναι, since ἄλλ’ ἦ is used only in questions (*GP* p. 28). A question is well suited to the ironic tone of Knemon here; he is a citizen of the sophisticated metropolis of Athens and has been well educated, as he makes clear in what follows. The bantering tone of Knemon can be seen in ἐλέγχειν, τὴν . . . ἐπιπολῆς διάνοιαν, περ, and τὴν . . . ἐγκατεσπαρμένην . . . θεολογίαν.

τὴν δὲ ἐγκατεσπαρμένην αὐτοῖς θεολογίαν ἠγνόηκα: The word θεολογία occurs in Plato during the discussion of the way in which poets should discuss the gods: ἄλλ’ αὐτὸ δὴ τοῦτο, οἱ τύποι περὶ θεολογίας τίνες ἂν εἶεν; (*Rep.* 379a5-6). According to Iamblichus θεολογία was a subject taught by Pythagoras (*De Vita Pyth.* 19.93.1-2, φυσιολογίαν τε καὶ θεολογίαν ἐπιτετημένην παρέδωκε). Proclus placed the subject at the top of his list (appropriately, it is found 17 times in the *Theol. Plat.*: cf. *Suda s.v.* ἐπίπροσθεν, ὅτι Πρόκλος τῆς φιλοσοφίας πάσης ἐπίπροσθεν ἦγε τὴν θεολογίαν). Philostratus classes θεολογία with the lore of magi (*Ep. et dial.* 8.17-18, ξένα καὶ τὰ γράμματα, ἐκ Φοινίκης γὰρ ἦλθε, καὶ Σηρῶν ὑφαὶ καὶ μάγων θεολογία) and the word was commonly used by Christian writers (69 times in Euseb. *Praep. Evang.*: cf. *Suda (s.v.)* Ἰωάννης, ὄνομα κύριον, ὅτι ὁ θεολόγος Ἰωάννης καὶ εὐαγγελιστὴς ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν Πάτμῳ ἐξορίας ἐπανελθὼν συντάττει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὧν ἐτῶν ρ', διαρκέσας ἕως ἄλλων ἐτῶν ρκ'. ἐκεῖσε διάγων καὶ συγγράφεται τὴν θεολογίαν).

3.13.1 Μικρὸν οὖν ἐπιστήσας ὁ Καλάσιρις καὶ τὸν νοῦν πρὸς τὸ μυστικώτερον ἀνακινήσας: the use of the comparative degree of the adjective (μυστικώτερον) signposts the irony (Winkler 1982, 146: the irony, together with Kalasiris’ duplicities, is a cover for his real purpose in Delphi, which is the pursuit of wisdom [2.26.1]). Sandy (1982b, 144) suggests parallels with Euripides in the *Acharnians* (402-409) and Socrates in the *Clouds* (227-234). Kalasiris’ pompous tone prepares the reader for the humorous explanation of

Homer's name which follows.

θεοὶ καὶ δαίμονες: the phrase is fairly commonplace: cf. Lib. *Or.* 15.29.3; Ach. Tat. 3.10.1; D.H. *Ant. Rom.* 12.12.2; Aeschin. *In Ctes.* 137.3 (the scholion on this passage distinguishes daimons from gods in that the former are the souls of those who obtain divine retribution and refers to Hesiod's view [*Works* 122] that daimons are the good souls of the dead members of the golden race of men): cf. West (1978, *ad loc.*). The δαίμονες were generally held to be intermediate between gods and men and a mixture of good and bad: cf. Plut. *Isis and Osiris* 25-26; Apul. *De Deo Soc.* 20.

In Heliodorus, the plural is less common than the singular or adjectival usage and mostly refers to spirits who punish men during and after life. He uses the word of: 'avenging daimons' (δαιμόνων ἀλαστόρων, 1.13.3), and 'spirits above and below the earth who watch and punish the wrongs of men' (δαίμονες ἐπὶ γῆς τε καὶ ὑπὸ γῆν ἀνθρώπων ἀθεμίτων ἔφοροί τε καὶ τιμωροί, 8.9.12): cf. Plut. *De def. orac.* 417a; *De sera* 566f-567f; Max. Tyr. 9.6g; Jul. *On Kingship* 90b; Sallust. *On the Gods* 19.2; 'monstrous daimons' (δαίμονες τεράστιοι, 2.5.4: wrongly translated as 'gods' by Morgan); 'stage ghosts' (ἐπὶ σκηνῆς δαίμονας, 2.7.3); 'spirits' (6.1.3, 6.1.4, 6.8.5, 8.7.4 [δαιμονία]). For the singular (δαίμων etc.) cf. 3.14.2 below and note.

ἐπιφοιτῶντες τε ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀποφοιτῶντες εἰς ἄλλο μὲν ζῶον: The use of the different compound forms of φοιτάω illustrates Heliodorus' fondness for wordplay (see introduction).

Some MSS (VMA) have εἰς ἡμᾶς for ἡμᾶς presumably because of the following εἰς ἄλλο but the plain accusative construction should be retained. LSJ⁹ suggest that the verb ἐπιφοιτάω is used with the accusative of the person for haunting visions as in the dream haunting Xerxes on the eve of his invasion of Greece in Herodotus (σὲ δὲ ἐπιφοιτήσει, 7.16.γ). This reading may well be wrong (Hude reads σὲ δέ here rather than οὐδέ although Herodotus previously used the word with the dative [μετιέντι τὸν ἐπ' Ἑλληνας στόλον ἐπιφοιτᾶν ὄνειρον, 7.16.β], as he did of the Phoenix [2.73]) and 'haunting' does not seem to be the sense required in the Heliodorus passage. However, Thucydides has the accusative with ἐπιφοιτάω in the sense of 'invade' (1.81 [cf. also Jul. *Or.* 7.221b]) as opposed to using the verb with εἰς meaning 'visit' (1.135), and the former, stronger sense is required in this passage—the gods take on human shape rather than merely visiting them. There does not, therefore, appear to be any justification for inserting εἰς before ἡμᾶς. The story of Xerxes' dream, in which the divine status of the dream is in question as it is here, would have been well-known to educated people in antiquity and ἐπιφοιτάω meaning 'haunt' may have been

in the back of Heliodorus' mind here. Ἀποφουτάω simply means 'abandon' (Plut. *Lys.* 4). This rather awkward sentence would be clearer with a comma between ἀποφουτώντες (used absolutely) and εἰς ἄλλο (with εἰδοποιούσι and balanced by the following εἰς ἀνθρώπους).

For Apollonius of Tyana's condemnation of the Egyptian belief in theriomorphic gods, cf. *VA* 6.19; here Heliodorus plays down (ἐπ' ἐλάχιστον) the theriomorphic aspect of Egyptian religion.

τῷ ὁμοίῳ πλέον ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν φαντασίαν ὑπαγόμενοι: Φαντασία is a term of some importance to Heliodorus (see introduction).

3.13.2 Τοὺς μὲν δὴ βεβήλους κᾶν διαλάθοιεν τὴν δὲ σοφοῦ γνῶσιν οὐκ ἂν διαφύγοιεν: the term βεβήλους ('the uninitiated', transferred from 'trodden ground' where the uninitiated stood outside a holy place; cf. Pl. *Smp.* 218b; Ph. 2.165). The same word is used in Philip's allegorical reading of the *Ethiopian Story* (1.35); cf. Tarán (1992, 216). Heliodorus uses the word also at 6.14.7 (the powers of a legitimate priest are different from those of the profane magicians); 9.9.5 (the understanding of initiates concerning the Nile festival is contrasted with that of the uninitiated). These authorial uses of the word show that religiosity is ubiquitous in the romance and that there is an element of seriousness in what Kalasiris says to Knemon here. Such passages encourage the reader to allegorise the text.

τοῖς τε ὀφθαλμοῖς . . . καὶ τῷ βαδίσματι: The question of the signs by which a god or goddess may be recognised was something of a literary topos. The debate may have originated in the contradictory statements in Homer as to whether the gods can be recognised or not: Homer says that the gods may be recognised by their special gaze (cf. 13.3.3 referring to *Il.* 1.200) and Telemachus recognises Athena as a deity although she takes the form of a bird (*Od.* 1.323, 2.262), but Achilles fails to recognise the god Apollo (*Il.* 22.8-10). This dilemma was discussed by Clement (*Strom.* 5.14.116-117). An unblinking gaze was often considered superhuman in antiquity: the fixed stare of the infant Pythagoras looking up at the sun in Antonius Diogenes' account of the infant philosopher's meeting with the Etruscan Mnesarchos is an example (Porphyry *Life of Pythagoras* 10, εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβλέποντα πρὸς ἥλιον ἀσκαρδαμυκτί). Plotinus likewise comments on the piercing vision of the gods (*Enn.* 5.8.4).

For the unusual word ἀσκαρδαμυκτί, cf. Lucian *Cat.* 26.19 (gazing on the sun without blinking); *Icar.* 14.12 (the eagle alone can look at the sun without blinking); *Tim.* 14.5 (the unblinking gaze arising from an intense desire of money). The word is also used by Aristophanes of being able to look someone in the eye without blinking (*Knights* 292), by Xenophon of the unblinking gaze of a lover (*Cyr.* 4.28.17) and by Galen of the fixed

gaze of people who are possessed (8.484.7; 9.188.9 [Kühn])—Galen also notes that looking directly at the sun in this way causes blindness or damage to the sight (3.777.3; 7.91.8 [Kühn]). Heliodorus uses a different word (ἀτενές) for the fixed gaze of the gods; elsewhere this word is used of the staring gaze of Thyamis and Petosiris at Kalasiris on their reunion (7.7.3) and of the gaze of lust of Kybele (7.12.7). The same phrase is used by Galen of the concentrated gaze of a woman who wanted to conceive a more handsome child than her husband's looks suggested she might have (ἡ δὲ ἀτενὲς βλέπουσα καὶ ὡς ἔστιν εἰπεῖν ὄλον τὸν νοῦν ἔχουσα οὐχὶ τῷ γεννήσαντι, ἀλλὰ τῷ γεγραμμένῳ ὁμοίως ἀπέτεκε τὸ παιδίον, 14.254.6 [Kühn])—in other words intense gaze is necessary for the Andromeda Effect to work.

The supernatural character of a fixed stare is also found in Plutarch, who relates that the Pythagoreans held that the souls of the dead do not make shadows or blink (μηδὲ σκαρδαμύττειν, *Q. Gr.* 300c). Occasionally some other unusual feature of the eyes is described as 'divine': Charikles describes the light in the eyes of the infant Charikleia as 'something grand and godlike' (2.31.1, μέγα τι καὶ θεῖον). In Antonius Diogenes, the eyes of Astraios wax and wane with the phases of the moon—a phenomenon possibly related to albinism (Photius 109b3 [Stephens & Winkler 1995, 124]; see introduction).

A peculiar gait is also cited as a sign of a deity (for the Homeric model see 3.12.2 above and note) as are outstanding beauty and stature (*Od.* 6.152). Vergil gives a fuller list—gaze, spirit, appearance, voice and step: *non Beroe uobis, non haec Rhoeteia, matres, / est Dorycli coniunx; diuini signa decoris / ardentisque notate oculos, qui spiritus illi, / qui uultus uocisque sonus uel gressus eunti* (*Aen.* 5.646-649).

Aerial movement, or levitation, such as Kalasiris describes here, is not a common sign of divinity. However, the combination of gaze and aerial movement were the signs by which John recognised the divinity of Christ (*Apocryphal Acts of John* 89.93; *Apocryphal Acts of Peter* 32; Luck 1985, 50). Is the obscure phrase in Petronius (*dii pedes lanatos habent*, 44.18) at all relevant here? The exact sense appears to be beyond recovery. Apuleius (11.11) talks of gods who 'deign to walk on foot' (*dei dignati pedibus humanis incedere*) and describes Venus walking on water (*plantisque roseis uibrantium fluctuum summo rore calcato*, 4.31.4). Further circumstantial evidence comes from Pliny (*HN* 34.148; cf. *Aug. Civ. Dei* 21.6; *Aus. Mos.* 311-317), who describes how the architect Timochares (or Dinochares) planned to place magnets in the roof of a temple he was building in order that an iron statue of Ptolemy's wife Arsinoe should appear to be suspended within it. This suggests that the architect wished the statue of Arsinoe to appear

to be more impressive by appearing in mid-air. The topos of how a god may be recognised is also found in the Indian tradition; in the *Mahabharata* (*Vana Parva* 75.8-17) Keshini describes to Damayanti how she recognised the god Vahuka disguised as Damayanti's husband, Nala, by his power of making empty vessels fill with water by looking at them, by his ability to touch fire without being hurt, and so on. Later 'Nala' shows himself to be, in fact, Vahuka, by restoring Nala to her and addressing him from the air (*Vana Parva* 76.36).

The fact that unblinking gaze and an unusual mode of locomotion are often found together as signs of divinity may be explained on the grounds that the Greeks represented their gods in the form of statues. Clearly, the Greeks would have visualised their gods and goddesses as they were represented in religious sculptures—static and with unblinking gaze. At any rate, this is what Kalasiris appears to have in mind (cf. 3.13.3 below and note). Kalasiris' explanation of how deities can be recognised is therefore not his own invention—as in the case of his excursus on the eye of envy (3.7-8), he is drawing his material from ancient commonplaces. This is not to say that he is not having some fun at Knemon's expense here; the effect is similar to Kalasiris' ironical account of the eye of envy to Charikles.

Δι' ὄλου is the reading of Colonna (1938) which is supported by Heliodorus' usage elsewhere (9.3.4; 9.15.4), rather than his (and RL's) διόλου (1987b).

ἀννομένω: P.'s reading, ἀννομένων, is preferable, in keeping with τεμνόντων and διαπορευομένων, rather than ἀννομένω which must be taken with βαδίσματι.

3.13.3 τὰ ἀγάλματα τῶν θεῶν: cf. Porphyry work *On the Worship of Statues* (Eus. *PE* 3.7-13), whose description of symbolic statues is similar to Kalasiris' discussion here (Sandy 1982b, 160-161).

ἄτε Αἰγύπτιος καὶ τὴν ἱερὰν παιδευσιν ἐκδιδαχθεῖς: Kalasiris here repeats an assertion first made at 2.34.5 (Morgan 1991, 97), who suggests that Kalasiris 'actively provokes his audience into demanding expansion.'

τὴν ἱερὰν παιδευσιν . . . γνωρίζειν καταλιπών: Morgan translates συμβολικῶς as 'enigmatic references'; Lamb 'in symbolical verses'; Hadas 'symbolically'; Underdowne 'in a manner by a riddle'. Knemon comments later on the 'enigmatic character' of Homer's poetry (3.15.1, τὸ ἠνιγμένον, RL's textual emendation). Signs and symbols (σύμβολα) are certainly of considerable importance in Heliodorus: cf. 1.1.4 (signs of battle); 1.22.6 (insignia of Charikleia's priesthood); 2.31.2 (the birth tokens of Charikleia); 3.14.2 (the hair on Homer's thigh is a mark of his divine birth); 4.8.7 (the pantarb stone bears a royal

seal); 5.4.7, 5.5.2, 7.7.7 (the secret passwords of Theagenes and Charikleia); 7.3.2 (the herald's staff is a sign of peace); 7.8.2, 7.8.7 (the insignia of Kalasiris' priesthood); 7.19.3 (removing the crown is a sign of greeting in the Persian court); 9.1.3 (the appearance of Theagenes and Charikleia is a favourable omen for Hydaspes); 9.11.2 (Oroondates enters Elephantine by means of a password); 10.9.7 (Sisimithres knows through signs from the gods that the sacrifice of Charikleia will not go ahead); 10.41.2 (Hydaspes places his mitre, the insignia of his priesthood, on to the head of Theagenes). Plutarch uses the term to mean 'mysteriously' in his discussion of Plato *Laws* 896d (370f, ἐν δὲ τοῖς Νόμοις ἤδη πρεσβύτερος ὢν οὐ δι' αἰνιγμῶν οὐδὲ συμβολικῶς, ἀλλὰ κυρίως ὀνόμασιν οὐ μιᾶ ψυχῆ φησι κινεῖσθαι τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλὰ . . .). Secret codes were used in the rites of Dionysus (Plut. *Cons. ad Uxorem* 611d) but above all in the school of Pythagoras (Plut. 727c; Iamb. *VP* 28.145, 33.238, 23.103, 32.227; cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. σύμβολον III.5). The word was also used for allegory (cf. Demetr. *On Style* 243; Philo) and is also used for metaphor and tropes (Theon *Progymn.* 99; 100; 101). For the literary development of the term, cf. Coulter (1976, 32-60 [the neoPlatonists], 60-72).

δεινῶ δέ οἱ ὄσσε φάανθεν: A direct quotation from Homer (*Il.* 1.200):

θάμβησεν δ' Ἀχιλεὺς, μετὰ δ' ἐτράπετ', ἀντίκα δ' ἔγνω

Παλλάδ' Ἀθηναίην· δεινῶ δέ οἱ ὄσσε φάανθεν·

ἴχνια γὰρ μετόπισθε ποδῶν ἠδὲ κνημῶν / ρεῖ' ἔγνω ἀπιόντος: The quotation is from Homer *Il.* 13.71; cf. 3.12.2 above, and note.

οἶον ρέοντος ἐν τῇ πορείᾳ· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ ρεῖ' ἀπιόντος καὶ οὐχ ὡς τινες ἠπάτηνται, ῥαδίως ἔγνω ὑπολαμβάνοντες: Kalasiris plays on ρεῖα 'easily', ρεῖν 'to flow' and πορεία 'walking' and perversely takes the adverb with ἀπιόντος rather than ἔγνω as the Homeric passage suggests, since the adverb is most naturally taken with the verb closest to it. His explanation of the Homeric text is not impossible but not the most likely one either (Lamberton 1986, 151 n. 21). Moreover, the etymology he suggests is false; ρεῖα is actually a Homeric adverbial form of ῥαδίος (see LSJ⁹ s.v. ῥεῖα) and has nothing to do with ρεῖν and πορεία. Kalasiris hints at the true etymology by including the Classical adverbial form of ῥαδίος (ῥαδίως) in the next line. Fondness for etymological interpretations goes back to Homer himself (*Od.* 19.407-9) but was also a feature of the philosophy of Pythagoras, Plato, Philo, Plotinus, and Proclus (Lamberton 1986, 38-40; 45-49; 86-87). However, Kalasiris is clearly parodying the practice in this trivial exercise in etymology and having fun with young Knemon, who does not pick up the absurdity of the priest's explanation of the text (see 3.14.1 below).

On the birthplace and birth of Homer

3.14.1 «Ταῦτά με, ᾧ θειότατε, μεμύηκας» ἔφη: cf. 3.12.1 above, and note. Koraes suggested με (δ ω C) for μέν. Richards (1906, 111) would put μέν before μεμύηκας but RL omit it entirely. The inclusion of με does not appear to be necessary, however. Plato, for example, writes: τὰ μεγάλα μεμύησαι πρὶν τὰ μικρά (*Gorg.* 497c4 [Stephanus]). The text should therefore read: Ταῦτά μέν, ᾧ θειότατε, μεμύηκας.

Αἰγύπτιον δὲ Ὅμηρον ἀποκαλοῦντος σου πολλάκις: Kalasiris has referred to Homer as Egyptian only once before (ἢ γὰρ Ὅμηρου τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου ποίησις, 2.34.5) but doubtless Knemon's πολλάκις is used loosely.

ὁ τῶν πάντων ἴσως οὐδεὶς ἀκήκοεν εἰς τὴν τήμερον: Later (5.15.1) Nausikles evidently assumes without question that Homer was an Egyptian, since he identifies a Homeric quotation with Egyptians in general. This suggests that Heliodorus did not think that the idea would be strange to his readers. Indeed, many late Greek authors assumed that Homer was Egyptian: for example, Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1.15 (66.1.5), Ὅμηρον γὰρ οἱ πλεῖστοι Αἰγύπτιον φαίνουσι; Olympiodoros in Photius *Bib.* 80.61b.6 (Bekker): cf. *FGrH* 4.65 (Müller); and the *Lives of Homer* (*Vita Quinta* l. 10; *Sexta* l. 23-25; *Septima* l. 2; *Eustathii Vita* l. 7). Eustathius reports the account of Alexander Paphios that Homer was the son of an Egyptian Demasagoras and his wife Aethra, and that he was nursed by a priestess of Isis, the daughter of Oros, who suckled the boy with honey from her breast. The infant Homer was once found playing with doves—a portent which was interpreted to mean that he would be a favourite of the Muses (Eustath. *Comm. in Odys.* 2.11; cf. Hor. *Od.* 3.4.9-12). According to Eustathius, another authority, Naukrates, believed that a woman from Memphis, the daughter of Nikarchos, Phantasia, wrote the story of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, which Homer, who was Greek, used in writing his poems (*Prooem. in Odys.* p. 2.25-44). These stories are in keeping with the late Greek idealisation of Egyptian wisdom.

If, then, Heliodorus' readers were familiar with the theory that Homer was born in Egypt, why is Knemon so surprised to learn of it? Is it because he is young and unlearned? Or is Heliodorus being true to the dramatic date of the romance (4th century B.C.), when the Egyptian theory would have been very surprising? Earlier writers are hesitant about the claim: cf. Aulus Gellius *NA* 3.11.6, *sunt etiam qui Aegyptium dicant fuisse*. The earliest (possible) reference to the Egyptian birthplace of Homer occurs in Sidonius Antipater (Ἐνθάδε θεῖος Ὅμηρος, ὃς Ἑλλάδα πᾶσαν ἄεισε, / Θήβης ἐκγεγαῶς τῆς ἑκατονταπύλου, *AP* 7.7 [2nd century B.C.]) but the poet may be referring to Thebes in Greece rather than Egyptian Thebes or confusing the two (cf. 3.14.2 below, and note).

The theory of Homer's birth in Egypt probably arose from the important part Egypt plays in the epics. The Egypt of the *Iliad* belonged to the time of Amenophis III, and the Egypt of the *Odyssey* belonged to a later period and was strongly influenced by Egyptian and Phoenician tales of shipwreck (Gilbert 1939, 47-61). The information about Egypt which the reader gleans from the *Odyssey* is of a more intimate kind from that of the *Iliad*. For example, Helen was given valuable gifts by Alkandre, the wife of Polybus, of Egyptian Thebes (*Od.* 4.126-127), and obtained drugs from an Egyptian woman, Polydamna, the wife of Thon (*Od.* 4.227-232). Menelaus also visited the island of Pharos in his travels to that country (*Od.* 4.351-162). Stesichoros (fr. 15-16 [Page]) was aware of the story that Helen had been in Egypt at the court of Proteus during the Trojan War. Many ancient authorities believed that Homer had visited Egypt: according to Herodotus (2.112, 116), Homer heard the story of Helen's stay in Egypt from Egyptian priests, although Stesichoros' poem shows that the Greeks must have known of it before his time. Diodoros Siculus noted that Egyptian women of Thebes still used the drug which Homer had mentioned as a cure for anger and sorrow (1.96.8; 1.97.7; *Od.* 4.227-232). He also pointed out that some Egyptians affirmed that Homer had learnt from Egyptian priests that the gods sometimes take on the appearance of mortals to note good and bad behaviour among men (1.12.9; *Od.* 17.483-487; Heliodorus may have been aware of this remark which is relevant to Kalasiris' comment that the gods visit men in human form [3.12.2 above, and note]). According to Diodorus, Orpheus, Musaios, Lykourgos, Solon, Pythagoras and other Greeks also came to Egypt to be instructed by the priests there (1.96.2-3; cf. Hdt. 2.119). Likewise Plutarch claimed that Homer and later Thales learnt that water was the basic material of life in Egypt (*Is. et Osir.* 34). On the other hand, Eratosthenes argued that the Greeks of Homer's day did not travel to remote regions and did not know Egypt, the Nile, or the island of Pharos (Strabo 7.3.6; 1.2.22; 1.2.23; 1.2.24; 1.2.30) and his arguments were later renewed by Pliny and Aelius Aristides (Plin. *HN* 2.85; Ael. Arist. *Or.* 48). Strabo objects to the crudity of this kind of criticism (1.2.30; 3.4.4), and Crates of Mallos, Hipparchos and Aristonikos argued that Homer did know about remote places (Strabo 1.2.24; 1.2.31). This argument may have been resolved in late antiquity with the theory of Homer's Egyptian birth (discussed above).

Helm (1956², 41) takes the discussion of Homer's Egyptian birthplace in Heliodorus to be a case of pretentious erudition, but the interchange between Kalasiris and Knemon reveals much of their characters and is in keeping with the bantering tone of their conversation. Earlier writers reject the discussion with contempt: for example, in his

monograph on the subject, Sinko (1906, 12-20) writes: *eiusmodi fabulas non nisi cum risu hodie legimus* (p. 20, my thanks are due to Tim Whitmarsh for obtaining a copy of this article for me). Sinko evidently followed the view of Naber (1873, 147), who also rejects the account as ridiculous. Thorlacius (1823, 6) wrongly stated (probably on the basis of the present passage) that Heliiodorus' suggestion that Homer was Egyptian was an unprecedented claim in Greek literature.

Εἰς τὴν τήμερον is the usual form in Heliiodorus (cf. 1.16.1; 1.16.4; 2.1.2; 2.31.4; 2.35.3; 4.6.1; 5.28.1; 7.10.2 with alliteration of 'τ' sounds; εἰς τὴν τήμερον, 7.10.5; 7.27.7; 8.7.4 twice; 8.7.5; 9.25.1; 10.12.3). Εἰς τὴν σήμερον should therefore be emended here and at 4.2.3.

εἰ καὶ ἔξωρον τὸ περὶ τούτων νυνὶ διαλαμβάνειν ἀλλ' ὅμως ἀκούοις ἂν ἐπιτέμνοντος; a rhetorical *praeteritio*. Knemon's avidity for Kalasiris' narrative again allows Kalasiris to embark on a digression, of which there are many in book 3 as there are in the *Ethiopian Story* as a whole (cf., e.g., the procession 3.1-5; the eye of envy 3.7-8; divine characteristics 3.13; amethysts 5.13; Hydaspes' ring 5.14; the Nile 9.9; the giraffe 10.27).

Kalasiris once more shows a concern to avoid digressions in his narrative (εἰ καὶ ἔξωρον), and he may be referring rhetorical rules for the composition of romances (Hefti 1950, 52-53; cf. 3.1.2 above and note), but Heliiodorus often puts digressions in the mouths of his characters and tries to ensure that they arise naturally in the course of the narrative (Hefti, 1950, 53-54). Occasionally, Heliiodorus uses dramatic dialogue to integrate a potential digression into his narrative: a good example can be found in the argument between Thyamis and Arsake (8.3-5) in which rhetorical themes such as equity, propriety and expediency become part of an emotional quarrel. In most cases the digressions (whether they are descriptive [cf. 3.1.1 above, and note] or literary) play some part in developing the characterisation or constructing the narrative, although they may be rhetorical in origin (cf., e.g., Longinus *On Sublimity* 11-13). In the present case, the digression, as in the case of Kalasiris' disquisition on the eye of envy (3.7-8) and the characteristics of gods (3.13), shows his erudition and love of learning—one reason for his presence in Delphi (2.26.1; 2.27.3-28 [the source of the Nile]) and the bantering tone of the dialogue between himself and Knemon (cf. 3.1.2, 3.12.2, 3.12.3 above and notes). For the relevance of the digression to the characterisation of Charikleia, see 3.14.2 below and note.

3.14.2 Ὅμηρος, ὦ φίλος, . . . πατριὺς ἔστω τῷ σοφῷ πᾶσα πόλις; cf. 3.14.4, ἢ καὶ τοῦτο σοφία καταργαζόμενος. A similar view is taken by the hero Protesilaus in the *Heroicus* of

Philostratus (*Her.* 728.22-729.7 [Olearius]). According to Protesilaus, Homer omitted to disclose his origins in accordance with a law of destiny (θεσμοῦ Μοιρῶν ἐπὶ Ὅμηρῳ ὄντος) which laid down that he should appear to be without a city. In this way Homer belongs to all cities and all nations, as a state belongs to its citizens (ἐγγράφουσαι τῷ Ὅμηρῳ ἑαυτὰς οἷον πολίτη). Lucian satirises Homer's claim to be a citizen of a large number of cities (*Dem. Enc.* 9, πατρίδα μὲν διδόντων αὐτῷ Ἴωνικὴν Κολοφῶνα, ἢ Κῶμην, ἢ Χίον, ἢ Σμύρναν, ἢ Θήβας τὰς Αἰγυπτίας, ἢ μυρίας ἄλλας) and relates a conversation with Homer in the underworld concerning the poet's birthplace in which Homer claims that he was a Babylonian called Tigranes and that he became known as Homer because he was given as a hostage (ὄμηρος) to the Greeks (*True History* 2.20). On Homer's name see 3.14.3 below and note.

Pausanias, while not affirming the truth of any claims about the birthplace or date of Homer, refers to a monument to the poet and his mother Clymene on the island of Ios. In the same passage Pausanias reports the claim of Cyprus to be the birthplace and Themisto the mother on the strength of an oracle pronounced by Euclus (10.24.3). The questions of Homer's birthplace and parentage were put to the Delphic oracle by the emperor Hadrian (who also restored Delphi to its former splendour). The response was that he was born in Ithaka and was the son of Telemakhos and Epikaste (*Certamen Hom. et Hes.* 36-40; Fontenrose 1978, 188). Homer himself was said to have asked the Pythia this question. The reply was that Homer had no fatherland but a motherland, which was Ios, but there was no comment on his parentage (*Certamen Hom. et Hes.* 56-62; Paus. 10.24.2). Meleager of Gadara claimed that Homer was Syrian, since Homeric warriors, like Syrians, never ate fish, although there were plenty in the nearby Hellespont, or boiled meat, because they could not carry pots and pans around with them on campaign (Ath. 4.157b; cf. Plato *Rep.* 404B).

Θῆβαι αἱ ἑκατόμυλοὶ εἰσι: Heliodorus here alludes to the passage in the *Iliad* where Achilles declares that he would not accept the gifts of Agamemnon, even if they came from the fabulously wealthy city of Egyptian Thebes (*Il.* 9.381-4, ὅτι πλεῖστα δόμοις ἐν κτήματα κεῖται, / αἱ θ' ἑκατόμυλοὶ εἰσι)—perhaps an early interpolation, confounding Thebes in Egypt with Thebes in Boeotia (the preceding line mentions the nearby Boeotian town of Orchomenos), cf. Von der Mühl (1952, 173); Leroy-Molinghen (1985, 136).

Heliodorus locates a number of incidents in his narrative at Thebes (Feuillâtre 1966, 39). In addition to being possibly the birthplace of Homer, Thebes is where Kalasiris goes after his encounter with Rhodopis, the famous Egyptian courtesan (2.25.6; cf. Hdt.

2.134-135; Ath. 596b-d, who calls her Doricha), and Oroondates launches his expedition against Ethiopia from the same city. Such economy of narrative is a feature of Heliodorus' narrative technique.

τῆ γὰρ τούτου γαμετῆ . . . συνήλθεν ὁ δαίμων καὶ ποιεῖ τὸν Ὅμηρον: cf. the story of the birth of Alexander (the snake and Olympias) and that of Scipio Africanus. More importantly, the miraculous conception of Homer parallels that of Charikleia: both have share a distinguishing birthmarks (see 3.14.3 below and note) and are exiled from the land of their birth (Winkler 1982, 102-103; Anderson 1982, 38). Similar stories of the birth of Homer are given in the life of Homer attributed to Plutarch (1.25-44), where Aristotle is cited as saying that Homer was the child of a girl of Ios who was made pregnant by a daimon. In shame at this event she went to Aigina where she was captured by pirates and taken to Smyrna. Here the Lydian king Maion fell in love with her and married her. Homer was born in Smyrna and got his name from the fact that, while still a child, he said that he agreed (ὀμηρεῖν) with the proposal that the citizens of Smyrna should leave the city when it was besieged by the Aeolians (1.43, ἔτι νήπιος ὢν Ὅμηρος ἔφη καὶ αὐτὸς βούλεσθαι ὀμηρεῖν· ὄθεν ἀντὶ Μελησιγένοῦς Ὅμηρος προσηγορεύθη).

Heliodorus uses ὁ δαίμων of a hostile divine being who controls the destinies characters in the romance and who generally places obstacles in their way: cf. 2.1.3, 2.4.4, 5.7.1, 6.12.1, 7.21.3, 7.25.7 (opposed to Theagenes and Charikleia); 6.8.3, 7.14.5, 7.14.6 (Charikleia); 5.6.2 (Theagenes); 2.17.2, 5.4.1 (Knemon); 2.25.3, 5.20.1 (Kalasiris); 4.19.8 (Charikles); 4.8.8 (Persinna). Sometimes τὸ δαιμόνιον is used with the same meaning: cf. 2.6.2, 2.33.2, 4.18.5, 4.19.3, 5.4.1 (τὸ δαιμόνιον), 5.2.7, 6.13.3. Heliodorus' usage here similar to the usage of Zoroastrian dualists who refer to the good god as ὁ θεός, the bad as ὁ δαίμων and place Mithras between them: cf. Plut. *Isis and Osiris* 25-26 (Rohde 1914³, 462-466 [434-437]). In general, the word δαίμων is used in a bad sense in the ancient romances (Puiggali 1981, 57-69; [62-67 refer to Heliodorus]; Birchall 1996, 45-56: the daimons act 'invariably to the disadvantage of man' [p. 45]), but sometimes it is clearly neutral (= 'heaven', 'destiny') or even benevolent to the characters of the romance (particularly Charikleia), though in these cases the more general adjectival usage is preferred: cf. 1.26.4, 5.16.4 (τοῦ δαιμονίου), 5.33.5 (τοῦ δαιμονίου), 7.13.1, 8.9.2 (δαιμονία), 8.9.15 (δαιμονίαν), 8.10.2 (δαιμονία), 9.8.2 (δαιμονίας), 10.4.2 (τὸ δαιμόνιον), 10.19.2 (τοῦ δαιμονίου). Occasionally the notion of the δαίμων is assimilated to the literary metaphor that life is a drama: cf. 1.1.6, 2.29.4, 7.6.4 (τί δαιμόνιον), 9.24.4 (Charikleia attributes the complexities of her story to the daimon), 10.13.5 (τίς δαίμων). This usage is

also found in the Classical tragedies (Birchall 1996, 48: cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1342). However, Heliodorus uniquely talks of Charikleia as a person possessed by a daimon and even having daimonic qualities herself (though allowance must be made for the context): cf. 1.2.7, 2.30.6, 4.7.10 (δαίμωνῶν), 4.7.12 (δαίμωνῶν), 5.32.4, 8.7.4. Similarly, Homer has daimonic powers that are attributable to his divine birth (3.15.1) and in the present passage the term is used of the god Hermes, for whom see 3.4.11, 3.5.1 above and notes. Homer was not the only child of Hermes: according to Cicero (*Nat. D.* 3.23.60) Hermes was the father of two Erotes, one by Diana and the other by Aphrodite (Kerényi 1976, 53-59). For further discussion of the term δαίμων, see Owen (1931, 133-153). For the plural form of the word: cf. 3.13.1 above and note.

3.14.3 τοῖν μηροῖν: Kalasiris derives Homer's name, Ὅμηρος in Greek, from ὁ μηρός 'a thigh' and explains that the name was given to the poet because of a patch of hair on his thigh, which was the result of the fact that Hermes had fathered him. Like Homer, Charikleia was also conceived in miraculous circumstances and carried a birthmark to confirm her parentage (in her case a black mark on her white arm, 10.15.2). She too was exiled from the land of her birth. Odysseus too carried a mark on his thigh by which he was identified after his long wanderings by his nurse, Eurykleia (*Od.* 19.386-475). Clearly, Charikleia's destiny parallels that of Homer (Winkler 1982, 102-103: Charikleia 'lives out a destiny essentially like Homer's own'; Bartsch 1989, 145) and Odysseus (see 3.4.1 above, and note).

Anderson (1982, 33-34; 1979, 149) assumes that Heliodorus is parodying the *Bacchae* of Euripides (289-297; cf. Neimke 1889, 12-13), in which Teiresias explains that the story that Dionysus was sewn up in the thigh of Zeus originated in the confusion between the word for thigh (ὁ μηρός) and the word for the pledge (ὁ ὄμηρος) which Zeus formed from ether and gave Hera instead of his son, in order to save him from being thrown out of heaven by the angry goddess. But it is unlikely that Heliodorus would have omitted Teiresias' play on ὄμηρος if he had been conscious of the *Bacchae* passage. Moreover, the resemblance between the story of Homer's birth and that of Charikleia are so close that it is hard to believe that this should not be taken as the primary intertextual link.

The specific identification of Hermes as the δαίμων involved (cf. 3.14.2 above and note) is also significant. In short, the religious tone of the passage, though veiled, is nevertheless discernible and should not be discounted. Kerényi (1962², 256-257) and Merkelbach (1962, 296-297) argue that this etymology, though false, simultaneously

conveys a mystical and symbolic meaning of how Charikleia wanders in exile over the earth as the Odysseus did, like a soul in search of its heavenly home. The strange mark on Charikleia's arm may be a sign of albinism (Pearson *et al.* 1911-1913, 21-22), which Kerényi (1962², 256-259) regards as a sacred category and which appears to underly the daimonic character of the heroine (see introduction).

αὐτὸς μὲν τὸ ἴδιον οὐ λέγων . . . εἰς ὄνομα κροτησάντων: Colonna (1987b, 1938) retains κροτησάντων, understanding the text to mean something like *cum prevaluissent ii qui noverant corporis vitium ad nomen efficiendum* 'since those who knew about his bodily defect prevailed in the matter of naming him' to help the sense of the passage. Hirschig and Richards (1906, 111) suggests καταστησάντων 'established'. However, RL's κροτησάντων is well suited to the hammering together of two words to forge a name, especially as the noun form (κρότος) is a favourite of Heliodorus (cf. 1.18.4; 3.3.1; 5.17.4; 7.8.5; 9.27.1; 10.15.1; 10.41.1; ἐπικροτῶν 3.3.7).

There are many different hypotheses for the etymology of the name Homer. For example, Lucian (*VH* 2.20) states that Homer was a Babylonian called Tigranes who was brought to Greek as a hostage (ὄμηρεύσας). Cf. Thesleff (1985, 293-314); Chantraine (1968, *s.v.* ὄμηρος); Curtius (1855).

3.14.4 ἢ καὶ τοῦτο σοφία κατεργαζόμενος: Either Homer was ashamed of his birth or he wisely wanted every city to be his fatherland (cf. Winkler 1982, 146: Homer 'lied about his birth in order to enhance his reputation and presumably his income'). Heliodorus probably took the thought from Philostratus, who also discusses the question of Homer's birthplace and reaches a similar conclusion (*Her.* 728 [Olearius]).

On the 'amphibolies' in Heliodorus, see appendix 3.

πάσαν ἑαυτῷ πόλιν [πατρίδα] μνώμενος: RL remove πατρίδα from the text on the ground that it was written above πόλιν in C and therefore was a scribal gloss. This appears to be right, since μνάομαι is not used with two accusative complements. Μνώμενος with an accusative complement means 'sue for, solicit' (cf. LSJ⁹ *s.v.* μνάομαι, who cite this passage for their definition II.2): cf. ἴδιον ἐκ τῆς ὀμιλίας μνώμενος κέρδος, *Char.* 6.5.6; μνώμενος ἀρχήν, *Hdt.* 1.96 (cf. also 1.205); δευτέρας ἀρχὰς ταῖς πρώταις μνώμενος, *Plut. Aem. Paul.* 3.6. The idea of claiming every city for oneself is not far removed from soliciting a reward, a kingdom, a consulship, or the command of an army. Homer must still be awarded citizenship of these cities, as it were, and so his silence on the question is, in effect, a solicitation. The μνούμενος of B is clearly an echo of μεμύηκας (3.14.1).

3.15.1 Ταῦτα μὲν εἶ τε καὶ ἀληθῶς μοι λέγειν ἔδοξας: cf. 3.12.1 above, and note.

τὸ ἠνιγμένον τε καὶ ἡδονῇ πάσῃ σύγκρατον, ὡς Αἰγύπτιον: Knemon' appreciation of the literary qualities of Homer's poetry is applicable to the narrative of Kalasiris, since he too is Egyptian. Heliodorus may be describing the qualities of his own work through the voice of Knemon here (Sandy 1982a 25; cf. 3.1.2; 4.4.3).

Colonna (1987b, 1938) reads τὸ ἀνηγμένον with VMCP¹A, which he glosses as *elatum, excellens* (cf. the following words, τοὺς πάντας ὑπερβαλλόμενον), where RL have τὸ ἠνιγμενον following Amyot's translation, 'la subtilité mystique' and citing 3.12.1, ὁ σοφὸς Ὅμηρος αἰνίττεται, οἱ πολλοὶ δὲ τὸ αἶνιγμα παρατρέχουσιν. Cf. also 4.2.3 (οἱ γράφοντες . . . αἰνιττόμενοι); 4.15.1 (τῶν ἐνουπνίων . . . αἰνιττομένων); 10.3.1 (αἰνιττομένου τοῦ ὄνειρατος); Plot. *Enn.* 4.2.2, τὸ θεῖος ἠνιγμένον. The characterisation of the disputed quality of Homer's poetry as Egyptian suggests that the emendation of RL is correct, since Egyptians had the reputation of being crafty (cf. LSJ s.vv. αἰγυπτιάζω, Αἰγυπτιστί). This appears to be the negative portrayal of their reputation for wisdom (Hdt. 2.160).

πινος θείας καὶ δαιμονίας ὡς ἀληθῶς μετέσχε καταβολῆς: καταβολή is also the term used for the conception of Charikleia (4.8.4). For the association between Homer and Charikleia, cf. 3.14.3 above and note. The word is also used by the apostle Matthew for the creation (κληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, 25.34) and frequently in the letters of Paul, although it is not exclusively Christian (cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. καταβολή). For the term δαίμων, cf. 3.14.2 above, and note.

ὀμηρικῶς: 'in the manner of Homer'—the adverb may be used of Homer's language (*Suda* s.v. ἀναβάδην—and often in the Homeric scholia); of close engagement with an argument (Plato *Phaedo* 95b; cf. also Strato fr. 1.30); of the Homeric practice of drinking less diluted wine (φιάλην ἑκατέρω ἔδωκε κεράσας ζωρότερον Ὀμηρικῶς, Eriippus fr. 3.2); and of the *in medias res* narrative technique of Homer (*respondebo tibi ὕστερον πρότερον, Ὀμηρικῶς*, Cic. *Att.* 1.16.1). Here Knemon refers to Kalasiris' explication of a Homeric text on how to recognise gods (3.12-13 above) but the Platonic analogy between close heroic combat and intellectual argument may also be relevant.

3.15.2 ὁμοια: ὁμοια (M) or ὁμοιαί (mAT)? For the latter, cf. 4.4.5, but Kalasiris has only experienced one night of disturbed sleep (3.11.5) at this point and the neuter plural follows naturally from the preceding τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα (3.15.1). Cf. also 5.2.8 (ὁμοια τὰ νῦν ἐκείνοις).

Kalasiris resumes his narrative

3.15.3 Ἐχαιρον, εἰρηκέναι τι . . . ἐπανήξειν προσδοκῶν: Heliodorus has not told the reader, what the οὐ προσδοκώμενα are that Kalasiris mentions here (Hefti 1950, 55-56)—perhaps the phrase is deliberately obscure in order to make it possible for Kalasiris to

know everything (Ἐμοῦ δὲ ἅπαντα μαθόντος ἐκ θεῶν, 4.12.3) and yet be unaware that his mission at the bequest of Persinna could be fulfilled in Delphi. The reader only learns later that the phrase οὐ προσδοκώμενα refers to Kalasiris' promise to Persinna (3.16.5) that he would find Charikleia and bring her back to Ethiopia (4.12.3-13.1 below, and note). Hefti maintains that Kalasiris gave Knemon a false explanation for his presence in Delphi (2.26.1) 'der Spannung zuliebe' (p. 55) and maintains the deception by telling him of the sleepless night he passed wondering what to do. Similarly, Fuchs (1993, 183) regards the words Ἐχαιρον, εὐρηκέναι τι τῶν οὐ προσδοκωμένων as a 'mögliche Andeutung' that both explanations for Kalasiris' presence in Delphi (to seek refuge from the world and to carry out Persinna's request to find her daughter) are true for both author and reader and that Kalasiris, who clearly knows more than the previous narrative has indicated, here rejoices at the coincidence of divine will and the request of Persinna. The narrative problem is fully discussed in the note at 4.13.1 below.

ἠνιώμην δέ, ὁ Χαρικλῆς ὅτι στερήσεται τῆς θυγατρὸς ἐννοῶν: the only expression of regret from Kalasiris at the pain he knows he will inflict on Charikles. At the end of the novel, Charikleia expresses contrition at her deception of her adoptive father (10.38.1). She is also, of course, the natural daughter of Persinna and Hydaspes (Hefti 1950, 56), but ethically and, presumably, emotionally, she owes more to her adoptive father for shelter and education. Children generally owed their parents (Hes. *Op.* 188, A.R. 1.283), and indeed the state (Plut. *Arat.* 25), the cost of their nurture and a foster-father could keep his foundling children as slaves to repay him for expenses incurred in their upbringing (Ael. *VH* 2.7).

ὄτω δεήσει τρόπον: The MS Vindobonensis Graecus 130 transposes the text of book 3 from this point to the end of the book to 9.13.3 after the words εἰ παρασκευάζεσθαι πρὸς μάχην. This may be due to the fact that the MS from which the scribe was copying was incomplete. Rattenbury (1925, 178) argues that this implies that β, the common ancestor of B and C, was defective.

συμφρονῶν: RL's emendation for the συμφρονεῖν of the codices makes this sentence easier to construe but is not attested in the MSS.

κλύδων μέ τις εἶχε φροντισμάτων ἄυπνός: Kalasiris' troubles are somewhat overstated. He has already heard the oracle (2.35.5), which suggested escape by sea (κῶμα τεμόντες), anticipating one of Kalasiris' worries here (πότερον διὰ γῆς ἢ θαλαττεύοντες). He has also been visited by Apollo and Artemis (3.11.5), who suggested Egypt as a first port of call (παράπεμπε ἀπὸ τῆς Αἰγυπτίων ὅποι τε καὶ ὅπως τοῖς θεοῖς φίλον), thus removing some

uncertainty about their immediate destination (ὅποι δὲ τραπῶμεν). Kalasiris also inflates his concerns with repetitions (κατασκευάσαι τὴν ἔξοδον συμφρονῶν τὸν δρασμὸν ἡγωνίων ὅπως μὲν λήσομεν). It is notable that Kalasiris fails to interpret the will of the gods at this point, despite the fact that the oracle provides the answers to Kalasiris' uncertainty whether they should flee by land or sea (Hefti 1950, 63).

For the metaphorical use of κλύδων, cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 599-600, ὅταν κλύδων / κακῶν ἐπέλθῃ; Soph. *OR.* (1889) 18, 1527, εἰς ὅσον κλύδωνα δεινῆς συμφορᾶς ἐλήλυθεν). The idea is common in Euripides (cf. *Med.* 362, κλύδων κακῶν; *Iph. Taur.* 316, κλύδων πολεμίων; *Ion* 60, κλύδων πολέμιος; *Suppl.* 475, κλύδων δορός; *Hipp.* 824, κῦμα συμφορᾶς; *Ion* 927, κῦμα κακῶν; *Hipp.* 822, *Hercul.* 1087, *Suppl.* 824; *Iph. Taur.* 1306; *Ion* 1509) and is a favourite of Heliodorus: Theagenes talks of a 'wave of troubles' (2.17.1, κλύδωνι κακῶν); Charikleia complains of the 'wave' that has torn away Charikleia the 'anchor' of his life (4.19.9, Χαρίκλεια μόνη παραψυχὴ καὶ ὡς εἰπεῖν ἄγκυρα καὶ ταύτην ὑπετέμετο καὶ παρήνεγκεν ὃ τί ποτέ ἐστι τὸ εἰληχὸς με κλυδώνιον); the attack of Trachinus on the ship of Tyrrhenus causes a 'storm' to break loose on board (5.24.2, Ἐσεῖσθη πρὸς τὴν ἀγγελίαν ἢ ὀλκάς ἔν τε γαλήνῃ κλύδωνος ἐμπέπληστο θορύβοις ὀλολυγμοῖς διαδρομαῖς καταγιζομένη); Arsake is also described as 'surrounded by a wave of thoughts' (7.4.1, κλύδωνι φροντισμάτων περιεστοίχιστο); Hydaspes calms the 'storm' of emotion that breaks out among his people on the discovery that Charikleia is his daughter (10.16.3, τὴν χεῖρα προτείνας καὶ κατασεῖων πρὸς ἡσυχίαν τὸ κλυδώνιον τοῦ δήμου κατέστειλε).

Porphyry uses the word κλύδων to refer to the material world from which, in the allegorical interpretation of the *Odyssey* by Numenius, Odysseus must escape to obtain release from his wanderings (*On the Cave of the Nymphs in the Odyssey* 34, πόντος δὲ καὶ θάλασσα καὶ παρὰ Πλάτωνι ἡ ὑλικὴ σύστασις 'the ocean, the sea and the waves are, according to Plato also, material substance'). Cf. Lamberton & Keaney (1992, 127-128).

3.16.1 ἐψόφει τε ἢ μέταυλος: Ἐψόφει is here used intransitively. The μέταυλος separated men from women in a Greek house (cf. Eur. *Alc.* 546-550).

Kalasiris explains how higher wisdom caused him to leave Egypt

3.16.2 ἐνδιδόναι μοι ταυτόματον ἀρχὴν τῶν ἐν χερσὶ βουλῶν ἡγησάμενος: By employing Kalasiris as narrator as well as protagonist, Heliodorus is able to speed up (cf., e.g., 4.8) and slow down the pace at which the plot unfolds. Here the reader is swept into the narrative through the description of how Kalasiris seizes the opportunity Theagenes presents to him by seeking his advice. This is an instance of the skilful development of the narrative noted by Thorlacius (1823, 5: *felix plerumque est nodorum nexio et solutio*).

According to Winkler (1982: 130, 136), the gods made things fall into Kalasiris' hands and consequently the Egyptian priest was a 'very passive observer' and 'not one who makes things happen' (p. 130); 'incredibly passive and reluctant to intervene' (p. 136). This is true only up to a point: Kalasiris is unexpectedly invited to join a party of Phoenicians from Tyre who were holding a sacrificial feast for Herakles (4.16.3) and Kalasiris regards his discovery of Charikleia in Delphi as a fortuitous bonus (4.13.1). Winkler's case can even be strengthened to the extent that many of the encounters in books 3 & 4 occur by accident. For example, Charikles and Kalasiris are invited to Theagenes' feast apparently spontaneously (3.10.1) and Kalasiris meets Charikles and Theagenes seemingly by accident on a number of occasions (3.18.1; 4.6.2; 4.6.3; 4.7.1; 4.7.10; 4.14.1; 4.16.1). However, Kalasiris certainly does make things happen at Delphi: he looks out for Charikles after the procession deliberately (3.6.2, σπουδάσας) because he was curious as a result of what he had heard and seen (3.6.3, περιεργότερος); he secures the band from Charikles (4.8.1) and, after reading it, decides to take action (4.9.3, τὸν λογισμὸν πρὸς τὸ νῆφον ἀνακαλεσάμενος ἔγνων μὴ ἀμελεῖν ἀλλ' ἔργου ἔχεσθαι); he states explicitly that he has watched over Charikleia for a long time (4.13.1, ἐκ πολλοῦ τε ὡς οἴσθα προσεδρεύω χρόνου, θεραπείας μὲν τῆς περὶ σε καὶ πάλαι τῆς πρεπούσης οὐδὲν ἀπολιπών); the kidnapping of Charikleia takes place after he had spent sleepless nights planning what to do (3.15.3, ἠπόρουν, ὅτῳ δεήσει τρόπον τοῦς νέους συναγαγεῖν; 4.4.5, ἐγὼ δὲ αὖθις ἄυπνος ἦν τὴν τε φυγὴν ὅποι τραπόμενοι λάθοιμεν); and, finally, the actual crime takes place on his instructions and at his signal (4.16.2, τά τε ἐκείνοις ῥητέα καὶ αὐτῷ πρακτέα καὶ τὸ παρ' ἐμοῦ δόθησόμενον τοῦ καιροῦ καὶ τῆς ὥρας ἐνδόσιμον ἐπιτηρεῖν ἐπιστείλας; 4.17.2, ἅ τε δεήσει καὶ ὅποτε πράττειν ἐκάτερον ὑποθέμενος, οἴκαδε ἐλθὼν ἐφήδρευον τοῖς ἐσομένοις). *πάσχων οἶμαι τὸ τῶν πολλῶν πάθος οἱ τὴν Αἰγυπτίων σοφίαν μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἠπάτηνται κακῶς εἰδότες*: That Theagenes indeed had faith in Kalasiris' supposed magic powers is clear from his earlier joy on hearing that Kalasiris was an Egyptian priest (3.11.3) and his later words (οὐκ ἐσφαλμένος . . . ὦν προσεδόκησε, 3.17.3). Similarly, Charikles believed that Kalasiris could make Charikleia fall in love through magic (2.33.6) and could cure her of the 'eye of envy' (3.9.1 above and note). On the other hand, Charikleia saw through Kalasiris' pretentious show of magic (4.5.4 below and note).

Colonna (1982, 38; 1987b, 1938) prefers ἠγάπηνται 'sono attrate da un solo tipo di sapienza egiziana' (V) for ἠπάτηνται 'are deceived', 'mistakenly believe' of the majority of the MSS. But ἠγάπηνται cannot be right here either in terms of meaning (ἀγαπάω = 'regard with affection') or construction (the active voice is required for ἀγαπάω to be

taken with εἰδότες, which Colonna does not translate, in the sense ‘to be contented with’: cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. ἀγαπάω III.2).

3.16.3 Ἡ μὲν γὰρ τις ἐστὶ δημώδης: The characteristics of the lower form of Egyptian wisdom given here are systematically compared with ‘true wisdom’ (ἡ ἀληθῶς σοφία) in 3.16.4 and can be tabulated as follows:

Lower Form	Higher Form
Practised by common people (δημώδης)	Practised by priests and prophets (ιερεῖς καὶ προφητικὸν γένος)
Earthly (χαμαὶ ἐρχομένη)	Heavenly (πρὸς τὰ οὐράνια βλέπει)
The slave of ghosts (εἰδώλων θεράπεινα)	Conversant with gods (θεῶν συνόμιλος)
Wound about the bodies of the dead (περὶ σώματα νεκρῶν εἰλουμένη)	Shares nature of higher powers (φύσεως κρειττόνων μέτοχος)
Stuck on drugs (βοτάναις προστετηκυῖα)	Tracking the movement of the stars (ἄστρον κίνησιν ἐρευνῶσα)
Sustained by spells (ἐπωδαῖς ἐπανεχούσα)	Profiting from foreknowledge (μελλόντων πρόγνωσιν κερδαίνουσα)
Neither itself advancing . . . to any good end (οὔτε αὐτὴ προϊοῦσα . . . πρὸς οὐδὲν ἀγαθὸν τέλος)	Withholding itself from the evil things here on earth (τῶν μὲν γήινων τούτων κακῶν ἀποστατοῦσα)
Sorry and . . . the servant of licentious pleasures (λυπρὰ δέ τινα . . . ἀκολάστων ὑπηρετίς)	Directing everything to what is . . . beneficial to human beings. (πάντα . . . πρὸς τὸ . . . ὠφέλιμον ἐπιτηδεύουσα)

The lower form of Egyptian wisdom can clearly be identified with magic, the higher with theurgy or astrology. St. Augustine refers to Porphyry’s distinction between magic and theurgy (*City of God* 10.9). For a brief discussion of the popularity of theurgy among the neoPlatonists: cf. Luck (1985, 20-25). However, ‘true wisdom’ (ἡ ἀληθῶς σοφία) may refer to astrology (cf. ἄστρον κίνησιν ἐρευνῶσα). Magic and astrology were assimilated in the fourth century and as such became a major crime in 358 (*Cod. Theod.* 9.16.1), not only because the insecurity of the empire at this time made the imperial court particularly suspicious of these arts but also because of the association between magical divination and paganism (Barton 1994b, 59). The assertion that most people (τὸ τῶν πολλῶν πάθος, 3.16.2) could not distinguish between the two may provide a small clue to suggest that the *Ethiopian Story* was composed in the fourth century. Further evidence for the identification between magic and astrology in the romance can be found in the name Petosiris, one of Kalasiris’ sons and also an astrological writer who wrote on the theurgic art of controlling Destiny (Proclus *In Rempublicam* 2.344-345). Cf. Barton (1994b, 70-71).

Kalasisiris here is careful to distinguish between the two and practises only the true wisdom (ἡ ἀληθῶς σοφία). Winkler (1982, 128-132) regards the distinction between higher and lower Egyptian wisdom as the fundamental structuring principle behind Kalasisiris' Delphic narrative (see appendix 3).

For the close resemblances between the lower form of Egyptian wisdom that Kalasisiris describes here and the magic performed by the witch of Bessa: cf. 3.16.3 below and note.

εἰδώλων θεράπεινα: εἰδῶλα means 'ghosts' here and at 1.3.1; 2.5.2; 2.11.3; 4.14.2, suggesting a preoccupation with the supernatural and the macabre in the romance. The word εἰδῶλον is used in a technical, neoPlatonic sense at 9.25.2, Τῶν δὲ περὶ αὐτὸν εἰπόντων ὡς φαντασία τις εἴη ψυχῆς τὰ μέλλοντα πολλάκις <εἰς> εἰδῶλα προτυπουμένης. Cf. Emilsson (1988, 119): 'In Plotinus *eidōlon* usually means "image" or "reflection" in the sense in which an ontologically posterior item is said to be an image of an ontologically prior one.' Τύπος is also a term in Plotinus for a 'representation' (*Enn.* 5.5.2) and may underlie Heliodorus' use of προτυπουμένης although the latter form is not attested in Plotinus (cf. Philo 1.69, 'forming'; LSJ *ad loc.*). Sisimithres also uses εἰδῶλα to refer to the 'images and representations' Persinna conceived Charikleia from the picture of Andromeda in her bedroom during intercourse with Hydaspes (10.14.7, ὁμολογούσης ἐν αὐτῇ ταυτησὶ Περσίννης ἐσπακέναί τινὰ εἰδῶλα καὶ φαντασίας ὁμοιοτήτων ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὴν Ἀνδρομέδαν πρὸς σε ὁμιλίας ὀρωμένην). Here the word may be used in the usual Epicurean sense, although the conjunction of φαντασῖαι with εἰδῶλα suggests a non-materialistic interpretation of the word here. Later in this passage, Heliodorus uses the term ἀρχέτυπος (10.14.7: cf. also 2.33.3), which occurs frequently in Plotinus (cf., e.g., *Enn.* 2.4.15). The use of neoPlatonic vocabulary does not, of course, mean that Heliodorus was himself a philosopher of this school, but it does indicate familiarity with their teachings.

περὶ σώματα νεκρῶν εἰλουμένη: Kalasisiris here refers to exactly the same kind of magic to which the bereaved mother from Bessa resorted (cf. περὶ . . . σώματα νεκρῶν εἰλουμένοις, 6.14.7) and for which her son condemns her (6.15.1). Εἰλουμένη is unusual; the word suggests the bandages wound around the bodies of mummies (κατειλίσσουσι πᾶν αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα σινδόνοσ βυσσίνης τελαμῶσι κατατετημένοισι, Hdt. 2.86)—a magic action is here transferred to a property of Egyptian magic (cf. προστετηκυῖα, 3.16.3 below and note). In fact all the features of the lower form of Egyptian wisdom listed in the table above (3.16.3 and note) can be paralleled in the description of the necromancy performed by the witch of

Bessa: the witch is a commoner from the village of Bessa (6.12.1; 6.13.1) and the practice of witchcraft is common among Egyptian women (σκηνῆς . . . ταῖς . . . Αἰγυπτίαις ἐπιχωριαζούσης, 6.14.2); her work is earthly—she digs a pit to contain her libations to the spirits of the underworld (βόθρον, 6.14.3); she interferes with the souls of the dead by preventing her son from leaving his body to join them (σῶμα νεκρὸν . . . ταῖς λοιπαῖς ἐπιμίγνυσθαι ψυχαῖς ἐμποδίζουσα, 6.15.2); her art is practised on dead bodies (περὶ . . . σώματα νεκρῶν εἰλουμένοις, 6.14.7); she uses magic herbs (πέμμα στεάτινον . . . δάφνη καὶ μαράθῳ καταστέψασα, 6.14.3); chants spells (πρὸς τὸ οὖς ἐπάδουσα, 6.14.4); her art is unholy (σκηνῆς τινος οὐκ εὐαγοῦς, 6.14.2); finally, she may fitly be described as ‘sorry’ (λυπρά, 3.16.3) and she certainly comes to a bad end (6.15.5).

These parallels show a strong condemnation of magic in the romance and conversely support for astrology or theurgy. The eloquent denunciation of the mother by her dead son (6.15) supports the negative attitude towards magic in comparison with astrology here. Heliodorus makes the necromancy of the witch of Bessa a pathetic and misguided exercise quite unlike the sensational actions of the Thessalian necromancer in Lucan (6.637-830). For necromancy in antiquity, cf. Luck (1985, 166-168). Kalasiris declares that merely looking at such magic being performed was an unholy action (6.14.7, τὴν θεῶν οὐκ εὐαγῆ). He adds that prophetic powers should derive only from sacrifice and prayer (ἐκ θυσιῶν ἐννόμων καὶ εὐχῶν καθαρῶν). His attitude is entirely in line with Plato’s earlier condemnation of magic as a criminal activity (*Leg.* 10.908-910; 11.933) but it also echoes contemporary attitudes to the black arts, the practice of which was punishable with death under Constantius II (*Amm. Marc.* 19.12.13; cf. also *Cod. Theod.* 9.16.7 for Valentinian and Valens); Barb (1963, 101-125); and Bonner (1932, 34-44), who discusses the incident in which a mutilated chameleon was left in the lecture room of Libanius (*Or.* 1.243-250). However, this and other references in the orations of the Syrian rhetorician (e.g., *Or.* 36.15, on nobbling race-horses; *Decl.* 41.29, on the power of demons; *Decl.* 41.7, on disturbing dead bodies) show that even highly educated people believed in the power of magic at this time. References to magic are, of course, frequent in the *Apology* and *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius. There appears to be a certain ambiguity in Heliodorus towards magic: on the one hand it is condemned and despised; on the other hand, the descriptions of magical procedures are detailed and extended (indeed the *Ethiopian Story* provides the best descriptions of the ‘eye of envy’ and necromancy in antiquity—perhaps forbidden fruit for Heliodorus).

In terms of the immediate narrative context, the strong similarities between the

necromancy of the witch of Bessa and Kalasiris' account of Egyptian magic effectively link Theagenes' hope that magic could secure the love of Charikleia with the mother's anxiety for the safety of her second son (6.14.5) and suggests to the reader that both are futile and misguided. In the case of Theagenes, this would only be apparent on a rereading of the text, but for the necromancy scene Kalasiris' discussion proleptically informs the reader of the falsity of the witch's hopes. Similarly, the reader is prepared for the mumbo-jumbo magic scene between Kalasiris and Charikleia (4.5.3 below and note).

βοτάναις προστετηκυῖα: Προστετηκυῖα is unusual; the literal meaning is 'melted onto, clinging to' as in the poisoned robe of Herakles (Soph. *Tr.* 833; cf. LSJ⁹ *s.v.* προστήκομαι). Cybele describes the erotic desire of Arsake with this word: καὶ καλὸς καὶ ἀκμαῖος γυναῖκα ὁμοίαν καὶ προστετηκυῖαν ἀπῳθεῖται, 7.20.2. The underlying meaning is 'melt'; the reader may intimate, as in the case of εἰλουμένη above, that the process of concocting a potion informs the catalogue of properties of Egyptian magic. Iamblichus *On the Mysteries* 3.27-29 denies the magic powers of statues and plants. However, Iamblichus holds no faith in the efficacy of the stars either (3.30), though to Kalasiris this represents 'higher wisdom' (3.16.4).

πρὸς οὐδὲν ἀγαθὸν τέλος οὔτε αὐτὴ προϊούσα οὔτε τοὺς χρωμένους φέρουσα: Bekker and Colonna (1938) read προσιοῦσα (VMPAT) but RL and Colonna (1987b) prefer προϊούσα (CZ). Προσιοῦσα . . . πρὸς would give the inappropriate meaning 'going against / towards any good end' rather than 'advancing towards, succeeding in respect of, any good end'. In any case, Heliodorus uses προσεῖμι with the dative at 2.9.1 and 8.5.9 in the sense of 'approach'. Προιοῦσα should therefore be read here.

οὔτε τοὺς χρωμένους φέρουσα, ἀλλ' αὐτὴ περὶ αὐτὴν τὰ πολλὰ πταίουσα: Possibly a rather cruel foreshadowing of the violent death of the witch of Bessa, who stumbles into a javelin (6.15.5).

φαντασίας τῶν μὴ ὄντων ὡς ὄντων καὶ ἀποτυχίας τῶν ἐλπιζομένων, πράξεων ἀθεμίτων εὐρέτις καὶ ἡδονῶν ἀκολάστων ὑπέρτις: For φαντασία see note on 3.13.1 above, and the introduction. Here the meaning is close to the modern sense of the word. Note the homoioteleuton in φαντασίας . . . ἀποτυχίας; ὄντων . . . ὄντων . . . ἐλπιζομένων . . . πράξεων ἀθεμίτων . . . ἡδονῶν . . . ἀκολάστων; and εὐρέτις . . . ὑπέρτις.

3.16.4 Ἡ δὲ ἑτέρα, τέκνον, ἢ ἀληθῶς σοφία: on the distinction between magic and astrology: cf. Phil. *VA.* 5.12; 7.39; 8.7; Apul. *Apol.* 26 [cf. Merkelbach 1962, 244 n. 1]; Apollonius of Tyana *Ep.* 16; August. *City of God* 10.9 (on Porphyry's separation of magic and theurgy). Apollonius has supernatural powers that Kalasiris does not have (Feuillâtre

1966, 129), although Kalasiris does claim knowledge of the future through astrology (cf., e.g., 4.12.3 below, and note).

ἦν ἱερεῖς καὶ προφητικὸν γένος ἐκ νέων ἀσκοῦμεν: for the reputation of the learning of Egyptian priests at this time: cf. Amm. Marc. 22.16.17-22.

θεῶν συνόμιλος καὶ φύσεως κρείττωνων μέτοχος: the use of οἱ κρείττονες for the gods is found in Plato *Soph.* 216B, τις οὗτος τῶν κρείττωνων; Plut. *Pyrrh.* 4.7.1, ὑπελθεῖν ἐπ' ὠφελείᾳ τοὺς κρείττονας; Lucian *Symp.* 7.5-7, πάντες αὐτῷ καὶ ἐδεξιοῦντο ὡς τινα τῶν κρείττωνων, καὶ ὅλως θεοῦ ἐπιδημία τὸ πρᾶγμα ἦν Ἴων ὁ θαυμαστός; and in Proklos' commentary on Plato *Rep.* Vol. 1, p. 34, l. 8 (Kroll), δι' ὕφεισιν τὴν πρὸς τὸ κρείττον. This form of the word can therefore not be used to date Heliodorus. However, Wifstrand (1944-1945, 107) notes that the singular form τὸ κρείττον, which Heliodorus used in the sense of 'superior being, god' (cf. 1.8.4; 4.18.6; 8.9.16; 10.4.3), was used frequently in the fourth century: cf., e.g., Eus. *Vita Const.* 2.26.1, τὸ κρείττον οὐκ ἔγνωσαν; Jul. *εἰς τὴν μητέρα τῶν θεῶν* 11.15, πρὸς τὸ κρείττον μετέστησεν; but cf. also Lucian *Apol.* 8.6-12, ὑπό τινος κρείττονος . . . ἀγόμεθα οὐχ ἐκόντες. Aelius Aristides used in the sense of 'victory' (397.11 [Jebb], οἱ μὲν τὴν ἀσφάλειαν, οἱ δὲ τὸ κρείττον προαιρούμενοι). Heliodorus' usage is close to that of Eusebius: cf. 4.18.6 below, and note.

καὶ ὅτι ἀνθρώποις ὠφέλιμον: ὅτι (RL; Colonna 1987b) should be ὅ τι (Colonna 1938; *codd.*).

3.16.5 δι' ἣν κἀγὼ τῆς ἐνεγκούσης εἰς καιρὸν ἐξέστην: Kalasiris here provides a third explanation for his exile from Memphis (2.25.1-5). He had told Knemon earlier that he had exiled himself because he did not want to disgrace the priesthood by his inability to overcome his lust for Rhodopis and emphasised that Rhodopis was the agent of his destiny (2.25.3). He then added a second, more important reason: that he knew that his sons were destined to fight one another and left for Thebes to visit Thyamis (2.25.5). The addition of this second reason enables Heliodorus to make a surprising connection between Kalasiris and the pirate chief who had taken Knemon, Theagenes and Charikleia prisoner, and links the story of Kalasiris with the main narrative of the romance. The connection between Kalasiris and Thyamis is then effectively forgotten until he finally encounters his elder son in combat with the younger son, Petosiris, at Memphis (7.6.5). Kalasiris registers no surprise when the friend of Nausikles mentions his son as the captor of Theagenes (6.3.4) or when Knemon tells him that he is sure Thyamis will not harm Theagenes (6.5.1). Kalasiris later tells Charikleia that he has already told her that Thyamis is his son, although in fact he has not (6.9.5). Heliodorus may have forgotten that Kalasiris had told

Knemon, not Charikleia, that Thyamis was his son (2.25.5). At any rate, the narrative breaks down at this point.

The present passage recalls the second reason for Kalasiris' exile (this time attributing the exile to the gods) but then suggests a third—that Kalasiris was looking for Charikleia. The reader only learns that the quest for Charikleia was the result of an oath which the priest had sworn to Persinna to bring her daughter back to Ethiopia (4.13.1 below, and note). The purpose of the overview of Kalasiris' life, as it is given here, may be to remind the reader of the importance of the feud of Kalasiris' sons in the development of the plot and of the 'mystery' of Charikleia's origins and of her presence in Egypt (Hefti 1950, 56-57).

The reasons Kalasiris gives for leaving Memphis (2.25.3-5) are similar to those given by Mattidia for leaving Rome in the *Clementine Recognitions* (*Hom.* 12.15.3). Both wish to preserve their chastity and to avoid a fight between their sons; both are instructed in a dream to leave with the children in their charge (cf. 3.11.5 above, and note; *Hom.* 12.15.3). Both Kalasiris and Mattidia, who are disguised as beggars, are laughed at and rejected as mad by their children in the recognition scenes (7.6-7; *Hom.* 12.22.1-3).

καὶ τὴν φυγὴν μοι τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἐνεγκούσης οὐ διὰ ταῦτα πλέον ὡς ἔοικεν ἢ τὴν Χαρι-
κλείας εὔρεσιν ἐπέβαλλον: cf. above 3.15.3; 4.13.1 and note. Here Kalasiris insists that it was the gods and fates who imposed his exile on him.

Barber (1962, 207) prefers the aorist ἐπέβαλον to the imperfect ἐπέβαλλον (RL, Colonna 1938, 1987b) here, because the action has a present effect. The aorist certainly appears to be more suited to the context and this tense should also be used at 4.7.8 (συνέβαλον) with Colonna (1938; συνέβαλλον 1987b).

Kalasiris confronts Theagenes and assures him that all will be well

3.17.1 Ἔγνων οὖν καιρὸν εἶναι τερατεύεσθαι πρὸς αὐτόν: Kalasiris consistently disassociates himself from the lower forms of magic (Thorlacius 1823, 14). The deception of Theagenes is strictly unnecessary, since he is deeply in love with Charikleia, but it serves to strengthen Kalasiris' influence over the young man (Hefti 1950, 57-58). There are other occasions on which Kalasiris behaves in this way (3.18.3; 4.5.2-4; 4.6.3-5; 4.7.1-2; 4.7.12-13; 4.10.1-12.1; 4.14.1; 4.15.2-3). Kalasiris also hoodwinks Nausikles by pretending to remove a jewel from a fire by sleight of hand (5.13.2). Here the deception serves to hide the truth about Charikleia from Nausikles, but in the case of Theagenes (3.11.3 above, and note), the deception is entirely gratuitous, although it is in keeping with the characterisation of Kalasiris as a composite 'holy man' and charlatan (Sandy 1982b,

145). In the case of Charikles and Theagenes, Kalasiris is only playing up the expectations they have of him (Winkler 1982, 130). For the expectations of Charikles, cf. 3.9.1 above, and note.

Philostratus condemns the credulity of those who allow themselves to be taken in by frauds (VA 7.39). Lucian tells of a magus who cast spells on a woman (*Philops.* 13-15). For the prevalence of false prophets and charlatans in later Greek literature: cf. Anderson (1993a) 131-150.

3.17.2 Καὶ ἐπιστήσας ὀλίγον . . . καὶ τοὺς κατόχους μιμούμενος: the terminology here (ψήφους . . . καταριθμούσας) appears to be astrological: cf. Vettius Valens 10.15, γραμματεῖς ἀπὸ λόγων ἢ ψήφων ἀναγόμενοι (LSJ *ad* ψῆφος II.1.b) or magical: cf. *PMagPar.* 1.1048. The word ὀλίγον shows that Kalasiris is not being serious, since calculations required to cast a horoscope in ancient astrology were complex (Barton 1994a, 86-102). Although astrology became illegal in 296 (Just. *Cod.* 9.18.12), and was frequently attacked by Christian writers (August. *Civ. Dei* 5.5.5; Barton 1994b, 62-69) it nevertheless continued to be influential under the Christian emperors (Barton 1994a, 64-68).

Divination was commonly performed in a state of trance (Luck 1985, 240-241). The prophecies of the Pythia at the oracle at Delphi are examples of this (Luck 1985, 246). For a description of a trance of the Pythia, cf. Lucan *Pharsalia* 5.86-224; a general description of ecstatic states and the signs of divine possession is given in Iamblichus *On the Mysteries of Egypt* 3.4-6. Kalasiris' description here is perfunctory and a mockery of true mantic states. This is in keeping with the rejection of popular magic in the romance: cf. 3.16.3 above, and note; 4.5.3 below, and note.

ἐφίλει πολλὰ τὴν κεφαλὴν: for a similar expression, cf. Soph. *Oed. Col.* 1131.

3.17.3 ὠμολόγει χάριν, οὐκ ἐσφαλμένος, ὡς ἔλεγεν, ὧν προσεδόκησε: Cf. 3.11.3; 3.16.2 above, and notes.

Colonna (1938) omits ὡς ἔλεγεν as an interpolation but he restores the phrase in his 1987 edition. The inclusion of the phrase suggests that Kalasiris detects some insincerity in Theagenes' protestations or at least that he views his own 'prophecy' with some misgiving. This is in keeping with Kalasiris' ironical stance and the words should stand.

ταύτης ταχείας ἀποτυχόντα: The resumptive use of οὗτος may be modelled on the usage of Xenophon (cf. *Anab.* 2.4.15; 7.1.29; *Oec.* 2.5): cf. Baumgarten (1932, 29).

3.17.4 Ὀμιλίας γὰρ ἔτι γυναικὸς ἀπείρατος εἶναι διετείνετο πολλὰ διομνύμενος: the picture is a convention in the romances: cf. Xenophon *Cyr.* (5.1.11-14); X. Eph. 1.1.5-6 (the arrogance of Habrokomes); Char. 2.4.4; 6.3.2; the *Parthenope and Metiochos*

fragment; Rohde (1914³, 156 [147 n. 1]); Trenkner (1958, 27). Theagenes resembles Euripides' Hippolytos in his contempt for Aphrodite and consistently defends the virtue of chastity (e.g., 7.25.7, where the expression ὁμιλίας γὰρ ἔτι γυναικὸς ἀπείρατος εἶναι is echoed). Heliodorus does not have recourse to the motif of an outraged god of love (cf. Eros in X. Eph. 1.4.5) to advance the action of the romance, but more naturally allows Theagenes' lack of experience in love to lead him to seek help from Kalasiris (Hefti 1950, 58; cf. 3.11.3 above, and note). However, the words διαπτύσαι πάσας καὶ γάμον αὐτὸν καὶ ἔρωτα seem to belong to the world of the ascetic, and the theme of chastity in the romance is clearly of wider significance than simply acting as a narrative device to bring Theagenes under the influence of Kalasiris.

The unusual word ἀξιέραστος also occurs in Xen. *Cyr.* 5.2.9; *Symp.* 8.14; Plut. *Thest.* 2; *Mor.* 84F; Arr. *Epict.* 4.11.35; Luc. *Dial. mar.* 1.2; *Dial. mort.* 9.2; Iambl. *VP* p. 45; Poll. 3.72.

3.17.5 ἀλλὰ διὰ σὲ πάντα κινητέον τέχνη καὶ φύσιν οἶδε βιάζεσθαι: cf. 4.6.4; 4.6.7; 4.14.1; 4.15.3. There may be a resemblance between Kalasiris and the clever slaves of Roman Comedy in these words (Sandy 1982a, 68).

Kalasiris also tells Theagenes not to insult his 'art' by which Charikleia has been compelled to fall in love with him (4.6.4). He later tells Charikles that he is not surprised that Charikleia has fallen in love as he did not think that she would be able to resist even his first assault (4.7.2). The priest's ruthless manipulation of Charikleia and Theagenes is softened by his ironic stance towards magic (Kerényi 1962², 253) and by his gentle and understanding approach to his charges (Winkler 1982, 131). To some extent Kalasiris is indeed playing up to what Charikles (3.9.1 above, and note) and Theagenes (3.11.3 above, and note) expected from him. But while Winkler points to 3.7.1, 3.19.1-2 as evidence of the 'tact and understanding' of Kalasiris (who continues to lie to Charikleia at 4.5.4-6.2, 4.10.1-13.5), it is actually Charikles who is primarily expressing concern in these passages (3.19.2) and the reference to Charikles' forcing Charikleia to marry Alkamenes (Winkler, *loc. cit.* p. 132) is a misrepresentation by Kalasiris (4.13.2), who wishes to induce her to comply with his will in order to fulfill the instructions of the gods in his dream (3.11.5).

μέχρις ὀνόματος: the use of this prepositional expression, meaning 'to the extent of . . .', is unusual, but similar phrases are numerous in *Ethiopian Story*: cf. μέχρι τοῦ ὀνόματος, 2.12.4; μέχρι τῶν ὄψεων 4.6.4; μέχρι μόνων ὠδίνων 4.8.1; μέχρις ὥρας 4.8.7; μέχρις ἄκοης 4.10.3; μέχρις ἐπαγγελίας 4.13.4; μέχρι τῆςδε τῆς ἐσπέρας 4.19.4; μέχρι τῶν νυκτῶν 5.1.3, 8.10.1; μέχρις ὀνόματος 6.8.4, 7.27.7; μέχρις αἵματος 7.8.2. The more normal construction

(‘until’) also occurs: μέχρι τοῦ τόκου χρόνος 4.8.5; μέχρι τῆς παρελθούσης 6.8.4; μέχρι . . . τούτων 6.12.1; μέχρις οὗ 7.27.6; μέχρι θανάτου 8.12.1; μέχρι τούτων 10.9.6.

ξιφῶν ἐπιβαίνειν: an unusual expression, possibly borrowed from Euripides *Herc.* 630, βαίνειν ἐπὶ ξυροῦ.

3.18.1 ὕμνον ἀποθύει: RL suspect the codices here and Lumb suggests ἀμνόν for ὕμνον, but ἀμνόν ἀποθύειν is not attested whereas Stephanus (s.v. ἀποθύειν) provides support for ὕμνον. The expression is unusual but the text is best left unchanged.

ἐπὶ θώκου τινὸς καταλαμβάνω τὸν Χαρικλέα καθήμενον: θῶκος refers to a kind of priestly high-chair: cf. *Anth. Pal.* 8.12; Hdt. 1.181.

Charikles tells Kalasiris of his dream

3.18.2 ὄνειράτων τέ με διαταραξάντων: cf. the later dream of Charikles (4.14.2). Since the content of the dream is not related here, the reader cannot tell whether this is exactly the same dream, but their purport is clearly similar. A clearer instance of *Doppelträume* occurs in the later books (9.25.1, Hydaspes dreams that a daughter was born to him that day, and 10.3.1, Persinna has the same dream but interprets it to signify a victory on the battlefield). On the significance of double-dreams: cf. Kerényi (1962², 166) who refers to Apul. *Met.* 11.22 (Isis herself appears) and 11.27 (Asinius Marcellus); and Merkelbach (1962, 242 n. 1). The dreams need not occur to the same person: Longus (1.7.1, Dryas and Lamon have the same dream); Achilles Tatius (4.1.2-3, Leukippe and Kleitophon have similar dreams—Achilles is clearly having fun with the convention here, since Leukippe says her dream requires her to remain a virgin whereas Kleitophon dreams that he is excluded from the temple of Aphrodite but that a beautiful woman tells him that he can enter and that she will make him the ‘priest of the god’—words which Kerényi (*loc. cit.*) strangely interprets as signifying the *Himmelfahrt* of Kleitophon); Char. (1.12.5-10, Theron dreams of a closed door but as a result runs into Leonas, who had just dreamed of someone offering to sell him a beautiful slave girl; and 2.1.2, Dionysius dreams about his wedding-day and Leonas tells him his dream is a reality). There is no suggestion in Heliodorus that the repetition of dreams (cf. also Kalasiris’ dream, 3.11.5) is not seriously meant but it is ironic that Charikles is less able to make sense of his dreams than Kalasiris, despite the fact that he is the priest of Apollo (cf. 4.15.1; appendix 1).

τοῖς ὀπίταις δρομεῦσι δῶδας ἀναφαίνειν καὶ βραβεύειν τὴν ζάκορον νόμιμον: cf. 3.5.3; 4.1.2, for the role of the acolyte at the games.

3.18.3 εὐσεβῶς δὲ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ποιούσης: for the expression τὸ θεῖον, cf. 1.8.4; 1.22.6; 2.22.5; 2.25.3; 4.16.3; 9.10.2; 10.9.6; 10.9.7; 10.16.7; 10.17.2; 10.39.3.

᾿Ωμολόγουν ἡμεληκέναι: Kalasiris is here being economical with the truth, in order to avoid telling Charikles about the symposium, the visitation of Apollo and Artemis, and the visit of Theagenes, which had occupied the previous day, possibly in order to manage the complex situation more effectively (Hefti 1950, 60-61). The situation is unusually ironic since Kalasiris has to deal with Charikleia's initial opposition to love, the arranged marriage between Charikleia and Alkamenes, and Charikleia's secret passion for Theagenes. In order to reconcile these difficulties with the will of destiny, Kalasiris must keep all knowledge of the love between Charikleia and Theagenes secret.

Naber (1873, 162) strangely regards ἡμεληκέναι as an incorrect reading and suggests μεμελετηκέναι, but this makes nonsense of the text and has no basis in the MSS. σοφιστεύων καὶ πρὸς ἐκεῖνον: Amyot (1547, 80) makes the participle refer to Theagenes as well as to Charikles (Hefti 1950, 59 and n. 494). The sense would thus be 'playing the sophist to him <as well as to Theagenes>'. Although Hefti seeks to restrict the participle to the preceding words ᾿Ωμολόγουν ἡμεληκέναι, Amyot's version would be required because of the καὶ. The verb σοφιστεύων is quite prevalent in the *Ethiopian Story*. Cf. 1.10.2; 2.11.2; 2.24.5; 6.9.7; 10.9.6.

Kalasiris did not make the admission that he was cheating Charikles when he first mentioned the 'eye of envy', although he does so here (Hefti 1950, 61). Conversely, although he was mindful of the oracle concerning the two lovers early on (3.5.7), he does not make this a justification for his deception of Charikles, which also takes place before the vision of Apollo and Artemis (3.11.4).

τὴν παροῦσαν ἐνδοῦναι παρεκάλουν, ἔχειν γάρ τι συνθεῖναι πρὸς τὴν ἴασιν: There appears to be no justification in the text for the assumption that Kalasiris requires a day's grace in order to arrange a private interview with Charikleia (Hefti 1950, 59) rather than that he is simply buying time. Kalasiris callously exploits Charikles' fears for his daughter health, whereas he knows there is nothing wrong with her apart from her passion for Theagenes. In pretending to be able to cure Charikleia, Kalasiris is living up to the reputation of Egyptian priests, who were famous for their knowledge of medicine (cf. Hom. *Od.* 4.231-2; Hdt. 2.84).

3.18.4 βούλομαί σε . . . ἀποφῆναι παρακαταθέμενον: Heliodorus appears to have forgotten that Charikleia already knew Kalasiris well and had participated in sacrifices with him and had asked him questions about the religious matters (2.35.3; 3.6.2).

Kalasiris and Charikles visit Charikleia

3.19.1 τὴν τε παρειάν ἤδη τὸ ἄνθος ἔφευγε: Elsewhere, Charikleia's hair is compared to a

rose (3.4.5) and Achilles Tatius (2.1.3) imagines Leukippe's lips to be like the petals of that flower. For the use of such metaphors in ancient accounts of female beauty: cf. Jax (1933, 168).

3.19.3 Ἄλλὰ θάρσει παρακέκληται Καλάσιρις ὅδε ὁ σοφὸς ἴασίν τινά σοι πορίσασθαι: cf. 3.9.1 above and note; 4.6.2 below. There is irony in Charikles' words, of course. In an unpublished paper delivered at Groningen in 1994, Hansen notes the similarity between Kalasiris in this scene and Appion in the *Clementine Recognitions* (*Hom.* 5.3).

3.19.4 Ἐσιώπα μὲν ἐπένευε δ' οὖν ἡ Χαρίκλεια: for a similarly modest silence, cf. Ach. Tat. 5.26.1, Ὡς δὲ ἐσιώπων ἐγὼ κάτω νενευκῶς, where the false modesty of the hero parodies that of the conventional romantic heroine; Clement of Rome *Hom.* 5.3.2, διὰ γε τῆς σιωπῆς καὶ τοῦ κάτω νεύειν περὶ οὗ ἤθελον ἐνδείκνυσθαι παρεῖχον τὴν ὑπόνοιαν.

γάμων καὶ ἀνδρῶν: Reeve (1968, 284) points out that the conjecture ἀνδρός, which RL attribute to Jackson, was originally made by Naber (1873, 337), who writes: *credideris Ienonis haec verba esse . . . corrige ἀνδρός*. The change is unnecessary, since Charikles' request to Kalasiris to make his daughter more disposed to the company of men does not imply that she should become promiscuous and Heliodorus consistently shows an inclination towards the use homoioteleuton.

ἀνυσθήσεσθαι αὐτῷ τὴν βούλησιν ἐπαγγειλάμενος: the irony is often at Charikles' expense as it is here (Hefti 1950, 114 and n. 940).

BOOK FOUR

THE GAMES

Kalasisiris continues to describe the Pythian Games

4.1.1 Τῆ δὲ ὑστεραία: The particle δέ here picks up the τότε μὲν in 3.19.4. The μέν . . . δέ . . . construction is also split between books 5 and 6, 6 and 7, and 8 and 9 (Morgan 1979 at 9.1.1; 3.1.1 above, and note). Heliodorus follows the model of the *Odyssey* by beginning books 1, 4, 5, and 6 on a new day (Keyes 1922, 45). Cf. 3.1.1 above, and note.

Reeve (1971, 518) condemns Jackson's emendation Τῆ δ' ὑστεραία on the grounds that Heliodorus allows hiatus after δέ (cf., e.g., 3.1.2, δὲ ἐκ; 3.1.4, δὲ ἀνθινοῖς), even within a noun phrase (cf., e.g., 3.3.3, Ἡ δὲ ἵππος; Fritsch 1902, 30) and δέ should be retained here. Hiatus does not occur before particles and conjunctions (cf., e.g., 3.10.2, δ' οὖν [numerous instances]; 4.7.7, 4.20.3, δ' ἄν; 4.8.8, δ' ὅπερ).

ὁ μὲν Πυθίων ἁγῶν ἔληγεν: the programme of events at the Pythian Games is reconstructed by Fontenrose (1988, 127 and n. 18). The Games were sometimes understood metaphorically: for example, Plato (*Phaedr.* 256b) describes how two souls of lovers regain their wings through a life devoted to philosophy and thus are able to ascend to the heavens after death after 'winning the first of three bouts in the real Olympian Games' (τῶν τριῶν παλαισμάτων τῶν ὡς ἀληθῶς Ὀλυμπιακῶν ἐν νενικήκασιν; referring to 249a—the three incarnations as a philosopher required for release from the cycle of becoming). Philostratus records how Apollonius used the analogy of the Pythian games to suggest to his disciples that those who had not kept in 'training' should leave him (*VA* 5.43). The practice of nudity at the games is contrasted with the more philosophical habit of the gymnosophists (*VA* 6.10) and the games are described as important and popular still in Apollonius' day (*VA* 8.18).

οἴμαι: Heliodorus often inserts this expression of uncertainty about the development of the plot (cf. 1.8.1; 2.22.1; 3.5.6; 4.2.1; 4.3.3; 5.5.3; 6.5.1; 8.8.2; 9.9.5; 10.6.5) as well as others such as ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν (cf. e.g., 4.1.2 below). This makes the reader believe that the events narrated have actually taken place and that the narrator is attempting to make sense of them. The characters in the romance also frequently attempt to construe motives (cf., e.g., 2.31.2; 3.16.2; 4.7.4; 4.18.5; 5.23.3; 6.3.4) and to interpret situations (cf., e.g., 1.3.6; 1.7.2;

1.18.5; 2.12.5; 2.19.6; 2.25.6; 5.29.5; 6.12.2; 7.4.3; 7.15.2; 8.1.4; 8.9.15; 8.11.5-10; 9.8.4; 9.12.4). These instances are different, I think, from mere suppositions and general expressions of opinion and add to the sense of realism in the romance (Morgan 1981, 227-229; 1993, 210). There are more instances of such comments in the first half of the romance than in the second, which is narratologically far less complex.

ἀγωνοθετοῦντος, οἶμαι, καὶ βραβεύοντος Ἔρωτος . . . φιλονεικήσαντος: cf. Menander (*peri Epideiktikon* 2.7), who compares marriage with a race in the Olympic or Pythian games and Chariton, who refers to a moral contest between passion and reason within Dionysius (5.10.6, Διονύσιος μὲν οὖν διέτριβεν ἄχρι τῆς κρίσεως μάχην βραβεύων ἔρωτος καὶ λογισμοῦ). Elsewhere Chariton uses the athletic metaphor for the competition between rival lovers, Dionysius and Chaereas, for Callirhoe, the prize of their contention (1.2.4, 2.8.2, 4.4.2, 5.8.4, 6.2.1-2, 6.9.3; cf. also Ach. Tat. 5.7.4). RL refer to Char. 1.1.4 for φιλονεικία as a characteristic of ἔρωτος (φιλόνεικος δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ Ἔρωτος), where Chariton is referring to the necessity for Chaereas and Callirhoe to overcome the political enmity of their families. In all these cases there is no contest between the lovers as in Heliodorus. Xenophon of Ephesus 1.2.1 comes closer to the meaning of Heliodorus (Μηνιᾶ πρὸς ταῦτα ὁ Ἔρωτος φιλόνεικος γὰρ ὁ θεὸς καὶ ὑπερηφάνοις ἀπαραίτητος). In this case, it is Eros who is in competition with Habrokomes, who claimed to be more handsome and powerful than the god. Consequently, Eros arranged that Habrokomes should have some competition in beauty, namely Antheia. For beauty contests: cf. also Long. 1.15.4, 3.34.2. However, this does not fully match the conceit of Heliodorus, who makes Eros the referee and the lovers unique competitors in a match of supreme importance—the contest of love. Heliodorus doubtless thought of this ‘contest of love’ as a contest in chastity (4.18.4-6, 5.4.5), though it is a contest in which Fate too plays its part (7.12.2). Cf. also 1.26.3, Ὅρμην γὰρ, ὡς οἶσθα, κρατούσης ἐπιθυμίας μάχη μὲν ἀντίτυπος ἐπιτείνει; 3.7.5, εἰστοξεύοντα; 4.11.1, τὸν ἐμοὶ πολέμιον; 7.10.2, ἐμοὶ δὲ ἀρχὴ τις ἀληθεστέρου πολέμου; 7.20.5, ἐνήθησεν. By way of contrast, Achilles Tatius makes his lovers rival athletes in a contest of pleasure (2.4.4; 2.38.4). Cf. Lucian (*Onos* 8-10); Apuleius (*Met.* 2.17, ‘*proeliare*’ *inquit*, ‘*et fortiter proeliare, nec enim tibi cedam nec terga vertam*’), who give a far more explicit account of this motif. The topos also occurs in Plato’s *Symposium*, where Eros is depicted as a warrior (189d), and anticipates the medieval idea of courtly love (cf. the *Knights’ Tale* in Chaucer’s *Canterbury Tales*).

ἐξεύξατο: the word is used here with a double sense: (1) ‘joined together in competition’ (2) ‘joined in marriage’.

ἔθεώρει μὲν ἢ Ἑλλάδος ἠθλοθέτου δὲ οἱ Ἀμφικτύονες; cf. 3.4.8; 4.3.2 for the hyperbole. Participants would have come from all over Greece to attend the Pythian Festival during a time of truce (Thuc. 5.1; *CID* 10 1.48; Harris [1964, 155-56]; Roux [1976, 172]). The Delphic Amphictyony was first established and the sanctuary removed from local control in the sixth century BC (Catherine Morgan 1990, 135-6). The Amphictyons were ‘notaries and deputies of the council at Pylae from the area around Delphi’ (Hesychius *ad loc.*, περίοικοι Δελφῶν, Πυλαγόροι καὶ ἱερομνήμονες) who appointed the managers and judges of the games (Schol. in Pind. *Pyth.* 4.118, Ἀμφικτύονες καλοῦνται οἱ ἀγωνοθέται τῶν Πυθίων ἐκ δώδεκα ἔθνων τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὄντες; Fontenrose 1988, 137 and n. 38; Feuillâtre 1966, 58; below 4.1.2, οἱ ἠθλοθέται). Athletic games were still extremely popular in the 4th century AD and Heliodorus knew that the games ended with the onset of winter (5.18.1; the setting of the Pleiades; Kowarna 1959, 77) since the people of Zakynthos express surprise that the Phoenician ship had managed to sail from Delphi at this time of year.

ὁ μὲν κῆρυξ: For the presence of a herald at the Pythian Games, cf. Pindar (*Pyth.* 1.31-33); Soph. *El.* 683-684 (see 4.3.1 below, and note); Feuillâtre (1966, 58); and Naber (1873, 162: cf. Philostratus *Gym.* 7.20).

δρόμων ἄμιλλαι καὶ πάλης συμπλοκαὶ καὶ πυγμῆς χειρονομίαι: For the standard Homeric games: cf. *Od.* 8.206; 8.246-7; *Il.* 23.621-623 (boxing, wrestling and running); *Od.* 8.120-130 (jumping and discus-throwing); Plut. *Quaest. Conviv.* 638B (adding musical contests, chariot and horse races [Fontenrose 1988, 126-128]). The term χειρονομία was used to refer to pantomimes (Ael. *Var. Hist.* 14.22), though Paus. 6.10.3 uses the word to mean the same as ‘box’ (πυκτεύειν). Cf. the discussion of Morgan (1979, at 9.16.2) where the term is interpreted as ‘hand to hand fighting’ (ἄνδρας ὀπλομάχους τε καὶ τῆς κατασυστάδην χειρονομίας ἐπιστήμονας).

Ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν τὰ ἄλλα μεγαλοπρεπῶς ἐτετέλεστο: Artemidorus says that the hoplite race was the last one held and open to all (*Oneir.* 1.63).

Ἄνδρες ὀπλίται παριόντων: Heliodorus provides authentic information about the games here; the hoplite race had been added to the contests held during the Pythian Games in 484 BC and was held after the other contests (Paus. 3.14.3; 10.7.3). The *Suda* (s.v. Φάυλλος) records the famous success of Phayllos in the hoplite race. Other references may be found in the scholia on Pindar *Pyth.* 9.1; 10.21; 10.22.

RL rightly retain the reading Ἄνδρες ὀπλίται in preference to Korae’s Οἱ ὀπλίται: cf. Arist. *Vesp.* 360; Aesch. *Sept.* 717; Eur. *Suppl.* 585; Hdt. 6.117; Long. 1.20.2; Lucian *Musc. Enc.* 11.11; Paus. 1.4.4.11, 1.12.2.4; Philostrat. *Apoll.* 6.36.38.

4.1.2 Ἡ ζῳακορος: a temple servant who was responsible for the fire and sweeping the floor: cf. *Suda ad loc.*; Men. fr. 5.2; Plut. 272F4 (Stephanus). Charikles describes his daughter in this way in the final book (10.36.3). However, there is no other evidence for the appearance of an acolyte at the Pythian Games (cf. 3.5.3 above, and note).

τὸ στάδιον ἀθρόον: the renovation of the stadium for the Pythian Games in 242 and 329-330 is recorded in inscriptions (*FD* 3.5.29, 1 & 2; 3.5.48 col. II l. 41; 3.5.59 B 4.8).

ἀφιγμένη καὶ ἄκουσα διὰ τὸ πάτριον ἢ πλέον, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, ὄψεσθαί που τὸν Θεαγένην ἐλπίζουσα: For Charikleia's indisposition, cf. 3.7.1; 3.18.2; 3.19.1. Heliodorus has previously not mentioned her unwillingness to attend the last day of the games in so many words. For amphibolies in Heliodorus, see appendix 3.

The duplication of encounters between the lovers is unusual (Hefti 1950, 61). This second meeting allows Theagenes an opportunity to impress Charikleia as an athlete.

τῇ λαιῶ μὲν . . . θατέρῳ δέ: Charikleia later awards the branch of palm to Theagenes as the prize in the hoplite race (4.4.2). For the palm as the prize in the later Pythian Games: cf. Plut. *Mor.* 724a-b; the palm is placed in the right hand of the victor, Paus. 8.48.2; Lib. *Laud.* 9.9. Cf. also 4.2.2 below, and note.

The torch that Charikleia holds appears to be redundant. The usual practice at races was for competitors to run towards a priest holding a torch, which the victor used to light the altar fire (Philostratus *Gym.* 5). Pausanias (6.20.9) corroborates this account, which Sansone (1988, 82-4) took as evidence for his theory that Greek athletics was in origin the 'ritual sacrifice of physical energy' (p. xiv). In the *Ethiopian Story*, however, Charikleia had handed a torch to Theagenes for him to light the altar fire as custom demanded (3.5.3) on the previous day. According to Charikles, a further custom required the acolyte to display a torch to the runners in the hoplite race and to decide the winner (3.18.2; 4.1.2). It is the latter custom that Hegesias proposes to ban on the grounds that it was this custom that led to Theagenes falling in love with Charikleia (4.21.1), although this actually happened on the first occasion. Heliodorus has therefore duplicated the scene in which Charikleia appears with a torch (Hefti 1950, 62), which serves no functional purpose here.

The posture of Charikleia, holding a torch in her left hand and a palm branch in the right may be symbolic. Theagenes later chooses the word 'palm' and Charikleia 'torch' as the verbal signs by which they could recognise each other in case of need (5.5.2). The torch was chosen as a reminder of the scene in which Theagenes and Charikleia first met (3.6) while the palm recalled their second encounter (4.4.2). However, the palm is in any case a multivalent symbol of Victory, the Sun, and Immortality (Merkelbach 1962, 245)—

especially as palm and the phoenix may be conflated as they are both designated by the word φοῖνιξ in Greek, which is also the word for Phoenician (cf. 10.41.4; Winkler 1982, 157).

The word λαμπάδιον occurs mainly in passages of heightened significance in the novel: 1.18.4 (Thyamis' torchlit dream); 1.30.4 (the inferno on the island reminds Thyamis of his torchlit dream); 2.1.3 (no wedding torches for Charikleia?); 2.3.3 (Theagenes throws his torch to the ground in suicidal despair); 3.4.6 (description of Charikleia with torch during the procession at Delphi); 3.6.1 (Theagenes lights the fire with a torch at the conclusion of the memorial service); 4.1.2 (Charikleia holds a torch during the games); 5.5.2 (Charikleia's password is 'torch'); 7.7.7 (Charikleia reminds Theagenes of her password, 'torch'); 9.9.5 (the torch of truth reveals the significance of the *Neiloa*); 10.39.2 (ὡσπερ λαμπάδιον δράματος 'the conclusion of the drama': cf. Winkler [1982, 157]; Morgan [1979, at 10.39.2]; Arnott [1965a, 235-255]; Walden [1895, 1-43]). By way of contrast, the various forms of δαΐς (1.12.2; 2.3.3; 2.3.4; 2.29.4; 3.4.6; 3.5.3; 3.5.5; 3.18.2; 8.12.4; 9.11.4; 10.16.10) are mundane.

The references given above show that the torch was a strong unifying symbol in the *Aethiopica*, connoting ideas of a goal or conclusion (4.1.2.5: cf. 3.18.2; 10.39.2), weddings (2.1.3: cf. 2.29.4), philosophical enlightenment (9.9.5), and prophetic inspiration (1.18.4; 1.30.4). Charikleia is frequently associated with light symbolism as here (4.1.2, ἐξέλαμψεν—Underdowne translates 'And therewithall Cariclia *glistered* at the race ende'). Walden's suggestion (*loc. cit.*) that ὡσπερ λαμπάδιον δράματος refers to the climax to the Eleusinian mysteries, in which light is shed on darkness, gives depth to this symbolism. In Artemidorus (74), the lamp symbolises the master of a house, life-breath, or love. There are therefore good grounds for accepting the view that lamps too are used symbolically in the romance (Merkelbach 1962, 262: comparing Psyche and Eros in Apuleius; Feuillâtre 1966, 59 n. 6: the torch as symbolic of marriage and the palm as symbolic of fecundity; Sourvinou-Inwood 1991, 121-122: altars, palms and virgins feature frequently in Greek mythological iconography and these motifs in combination give expression to the role played by Artemis in bringing unmarried girls to womanhood through marriage). Palms feature particularly strongly in representations of the Thetis myth.

The Syrian saint Ephrem (c. 306-373) used of the symbolism of lamps and palm branches (*Resurrection* 3.4-5) to allegorise the parable of the wise and foolish virgins (Matt. 25.1-13; cf. Brock 1985, 119). In Ephrem, according to Brock (*op. cit.*, 162-163), Hellenic analytic philosophy combined with Semitic synthetic symbolism in which

symbols (*raze*) are compared to pin-pricks in a pane of cloudy glass—contemplation of symbols resembles the act of bringing the eye to the pin-pricks so that more than can be seen through the glass. The parable probably also underlies the statement of Methodius, a contemporary of Heliodorus, that the virgin young are lamps in the darkened world, that light the way to the dawn of Christ's second coming (*Symposium* 6.4.141; 5.2.113). In the conclusion of Heliodorus's work the gymnosophist Sisimithres predicts from the halo of light around Theagenes and Charikleia that they will be saved (10.9.7).

There is a strong probability, therefore, that Heliodorus represented Charikleia with a torch in this scene to reinforce the light symbolism with which she is associated.

ἡμμένον πυρφοροῦσα λαμπάδιον: the expression is pleonastic (πυρφοροῦσα = 'carrying a lighted torch') but Heliodorus wants to emphasise the brilliant flame carried by his heroine.

4.1.3 αὐτῇ ἐκείνη: for the hiatus, cf. 3.4.7 above, and note.

Καὶ τῷ μὲν ἡρεμεῖν ἐπέταττον: Koraes' emendation for τὸν μὲν . . . ἐπέταττον must be correct as ἐπιτάσσω regularly governs the dative case.

Theagenes takes up the challenge of Ormenos

4.2.1 εὐσταλῶς ὀπλισμένος: 'In fine armour' rather than 'in light armour' (Morgan). Below (4.3.1) Theagenes puts on full hoplite armour (πανοπλία). Athletes wore full archaic battle armour in the hoplite race at Plataea in commemoration of the battle of Marathon (Phil. *Gym.* 8; Paus. 9.2.6; Strabo 9.2.31; Sansone [1988, 115-117]) and the race was then introduced at Olympia to improve military training (Paus. 5.8.10). The runners wore helmets (Schol. in Arist. *Av.* 392) and carried shields (Paus. 5.12.8). A red figure *kylix* in the British Museum (K66551) shows the armour used in the race (helmet, shield and greaves). Cf. also the hoplite runner on a neck amphora dated to 535 B.C. in Group E in Munich (1471, *ABV* 137, 60). Pausanias also describes the armour of the champion Demarete to consist of these three items (6.10.4). Philostratus (*Gym.* 3) classifies the hoplite race as a easier event than the *pankration*, wrestling or boxing. Ἐυσταλεῖς is, of course, used of lightly armed troops (e.g., Thuc. 3.22.2; Hld. 9.16.2) but the adverbial form does not appear to carry this sense: cf. Plut. *Mor.* 942B10 (Stephanus) τὰ μὲν ἄλλα κατεσκευασμένος εὐσταλῶς ἐφόδιον δὲ συχνὸν ἐν χρυσοῖς ἐκπώμασι κομίζων; Lucian *Hermot.* 18.3 κοσμιῶς βαδίζοντας ἀναβεβλημένους εὐσταλῶς; *Suda* (*ad* εὐπετής). A parallel is provided by Plut. *Dion* 28.3 ὀπλισμένος λαμπρῶς.

μέγα τε φρονῶν καὶ μόνος ἐπίδοξος, ὡς ἐδόκει: Koraes notes that Heliodorus later uses the word ἐπίδοξος to mean 'notable' with reference to the leaders of Thyamis' band (7.3.2)

but in view of the condemnation of this usage (by Phrynichus and Ammonius) and the exegetic force of ὡς ἐδόκει, he proposed the reading ἐπίδοξος ὧν νικῆσαι 'likely to win' (cf. Plut. *Thes.* 19.4.2). It should also be remembered that Heliodorus goes on to give reasons why this champion could have expected to win, and that both the *Suda* and Hesychius (*ad loc.*) give the gloss προσδόκιμος 'expected'.

However, Heliodorus regularly uses the adjectival form of the word with the meaning 'noble' or 'honourable' (10.21.2; 10.32.3; 10.37.2) and see below for ἀδοξία meaning 'disgrace' (4.2.2). RL point out that the latter sense of the word occurs commonly elsewhere (Pind. *Nem.* 9.46; Plut. *Mor.* 239d; Diod. Sic. 13.83). Clearer instances occur in Plutarch's *Lives* (e.g., *Mar.* 30.5; *Sull.* 34.4; *Luc.* 5.2), while Plut. *Amat.* 760a10 provides a cross-over usage. Heliodorus appears to be using the word in a sense more suited to the class-conscious times in which he lived than to the dramatic date of the romance (ἐπίδοξότερος, though rare, may resemble the distinction between *honestior* and *humilior*: cf. Plut. *Mor.* 226A9, ἐπίδοξότερος καὶ εὐγενέστερος; *Hist. Alex. Magni* 3.30.7).

ἤδη πρότερον: this pleonastic usage occurs sporadically from the fifth century BC on (e.g. Andoc. *De Pac.* 2.5; Arist. *Met.* 359b28; Polyb. 3.30.1; Dio Chrys. 6.61.5—a total of 17 occurrences between the fifth century BC and the third century AD)—but becomes very common in the fourth century AD (42 occurrences in Eusebius, e.g. *Eccl. Hist.* 3.4.8.5; 25 times in Socrates Scholasticus, e.g. *Hist. Eccl.* 1.9.324; and 102 times in total during this century) and should be added to those put forward by Wifstrand (1944-1945, 36-41) as evidence for the fourth century date of Heliodorus.

ἄγωνας ἀναδησάμενος: for the unusual expression, cf. νίκας ἀναδήσασθαι (Simon. 21 [Diehl]; Appian *Bell. Civ.* 1.84; Procop. *Vand.* 2.27). This is another instance of the figured language of Heliodorus.

Ἄπέπεμπον οὖν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἀμφικτύονες . . . ἀποκληροῦν: Heliodorus here again offers realistic detail of the way in which the Pythian Games were administered. Philostratus states that an uncontested victory (ἀκονιτί) was only allowed for wrestlers (*Gym.* 11). However, a case of such a victory in the pankration is mentioned by Pausanias (6.7.4) and inscriptions provide evidence for uncontested victories in the boxing event as well (cf. Paus. 5.21.14). The reason for these exceptions appears to have been that both wrestling and boxing were tough events, unlike the lighter running contests (Philostrat. *Gym.* 11). Three victories of Theogenes are recorded as being won ἀκονιτί (*Syl.* 3.36 A & B; Feuillâtre 1966, 59) and, although the event is not stated, one is reminded of the famous foot-race runner Theagenes mentioned by Pausanias (6.11.5; see appendix 1). If these

names refer to the same athlete, this would indicate that uncontested victories could be awarded in the running races also. To complicate the issue, there were various kinds of uncontested victory; one in which only one athlete enters the competition (Paus. 6.11.4), one in which many competitors enter but all except one withdraw (Paus. 6.1.1), and one in which the victory was easy (*Suda ad loc.*). Pouilloux (1983, 268 n. 38) suggests that the word *μόνος* (4.2.1, above) may indicate the first alternative, but this appears to stretch the meaning of the word too far. Feuillâtre (1966, 60) suggests a distinction between being awarded the crown and being given a prize for victory in the running race. According to this view, Ormenos was not content with the prize but wanted the crown, which he could not win without opposition, as well but there appears to be no evidence to support this speculation. It would appear, though, that Heliodorus is more interested in emphasising Ormenos' awesome reputation here (and therefore Theagenes' courage in taking him on), rather than necessarily conveying accurate detail.

In Chariton one of Callirhoes' failed suitors urges his fellow suitors to prevent Chaereas carrying her off without opposition, a further instance of the metaphor of love as contest (cf. 4.1.1 and note above): *ὁ δὲ πόρνος καὶ πένης καὶ μηδενὸς κρείττων βασιλέων ἀγωνισαμένων αὐτὸς ἀκονιτὶ τὸν στέφανον ἤρατο.* (1.2.3-4).

4.2.2 *Οὗτος ἐμὲ καλεῖ*: Theagenes is portrayed as the stereotypical athletic hero but there is no real indication in the text of any connection with the theme of the bride's race (Sandy 1982a, 60-1, 93). Theagenes is, of course, victorious here and in his contest with the Ethiopian giant (10.25.1; 10.32) but this does not lead to Theagenes winning his bride. Heliodorus is thinking of the funerary athletic races of the Homeric heroes in the *Iliad* (e.g. 23.621-23).

ἔφησεν: the only instance of the aorist tense of this verb as opposed to 399 uses of the imperfect (Barber 1962, 45). Notice also the variation of verbs of saying: *ἔφησεν . . . εἶπεν. ἐκ τῶν Χαρικλείας χειρῶν*: Again there is no evidence that the prize was awarded to the victor by the acolyte of Artemis at the Pythian Games (Feuillâtre 1966, 59). The evidence suggests that this was the function of the priest (see 4.1.2 above, and note).

τὸ νικητήριον ἀποίσεται: the prize awarded to Theagenes is a palm branch (4.4.2; 4.4.4). Various prizes are recorded for victories in the Pythian Games (a laurel wreath, Paus. 8.48.2; laurel berries, Lucian *Anach.* 9; apples, *AP* 9.357; Maximus of Tyre 1.4, 34.8; Libanius *Laud.* 9.9; Fontenrose [1988, 136-37 and n. 36]). Parsley was used at the Isthmian and Nemean Games, though the latter also used the pine (Plut. *Timol.* 26.4; *Quaest. Conviv.* 676c8-10). Later the palm was awarded at all the games (Plut. *Quaest. Conviv.*

723b4; Paus. 8.48.2.6, οἱ δὲ ἀγῶνες φοίνικος ἔχουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ στέφανον· ἐς δὲ τὴν δεξιάν ἐστι καὶ πανταχοῦ τῷ νικῶντι ἐστιθέμενος φοῖνιξ).

There appears to be nothing in the text to connect Theagenes, the victorious runner, with *Sol Invictus* (Merkelbach 1962, 245).

Τὴν δὲ ἀποτυχίαν . . . τὴν ἐκ ταύτης ἀδοξίαν: the word ἀδοξία is the Classical equivalent (Thuc. 1.76.4; Xen. *Hell.* 7.5.9; Plat. *Phaed.* 82c6) of the Homeric αἰδώς (e.g., *Il.* 5.787; 13.95; 15.129). Theagenes is cast in the Homeric mould. For the possibility of disgrace: cf. Pindar *Pyth.* 8.115-122; Epictet. *Or.* 3.22.52. Heliodorus uses the Late form ἀποτυχία here rather than the Classical δυστυχία. The word is a favourite of his, particularly in the sense of frustrated desire (1.17.5; 2.12.5; 3.16.3; 5.32.4; 6.4.1; 6.4.2; 7.29.1; 8.6.1).

For the hiatus in δὲ ἀποτυχίαν, cf. 3.1.1 above, and note.

οὐ γὰρ τις ἐμοῦ παρόντος . . . ἀποίσειται: Koraes noted the clever play on Achilles' words in Hom. *Il.* 1.88-9:

οὐ τις ἐμεῦ ζῶντος καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ δερκομένοιο

σοὶ κοίλης παρὰ νηυσὶ βαρείας χεῖρας ἐποίσει

παρόντος picks up ζῶντος, ὀρῶντος is matched with δερκομένοιο, and χειρῶν . . . ἀποίσειται goes with χεῖρας ἐποίσει. Besides this verbal virtuosity, the allusion adds to the impression of the jealous aggression of Theagenes and confirms his resemblance to Achilles.

4.2.3 ὥστε με: RL suggest ὥστ' ἐμέ, but the codices and Heliodorus' usage elsewhere show ὥστε με (cf. 1.25.4; 7.25.7).

περῶσαι δύναται καὶ μετάρσιον ἐπισπάσασθαι: unlike the lover in Plato's *Phaedrus*, who metaphorically sprouts wings, Heliodorus makes Theagenes claim to be literally able to fly (cf. Feuillâtre 1966, 126)! The idea strikes the modern reader as ridiculous, but other examples of the power of sight in the romance suggest that Heliodorus would not have shared this view (cf., e.g., 1.2.3 ἡ δὲ ὄψις τῆς κόρης ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν ἀνεῖλκε καὶ τοῦτο ὀρᾶν αὐτοῦς ἠνάγκαζεν, ὅτι ἐκείνην ἐώρων). On the connection between love and sight in Heliodorus see 3.5.4 above, and note. Similarly Arsake's plan to increase the misery of the lovers by chaining them up together backfires, since they draw consolation and inspiration from each other instead (8.9.21, θεαταὶ γίνονται ἀλλήλων ἐν δεσμοῖς καὶ κολάσεσιν ἐξεταζομένων).

The strangeness of Theagenes' words here may be intended to recall Homer's description of how Athene lightened the limbs of Odysseus in the footrace held during the funeral games for Patroclus (*Il.* 23.772).

οἱ γράφοντες . . . αἰνιττόμενοι: Striking evidence for the influence of the visual arts on Heliodorus, which is particularly noticeable in his description of Charikleia (3.4) and the amethyst ring (5.14). Cf. Phil. *Imag.* 1.29; Plat. *Phaedr.* 252b; Alexis fr. 20 (Kock); Bartsch (1989, 149-150). The use of the verb αἰνίττομαι is particularly revealing. The word is also used of Homer's description of the gods (3.12.2; 3.12.2 [αἰνίγμα]); the dream of Charikles (4.15.1); and the dream of Persinna (10.3.1). The noun form is used for the sexual insinuations of Arsake and her maid, Cybele (7.3.2; 7.19.7).

οὐδείς ἐς τὴν σήμερον ποσὶ με παρελθὼν ἐσεμύνατο: Like 'the swift-footed Achilles' (e.g., Hom. *Il.* 1.58 πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς), Theagenes is a fast runner.

Ἐς τὴν σήμερον is not Attic (cf. Plato *Symp.* 174a8, εἰς τήμερον).

The hoplite race between Theagenes and Ormenos

4.3.1 τοῦ δρόμου τὴν χώραν: A colour coding system was used to allocate places to the runners (Feuillâtre 1966, 59).

ἐκεκλήρωτο: for the drawing of lots for starting places, cf. Sophocles *Elektra* 708-710 (a chariot race); Lucian *Herm.* 39.

RL and Colonna (1987b [ἐκκληροῦτο 1938]) prefer ἐκεκλήρωτο (C) for ἐκκληροῦτο (mAT). Barber (1962, 149) accepts the pluperfect but Fritsch (1901-1901, 33) points out instances of the imperfect being used alongside the pluperfect (e.g., 1.11.2, 4.4.4, 4.7.12, 5.7.3, 7.7.5) and Heliodorus elsewhere only uses the unaugmented form of the pluperfect of this word (4.9.2, 7.9.1, 9.3.8). Although the places should logically be allotted to the runners before they take up their positions, Heliodorus is not concerned with the exact details of the race; he prefers (see introduction on tense) to set the scene with a series of imperfects linked by καί (προσῆγγελλε, ἐδήλου, ἐκκληροῦτο) before concluding his description an aorist participle and a pluperfect tense (ἐφειστήκει). Other instances of the imperfect of ἀποκληρόω occur at 1.24.1, 5.18.8, 5.27.3, 10.8.2, and this tense of the verb should be retained here.

ἐφειστήκει τῇ βαλβίδι: Philostratus (*Imag.* 1.24.3) describes Apollo in a similar stance and the runners in Homer (*Il.* 23.757) line up similarly. For the starting mechanism, see the unhelpful entry in Hesychius (s.v. βαλβίς), according to which the βαλβίς was a synonym for the ὑσπληξ which replaced it in the fifth century. Heliodorus mentions the ὑσπληξ below (4.3.3).

τὸ παρὰ τῆς σάλπιγγος ἐνδόσιμον: a trumpet blast was used to start races in Greek athletics (cf., e.g., Soph. *El.* 711) but not to indicate victory (Morgan 1979, at 10.31.5). In less formal races, no doubt words were used, as in the mock race in Aristophanes *Knights*

1161-62 (ΑΛ. ΠΑ. Ἴδου. ΔΗ. Θέοιτ' ἄν).

σεμνόν τι θέαμα καὶ περίβλεπτον: cf. 8.8.3, καινὸν θέαμα; 9.5.5, θεαμάτων τὸ καινότεον.

For Heliodorus' fondness for spectacular descriptions: cf. 3.1.1 above, and note. The wording may owe something to Euripides *Med.* 1167, δεινὸν ἦν θέαμ' ἰδεῖν; *Bacch.* 760, δεινὸν ἦν θέαμ' ἰδεῖν; *Or.* 952, θέαμα πικρὸν (Neimke 1889). Theagenes cuts an impressive figure, as did Orestes in the foot-race at the Pythian Games *El.* 685, εἰσήλθε λαμπρός, πᾶσι τοῖς ἐκεῖ σέβας. There are similarities between the foot-race in Heliodorus and Sophocles' description of Orestes' race at Delphi, on the one hand, and the foot-race during the funeral games for Patroclus in the *Iliad* (23.740-779), on the other (Létoublon 1990, 3-6).

οἷον Ὅμηρος τὸν Ἀχιλλεῖα τὴν ἐπὶ Σκαμάνδρῳ μάχην ἀθλοῦντα παρίστησιν: cf. Homer *Il.* 21.211-382. The race is generally reminiscent of Homer (*Il.* 23.740-797). RL *ad loc.* comment that the comparison is arbitrary as there is nothing in common between the exploits of Achilles and those of Theagenes but Heliodorus wishes to convey a general impression of heroic strength.

4.3.2 Θεαγένει νίκην ἤχχετο καθάπερ αὐτός τις ἕκαστος ἀγωνιζόμενος: The reactions of a crowd or audience is an important part of Heliodorus' vivid narrative technique (Woronoff 1987, 36; Morgan 1991, 101; cf. 3.1.1 above, and note). The model for this technique was probably Thucydides' description of the final naval battle between the Athenians and the Syracusans in the harbour of Syracuse (7.71).

ἐπακτικὸν γάρ τι—καὶ πρὸς τῶν ὁρώντων—εἰς εὔνοιαν τὸ κάλλος: cf. 3.10.5, for the inclusion of such *sententiae* in the narrative. For beauty as a valuable asset: cf. Jax (1933, 161).

The text is that of Colonna (1987b, 1938) who construes the meaning as *anche da parte degli spettatori*. RL regard the text here as *valde dubius* and suggest καὶ πρῶτον ὁρώντων but the parenthetical prepositional phrase is not impossible (see the introduction). ἐκ πολλοῦ: 'From a distance' rather than 'for a long time' (Morgan). Charikleia stands at the end of the racetrack (4.1.2), while Kalasiris is one of the crowd. Kalasiris would have been interested in Charikleia's immediate reaction to Theagenes' sudden and unexpected challenge (3.3.2) rather than observing her for a long time. Both meanings are attested: cf. LSJ *s.v.* πολὺς IV.3 (Thuc. 4.32); ἐκ II.1 (Thuc. 1.68). The addition of χρόνου at 4.13.1 (ἐκ πολλοῦ . . . χρόνου) suggests a need to disambiguate the expression.

4.3.3 Ὅρμενος: the name comes from the verb ὀρνεμι = 'to stir up, rush furiously'. Heliodorus often chooses significant names for his characters (e.g., Theagenes 'goddess-born' and Charikleia 'famous for grace'). The name is also given to the dead dog under the nose

of the Caledonian boar on the François Vase (Florence 4209; *ABV* 76.1—I owe this reference to Professor Anne Mackay). Cf. the name Akesinos below (4.7.4).

Θεαγένης Θετταλός: Previously, the messenger had announced Theagenes as one of the Ainianes (2.34.1), whereas here he is described as Thessalian. However, Ormenos is also announced by region (Arcadian) rather than tribe in this same passage, and no significance can be read into this detail (as Pouilloux 1983, 272 tries to do). Identification was normally by city: for example, Sophocles relates how Orestes was announced as ‘Orestes of Argos’ after his victory in the foot-race in the Pythian Games (*El.* 693). The phrase has no significance for the dating of the romance.

ἔσχαστο μὲν ἢ ὑσπληξ: the operation of the ὑσπληξ evidently involved a barrier which dropped to allow the runners through (Harris 1972, 27-33) as the verb σχάζω ‘let go’ suggests. Heliodorus, however, clearly envisioned the runners starting on the note of a trumpet (below, 4.3.1). Aristophanes talks the ὑσπληξ as a barrier to keep the runners apart (*Equ.* 1159), whereas the *Suda* (*ad loc.*) glosses the meaning as a starting-point, winning-line (used also for horses) and sometimes the turning-post (καμπτήρ) or starter’s pit. Despite the lack of clarity about the exact function of the device, it is clear that Heliodorus has taken the trouble to include realistic detail in his narrative.

ὑποτέμων: For the metaphor, cf. Feuillâtre (1966, 82); 4.18.6 below. Lucian (*Tim.* 20, ὑπερπηθήσας τὸ στάδιον οὐδὲ ἰδόντων ἐνίστε τῶν θεατῶν) has a similarly hyperbolic description of blinding speed in a foot-race.

ἐσφάδαζεν ἢ βάσις: cf. *Suda ad loc.* Σφαδάζειν: θράσσειν, δυσθανατεῖν, ματαιῶς σπάσθαι, χαλεπαίνειν, μετ’ ὀργῆς στενάζειν. Σφαδάζειν καὶ τὸ πηδᾶν, ἀπὸ τοῦ σπάσθαι. καὶ σφακελίζειν.

οἱ πόδες ἔσκαιρον: Σκαίρω is Homeric, cf. *Il.* 18.571, and a favourite of Heliodorus (4.17.1; 5.14.3; 9.19.4; 10.17.3). Charikleia here reveals an intensely emotional temperament. Cf. 4.7.11 below, and note; Wolff (1912, 177).

συνεξαιρομένης: for the unusual word, cf. 7.15.1; Lucian *De Domo* 4.1.

4.3.4 Οἱ μὲν δὴ θεαταί: Heliodorus often presents his narrative as a spectacle and emphasises the dramatic character of the events he describes (cf. 3.1.1 above, and note). His characters are also frequently the spectators of the events in which they participate (cf. 8.9.21; 2.11.1; 3.1.1; 6.14.5).

ἀγωνίας ἀνάμεστος: the etymological play on ἀγωνία (‘contest’, ‘anguish’) is an example of Heliodorus’ interest in word-play.

ἄτε δὴ μοι λοιπὸν ὡς παιδὸς ὑπερφροντίζειν προηρημένον: ὑπερφροντίζειν occurs only in

Heliodorus here and at 10.29.4.

The impersonal construction προηρημένον (from προαιρέω ‘choose deliberately’) is Richards' emendation (1906, 111) for the προηρημένω of the MSS and must be taken as a passive. Morgan translates as προειρημένον ‘I had been charged’ from προερέω ‘give prior orders’ following a suggestion by RL (cf. 3.11.5 where Apollo and Artemis give Kalasiris verbal instructions). This is an attractive proposal with some justification in the mss (A) and certainly to be preferred to the interpretation of Colonna (1938) who suggests προηρημένος ‘I had chosen’ with the more usual middle sense (προηρημένω in his 1987 text). Warszewicki translates: *ego vero etiam magis, qui iam apud me constitueram, ut illius non secus ac filii curam susciperem* (the Polish aristocrat's translation appears virtually unchanged in subsequent bilingual Latin-Greek texts, such as Hirschig's, and formed the basis of the vernacular translations as well: cf. Balinski [1992, 274]). Lamb (1961, *ad loc.*) renders the words as: ‘since I had made up my mind to be concerned for him as for a son’. However, Kalasiris is portrayed as an agent of destiny (e.g., 2.25.3-4, 7.8.1) rather than as a free agent and RL's proposed reading προειρημένον should be followed.

Kalasiris had a close relationship with Theagenes and Charikleia and calls Theagenes his son (3.3.4, τὸ μέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν Θεαγένης; 3.17.2, τέκνον), Charikleia his daughter (4.5.4, Θάρσει θύγατερ; 4.5.7, οὐχὶ πατήρ εἰμί σοι;) and both Theagenes and Charikleia his spiritual children (2.23.2, «Παῖδες εἰσὶ σοι τῷ ὄντι Θεαγένης καὶ Χαρίκλεια;» «Παῖδες» εἶπεν «ὦ ξένε, ἀμήτορες ἐμοὶ γεγονότες· τύχη γάρ μου θεοὶ τούτους ἀνέδειξαν καὶ ἀπέτεκον αἱ ψυχῆς ὠδίνες καὶ φύσις ἢ διάθεσις ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἐνομίσθη, καὶ πατέρα με ἀπὸ ταύτης ἐκεῖνοι καὶ ἐνόμισαν καὶ ὠνόμασαν»). He also counts them as ‘gods’ (2.23.1, τούτους εἰς θεοὺς ἀναγράφω) and ‘dear ones’ (3.4.5, τοὺς φιλάτους). Moreover, Theagenes and Charikleia call Kalasiris ‘father’ throughout the work (2.23.2 [quoted above]; 4.2.2; 4.5.6). The appellation was conventional and many others in the novel call Kalasiris by this title (Knemon 2.33.4; the Tyrian merchant 5.19.3; Trachinos 5.28.1; Nausicles 5.33.4) just as Theagenes calls Cybele ‘mother’ (7.13.1) and Meroebos calls Hydaspes ‘father’ (10.24.3). Nevertheless, the relationship between Kalasiris and Charikleia, in particular, goes further than mere convention (7.13.1, τὸν δοκοῦντα καὶ ὄντα πατέρα μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων προσαπολωλεκότες), and is transferred, according to a sacristan (νεωκόρος), to Thyamis along with the other responsibilities of his priesthood (7.11.9) despite his previous erotic relationship with her during his days as a bandit when he attempted to murder her (1.30.7; cf. Charikleia's concern at 6.9.6—there appears to be a narratological anacoluthon in respect of Thyamis between 1.33 [cf. 2.19.6, 5.4.3] and

6.3.4). Charikleia is aware that she has four ‘fathers’—Hydaspes, Charikles, Kalasiris and Sisimithres (7.14.5-6, Καλάσιριν ἀνεκάλει κωκύουσα, τὸ γὰρ χρηστότατον ὄνομα καλεῖν ἀπεστέρημαι πατέρα, τοῦ δαίμονος πανταχόθεν μοι τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς προσηγορίαν περικόψαι φιλονεικήσαντος. Τὸν μὲν φύσει γεννήσαντα οὐκ ἔγνωκα, τὸν δὲ θέμενον Χαρικλέα, οἴμοι, προδέδωκα, τὸν δὲ διαδεξάμενον καὶ τρέφοντα καὶ περισφάζοντα ἀπολώλεκα). Her subconscious preoccupation with this conflict is suggested by Knemon’s analysis of the dream in which Charikleia had her right eye put out by a bloody swordsman (Knemon suggested that the loss of an eye meant that a parent would die, 2.16.5). Artemidorus put forward a similar interpretation in his textbook on dreams, except that he added that the right eye represented the life of a father (*Oneir.* 1.26). Winkler (1982, 114-117) argued that the dream is finally fulfilled with the death of Kalasiris (7.11.4), but Charikleia’s relationships with Charikles and Hydaspes are also important and the novel concludes only when this conflict is resolved and Hydaspes accepts the evidence of Charikleia and Sisimithres that she is his daughter (10.12.3; 10.14.6; 10.17.2), although Charikleia at one point threatens to reject him (10.20.2). The dream is reminiscent of the blinding of Polyphemus in a cave by Odysseus, which Porphyry (*On the Cave of the Nymphs in Homer* 35) interprets allegorically as Odysseus’ attempt to put aside the material world of the senses (Lamberton & Keaney 1992, 128-9) but this interpretation cannot convincingly be applied to Charikleia’s dream.

Kalasiris’ concern for Theagenes is apparent from the description he gives of his noble bearing (2.35.1-2), the oracle he receives in the temple of Apollo (2.35.5) and the fact that he was asked to cure Charikleia (with whom he knew Theagenes was in love) by her adoptive father Charikles (2.33.6-7; 3.9.1).

4.3.4 λοιπόν: For the supposedly late use of this word in the sense of ἤδη see Wifstrand (1944-1945, 40).

Knemon (7) asks Kalasiris for the result of the race

ὄτε κἀγὼ νυνὶ περὶ τῷ Θεαγένει δέδια καὶ σου δέομαι θάπτον εἰ νικῶν ἀνηγορεύθη διελθεῖν: for Knemon as an impulsive listener, cf. 3.1.1; 4.4.3.

4.4.1 μέσον . . . ἤνυετο τὸ στάδιον: this suggests (wrongly) that the race was one stade in length (Fontenrose 1988, 126) but Aristophanes (*Aves* 292) and Pausanias (2.2.8) show that the race was over two stades—a δίαιλος. At Nemea the length was doubled (Phil. *Gymn.* 7; cf. Eurip. *Electr.* 824-5) and the race at Plataea was over a considerable distance (Phil. *Gym.* 8).

The use of the historic present (ἀνακουφίζει), imperfect (ἤνυετο) and aorist

(παρέφθη) to pace the narrative is noteworthy here (Barber 1962, 23-134, 229); 4.5; 4.7.1 below, and note. Naber (1873, 163) thinks ἡνύετο should be emended to ἡνυστο, disregarding the narrative effect of the variation of tense entirely. He also unnecessarily wishes to replace ὑπερβαλόμενον with ὑπερβαλλόμενον, 3.15.1 (p. 322); καταριθμήσας with καταριθμούσας, 3.17.2 (p. 336); ἀπολειπών with ἀπολιπών, 4.13.1 (p. 341).

τὸ βλέμμα τε ὄλον εἰς τὴν Χαρίκλειαν τείνας: There may be an echo of Euripides *Iph. Aul.* 648, μέθεξ νῦν ὄφρὸν ὄμμα τ' ἔκτεινον φίλον in these words (Neimke 1889, 17); in a different context: cf. 10.16.2: τὸ ὄμμα δὲ οἴονεϊ κέρασ ἢ σίδηρον εἰς τὰ ὀρώμενα τείνας.

καθάπερ βέλος ἐπὶ σκοπόν: cf. 7.7.7 (Charikleia's words pierce Theagenes' heart like an arrow). Heliodorus frequently makes use of similes (see introduction for similes from books 3-4), some of which are very striking (e.g. 1.26.5, καθάπερ πάλαισμα τὸ πλάσμα [including a characteristic play on words] 'my invention [that Theagenes and Charikleia are siblings] is like a trick throw in wrestling'; 2.33.1, the young Charikleia is like a puppy; 7.7.7, Charikleia's eyes are like a shaft of sunlight between clouds; 7.14.7, Theagenes and Charikleia are like a pair of maimed horses). Occasionally, the comparisons are entirely tasteless (9.18.6, arrows project from the eye-sockets of the dead like the shafts of a double-flute). Heliodorus often repeats his comparisons, most obviously the obsessive comparison between the story of Theagenes and Charikleia and a stage drama (2.7.3; 2.8.3; 2.25.3; 2.23.5; 4.5.3; 5.6.3; 5.12.2; 7.6.4-5; 8.17.5; 9.11.6; 9.15.1; 9.24.6; 10.12.2; 10.13.5; 10.39.2; 10.39.2) but he also repeats images of hunting (1.30.7; 8.2.3; 7.11.7; 8.17.4; 9.1.1), becoming one in mind or body (2.6.3; 2.16.2; 4.3.3; 5.4.5; 10.35.2), and the sound of a trumpet (6.6.3; 10.30.5). The comparisons are often traditional (2.22.4, Kalasiris resembles a bird whose nest has been robbed: cf. Hom. *Il.* 2.311; Soph. *Ant.* 423ff., Moschus *Meg.* 21).

Kerényi (1962², 147 n. 138) stretches credibility too far with his suggestion that running is used by romance writers to mark crucial moments in the narrative.

τοσοῦτον παρέφθη τὸν Ἀρκάδα ὀργυιῶν πλήθος ὃ διαλείπον εἰς ὕστερον ἐμετρήθη: RL indicate that this is a *locus vix sanus*. Most MSS read τοσοῦτον (mAT) but τοσοῦτων (P) is also attested; παρέφθη (mAT) has a variant παρελήφθη (B); and ἐμετρήθη (mAT) is written as μετρηθῆναι in C. Koraes suggested that Heliodorus wrote τοσοῦτων (ἢ τοσοῦτον) παρέφθη τὸν Ἀρκάδα ὀργυιῶν πλήθος διαλιπών, ὡς ὕστερον ἐμετρήθη. There is support for his conjecture of διαλιπών for διαλείπον, since Heliodorus elsewhere uses διαλιπών meaning 'having left', e.g. μικρον . . . διαλιπών 'after a short interval' (2.6.1; 2.23.5; 9.3.3). Koraes' suggested Greek version does not correspond to the French translation he quotes (*Laissant*

derrière lui l'Arcadien de plusieurs brasses, comme l'on le mesura puis après). Lumb suggests τεσσάρων for τοσοῦτον supplying a figure in the place of τοσοῦτον which weakens the following ὁ διαλείπων as RL remark in their note. Moreover, an exact measurement cannot have been intended because of the impossibility of making such a measurement of the margin of victory. Thus Hadas: 'leaving the Arcadian behind by more than a furlong, as was subsequently determined by exact measurement' cannot be right; Rattenbury proposes πλήθος, ὡς τὸ διαλείπων εἰς ὕστερον μετρηθῆναι interpreting the passage to mean that the length by which Theagenes won was so great that a rough estimate of the interval between the first two runners was made after the race to ascertain the 'record'. Τὸ διαλείπων meaning 'the rest, the remainder, the interval' is found regularly (Xen. *Anab.* 4.8.13.2; Plut. *Mor.* 215a2), occasionally without the article (e.g., Arist. *On Rome* 199.22, ὅσον νῦν Ἰταλίας διαλείπόν ἐστιν, ἀναπληρωθῆναι τοῦτο πᾶν ἄν μοι δοκεῖ). Cf. Lamb: '(he) came in so many yards ahead of the Arcadian that the measure of the interval was taken afterwards'; Morgan (who acknowledges the problem in the text): 'finished several yards ahead of the Arkadian, the margin of victory being measured afterwards.' Rattenbury's text yields the best sense here; the gap between Theagenes and Alkamenes was so great that it was reconstructed and discussed after the race.

Homer's description of the victory of Klytoneos is also a little cryptic (Hom. *Od.* 8.123-5, τῶν δὲ θέειν ὄχ' ἄριστος ἔην Κλυτόνηος ἀμύμων / ὅσον τ' ἐν νειῶ οὖρον πέλει ἡμιόνουιν, / τόσσον ὑπεκπροθέων λαοὺς ἴκεθ', οἳ δ' ἐλίποντο.)

4.4.2 τὴν χεῖρα τῆς κόρης φιλῶν: A kiss on the hand appears to have been a gesture of politeness and respect in Heliodorus' day; compare the attempt of Theagenes to kiss the hand of Arsake, for which she substitutes her lips (7.16.6). So too Chaereas' Egyptian troops insist on kissing the head and hands of their general (Char. 8.4.11). More ambiguous are the adulterous kisses Melite bestows on Kleitophon's hands which she then places on her eyes and heart (Ach. Tat. 5.17.1). No doubt her actions in this instance reflect the way in which her seduction of him perverts the proper formal relationship between them.

Kisses between Heliodorus's hero and heroine are generally chaste (καθαροῖς . . . φιλήμασιν 5.4.5; ὄρκια τὰ φιλήματα ποιούμενοι, 5.5.3; cf. 2.1.3, 5.4.3-4, 7.6.1) and in no way similar to Achilles Tatius' comparison of the way women and young boys kiss (2.38.5; Goldhill 1995, 85-91) or indeed kisses in Longus (1.18.1; 2.7.7) and Chariton (2.8.1).

Knemon (8) begs Kalasiris to continue his story

« Ἀπέσωσας » εἶπεν ὁ Κνήμων « ὅτι καὶ ἐνίκησε καὶ ἐφίλησεν· ἀλλὰ τίνα δὴ τὰ ἐξῆς; »

Cf. 3.1.1, above, and note. The effect of Knemon's interruption here is to remind the reader of the frame-situation of the narrative but, for the romantic reader, there is also a 'community of values between Knemon and the reader' (Morgan 1991, 96).

ἤδη γοῦν οὐκ ὀλίγης μοίρας . . . οὐκ ἀποκναίει: cf. *Il.* 10.252-3. On Knemon as a reader: cf. 3.1.1, 3.4.9 above, and note; Sandy (1982a, 57).

Koraes rightly emends the reading of the codices (ἀποκναίεις) to ἀποκναίει.

4.4.3 Ἐγὼ καὶ Ὀμήρῳ μέμφομαι: cf. Homer *Il.* 13.636-9: πάντων μὲν κόρος ἐστὶ καὶ ὕπνου καὶ φιλότητος / μολπῆς τε γλυκερῆς καὶ ἀμύμονος ὀρχηθμοῖο, / τῶν πέρ τις καὶ μᾶλλον ἐέλδεται ἐξ ἔρον εἶναι / ἢ πολέμου· Τρῶες δὲ μάχης ἀκόρητοι ἔασιν 'There is satiety in all things, sleep and love / sweet song and the blameless dance, / and a man longs to discharge his desire for these things more / than for war. But the Trojans are insatiable in battle'. Koraes thought the sentiments of Knemon were better suited to a Milesian tale than to the romance of Heliodorus, quoting by preference Pindar (*Nem.* 7.52-3, κόρον δ' ἔχει / καὶ μέλι καὶ τὰ τέρπν' ἄνθε' Ἀφροδίσια), to the effect that there is satiety in love. However, Koraes fails to observe the characterisation of Knemon here as an impulsive and romantic young man. His character here is consistent with his troubled life in Athens.

οὔτε καθ' ἡδονὴν ἀνυόμενον οὔτε εἰς ἀκοὴν ἐρχόμενον 'neither when it is pleasurably fulfilled, nor when one comes to hear of it': Cataudella (1976, 157-161) suspects εἰς ἀκοὴν ἐρχόμενον 'when it comes to one's ear' on the grounds that the second half of the correlative οὔτε . . . οὔτε construction is normally of equal weight or carries greater emphasis than the first. Moreover, the expression in suggests a report rather than the telling of a love story. Instead he suggests εἰς ἀκμὴν ἐρχόμενον, a phrase used elsewhere by Heliodorus (9.25.1, εἰς ἀκμὴν τοσαύτην ἦκειν 'to have come to such a peak of youthful beauty') and glosses the phrase under discussion as 'l'amore non conosce sazietà nè quando è appagato nè quando si sia giunti al culmine di esso'. But ἀκοὴν clearly refers to ἀκουσμάτων (4.4.2). Note also the closely preceding εἰς ἀκοὴν πάντων (4.3.3) and the immediately following τίς οὕτως ἀδαμάντινος ἢ σιδηροῦς τὴν καρδίαν ὡς μὴ θέλγεσθαι καὶ εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν ἀκούων; (4.4.3) whence no doubt the anomalous κλύοιτο in the line κἄν ἡδονὴ τελοῖτο, κἄν κλύοιτό μοι of Nicetas Eugenianus (6.352) derives. Furthermore, ἀκμὴν would dwell on sexuality in a manner more suited to Achilles Tatius (cf., *Ach. Tat.* 2.37.8, ἐν δὲ τῇ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἀκμῇ οἰστρεῖ μὲν ὑφ' ἡδονῆς 'in a sexual climax the woman writhes with pleasure', and the comment of Koraes in the note above; *Ach. Tat.* 2.36.1, ποθεινὸν γὰρ αἰεὶ τὸ ἀκόρεστον). The words καθ' ἡδονὴν ἀνυόμενον already convey the idea of a sexual climax and a repetition of this in the second half of the correlative expression would be

redundant. The passage does make direct reference to the joys of love and Heliodorus may have wanted to portray Knemon as a young man engrossed in sensuality, who picks out sex from the Homer passage and passes by the more pessimistic comment on man's propensity for war (cf. 3.4.7 above, and note), but ἀκμήν is not required for this effect.

τίς οὕτως ἀδαμάντινος . . . ἀκούων: perhaps an indirect reference by Heliodorus to his own work (Woronoff 1987, 41; Sandy 1982a, 25; cf. 3.1.2; 3.15.1 above, and notes). Knemon certainly reveals himself here as an enthusiastic audience of love stories (cf. 3.1.1, and note; 4.3.4) but it is not necessary to assume that all readers would share this attitude to the narrative (cf. Morgan 1991, 96). The sentiment is in any case something of a commonplace and too much should not be read into it. Cf. *Od.* 4.293; Pind. fr. 123 (Schroeder); Plut. *Mor.* 90f10. Longus *Proem* 2 is a more serious and programmatic expression of the value of romantic fiction.

Ἄδαμάντινος is a favourite adjective with Philostratus (e.g., *Her.* 679 [Olearius]; *VA* 1.17; 3.21; 6.10). The word is also used to describe the teachings of Apollonius of Tyana (cf. *Suda s.v.* 'ἀδαμάντινα', δόξαι βραχεῖαι καὶ ἀδαμάντιναι). The noun form had been used by Pindar (fr. 123 [Maehler], ὅς μὴ πόθῳ κυμαίνεται, ἐξ ἀδάμαντος ἢ σιδάρου κεχάλκευται μέλαιναν καρδίαν). Note the continued poetic life of the word in the famous lines of Milton (*PL* 1.44-49). The metaphor comparing an unfeeling heart to iron is commonplace. Cf., e.g., *Il.* 24.205; *Od.* 4.293; 5.191.

The effect of the race on Charikleia

4.4.4 ἡ Χαρίκλεια δὲ ἥττητο λαμπρῶς καὶ δεδούλωτο τῷ πόθῳ πλέον ἢ πρότερον: for the metaphor of love as enslavement see the section on language and style in the introduction. Further examples of this metaphor occur at 3.19.1 Δεδούλωτο μὲν γὰρ ὀλοσχερῶς τῷ πάθει; and 5.2.10, δουλεύεις τὸ μόνον ἐλεύθερον καὶ ἀδούλωτον πλὴν ἔρωτος φρόνημα.

Ἡ γὰρ τῶν ἐρωτικῶν ἀντίβλεψις ὑπόμνησις τοῦ πάσχοντος γίνεται καὶ ἀναφλέγει τὴν διάνοιαν ἢ θεὰ καθάπερ ὕλη πυρὶ γινομένη: A reminiscence of the first encounter of Theagenes and Charikleia (3.5.4-6). For other instances of 'love at first sight' in the novels: cf. *Ach. Tat.* 1.4.2-5; 1.9.3-6; *Char.* 1.1.6-8; *Xenophon Ephesus* 1.3.1-4. The idea originates with Plato *Phaedr.* 251b. For the fire metaphor: cf. 4.18.5.

The word ἀντίβλεψις is used by *Xenophon Hier.* 1.35; *Plut. Mor.* 681B; *Ael. NA* 418.4. *Pollux* (2.56) notes that the usage originates with *Xenophon* (Baumgarten 1932, 10).

KALASIRIS TESTS THE FEELINGS OF CHARIKLEIA AND THEAGENES

Kalasisiris ponders what to do

4.4.5 συνήθη νύκτα ταῖς προτέραις: cf. 3.18.2; 4.5.2.

ἐγὼ δὲ αὐθις ἄνπιος ἦν: this is the third time Kalasisiris expresses his anxiety about how to escape from Delphi (cf. 3.11.4; 3.15.2-3). On the previous occasion (3.15.3), Kalasisiris had exaggerated his worries. The lapse of time, during which the games took place, has removed his concerns about how to bring the young couple together, since they both showed their passionate love for one another then. He now finally remembers the oracle and interprets it correctly to mean that their flight must be by sea (cf. below, 4.4.5 and note), although he failed to call it to mind earlier (3.15.3). It is surprising that Kalasisiris only now thinks of the band which Charikles had told him had been exposed with Charikleia (Hefti 1950, 63-64; 4.5.1 below, and note).

τήν τε φυγὴν: the neoPlatonists, especially Plotinus, talked of the flight of the soul from the material world to her homeland (Merkelbach 1962, 247 n. 2, who quotes *Enn.* 1.6; 2.3; 6.9; Plato *Theaetet.* 176A). Cf. also 4.18.2 (Theagenes and Charikleia are fugitives just as Homer fled his home [3.14.4] and Kalasisiris fled Memphis [3.16.5]).

On the narratological level, Kalasisiris immediately turns his mind to flight because he knew that Charikles had already engaged Charikleia to be married to his nephew, Alkamenes (2.33.4) and that Charikles was the priest of Pythian Apollo and therefore one of the leading citizens in Delphi (2.29.1). Moreover, he was aware that the laws of Delphi prescribe death for those who carry off girls, as he tells Theagenes later (4.6.6). Theagenes threatens violence to Alkamenes when he hears of the match (4.6.7) and Charikleia makes it clear that she will kill herself rather than submit to the arrangement (4.7.11; 4.11.3). Charikles himself is (unusually) diffident about his influence over his daughter, although he wants the match more than anything in the world (4.7.9) and would use force to bring it about (4.13.2). The custom of arranging marriages is accepted in the *Ethiopian Story* (cf. Persinna's assumption that Charikleia will submit to her parents' decision to marry her to Meroebos, 10.21.3, and Charikleia's coyness in explaining the true situation, 10.18.2; 10.19.2; 10.20.2; 10.22.1; cf. Winkler [1982, 132]). However, it is the practical difficulty of how to arrange their escape rather than the moral dilemma that worries Kalasisiris.

In general, Greek marriages were arranged by the parents of the bride and groom. In Achilles Tatius the hero Kleitophon is engaged to marry his half sister, Kalligone

(1.3.2)—a fact which he accepts even when he falls in love with the heroine, Leukippe. Kleitophon explains to his friend Kleinias that he felt a sense of duty to his father in this matter, since the match was not being arranged for money and the girl was neither a foreigner nor ugly (1.11.2). Kleitophon's sense of obligation may stem from the fact that his mother had died when he was very young (1.3.2). Despite this, however, when Kleitophon is discovered in Leukippe's bedroom, the lovers both agree to elope (2.30.1-2). Achilles also tells the story of Charikles, who is engaged to marry an ugly girl for her money (1.7.4) and later the fathers of Leukippe and Kleitophon correspond concerning Leukippe's engagement to Kleitophon (5.10.2). Thus both Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus set their plots in motion with an elopement (Durham 1938, 13) but the reasons given are very different; Leukippe agrees to flee after Kleitophon was almost caught by her mother in her bedroom (2.27) whereas in the *Ethiopian Story* Charikleia leaves Delphi in order to return to her motherland and to regain her rightful place in society (4.13.2)—clearly a more moral motive.

In Chariton, the lovers come from opposed political families (1.1.3) but fall in love nevertheless (1.1.6). The father of the hero, Chaereas, dissuades him from the marriage because of this (1.1.9) but the people of the city insist on it when they hear that the couple are in love, because they are both outstandingly beautiful, and eventually Hermocrates gives his consent (1.1.11-12). The heroine, Kallirhoe, does not know whom she is to marry until Chaereas is brought to her as her bridegroom (1.1.14-15).

In the case of Xenophon's *Ephesian Tale*, the parents of Habrokomes and Antheia marry the lovers and send them on a trip abroad after consulting an oracle to this effect (1.7.1-2). Longus's Daphnis and Chloe only marry at the conclusion of the novel after being recognised as the children of noblemen of Mytilene and securing their consent to the match (4.21, 4.35, 4.36, 4.40).

Τὸν μὲν δὴ δρασμὸν μόνον ἔγνων: RL restore μόνον which they conjecture fell out of the text but was wrongly restored after ἔγνω (B) or θάλατταν (C) and was left out by the other mss. However, the inclusion of μόνον is rather awkward since it occurs just after μὲν (and therefore makes the correlative construction with δέ more difficult) and results in six syllables ending in nasals in six words. Μόνον is not necessary and should be omitted.

κῦμα τεμόντας κτλ: cf. 2.35.5 (the full version of the oracle). In this instance, the prophecy was unusual in that it was pronounced during a public sacrifice rather than in a private consultation. At the time, the bystanders did not understand the prophecy, since each person tried to interpret it to suit himself and no-one took sufficient time to make

sense of it. Kalasiris further undermines the oracle for the reader by adding that the interpretation of dreams and oracles depends on their outcome in any case (2.36). Heliodorus has therefore invested the words of the priestess with a great deal of ambiguity: on the one hand, they are delivered on a significant occasion, on the other, they are not understood or considered important. This passage stresses the sceptical attitude of Kalasiris, which helps to explain his inability to read the will of fate to some extent (cf. 3.12.1 above, and note). The reader is also left with the impression that the lovers are under the guidance of destiny but is in the dark as to how, or indeed whether, the oracle will be fulfilled at the conclusion of the novel (10.41.2; Morgan 1990, 148-190).

The origin and function of the Delphic oracle has been extensively studied (see bibliography under 'Delphi'). Anthropological studies of similar institutions in African culture have shed light of how the oracle functioned in an oral society (Evans-Pritchard 1937; Whittaker 1965, 21-47). Plutarch's three Delphic dialogues *On the E at Delphi*, *Why Delphic oracles are not given in verse* and *On the Decline of Oracles* all give important information about the sanctuary in the second century AD, but with the rise of Christianity and the persecution of the pagan prophets in the fourth century, the authority of the oracles declined and 'holy men' (such as Kalasiris) gained in prestige (Lane Fox 1986, 679-681).

4.5.1 Τὸ δὲ ὄποι παραπεμπτέον . . . ταινίας; Kalasiris already suspected what was going to happen (cf. 3.5.7 above, and note; 3.11.4; 4.4.5; Winkler 1982, 150; Sandy 1982a, 41) but his uncertainty here forces the reader to puzzle out the plot.

The word ταινία refers to any strip of material but in this context to a swaddling band (cf. Soranus *Gyn.* 2.14.1), which the gymnosophist Sisimithres found with the baby Charikleia (2.31.2) and which he gave to Charikles at Katadoupoi (2.31.4). Although the existence of the band has been known to the reader for some time, this is the first time that its importance becomes apparent, although the first-time reader cannot yet know why. There are several unanswered questions concerning the band: (i) Why does Kalasiris not simply ask Charikles for the band? Is it because Heliodorus cannot allow Charikles to share the information that would result (cf. 4.8.1 below and note)? Or does the answer lie in the fact that the oracle has indicated that their destiny lies overseas, which entails that Charikles must lose his daughter? Or does the sheer unexpectedness of a Greek child coming from Ethiopia delay Kalasiris' request (Hefti 1950, 64)? (ii) Why did Charikles not get the band translated while he was in Egypt? Is it because Sisimithres had told him that the band was written in native (ἑγχωρίως) characters? Is Charikles simply obtuse (cf. 3.5.7 and note)? Or does he simply not want to know (cf. 4.11.3 and note)? Heliodorus has

concealed much from his readers, here as elsewhere (cf. 4.8.1 below, and note), perhaps as a result of having to maintain the pace of his narrative, despite the complexity of the plot (cf. 3.2.3 above, and note).

Whatever the reason for the delay, Kalasiris eventually asks Charikles for the band under the pretext that it was imbued with hostile magic (4.7.13); when Charikles brings him the band he reads it and learns the story of Charikleia's birth and exposure (4.8.1-6); Kalasiris then tells Charikleia of the band and the story of her birth and she remembers how Charikles had kept it locked in a casket (4.11.3); Kalasiris tells her he had tried for a long time to obtain the band (4.13.1); Later Charikleia tells Theagenes of the band and the ring with the magic pantarb stone (8.11.9); she eventually produces it in the recognition scene at the conclusion of the romance (10.13.1-3) during which Sisimithres confirms the story of her miraculous birth (10.14.1-7).

καὶ τοὺς ὑπονοηθέντας ἤδη παρ' ἐμοὶ γεννήτορας: Kalasiris has some idea who the parents of Charikleia are because he claims that during his travels in Ethiopia he was instructed to find her by her mother, Persinna, the queen of that country (4.12.1-13.1). Previously, he had said that he was an exile from Memphis because he had been seduced by Rhodopis—a failing unsuited to his position as high priest of Isis—and also because he knew that he would witness the mortal combat of his two sons if he stayed (2.25.1-7). Much has been made of this inconsistency in the plot by Futre Pinheiro (1991b, 79-80); Winkler (1982, 93); Reardon (1971, 390-392); and Hefti (1950, 72-78). See 4.12.3 below, and note.

τοὺς ὑπονοηθέντας ἤδη παρ' ἐμοὶ γεννήτορας τῆς κόρης ἐντεῦθεν ἐκμαθεῖν: Kalasiris does not explain the grounds on which he has guessed the identity of Charikleia's parents. Later (4.9.1 below, and note) he talks of the discovery of what had been unknown.

ὑπὸ τῆς εἰμαρμένης 'by destiny': cf. 2.24.6, οὐρανία φωστῆρων εἰμαρμένη περίοδος 'the destined cycle of the stars of heaven'; 4.11.3, τὸ τῆς εἰμαρμένης 'my destined end'; 5.6.2, τὴν πανταχοῦ διώκουσαν εἰμαρμένην 'destiny which pursues us everywhere'; 7.6.5, ὑπὸ τῆς εἰμαρμένης 'by destiny'; 8.17.1, ὑπὸ τῶν εἰμαρμένων χειραγωγουμένη 'led by the hand of the fates'.

Μοῖραι is also used for destiny or fate (2.20.2; 2.24.6; 3.9.11; 3.16.5; 6.15.1; 7.7.2; 7.8.1; 8.11.2; 10.3.3; 10.20.2 capitalised by RL) but also, in a weaker sense, for 'evil, death' (1.33.3; 2.25.1) and, finally, in the ordinary sense of 'portion, part' (1.3.3; 2.34.2; 4.4.2; 5.7.2; 7.19.5; 8.16.4; 9.1.5; 9.3.1; 9.11.5).

Τύχη is a powerful force in the *Ethiopian Story*. Cf. below 4.8.6. The concept of

destiny is complemented in the romance by the notion of ‘providence’ (cf. below 4.9.1). Heliodorus appears not to have been concerned that the pagan concept of destiny occurs side by side with the Christian idea of providence.

Kalasisiris visits Charikles

4.5.2 Ἐπέτεινεν ἡ νόσος: a technical medical expression. Cf. e.g., Hipp. *De morb. pop.* 3.3.17(5); Galen *De Crisibus* 9.629.6.

χαλεπωτέρας ἢ πρότερον πεπεύραται τῆς παρηκούσης νυκτός: this is the third night at least in which Charikleia has been without sleep and yet Charikles has not complained at Kalasisiris’ neglect of his daughter (Hefti 1950, 64). However, it was common for illness to run a long course in antiquity: cf., e.g., Hippoc. *Epid.* 3.8, 3.9.

τρίποδά τις καὶ δάφνην καὶ πῦρ καὶ λιβανωτὸν παραθέσθω: the implements used by the priestess of Apollo at Delphi. The incense appears to be the odd item (cf. Plut. *De Pyth Orac.* 397a5). However, a more appropriate *comparandum* would be the ‘exorcism’ performed on Antheia after she became love-sick for Habrokomes (X. Eph. 1.5.6-7, Οἱ δὲ ἐλθόντες ἔθυόν τε ἱερεῖα καὶ ποικίλα ἐπέσπενδον καὶ ἐπέλεγον φωνὰς βαρβαρικός). Cf. the case of a girl bewitched by a love-spell and exorcised by a ‘holy-man’ (Theodoretus *Hist. Rel.* 13.10-12) and the cases of the enchantment of chaste and noble ladies amid the political uncertainties of the fourth century mentioned by Brown (1970, 17-45). The paraphernalia of Kalasisiris’ mumbo-jumbo bears a close resemblance to that used in the sensational conspiracy of Patricius and Hilarius against the emperor Valens in 371. The conspirators confessed under torture to have used a Delphic tripod, consecrated with spells and incantations, from which a ring was suspended over a ouija board in a room fumigated with Arabian spices, to produce the name of Valens’ successor, Theodorus. The proceedings were conducted by a man wearing linen garments, shod in linen sandals and carrying branches of an auspicious tree (Amm. Marc. 29.1.27-32). All the elements of Kalasisiris’ rites are present in this incident: clothing, tripod, laurel branch, fire and incense, though these elements were probably largely conventional.

προσκαλέσωμαι: Naber (1873, 318) suggests εἰσκαλέσωμαι but Heliodorus evidently likes to vary the prefixes of compound verbs and there is no need to normalise the text.

Kalasisiris pretends to work magic on Charikleia and discusses her well-being with her

4.5.3 ψιθύροις: A marvellously evocative word—onomatopoeic and suggestive (Hesch. [*ad* ψυθός] glosses this word with ψυθός and ψεῦδος, aptly in the context). According to the *Suda* (*ad* ψιθυρίζω, ψιθυριστής) the word conveys the sound of a gentle wind blowing

through the leaves of trees (cf. Theocr. *Id.* 1.1) and is used as an attribute of Aphrodite. The word is also applied to the slanders of an accuser (Soph. *Ajax* 148, Τοιούσδε λόγους ψιθύρους πλάσσων / εἰς ὧτα φέρει πᾶσιν Ὀδυσσεύς, / καὶ σφόδρα πείθει). Hermes in his human form carries this epithet when he comes among men and causes slander among them (*Ep. ad Cor.* 12.20.4).

ἤρχομένη ὡς περ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τῆς ὑποκρίσεως: for the theatre simile see above (4.4.1). Both Kalasiris and Charikleia maintain a pretence with one another here (as Odysseus and Penelope did: cf. *Od.* 23 *passim*). For Charikleia's reserve see 4.5.4 below, and note.

ὑπνώδες τι μᾶλλον δὲ γραῶδες ἐπιχασμῶμενος: exorcisms by holy men in antiquity were often staged for maximum effect (Anderson 1993a, 91-94) and magic, as in Apuleius' *Apologia de Magia*, for example, was a common theme in the rhetoric of the Second Sophistic (Anderson 1993b, 223-227).

Γραῶδης is post-classical and commonly used with μῦθος (cf. Strabo 1.2.3.48-50) but μᾶλλον δέ is classical (cf. Dem. *De Cor.* 65). Ἐπιχασμᾶσθαι is found nowhere else (perhaps because it is colloquial [Colonna 1982, 56]—this may be the case since yawning to draw out the evil inflicted by the 'jealous eye' that still belongs to folk tradition [Yatromanolakis 1988, 203] and the word certainly does not occur in the written tradition since the closest cognate is ἐπιχάσκοντας in the *Suda s.v.* Σαρδάνιος γέλως).

4.5.4 Ἡ δὲ πυκνὰ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐπέσειε καὶ σεσηρὸς ὑπεμειδία: RL point out that Charikleia is not taken in by Kalasiris' mumbo-jumbo as easily as Theagenes was (cf. 3.16.2; 3.17.2; 3.17.5). Kalasiris later acknowledges her cleverness and perspicacity (5.26.2). Charikleia does not immediately admit that what is troubling her is her passion for Theagenes (cf. 4.5.6; 4.6.1); she is being disingenuous (*schalkshaft*: Hefti 1950, 64). Compare the interesting case of the intelligent young lady, Sosipatra, who stood up to magic spells which a relative tried to cast on her (Eunapius 6.6.5 [Giangrande]; Winkler 1982, 131).

σεσηρὸς: cf. Hesychius *s.v.*, who describes the word as meaning 'to laugh mentally, or rhetorically or affectedly' (σεσηρυῖαι: γελῶσαι κατὰ θυμοῦ, ἢ ἐν ὑποκρίσει, ἢ προσποιητῶς).

πλανᾶσθαι με τὴν ἄλλως καὶ τὴν νόσον ἀγνοεῖν: Koraes' suggestion τὴν ἄλλως (sc. ὁδόν with the metaphorical use of πλανᾶσθαι here) has inexplicably not been followed by RL, who keep the expression in their text elsewhere (5.26.4, ἄχθος τὴν ἄλλως 'a useless burden'; 5.33.3, εἰπόμην . . τὴν ἄλλως 'I followed vainly'; 8.3.8, προνοεῖν τὴν ἄλλως 'to hope futilely'; 9.24.7, κειμάλια τὴν ἄλλως 'useless trinkets'). The expression originated in Plato (*Theaet.* 172e6-7, οἱ ἀγῶνες οὐδέποτε τὴν ἄλλως ἀλλ' ἀεὶ τὴν περὶ αὐτοῦ, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ

περὶ ψυχῆς ὁ δρόμος) and is clarified by Aristophanes (*Av.* 4, Ἐπολούμεθ' ἄλλως τὴν ὁδὸν προφορουμένω). This usage was particularly popular in Late Greek: cf., e.g., *Aristid.* p. 130 l. 15 (Jebb).

τὸ ἐνόπλιον δραμών: cf. 4.21.1 ἐνόπλιον should possibly be ἐνόπλον: cf. *Phil. Gymn.* 7; *Call. Dem.* 241; *DH* 22.2.

4.5.5 ἀνηγόρευεν: Colonna (1938) prefers the aorist here, but restores the imperfect in his 1987 text. Heliodorus' actual usage is favours the two tenses equally after ὅτε: cf., e.g., 2.7.2, 2.8.5, 3.5.4, 3.14.4, 4.5.4, 4.14.1, 5.18.8, 7.6.4, 8.3.4, 9.13.2 10.18.3 (Imperfect); 2.12.2, 2.26.3, 2.35.3, 4.13.5, 4.19.9, 5.31.1, 5.33.2, 7.7.2, 10.11.1, 10.14.1, 10.18.2 (Aorist). In the absence of clear evidence for the aorist, the reading of the majority of the mss., ἀνηγόρευεν, should be retained.

πιστουμένων: RL read πιστουμένων (CB) rather than πιστουμένω (VMPZAT) citing a similar use of an unattached genitive participle (ἄρδοντος, 9.9.3), where the antecedent is Νεῖλον. Here the antecedents must be understood to be μεγέθει and κάλλει—the young man's stature and beauty are proof of good birth. This yields better sense than πιστουμένω (agreeing with μοι) 'I guarantee his good birth'.

οὐχ ὑπέρφρων οὐδὲ ἀγήνωρ: In the *Iliad* (9.699) Diomedes accuses Achilles of arrogance: ὁ δ' ἀγήνωρ ἐστὶ καὶ ἄλλως.

4.5.6 ὑπεραλγοῦντι τὰ ἡμέτερα: a dative complements this verb in the classical writers: cf., e.g., *Hdt.* 2.129.

4.5.7 « Εἶτα ἀποκρύπτεις » ἔφην « ᾧ τέκνον, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ θαρσοῦσα λέγεις, ὅπως ἂν καὶ βοηθείας εὐπορήσαιμεν; »: in an unpublished paper delivered at Groningen in 1994, Hansen noted the close resemblance of these words to those of Appion in the *Clementine Recognitions* (*Hom.* 5.3.2, Τέκνον, ὡς πατρὶ θαρσῆσας λέγε, τίς σου τῆς ψυχῆς ἡ νόσος;).

οὐχὶ πατήρ εἰμί σοι: cf. 4.3.4 and note.

ὁμόψυχος: a late, Christian term. Cf. *Macc.* 4.14.20; *Eus. Vita Const.* 2.68.2.

χορήγει: yet another dramatic metaphor: cf. introduction on style (metaphors). Χορηγέω means to provide a chorus for a drama, from which a metaphorical meaning 'minister to', 'indulge' (with a dative complement) developed. Cf. *LSJ*⁹ s.v. χορηγέω II.2, citing *Aeschin.* 3.240 (ἡδοναῖς) and *Luc. Par.* 12 (ἐπιθυμίας), but the metaphorical force of the word was weak: cf. 1.28.5 (the Nile supplied by rain).

εὐβοθήητον: a medical term: cf. *Hippocr. De Diaeta Acutorum* 5.15; *Paulus Aegineta Epit. Med.* 5.36.1.4. The thought is echoed by *Antonius Melissa* (2.80; cf. Colonna [1987a, 363]).

ἔγγυς ἀνίατον: σχεδόν rather than ἔγγυς would be the Attic usage (Naber 1873, 157).

τροφή γὰρ νόσων ἢ σιωπή: cf. Ach. Tat. 2.29.5, ἀλγεινότερα γίνεται τὰ ἔλκη τῇ σιωπῇ; Aristaenet. 1.16; Soph. *Phil.* 795 [Feuillâtre 1966, 84]).

εὐπαραμύθητον: A philosophical word: cf. Plat. *Leg.* 885b8; Plut. *Cons. ad Apoll.* 110e5; Sext. Emp. *Adv. Math.* 10.212.1.

4.6.1 τὸ αἰδούμενον: Neuter article and participle for noun—a feature of the style of Thucydides much favoured by Heliodorus: cf. also 2.15.1; 7.28.1. Other examples in books 3 & 4 may be found at 3.3.4; 3.15.1; 3.15.3; 4.1.2; 4.1.3; 4.6.1; 4.15.3; 4.18.3.

Kalasis reports to Charikles

4.6.2 « Πάντα δεξιῶς » ἔλεγον: for Charikles' belief in the magic powers of Kalasis, cf. 3.9.1 above, and note; 3.19.3.

ἕτερον δέ τι τῶν σοι καθ' ἡδονὴν ὑποστήσεται: Hefti (1950, 64-66) suggests that Kalasis here cryptically refers to his intended flight from Delphi with Charikles' daughter (*faßt also die Flucht unmittelbar ins Auge*), but how can this be to Charikles' liking? Kalasis is hinting to Charikles that he would learn that Charikleia had changed her attitude to love. This is, in fact, what happens, to Charikles' great joy (4.7.1). Of course, Kalasis is quite safe in making this prediction since he knows that Charikleia is, in fact, in love (but with Theagenes). His ambiguous statement is designed to strengthen his influence over Charikles.

κωλύει δὲ οὐδὲν καὶ ἰατρῶν τινα εἰσκαλεῖν: These words, which come immediately after Kalasis' promise of a cure for Charikleia, are best understood as a strategy by Kalasis to secure the revelation that Charikleia is in love, since she would not reveal this fact of her own volition even to him (cf. 4.6.1). The suggestion that Kalasis intends them to convey his contempt for ordinary doctors, as Charikles' later words to him may suggest (4.7.8, ὄν μόνον εὐεργετησαὶ δύνασθαι κάκεινη γινώσκει), is therefore unnecessary (cf. Hefti 1950, 64). Kalasis' statement is thus a good example of how Heliodorus plans the development of his narrative.

Kalasis talks with Theagenes

4.6.3 περὶ τὸν νεῶν καὶ τὸν περίβολον: although Heliodorus gives a realistic account of the procession at Delphi, he does not give a precise, detailed description of the temple of Apollo here—certain details are picked out against an indiscriminate background of the scene being described (cf. 3.1.5 above, and note). The temple is mentioned also at 2.26.5; 2.35.4; cf. Feuillâtre 1966, 48.

ὡσπερ ἀποχρῶν αὐτῷ καὶ μόνην τὴν οἴκησιν τῆς Χαρικλείας περισκοπεῖν: There is irony here, this time at Theagenes' expense (Hefti 1950, 114 and n. 940). Theagenes here resembles the ardent lover of Greek New Comedy and there are suggestions of the *paraklausithyron* topos.

Kalasisiris' encounter with Theagenes

4.6.4 Ἥγανάκτου ἐγὼ μέχρι τῶν ὄψεων: Cf. 3.17.5 above, and note. The expression is also common in Achilles Tatius: cf., e.g. 1.9.3, μέχρι τῶν ὀμμάτων εὐτυχῆ.

τὴν ἐμὴν τέχνην, ὑφ' ἧς ἤλωκεν ἤδη: cf. 3.17.5, τέχνη καὶ φύσιν οἶδε βιάζεσθαι; 4.14.1, σὺν τέχνῃ πολλῇ καὶ σοφίᾳ τῇ ἐμῇ; 4.15.3, τὸ κατηναγκασμένον τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἀμετάβλητον ἔχει παρὰ τῆς τέχνης ἢ κόρη. Kalasisiris' methods here are clearly fraudulent and resemble, in effect, those of the go-between of Greek New Comedy (Sandy 1982b, 145). He goes along with Theagenes' belief in the magic powers of Egyptian priests, although he reserves for himself knowledge of higher wisdom (3.16.3).

ἐρᾶν . . . ὄρᾶν: for the homoioteleuton and the link between vision and love, cf. 3.5.4 above, and note.

4.6.5 ἐρᾶ μου Χαρίκλεια; Colonna (1938, 1987b) reads ὄρᾶν ἐμὲ Χαρίκλειαν; ('Cariclea vuole vedermi?') taking the words as an echo of the earlier ἐρᾶν σου κατηνάγκασται καὶ ὄρᾶν ὡσπερ τινὰ τῶν κρειπτόνων εὐχεται. However, the more significant of the two words for Theagenes would undoubtedly have been ἐρᾶν and the expression was common and idiomatic in the romances: cf., e.g., X. Eph. 1.14.7, 1.16.4, 2.1.2, 2.1.5, 2.3.7, 2.5.1, 2.5.7, 2.11.1, 3.12.3, 4.5.1; Long. 3.17.1; Ach. Tat. 1.17.2.

οὐ γὰρ ἄρπαγμα τὸ πρᾶγμα: The play on words is repeated at 7.20.2, where Heliodorus uses the word ἄρπαγμα metaphorically to describe how Cybele hunts Theagenes and Charikleia on behalf of Arsake as sexual prey (7.11.7) and how she portrays her mistress in the same terms to Theagenes (7.20.2). The word also suggests Arsake's sexual frustration when used to describe how the Persian queen eagerly grabs at Cybele's words (8.7.1). Related forms of the verb are used to describe the abduction of Thisbe (2.24.1; 6.8.1) and Charikleia (4.19.1; 4.21.1; 5.20.7; 7.11.7; 10.37.1). The sexual connotations justify the translation 'rape' rather than 'robbery' (for which, cf. Plut. 330D [Stephanus]; Paul *Ad Phil.* 2.6; quoted by Eus. *Eccl. Theol.* 1.13.6; Johannes Chrysostom *In Ep. ad Phil.* Vol. 62 p. 218 l. 43).

εὔωνον . . . προκειμένων: RL's reading for the προκειμένων of the codices which Colonna (1938, 1987b) retains. It is doubtful, however, that Heliodorus would have used punctuation to coordinate his sentence in this way and the shift from neuter singular to genitive

plural and back is extremely awkward. The words ἐν μέσῳ and (προ)κείμενος are commonly associated: cf., e.g., Dem. *Phil.* 1.5, ἄθλα τοῦ πολέμου κείμεν' ἐν μέσῳ; Xen. *Anab.* 3.1.21; Liban. 59.166; LSJ⁹ s.v. μέσος IIIa (of prizes offered in a competition). Cf. also κρατῆρος ἐν μέσῳ προκειμένου, Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* 615b. In the context, εὐωνον implies 'a cheap slave or prostitute': cf., e.g., σωματίον δὲ ἔχω ἀρρενικὸν πωλῆσαι εὐωνον, *Vita Aesopi* 12.8.

4.6.6 Τοὺς δὲ νόμους οὐκ ἐννοεῖς οἱ θάνατον τοῖς τοιούτοις ἐπιβάλλουσιν; Constantine had passed legislation which laid down the penalty of having molten lead poured down the throats of those who abducted girls before their wedding day (*CTh* 9.24.1): the practice of abducting girls on their marriage days was often condoned as a way of obviating arranged marriages. Cf. 4.4.5 above, and note.

οὐ διαφέρομαι: an expression that is the equivalent of οὐ μοι διαφέρει: cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. διαφέρω IV, who quote Dem. 9.8 (φάσκειν δ' εἰρήνην ἄγειν εἰ βούλεσθε, ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνος, οὐ διαφέρομαι). Cf. also, in later Greek, Aristid. 296.16, 410.13, 470.34 (Jebb); Clem. Alex. *Protrepticus* 4.47.4.5.

οὐ γὰρ δὴ μὴ ἀνάξιοί γε τῷ Χαρικλεῖ κηδεύσωμεν: the combination of the emphatic particle δὴ with an asseverative γὰρ and a following γε 'for clearing the ground by ruling out at least one possibility' (*GP* p. 243) is normal: cf. (οὐ γὰρ δὴ), 2.11.3, 2.11.5, 2.22.5, 7.26.9, 8.9.15. The expression is concentrated by the particle γε ('at any rate'): cf. S. *El.* 1029 (Οὐ ποτ' ἐξ ἐμοῦ γε μὴ πάθης τόδε); *GP* pp. 114-116. The subjunctive κηδεύσωμεν with οὐ μὴ expresses an emphatic assertion, here reinforced by litotes (οὐ . . . μὴ ἀνάξιοι). The combination of all these elements is striking and serves to underline Theagenes' self-esteem and determination. RL refer to this passage at 5.2.2 n. 3 to support the less easily justifiable reading there (οὐ μὴ μανῶ) but the usages are not comparable. The combination οὐ γὰρ δὴ μὴ does occur in late Greek: cf. Liban. 52.32.3 (+ fut. ind.); John Chrysostom 60.244.14 (+ fut. ind.); Constant. *De Leg.* p. 538.14 (+ subj.), *De Sent.* 67.12 (+ subj.). Cf. App. *Hisp.* 53.2 (+ subj.). Occasionally editors punctuate with a comma after δὴ and this may help to clarify the text here.

ὁ Χαρικλῆς ἀδελφῆς ἑαυτοῦ παιδὶ τὴν κόρην πάλαι κατηγγύησεν: the theme of the love-rival is subordinate in the story of Theagenes and Charikleia, but nevertheless important for bringing the daughter into opposition with her father—thus setting the action of the romance in motion (Hefti 1950, 65 and n. 542). Conflict within families arising from their younger members' falling in love is a constant theme in the ancient Greek romances (cf. 4.4.5 above, and note).

4.6.7 θαλαμεύσει: for the metaphor, cf. 4.19.9; *Anth. Graec.* 749.6; Feuillâtre (1966, 84); Naber (1873, 157).

οὐχ οὕτως ἦδε ἡ χεὶρ καὶ ξίφος τοῦμὸν ἀργήσει: Cf. 1.2.4, where Charikleia threatens suicide if Theagenes does not revive. The passage is a close echo of Euripides (*Phoen.* 625).

παῦσαι: elsewhere the present imperative is used with no discernible difference in sense (1.8.4; Barber 1962, 354).

οὐδενὸς δεήσει τοιούτου· μόνον ἐμοὶ πείθεσθαι καὶ πράττειν ὡς ἂν ὑφηγήσωμαι, νῦν δὲ ἀποχώρει: cf. 3.17.5 above, and note.

Koraes notes that the infinitive πείθεσθαι (CBZT) is to be retained instead of πείθου (VMFA), because of the following πράττειν. The expression is elliptical and must depend on δεήσει.

CHARIKLES ATTEMPTS TO SOLVE HIS DAUGHTER'S TROUBLES

Charikles tells Kalasiris of the improvement in Charikleia's condition

4.7.1 Ὁ δὲ Χαρικλῆς εἰς τὴν ὑστεραίαν ἐντυχῶν: this does not necessarily mean that Charikles had only brought Akesinos to examine his daughter that morning (Hefti 1950, 65) but the chance encounter of Charikles and Kalasiris is rightly adduced by Hefti (*loc. cit.* p. 120) as an counter-example to Wolff's rule (1912, 117) that the actions of the main characters of the romance are divinely motivated: cf. also 4.7.10; 4.16.1.

ἐάλωκεν ἢ δυσάλωτος καὶ νενίκηται ἢ δυσκαταμάχητος: this phrase is remarkable for the use of polysyllabic perfect tenses and anaphoric, homoioteleutic compound adjectives.

ἐρᾷ Χαρίκλεια: The irony in the words is clear (cf. 3.7.2 above and note). Charikles fails to ask about Kalasiris' diagnosis that Charikleia was suffering from the 'eye of envy'.

Naber (1873, 338) regards these words as a marginal gloss which has been added to the text, but without substantial justification. Some erotic contextualisation of the military metaphor (νενίκηται) is necessary.

4.7.2 ἐθρυπτόμην: a fairly common word in Heliodorus (2.10.2; 4.7.2; 7.10.5; 7.23.4; 7.24.1; 7.27.7; 10.31.4: cf. Morgan 1979 *ad loc.*).

βλακῶδες βαίνων: βλακῶδες meaning 'arrogant' is unusual: cf. 10.31.4, ἐθρύπτετο καὶ ἐπεγέλα βλακῶδες 'he put on airs and laughed arrogantly'; 7.27.5, εἰ δὲ ἐπιμένει βλακευόμενος 'if he persisted in his arrogance'. Baumgarten (1932, 24) refers to Xen. *Hipp.* 9.1, βλακωδέστερος ἵππος 'a rather lazy horse'; *Anab.* 2.3.11, καὶ εἴ τις αὐτῷ δοκοίη .

. . . βλακεύειν ‘if anyone . . . should appear to be taking things easy’; 5.8.15, ὅποτε ἴδοιμι καθήμενον καὶ βλακεύοντα ‘whenever I saw anyone sitting down and taking things easy’; *Lac.* 2.10, ὁ βλακεύων ‘a person who was taking things easy’. The Atticists appear to have revived this word, after it had initially been used by Xenophon. Heliodorus appears to have diverted the word from its original sense.

The posturing of Kalasiris here is undertaken in order to get hold of the birth-tokens of Charikleia (4.5.1), which would reveal more clearly what course of action he was required to take (Sandy 1982b, 148-150). Sandy rather inappropriately cites the argument of the ‘noble lie’ (Plato *Rep.* 415b-c; Synezius of Cyrene *Ep.* 105.88-100) and notes that Kalasiris was living up to the expectations that others have of Egyptian ‘low’ magic (3.16.2; cf. 3.1.1 above, and note). However, Kalasiris’ character is not flat and one-dimensional; like many of Heliodorus’ characters he is a complex human being, with his own story to tell. Failure to recognise this results in the conflation of plot and sub-plot and consequent confusion over his motives (cf. 4.13.1 below, and note).

μηδενὸς τῶν μειζόνων ὀχλήσαντος: Lamb’s translation reflects the text of RL: ‘without any harassing action by my stronger forces’ (the person harassed being Charikleia, by implication). Morgan’s version follows the text of Colonna (1987b) and requires the subject of the genitive absolute to be understood from the context as ἐμοῦ and the textual variant μηδενί (ΔΑ 568; Colonna 1938) to be used for μηδενός: ‘even without my invoking any of the greater powers’ (the greater powers being the affected parties in this case). In the light of the remarkably close parallel at 4.7.12, οὐ διήμαρτες εἰπὼν δαιμονῶν τὴν κόρην ὀχλεῖται γὰρ ὑπὸ δυνάμεων ἅς αὐτὸς κατέπεμψα καὶ τούτων οὐκ ἐλαχίστων, Lamb’s version is to be preferred. Koraes notes this parallel and explains that Kalasiris had here (4.7.2) attained his primary goal of making Charikleia susceptible to love without troubling the greater powers, which (as he told Charikles) he had invoked in order to turn his affections to Alkamenes (4.7.12).

Τῶν μειζόνων is not necessarily synonymous with οἱ κρειττόνες, which means θεοὶ and δαίμονες in general (cf., e.g., 4.15.2). Τῶν μειζόνων means ‘more important affairs’ at 7.27.8 (cf. 7.28.2). Here the meaning must be τῶν μειζόνων <δυνάμεων>: cf. 4.7.12 (quoted above). Belief in powers mediating between earth and heaven was widespread in the Graeco-Roman world and was incorporated into the dogma of Middle Platonism (Anderson 1993a, 9; Dillon 1977, 46; Brenk 1986, 2068-2145; Smith 1978, 425-439). Cf. also 4.7.12 below, and note.

The variant νομιζομένων in ΔΑ mentioned by Koraes seems entirely groundless and

may have been introduced to avoid what the copyist conceived to be an impiety.

4.7.3 ἀμοιβὴν τὴν προσοῦσαν οὐσίαν ὑπισχνούμενος: This is too much for Koraes, who argues that Heliodorus must have believed doctors to have been robbers but (he protests) who would ask robbers for help? However, Heliodorus may have been thinking of Herodotus' account of the Greek doctor Democedes, who cured Darius of the pain in his foot and was richly rewarded by Darius' wives (3.129-130). The same man later cured Atossa, Darius' wife, who offered him whatever he wanted in payment for the cure. Democedes chose to return to Greece as a free man (3.133-134). The first passage mentions the golden chains which Darius at first offered Democedes in return for curing his foot and which the doctor jokingly refused. Heliodorus certainly knew of the use of golden chains in Ethiopia (Hdt. 3.23) and refers to it during the siege of Syene (9.1.5). He may also have been aware of the unusual gift of Darius to Democedes.

The diagnosis of Akesinos

4.7.4 ὦ Ἀχιλεῦ Πηλῆος νιέ, μέγα φέρτατ' Ἀχαιῶν. a direct quotation from the *Iliad* (16.21) in which Patroclus tells Achilles that the Greeks are suffering defeat in battle. Theagenes has by now been strongly associated with the heroic warrior, Achilles. Thus Charikleia, a Patroclus to Theagenes' Achilles, cleverly encodes an appeal to him through the quotation. We are possibly supposed to presume that she thought that the similarity between the two men was sufficiently obvious for someone to pick it up and to convey her feelings to the Thessalian envoy. On another level, Heliodorus is here addressing the discerning reader, drawing him or her more intimately into the story.

ὁ λόγιος Ἀκεσίνος (οἶσθα δὲ δήπου τὸν ἄνδρα): the name is based on the word ἀκεῖσθαι 'to heal' (originally 'stitch' [Koraes]). The variant form Ἀκεστίνος (Colonna 1938, Bekker; Ἀκεσσίνος Colonna 1987b) is based on ἀκεστός 'curable'. The names Ἀκεσίνης and Ὑδάσπη occur as names of rivers in Arrian (5.4.2) and Strabo (15.1.27). Ἀκέστης is attested in Herodian as Macedonian (*De Pros. Cath.* 3.1 p.78 l. 16). RL refer to the name Ἀκουμενίης the father of Erisymachus and a doctor (Plato *Phaedr.* 268a; *Prot.* 315c). Koraes notes the name Ἀκεσίας also, who became proverbial for making his patients worse (*Suda ad loc.*; Arist. *Gramm. Paroemiae* fr. 6.3; Ath. 12.12.8 [Kaibel]; Liban. *Ep.* 476.5.4). For significant names, see the note on the name Ormenos above (4.3.3).

Koraes (*ad loc.*) points out that Heliodorus is here hinting at the case of Antiochus I, the son of Seleucus, who fell so much in love with his young step-mother, Stratonike, that he became ill. In the standard account (Plut. *Demetr.* 38 [based on Duris, according to Maehler (1990, 8), following von der Mühl (1954, 243-44)]; Appian *Syr.* 308-327; Sen.

Contr. 6.7; *Suda* Ἐρασίστρατος, Σέλευκος) the doctor, Erasistratus, was able to diagnose the illness through the symptoms of love displayed by the patient when his step-mother entered the room. Erasistratus then pretended to Seleucus that Antiochus was in love with his (Erasistratus') wife. When Seleucus asked him to hand over his wife to his son, the doctor asked the king whether he would do the same *ceteris paribus*. When Seleucus swore that he would, Erasistratus revealed the truth. The king then gave his kingdom and his wife to his son. Valerius Maximus (5.7 ext. 1) introduces an astrologer, Leptines, as an alternative to Erasistratus, omits the deception of the king and enhances the magnanimity and understanding of the monarch. Pliny (*HN* 7.123) ascribes the diagnosis to the father of Erasistratus, Cleombrotus of Keos, but elsewhere to Erasistratus himself (*HN* 29.5). The story is also told of a nameless physician, who becomes the focus of the anecdote in Lucian (*De Syria dea* 17-18) and of a doctor called Panakeios in Aristaenetus, who also alters the names of the other characters in the tale (1.13). The emperor Julian (*Mis.* 17) provided some variations on the standard account. Concealment of the young man's secret love was always part of the story, but Julian made Antiochus refuse to take his father's wife until after his death. The doctor's trick was omitted and the queen was made to show concern for the boy's well-being. Julian may have introduced these changes as a result of his own prurient interest in sex, which he denied himself (Bowersock 1982, 161).

Heliodorus hints at the fact that he is relating a well-known story with the words (οἴσθα δὲ δῆπου τὸν ἄνδρα). It is notable that (perhaps following Galen: cf. below) he transfers the story of a young man's troubled love for his mother-in-law to a young girl's love for a young Thessalian athlete. The reader knows that Charikles wants Charikleia to marry Alkamenes (4.6.6) but does not know whether Charikleia is aware of her father's plan, since Kalasiris only informs her later (4.11.2). The story may therefore have suited Heliodorus' purpose, since it would convey to the reader the subliminal impression of a serious, potentially fatal, difficulty which the lovers would have to overcome in order to be united in marriage, without having to build this problem into his plot.

The use of the story also adds further depth to the parent-child theme in the romance. Charikleia is a young girl with four 'fathers' none of whom are actually her fathers in the usual sense, since she was miraculously conceived by her mother's impression of an image of Andromeda (see 4.3.4 above, and note). All four men care deeply for her and are selflessly devoted to her (2.31.1, Sisimithres; 4.9.2-3, Kalasiris; 4.19.8, Charikles; 10.16.2, Hydaspes). The noble generosity of Seleucus towards his son is entirely in keeping with this theme.

The story exalts the sexual self-denial of Seleucus, which is clearly in keeping with the theme of virginity in the romance. It is also clear that Heliodorus has dramatised the story considerably, giving Akesinos an individual voice and establishing clear contrasts between the drily scientific doctor, the emotional priest of Apollo and (indirectly) the charlatan Egyptian magic-monger.

The various accounts of this famous incident have been made the subject of *Quellenforschung* by Mesk (1913, 366-394), who argues that all versions of the story have four basic elements: (1) the illness of the prince; (2) the diagnosis of the doctor; (3) the report to the king; and (4) the cession of the queen to the prince. Mesk also observes that Erasistratus (born 310-300 BC, Eus. *Chron.* p. 200 [Karst]) was unlikely to have been the physician who attended to the young Antiochus I (324-261 BC). For Erasistratus, see Lonie (1964, 426-463) and Dobson (1927, 825-832). Mesk argued that the *Urquell* was either directly or indirectly the *Hippolytus* of Euripides (cf., e.g., 38-40; 477), which inverts the erotic situation but otherwise shows strong similarities to the case of Antiochus and Stratonike. The play, of course, had a marked influence on Alexandrian love poetry and the Hellenistic ἐρωτικά παθήματα. In his second article, Mesk (1939, 172) suggests, less convincingly, that the *Oedipus* myth had some influence on the growth of the story and that, from there the story was taken up by the historians and anecdotalists mentioned above to lend colour to their narrative and by rhetoricians to provide material for debate (e.g., Sen. *Contr.* 6.7).

Aristaenetus clearly modelled his account on that of Heliodorus as well as on the sources mentioned above (cf. Koraes *ad loc.*, Rohde 1914³, 59 [55 n. 2] and Arnott 1974, 209-211; 1982, 305). The version of Aristaenetus is particularly close to Heliodorus because of the similarity in the wording—a fact noted originally by Koraes. For example, Aristaenetus calls the doctor ὁ συλλογιστικὸς ἰατρός while Heliodorus calls Akesinos ὁ λόγιος Ἀκεσίνοσ. The characters involved can be neatly matched: Akesinos with Panakeios, the father Charikles with Polykles, and Charikleia with Charikles (the young boy in love).

The tale continued to be popular (Rohde 1914³, 55-59 [52-55]; Perry 1967, 301) and may have formed the basis of the incest of Antiochus in *Apollonius King of Tyre* (cf. 18), although this is denied by Rohde (1914³, 57 [53 n. 2]), who traces the later history of the tale in the Arabic medical writer Avicenna, the *Gesta Romanorum* and Boccaccio (*Decameron* 2.8). The story is found in Egyptian and oriental literature (Kerényi 1962², 226 n. 82), but appears to have been a historical incident transmitted to the east by Greek

medical writers (cf. below) rather than *vice versa*.

τῷ καρπῷ τὴν χεῖρα καὶ ἀκούσης ἐπιβαλὼν ἀνακρίνειν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρτηρίας ἐφκει τὸ πάθος: Plutarch frequently refers to the pulse as an indication of emotional disturbance (e.g., *De Sera Numinis Vindicta* 565D2 [Stephanus]; *Demetr.* 38.4.6; Koraes *ad loc.*). Lucian talks of putting a hand over the heart of a distressed person (*De Syria Dea* 17.20). Aristaenetus talks of λογοδιάρροια as a symptom in a parody of these passages. The emphasis on the pulse indicates that Heliodorus may have read Galen's account of how (following Erasistratus) he diagnosed that a female patient of his was not sick but in love with the dancer Pylades by feeling her pulse at the moment when the dancer's name was mentioned (*On Prognosis* 631-633 [Kühn]). The Pylades concerned may have been the pantomime mentioned by Fronto (*Ep.* 1.2; *ILS* 5185), *L. Aurelius Augg. lib. Pylades*, who was manumitted by Lucius Verus (SHA *Life of Verus* 8.10; *ILS* 5187-5191), honoured by Puteoli for his benefits to the town c. 180 (*ILS* 5186) and to whom an inscription was set up in Milan (*ILS* 5195), possibly the same artiste who performed for Julianus (Cassius Dio 73.13.1); cf. Nutton (1978, 198). In this regard, the comment of Lucian—that a pantomime should know the story of Antipater (*sic*), Seleucus and Stratonike (*On Dancing* 58)—would suggest that it was a very familiar story.

The change from the discovery by a doctor of the love of a young man to that of a young woman would have been an important precedent for Heliodorus. Elsewhere Galen also says that his patient was a man in love with a woman (*Commentary on the Prognosis of Hippocrates* 1.8; CMG 5.9.2, p. 218.20). The story was something of a medical commonplace also since Hippocrates was said to have cured Perdicas of Macedon who had fallen in love with the concubine of his father Alexander (Soranus *Life of Hippocrates* 1; CMG 4, p. 176.4-11; Marcellinus *On the Pulse* 29-32 [Schöne]). This anecdote is also mentioned in Lucian (*On Writing History* 35 [omitted by Dindorf]) and later in the *Aegritudo Perdiccae*, which models the love of Perdikkas for Castalia on the passion of Antiochus for Stratonike (Mesk 1939, 166-172). For the theme of medicine in the romances in general, see Amundsen (1974, 333-337).

οὐδὲν ἄν οὐδαμῶς ἀνύσειε πρὸς ταύτην: Double and even triple negatives occur commonly in Greek (Eur. *Cycl.* 120; Plato *Phil.* 19b7 [Stephanus]). The same is true for πᾶς (Plato *Menex.* 249c2, πᾶσαν πάντων παρὰ πάντα τὸν χρόνον ἐπιμέλειαν ποιουμένη).

4.7.5 τότε μόνον ὅταν συμπάσχη μὲν τῷ σώματι κακουμένῳ συνωφελῆται δὲ θεραπευομένῳ: *Mens sana in corpore sano* (Juv. *Sat.* 10.356) is a truism which is constantly reaffirmed in antiquity; Hippocrates, for example, advises the doctor to take the

soul as well as the body into consideration in curing a patient (*On the Affections* 46.3).

4.7.6 τοῦτο οὖν ἄλλο τι νομιστέον: the negative οὐκ is surprising after the preceding negatives (οὐ πυρετὸς ἀναφλέγει, οὐκ ἄλλο τι τοῦ σώματος, οὐ μέρος, οὐχ ὄλον νοσεῖ που), and οὖν should be read in its place (Wifstrand 1944-45, 31). The sense would then be ‘this (the sickness of Charikleia) is therefore something else’ (*Dies [d. h. die Krankheit Charikleias] ist also eine andere Geschichte*). Bekker omits οὐκ ἄλλο τι as a case of dittography from the previous line. The emendation of Wifstrand is easy and makes much better sense than that of Bekker.

4.7.7 οὐχ ὀρθῶς ὡς κυλοιδιά μὲν τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς; The word κυλοιδιά has attracted much comment from the *Suda* (*ad* κυλοιδιόων) and the commentators on Aristophanes and Theocritus: It is derived from κύλα rather than κυλλός ‘crooked, crippled’. Hesychius (*ad* κοικύλλειν) defines κύλα as the hollows of the eyes (κύλα γὰρ τὰ ἐπάνω τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν). Inflammation of the eyes is used by Hippocrates as a symptom of illness (*De Morb.* 2.48.4; *De Natura Muliebri* 9.4). Aristophanes uses the verb form κυλοιδιᾶν to mean ‘give a person a black eye’ (*Lys.* 472) but in its more usual sense it refers to the swelling of the eyes caused by erotic passion (Theocr. *Id.* 1.38). Cf. Arsake’s swollen eyes (7.15.5, κυλοιδιώσαν).

τὸ πρόσωπον ὠχρίᾳ, σπλάγχνον οὐκ αἰτιωμένη: a pale face was normally taken as a symptom of a headache or intestinal pain. Koraes quotes Hippocrates for this (*Hipp. Prorrheticon* 2.32.3, Ὀκόσοι δὲ πούλιν χρόνον ὠχροὶ φαίνονται, καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα ἐπηρμένα ἔχοντες, εἰδέναι χρὴ τούτους τὴν κεφαλὴν ὀδυνωμένους, ἢ περὶ τὰ σπλάγχνα ἀλγήματα ἔχοντας).

τὴν διάνοιαν δὲ ἀλύει: according to Hippocrates this is a condition common among nubile girls and is due to bad blood (*De Virginum Morbis* 1.32, ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς κακίης τοῦ αἵματος ἀλύων καὶ ἀδημονέων ὁ θυμὸς κακὸν ἐφέλκεται).

καὶ ἀπροφάσιστον ἀγρυπνίαν ὑφίσταται καὶ τὸν ὄγκον ἀθρόον καθήρηται: although Koraes holds that the ancient doctors preferred their patients to lose weight in the interests of a ‘dry’ constitution, weight was a sign of strength, according to Hippocrates (*On Nourishment* 46.1, Δύναμις τροφῆς κρέσσων ἢ ὄγκος, ὄγκος τροφῆς κρέσσων ἢ δύναμις, καὶ ἐν ὑγροῖσι καὶ ἐν ξηροῖσιν). But, besides the implausibility of such rapid weight loss, ὄγκος constructed with the verb καθαίρω here must mean ‘lose confidence’. Cf. John Chrysostom, who used the phrase τὸν ὄγκον καθαιρεῖν ‘to destroy their pride’ in his homilies (*On the Incomprehensible Nature of God* 2.501-4, πειρώμεθα καταστέλλειν αὐτῶν τὸ φύσημα καὶ τὸν ὄγκον καθαιρεῖν ἅπαντα: κἂν ὑβρίζωσι, κἂν λακτίζωσι, κἂν ἐμπτύωσι, κἂν ὀτιοῦν

ποιῶσι, μὴ καταλείψῃς τὴν ἰατρείαν, ἀγαπητέ.) Morgan translates: 'she has suddenly lost her self-confidence.'

ὁ ποθοῦμενος: there may be an echo of the word-play on πόθος and πάθος (cf. 2.22.4) here (πάθος is mentioned in the same paragraph). The play on words and the reference to the beloved as the only cure for the lover's 'illness' is a clear reference to Plato *Phaedrus* 252a, πρὸς γὰρ τῷ σέβεσθαι τὸν τὸ κάλλος ἔχοντα ἰατρὸν ἤρρηκε μόνον τῶν μεγίστων πόνων. The sentiment later became conventional: cf. Char. 6.3.7, φάρμακον γὰρ ἕτερον Ἔρωτος οὐδέν ἐστι πλὴν αὐτοῦ ὁ ἐρώμενος, where the eunuch, Artaxates, reminds Artaxerxes of the oracle ὁ τρώσας αὐτὸς ἰάσεται (referring to the *Telephus* of Euripides [*Fr.* 724 Nauck and Snell] in which Telephus is cured by the rust from Achilles' spear), which was proverbial (cf., e.g., Plutarch *On Listening* 47a). Philostratus refers to the story of Telephus in his anecdote of a boy cured of rabies by the rabid dog which bit him (*VA* 6.43, ὡς ἰατρὸς αὐτῷ πάλιν ὁ τρώσας γένοιτο). For the use of the expression in an erotic context: cf. *Anth. Pal.* 5.291, Τήλεφον ὁ τρώσας καὶ ἀκέσσατο. Various cures for love were proposed by the poets, such as poetry itself and starvation, but in Longus (2.7) there is only one cure, ἔρωσ itself. Even magicians are powerless in dealing with it (Winkler 1990, 84 and note).

Kalasisiris recommends that Charikles introduce Alkamenes to Charikleia

4.7.8 πρὸς σὲ δὲ ἐγὼ <ἦκω> δρομαῖος: RL introduce hiatus into the text with their addition of ἦκω after ἐγὼ (Reeve 1971, 519). Moreover, the ellipse of verbs of movement is common in Greek. However, support for RL's text can be found at 1.27.3 (ἦκω δρομαῖος, wrongly cited as 1.19.3 in the Budé *apparatus*) and 4.19.1 (δρομαῖος ἦκων). The problem of hiatus can be overcome by putting ἦκω after δρομαῖος as in 4.19.1 as would be expected in a proleptic definition of the predicate (*proleptischen Praedicats-Bestimmung*, Fritsch 1902, 28) that was a feature of Attic style (cf., e.g., δρομαῖος ἔσπευδεν, 1.30.1).

ὡς Καλάσιρις ἰάσεται μόνος: Charikleia avoids all mention of Theagenes with this evasive answer.

The optative ἰάσαιτο is preferable here (Colonna 1938; Barber 1962, 192); the future indicative (RL) is far too definite for this context, although Colonna reverts to it in his 1987 edition. The optative would make the expression more correctly Attic.

ὑπὸ τῆς σῆς σοφίας ἐάλωκεν: Charikles believes that the 'Egyptian magic' of Kalasisiris has had the desired effect. Kalasisiris later tells Charikleia that he realised that her relationship with Theagenes was a spiritual one and that he increased the Thessalian's passion for her (4.11.2). His action was of course entirely unnecessary as he was

personally quite aware of the strength of the young man's love (4.6.5). Cf. Furiani (1990, 221) 'Ambigui, problematici, perfino falsi, sono infatti i rapporti tra . . . Cariclea e Cnemone (*sic*, read Calasiri for Cnemone).'

4.7.9 καὶ τὸ τίνοσ ἔχοις ἄν λέγειν; Charikles should have asked this question of himself, when Akesinos suggested that only the person she was in love with could cure Charikleia (4.7.7; Hefti 1950, 65), but Heliodorus required Charikles to be dependent on Kalasiris for the further development of the plot. Charikles is never very observant: cf. 3.5.3 above, and note.

Ἄλκαμένους . . . τοῦ τῆς ἀδελφῆς παιδὸς τῆς ἐμῆς: cf. 4.6.6; 10.23.1, where Hydaspes hints that Meroebos, his brother's son, should marry Charikleia (cf. Morgan 1979, at 10.24.1). The relationship between Hydaspes and Meroebos resembles that between Charikles and Alkamenes. Further similarities between book 4 and book 10 can be found in the contests of Theagenes with Ormenos and an Ethiopian athlete, the complaints of Charikles at the kidnapping of his daughter, and the discovery of the secret of Charikleia's exposure. These parallels are instances of Heliodorus' tendency 'to redeploy thematic material' (Sandy 1982a, 43-44) and to give depth to his narrative (Morgan 1993, 221).

The desire to escape from an arranged marriage clearly precipitates the action of both Achilles Tatius' *Leukippe and Kleitophon* (cf. 1.3.2) and the *Ethiopian Story* (Neimke 1889, 23-24), although in Achilles the action is given further impetus from the discovery of Kleitophon in the bedroom of Leukippe by her mother (2.30.1-2). Arranged marriages are a feature of all the romances, however (cf. 4.4.5 above, and note).

The name Alkamenes may be based on ἀλκή 'strength', although the character plays so slight a part that this etymology is meaningless.

ὄσα γε εἰς βούλησιν ἤκει τὴν ἐμὴν: a revealing admission of a parent's powerlessness to arrange a daughter's wedding. Charikles has to resort to magic to induce his daughter to marry (2.33.6; Egger 1994, 270). By way of contrast, Hydaspes is quite ready to be persuaded by his wife to agree to the marriage of his new-found daughter to a Thessalian stranger (10.38.2). The king consults the opinion of the Ethiopian crowd and the gymnosophist, Sisimithres (10.39.1), before agreeing to the match (10.40.1).

Colonna (1938) reads ἤκειν for ἤκει (RL; Colonna 1987b). Fritsch (1902, 7) supports the infinitive after ὄσον and οἶον (1.14.6, 1.29.6, 7.24.4), but Barber (1962, 252) reserves judgement on the question, citing the use of finite verbs after οἶον (4.3.1) and ὄσον (3.3.1). To Barber's examples, add 3.4.8; 4.8.6, 4.18.3 (all finite verbs). On balance, ἤκει is to be preferred.

Charikles describes the meeting between Charikleia and Alkamenes

4.7.10 *περὶ πλήθουσιν ἀγοράν*: an archaic way of telling the time. Cf., e.g., Xen. *Hist.* 2.1.7.1; Philostr. *VA* 7.29.3. Heliodorus also uses the poetic term for evening *περὶ βουλευτόν* (2.19.6; 5.23.2).

ἡ *παῖς δαιμονῶν* *ἔοικεν*: the form *δαιμονῶν* is generally preferred to *δαιμονιῶν* (e.g., Xen. *Mem.* 1.1.9) whereas *δαιμονίζεσθαι* is found in the New Testament (e.g., Matt. 4.24.3; 8.16.2).

Charikles implausibly does not wonder whether Charikleia's tantrum could have been caused by her opposition to the marriage with Alkamenes. Charikles' lack of psychological understanding could be ascribed to the belief of Heliodorus' contemporaries in demons as much as to his characterisation (cf. Hefti 1950, 66), although Charikles appears to be a rationalist, at least concerning the 'eye of envy' (3.7.2). Kalasiris at any rate supports Charikles' view that Charikleia is troubled by powers opposed to his own (cf. 4.7.12-13, *ἀντίθεός τις*, below, and note). Kalasiris adopts a two-phase strategy: in the first, he pretends to make Charikleia susceptible to love (and for this purpose pays a special visit to Charikles), in the second, he offers to make her agree to marry Alkamenes (for which purpose, he tells Charikles, he needs to consult the band with which Charikleia was exposed as a baby).

οὕτως ἀλλόκοτόν τι τὸ κατ' αὐτήν: See also 10.22.2, *ἀλλόκοτα ῥήματα*; 10.27.1, *ζῶου . . . ἀλλοκότου*; 10.28.2, *ἀλλοκότου ζῶου* (cf. Koraes *ad loc.*). The meaning 'unusual, strange, monstrous' is not in dispute (see the *Suda*, the *Etymologicum Magnum* and Hesychius *ad loc.*, LSJ⁹) but the meaning of *κότος* is unclear. Koraes suggests that *κότος* meaning 'wrath, temper' developed a meaning close to *τολμηρός* 'hardy, daring' under the influence of a related word *ἀπόκοτος*, quoting Plutarch *Gracch.* 23.7 (Gaius Gracchus, angered by the senate, returns to Rome without authorisation—an unprecedented action), by way of illustration. The idiomatic English expression 'otherwise' neatly conveys the sense.

4.7.11 *ἀβρότερον*: a favourite word of Heliodorus, connoting unnatural softness, wantonness and even deceit: cf. 1.17.1 *Demainete*; 1.24.2 *soft life*; 2.21.1 *Knemon*; 2.24.6 Kalasiris' earlier years in Memphis; 5.29.1 Kalasiris' trick played on Trachinos; 6.6.1 Nausicles' daughter; 7.19.1 *Arsake*; 8.7.7 the slave serving poison. The use of the word in these contexts is in keeping with the critical attitude towards profane love evident elsewhere in the romance, particularly in the contrast between the sexual experiences of Knemon and the spiritual love of Theagenes and Charikleia. For the view that there is a 'philosophical dimension' to the romance 'that gives a serious answer to the question of

how and why one should love’, see Morgan (1989b, 113).

ἡ δὲ ὡσπερ τὴν Γοργοῦς θεασομένη κεφαλὴν: in Lucian, Athena alone causes Eros to be afraid because of the Gorgon shield which she carries (*Dial.D.* 23; cf. Eur. *Orest.* 1520; Ach. Tat. 3.7.7-8). The image of the Gorgon featured on the clasp of Theagenes (3.3.5 above, and note). The word was used as an adjective by Heliodorus (1.21.3; 2.31.1; 7.10.4; cf. Ach. Tat., ὄμμα γοργὸν ἐν ἡδονῇ, 1.4.3).

καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ὡς βρόχον ἐπάγουσα τῷ τραχήλῳ διαχρήσεσθαι ἠπεῖλει καὶ ἐπώμνυεν: a rather tactless reaction to say the least, but in keeping with the violence of Charikleia's behaviour on Knemon's wedding-day (6.8.3-6) and her threat to Kalasiris that she would kill herself rather than marry Alkamenes (4.11.3). Feuillâtre (1966, 19) strangely regards her behaviour as ‘aussi peu féminine que possible’.

Richards (1906, 111) notes that the hiatuses in διαχρήσεσθαι ἠπεῖλει καὶ ἐπώμνυεν indicate that something (e.g., ἐαυτήν) is missing in the text but cf. 1.1.2, Καὶ ἦν τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ τοιάδε. For hiatus in the romances in general, cf. Reeve (1971, 514-539); Fritsch (1902, 30, for the relative tolerance of hiatus in Heliodorus).

THE REVELATION OF CHARIKLEIA'S BIRTH

Kalasiris requests Charikles to give him Charikleia's birth tokens

4.7.12 ὀχλεῖται γὰρ ὑπὸ δυνάμεων ἅς αὐτὸς κατέπεμψα καὶ τούτων οὐκ ἐλαχίστων: RL refer to Koraes for the logical explanation that this does not contradict 4.7.2 because it was more difficult to make Charikleia fall in love with Alkamenes than to make her susceptible to love at all, although this is not made clear by Heliodorus.

Δύναμις ‘divine power’ is a term often used in the *Septuagint* and *New Testament* of the power of God: ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπεν αὐτῇ, Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι (*Luc.* 1.35.2-3). The word is also used of the magician Simon: Οὗτός ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη Μεγάλη. The plural form is used equally frequently of humans capable of performing miracles, e.g.: καὶ οὗς μὲν ἔθετο ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρῶτον ἀποστόλους, δεύτερον προφήτας, τρίτον διδασκάλους, ἔπειτα δυνάμεις, ἔπειτα χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων, ἀντιλήμψεις, κυβερνήσεις, γένη γλωσσῶν (*Ep. Paul. 1Cor.* 12.28.1-4). The apostle Matthew uses the word to mean ‘miracles’ (7.22.4). However, the word occurs also in Galen: Ταῖς τοῦ σώματος κράσεσιν ἔπεσθαι τὰς δυνάμεις τῆς ψυχῆς οὐχ ἅπαξ ἢ δις ἀλλὰ πάνυ πολλάκις (4.767.1 [Kühn]). Heliodorus mentions the power of the ring given to Charikleia by her mother (see 4.8.7 and note below; 8.11.8). The

amethyst given to Nausicles by Kalasiris has the power to prevent intoxication: οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ δύναμις αὐτῇ γνησιωτέρα τῶν ἐκ δύσεων ἐγκαθίδρυται, οὐ γὰρ ἐπιψεύδεται τὴν προσηγορίαν ἀλλ' ἀληθῶς ἀμέθυστος τῷ φέροντι γίνεται, νηφάλιον ἐν τοῖς συμποσίοις διαφυλάττουσα (5.13.4). Cf. also Plut. *Mor.* 15b; 647b; Ath. *Deip.* 1.62 (Kaibel). Knemon points out the power of the name Thisbe over Nausicles (6.2.1). Pagan mythology knew of numerous heroes and demigods, who played a similar role to these 'powers'. For demonology in the ancient world, cf. 4.7.2 above, and note.

4.7.13 ἀντίθεός τις: on the meaning of ἀντίθεος, see appendix 2. Naber (1873, 163) comments: *quis non probabit αντίθετος pro αντίθεος?* But, in fact, no editors have followed his unnecessary suggestion.

τὴν ταινίαν: for a summary of references to the band, cf. 4.5.1 above, and note. Kalasiris obtains the band by pretending that it is imbued with hostile magic. The importance of the band is again stressed here but the reader only becomes aware of its meaning later, when Kalasiris explains the message to Charikleia (4.12.1). This kind of proleptic deployment of information is characteristic of Heliodorus (Saïd 1987, 177; cf. 4.6.2 above, and note).

δέδοικα μὴ τινος ἐμπέπλησται γοητείας καὶ μαγγανείαις τυγχάνει τραχυνοῦσαις τὴν ψυχὴν ἀνάγραπτος: Koraes' conjecture of the dative μαγγανείαις to accommodate ἀνάγραπτος is borne out by other instances of this construction (3.8.1; 4.8.7; 8.11.8). For Heliodorus' interest in 'religious mystification', cf. Anderson (1993a, 185-187), but there is more to the religious dimension of the romance than Anderson allows.

γνωρισμάτων: a frequent word in Heliodorus. Cf. 2.31.2; 4.8.8; 4.15.4; 5.5.2; 6.11.3; 8.11.7; 9.24.7; 8.24.8; 10.13.5; 10.14.2; 10.14.3; 10.18.1; possibly borrowed from Xenophon (cf., e.g., *Cyr.* 2.1.27, γνωρίσματα; Baumgarten 1932, 22: but see 3.3.3 above, and note).

The story of Persinna

4.8.1 Ἐπῆνει ταῦτα: Charikles does not question why Kalasiris only asks for the birth-tokens of Charikleia at this late stage (Hefti 1950, 66). The way in which Charikles accepts Kalasiris' word that he needed the tokens to counteract the opposition of a 'counter-power', which had brought about the failure of his earlier magic, is a further illustration of his gullible and superstitious nature (cf. 3.5.3 above, and note).

τὴν ταινίαν ἐνδοῦναι δὴ μοι σχολὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰπὼν . . . ἐπελεγόμεν τὴν ταινίαν: The words between ἐνδοῦναι and τὴν ταινίαν are omitted by M. This is clearly a case of haplography of τὴν ταινίαν with the intervening text dropping out. Koraes (*ad loc.*) notes that Amyot omits the words ἐλθὼν τε οὐ κατηγόμεν from his transcription of readings from manuscripts in the Vatican library which differed from his copy of the *editio princeps* but

argues that the words must be retained on the grounds that Kalasiris would have needed to return to his lodgings to read Persinna's long letter at leisure (Hefti 1950, 67). Sandy (1984-1985, 18) adds that Amyot translated the phrase as if it were in the third person and concludes that 'his translation seems to be an unusually imprecise rendering of what is an undoubtedly textually difficult passage'.

It would have been more natural for Kalasiris to have read the document immediately rather than returning to his lodgings, since Kalasiris was transfixed as soon as he read the first sentence of the letter (4.8.2, Ἐπώγην). There is also no reason for Kalasiris to return to his lodgings, since his next action is to visit Charikleia to tell her the news—he is described as standing after he read the letter (4.9.3, εἰστήκειν). Heliodorus does not, in general, bother to explain the movements of Kalasiris elsewhere in book 4. For example, the reader is not told that Kalasiris returned to his lodgings after the race between Theagenes and Ormenos (4.4.5); he leaves Charikleia (and shortly afterwards Charikles) for an undisclosed destination after pretending to cure her of the 'jealous eye' (4.6.1; 4.6.2); he meets Charikles three times at places unknown on the following day (4.7.1; 4.7.10; 4.13.5); and later meets Theagenes at an unknown location (4.16.1). The omission of these details suggests a degree of compression of the narrative. Wolff (1912, 195) notes the obscure time scheme of the romance.

The difficulty lies in the presence of Charikles, who had just brought Kalasiris the band and who disappears from the narrative at this point without explanation and reappears outside Charikleia's lodgings in 4.14.1 (something of the confusion here is reflected in the reading ἐλθόντες of C for ἐλθών τε of VBPZAT). Assuming that Kalasiris would have read the letter aloud, he could not have helped overhearing its contents. But even if Kalasiris read the letter silently (for this cf. Ach. Tat. 1.6.6; Bowie in *Search* 1994435-59), it would have been unnatural for him not to discuss the band with his colleague. Hefti's comment here to the effect that Kalasiris does not owe Charikles any explanation of the contents of the band ('*Er ist dem Charikles jedenfalls nicht gleich Rechenschaft schuldig*', p. 67) is preposterous in the light of the fact that Charikles pursues his claim for justice to the remotest ends of the earth (10.34.3, πολλὴν ἀληθέντι γῆν καὶ κατὰ ζήτησιν τῆς θυγατρὸς). However, the fact is that Kalasiris does leave Charikles in the dark about his daughter and departs to his rooms in a manner contrary to psychological probability and, in fact, in violation of his own immediate narrative. Similarly, the Ethiopian ambassador was earlier summarily expelled from Egypt by the Persian satrap before he could tell Charikles the full circumstances of Charikleia's birth

(2.32.2; Winkler 1982, 119 and n. 33). Likewise, the band is written in the royal Ethiopian script, which Charikles was not able to read and (rather implausibly) never arranged to get translated (4.8.1, and note below).

Why, then, is Charikles not informed of his daughter's background? Is it because this would be to preempt the final recognition scene (Dunlop 1876, 22)? Yet, when Charikles appears in Meroë he knows the full circumstances of her birth already, although he chooses to conceal his knowledge from Hydaspes and Persinna (10.36.1). The final recognition scene is played out for the benefit of Charikleia's natural parents. The reason why Charikles must remain ignorant of his daughter's past is related to his plans for her marriage (4.7.9). Had he been informed of her identity, Charikles would have been expected to resolve the plot by acquiescing in her desire to marry Theagenes. His main concern was that she marry (2.33.4) and he is diffident about his ability to sway her views on whom she should wed (4.7.9). Cf. 4.4.5 above and note. The ignorance of Charikles prevents his consent to the marriage becoming an issue and allows the elopement to proceed.

The initiation of the plots of the romances is generally rather unconvincing. In Xenophon, Habrokomes and Antheia are sent on a cruise because their parents could not understand the oracle of Apollo (1.7.1); Longus resorts to the exposure of both hero and heroine in infancy (1.2.1; 1.4.1) and asks the reader to believe that a rustic shepherd and goatherdess on the island of Lesbos are entirely ignorant of the facts of life; Chariton arguably handles the initiation of his plot best by describing how conflict arises between Chaereas and Kallirhoe as a result of the machinations of the heroine's disappointed suitors (1.2.1), but then has recourse to the artifice of Kallirhoe's false death from being kicked in the stomach by Chaereas (1.5.1). Achilles Tatius is reasonably plausible in making a seduction go wrong and as a result his lovers decide to elope, in Leukippe's case in a fit of pique (2.30.1).

It is important to notice that the need to preserve Charikles' ignorance has led Heliodorus to compromise Kalasiris's character. Previously, Kalasiris had felt sympathy with Charikles for the impending loss of his foster daughter (3.15.3). Had this sentiment been sincere he would have been obliged to divulge the circumstances of Charikleia's birth to her adoptive father. Neither the oracle concerning the two lovers (2.35.5) nor the words of Apollo and Artemis in Kalasiris' dream oblige him to deceive the priest of Apollo, who had already told him how he had tragically lost a wife and daughter (2.29.3-4).

It was therefore necessary for Heliodorus to invent the occasion on which Kalasiris

visited Persinna in Ethiopia, who then asked him to recover the child she had exposed (4.12.1-4.13.1, especially 4.13.1, ἐγὼ δὲ ἤκω τὴν ἐνώμοτον ἱκεσίαν ἐκτελέσω, οὐ διὰ τοῦτο μὲν τὴν ἐπὶ τάδε σπουδάσας ἄφιξιν θεῶν δὲ ὑποθήκη μέγιστον ἐκ τῆς ἄλης τοῦτο κερδήσας), although Kalasiris had already explained his presence in Delphi as the result of a self-imposed exile from Memphis because of the seductive Rhodopis and the feuding of his sons (2.26.1). Far from being a deliberate narratological device to further bolster the credibility of Kalasiris (cf. Winkler 1982, 93-158), Heliodorus actually disassociates the priest from the kidnapping of Charikleia, which he describes as if Kalasiris had had no involvement in it at all (4.17.2).

ταινίαν γράμμασιν Αἰθιοπικοῖς . . . ἱερατικοῖς καλουμένοις ὁμοίωται: Herodotus states that the Egyptians had two scripts—hieratic and demotic (2.36); Diodorus Siculus (3.3.5) adds that in Egypt, only the priests can read hieratic script which they learn from their fathers in secret, whereas all Ethiopians use it; and Diogenes Laertius relates that Democritus wrote works on the ‘sacred’ scripts of Babylonia and Meroë (Περὶ τῶν ἐν Βαβυλῶνι ἱερῶν γραμμάτων and Περὶ τῶν ἐν Μερῶν, 9.49.3)—according to Clement of Alexandria he also translated the stele of Ahikar (*Stromata* 1.15.69). These passages do not make it clear that there were two Ethiopian scripts (which we know was, in fact, the case). The hieroglyphic and cursive forms of the Meroitic script are identified by Griffith (1912, xv) who first deciphered them. Griffith also gives examples of Meroitic and Greek inscriptions discovered at Kalabsha, Philae and other sites. Although the script is now known, insufficient examples of Meroitic inscriptions survive to enable the language to be properly understood.

Heliodorus clearly mentions two Ethiopian scripts, one royal and one demotic. Sisimithres describes the letters of the band to Charikles as ἐγχωρίους ‘native’ (2.31.2) but later as βασιλείους ‘royal’ (10.14.1). In this passage Persinna calls them βασιλικοῖς ‘regal’. The engagement ring which Hydaspes had given Persinna and which the queen in turn gave Charikleia as a birth-token has holy powers and is inscribed with a ‘royal symbol’ (βασιλείῳ . . . συμβόλῳ, 4.8.7) but later Charikleia labels the characters on the ring containing the pantarb jewel ἱεροῖς ‘sacred’ (8.11.8). Heliodorus has therefore departed from the tradition and invented a new Ethiopian script which is both royal and sacred. What is more interesting is the fact that he has concealed the fact that Charikles is unable to read the script whereas Kalasiris is. What is the purpose of this concealment? To patch up the narrative? To introduce an atmosphere of mysticism? Why does Persinna embroider the story of her daughter’s birth on the band in royal characters (which would identify the

author as being a member of the royal house) in defence of her own character if she is afraid of being accused of adultery? Again, if Persinna thought the baby would be taken to foreign climes, why write a personal apology to the infant in royal Ethiopian characters which the daughter herself would be unable to read, since she would not have been brought up in the palace of that country? Why does she fear an accusation of adultery arising from the birth of a white baby when she resides in Ethiopia—a country far removed from white men with whom she could form a liaison?

As it happens, Sisimithres finds the girl by chance, reads her story on the band, and entrusts her to the care of shepherds until she is seven (2.31.2). Fearing that the girl's beauty would lead to the secret of her birth being revealed, he then takes her to Egypt where he gives her to Charikles without telling him the full circumstances of her exposure (2.31.5). Charikles then tells Kalasiris how he came to be the girl's guardian and how the Ethiopian ambassador (Sisimithres) gave him the jewellery, band and birth-tokens. Charikles is clearly not able to read the band as he tells Kalasiris that he was dismayed that the Ethiopian ambassador had been expelled from Egypt by the Persian satrap before he could learn more about the mysterious girl (2.32.3). It is strange that Charikles does not ask Kalasiris to tell him what was on the band at their first meeting (Hefti 1950, 69), but the explanation for this may lie in the fact that Sisimithres described the writing as 'native' (2.31.2, ἐγγωρίους) and Charikles therefore assumes that Kalasiris cannot read the script. However, Heliodorus conceals this information and the inference must be drawn by the reader. Conversely, Kalasiris does not tell Charikles that he can, in fact, read the script and asks to see the band on the grounds that he believes that it is imbued with magic (4.7.13). Kalasiris immediately identifies the script as βασιλικοῖς 'regal' and this is later confirmed in Ethiopia where the letters are described as βασιλείους 'royal' (10.14.1). The message on the band is recalled by Charikleia (8.11.9) and finally given to Hydaspes to prove the circumstances of Charikleia's birth (10.12.4). The queen immediately recognises it (10.13.1) and is so overcome with emotion that she is unable to speak. Sisimithres is also deeply affected after reading the script with the king (πολλὰ μὲν αὐτὸς [sc. Ὑδάσπης] θαυμάζων πολλὰ δὲ καὶ τὸν Σισιμίθρην ἐκπεπληγμένον καὶ μυρίας τροπὰς τῆς διανοίας ἐκ τῶν ὄψεων ἐμφαίνοντα ὄρων συνεχές τε εἰς τὴν ταινίαν καὶ εἰς τὴν Χαρίκλειαν ἀτενίζοντα).

The explanation may not lie so much in the problems of the narrative, however, as Heliodorus' desire to create an enigma. In the third century, Porphyry observes that Pythagoras associated with the priests of Egypt and learned three scripts; epistolary, hieroglyphic and symbolic—the latter two being used for enigmas and allegory (*De Vita*

Pythagorae 12.1) and according to Clement of Alexandria, while in Egypt Moses learnt the Egyptian symbolic script, the hieroglyphic script and the Assyrian script, the latter with the purpose of learning about Chaldaean astrology (*Stromata* 1.23.153). Sacred writings proliferated in the third and fourth centuries AD (cf. Altheim 1957, 47-66). It was a time when the Christian codex was establishing itself as a medium for individual reference and when the bible was used as a guide to individual salvation. Similarly, Manichaean, Zoroastrian and other religious texts were committed to writing and published. This impulse extended to pagan literature and editions of the pagan authors also proliferated. The age was self-consciously literary and obsessed with writing and reading. Apuleius (11.22) already gives a description of *libros litteris ignorabilibus praenotatos* brought out of the secret place of the temple (*de opertis adyti*) by the priest of Isis. According to him, the writing was intended to be illegible by the profane (*a curiosa profanorum lectione munita*). For the use of riddles on statues and in inscriptions, cf. Stoneman (1994, 159-170, esp. 165), although the band of Persinna does not present quite the same interpretative challenges as the inscriptions in the *Alexander Romance* (1.32) and the *Life of Aesop* (78-80).

τοιιάδε ἡῤῥισκον τὸ γράμμα διηγούμενον: γράμμα here means ‘story’ and the words constitute a metaliterary conceit by Heliodorus. A similar example of this occurs when Charikleia finally presents the band as proof of her identity to Hydaspes. She describes the band as ‘the story of my destiny and the narrative of all your lives’ Cf. 10.12.4, γράμματα δὲ τάδε τύχης τῆς ἐμῆς τε καὶ ὑμῶν διηγήματα).

The letter of Persinna belongs to the tradition of imaginary letters such as Propertius (4.3, Arethusa to Lycotas), Ovid (*Heroides*) or Alciphon (*Letters of Courtesans*), which are fictional epistles written in the first person, often as exercises in *prosopopoeia* (a dramatic monologue revealing the character of the speaker). The letter is therefore a literary cameo (Anderson 1993b, 190-191; Winkler 1982, 127); it is also unique in that it is written by an Ethiopian queen about whom nothing is otherwise known, and because the letter is addressed to her daughter rather than her husband. Letters (γράμματα) are used commonly in the romance and play a part in the development of the plot. Cf. the letter of Thisbe to Knemon (2.10.1-4), which the young Athenian fears contains more schemes against him; Mitranes’ letter to Oroondates (5.9.2, used later by Achaimenes 7.24.2); Oroondates’ letter to Arsake (8.3.1); Oroondates’ letter to Euphrates (8.3.2, used by Bagoas 8.12.5); Hydaspes’ letter to the gymnosophists (10.2.1); Hydaspes’ letter to Persinna (10.2.2, used by Persinna 10.4.1); Hydaspes’ second letter to Persinna (10.4.3);

and Oroondates' letter to Hydaspes (10.34.1). By Heliodorus' day the letter was a well-established literary form and Heliodorus makes good use of it in order to develop his complex story-line and to convey the pathos of the queen's predicament and her dignified and noble character. For a typology of letter writing in antiquity, see Stowers (1986, 71-76 [family letters]). The popularity of the genre in late antiquity counts against Merkelbach's argument (1962, 247) that the reading of a letter must have formed part of the initiation rite in the cult of Helios on the grounds of a comparison with the hymn to the soul in the Acts of Thomas (41-48, text and commentary supplied by Merkelbach *loc. cit.* pp. 299-320).

Of course, Kalasiris would have had to have had a superb memory to quote the long letter of Persinna *verbatim* (Neimke 1889, 39). Heliodorus clearly imagines Kalasiris reading the letter aloud after receiving it from Charikles and has not taken the trouble to transfer the actual reading of the letter to the circumstances of his conversation with Knemon. Heliodorus is guilty of a technical error in handling a complex of three narrative time frames: (1) the time of composition of the band by Persinna, who describes the circumstances under which the letter was written (χαράττω τόνδε τὸν ἔγγραφον θρήνον 'I record this lament in writing'); (2) the time at which Kalasiris received the band from Charikles (οὐδε ὅσον ἐλάχιστον ὑπερθέμενος ἐπελεγόμην τὴν ταινίαν 'I immediately read the band'); and (3) the time of narration to Knemon (Ἐπάγην, ὦ Κνήμων 'I was transfixed, Knemon'). The change of narrative time frame is indicated by shifts in tense from imperfect to historic present to aorist. However, in narratological terms the problem can be explained as a shift in focalisation from narrator to author. Such shifts occur commonly in Homer and in the romances (e.g. Achilles Tatius, cf. Reardon 1994, 80-96). It is therefore unnecessary to argue that Heliodorus is here following the practice of the historians, who reported extensive speeches in their own words (while preserving the overall sense) as if they were the *ipsissima verba* of the speaker concerned (Hefti 1950, 70).

Περσίννα Βασίλισσα Αἰθιοπῶν: Ethiopia was traditionally ruled by queens bearing the name Kandake, from whom the line of succession was taken (Plin. *HN* 6.186.2). Heliodorus appears to have been unaware of this and makes a king, Hydaspes, ruler of the kingdom. Both here (4.8) and in books 9 and 10 Persinna plays a secondary role to her husband, Hydaspes (Morgan 1979, at 9.1.2).

The name occurs elsewhere in the masculine form with one ν (Orphica fr. 1.11; cf. *Suda ad* Ὀρφεύς). Etymologically, it is probably to be derived from Περσεύς with the

addition of the suffix -ινος (see Koraes *ad loc.*). Photius spells the word with a single ν (*Bib.* 73.51b.9 [Bekker]).

The title Βασίλισσα occurs in Xen. *Oec.* 9.15, but the name appears to be Hellenistic (Baumgarten 1932, 21) and is used frequently of Olympias in the *Alexander Romance* (4.8.1). The use of this title in the opening sentence of the message and the fact that Charikleia is mentioned in the third person give the words the character of a public declaration which contrasts strongly with the personal confession and the use of the second person in the rest of this letter.

δῶρον ἔσχατον: the adjective is added for pathos, though Persinna also gives her daughter clothes and as much wealth as she could afford (4.8.6 below).

χαράττω: Heliodorus prefers the Attic spelling, possibly because the harsher sound was more suited to the tone of the passage (cf. also ἐχάραττον 4.8.6 below). The verb means 'cut, engrave' particularly on monuments: cf. LSJ⁹ III who quote Erinna 5.8, ἐν τύμβῳ γράμμ' ἐχάραξε τόδε. The meaning can be extended to drawing, marking or simply writing, particularly in poetry (cf. *AP* 11.412), but the natural verb to use would have been ὑφαίνω or possibly γράφω. Heliodorus has therefore chosen an unusual verb to convey the impression that the recording of Persinna's story is painful and laboriously written epitaph (cf. ἐπιτύμβια καὶ μητρὸς ἐπικήδεια δάκρυα 4.8.8 below, and note). The verb is repeated below (ἐχάραττον 4.8.6 and note) and the derivative χαρακτηρίζει (via the noun χαρακτήρ) is also used (4.8.7), perhaps suggesting that the message of Persinna is also the maternal imprint which defines Charikleia's character.

τῇ ὅ τι δὴ κληθησομένη καὶ μέχρι μόνων ὠδίνων θυγατρὶ: the words add pathos to the queen's story. The fact that the child as yet has no name is a consequence of the fact that she has not been recognised by her father and family and emphasises the loss of her status and inheritance (cf. 4.12.1; 4.13.2). In most cases the father would have named the newborn child, as the masculine bias in naming suggests (Golden 1990, 24-25). Furthermore, the statement that Persinna can only call her daughter a daughter by virtue of the fact that she physically gave birth to her, underlines the years of motherhood that she is about to sacrifice. The pathos is accentuated by the fact that Persinna had been childless for ten years before this conception (4.8.4) although the king needed a successor to his line (4.8.5) and that she would permanently be barren as a result of complications in the birth of her daughter (4.12.3). The emotional reunion of mother and daughter in the final book (10.16.1) emphasise the intense feelings of Persinna. Her past and future barrenness and the exposure of Charikleia immediately after her birth enhance the reader's impression

that the latter is something of a prodigy and that she emanates from a higher, more spiritual world. The human pathos of Persinna's predicament contrasts sharply with the supernatural character of the birth of her 'daughter'. These details suggest that much of the *Ethiopian Story* belongs in the sub-genre of 'family novel' in antiquity (Szepessy 1985-1988, 357-365).

The use of the future tense locates the narrative at the time of the writing of the message, which gives the reader a sense of dramatic immediacy as if she is witnessing the composition of the letter. Later (4.8.2) the message shifts from the time of writing to the time of reading and back, thus interweaving two chronological frames, providing temporal perspective and juxtaposing past and present time.

τόνδε τὸν ἔγγραφον θρήνον: the story of Persinna is, in rhetorical terms, a lament (Hefti 1950, 108-110). The device whereby a lament recapitulates the narrative is common in the romances, especially Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesus, but less so in Heliodorus (Birchall 1996; Kerényi 1962², 28; 4.19.6-9 below, and notes).

The phrase calls to mind the story of Tereus and Procne, particularly in respect of the tapestry woven by Philomela to tell Procne of her rape by Tereus, which resembles the band embroidered by Persinna (Apolldoros 3.193; Ovid *Metamorphoses* 6.424-674). In both cases a traumatic event is communicated between women (sisters in the Philomela myth; mother and daughter in the *Ethiopian Story*) by means of embroidery. Cf. also the note on πολύθρηνον (4.8.6 below). In more general terms, the letter is a form of ἐπιτάφιος λόγος for a dead child—a genre exploited for its poignancy also by Philo, who gives his version of Jacob's lament for Joseph (*Legatio ad Gaium* 12.86-90).

The word ἔγγραφα was used of official documents and the verb, ironically, regularly refers to the enrolment of children into the public register (cf. LSJ⁹ II).

4.8.2 Ἐπάγην, ᾧ Κνήμων, ὡς τοῦ Περσίννης ὀνόματος ἤκουσα: Kalasiris is startled by the name Persinna because of his personal knowledge of the queen's story (4.12.2). A parallel instance occurs when Kalasiris mocks Knemon for his fear of the name, 'Thisbe', his former, treacherous lover, who had earlier been stabbed to death by Thyamis (6.1.3; cf. 2.8.2). When Nausicles mentions that he had brought Thisbe back with him, Knemon imagines that her ghost had returned to haunt him (5.2.1). Instead, Nausicles and Charikleia have colluded in using this name for her in order for the merchant to cheat the Persian commander, Mitranes, and for the heroine to escape from capture (5.8.3). Knemon has the last laugh, however, because, when Kalasiris mentions the name in chaffing Knemon, Nausicles is struck dumb with amazement that Knemon knows it also (6.2.1-2).

Knemon was similarly affected on hearing the names Theagenes and Charikleia, whom he had just met as fellow prisoners of the pirate Thyamis, mentioned by an Egyptian priest, Kalasiris (2.23.3). He was also stunned to learn that Thyamis was Kalasiris' son (2.25.7). Knemon's emotional reaction to these names is an indication of his impressionable nature, but also serves to alert the reader to a surprising twist in the plot and to the inscrutable potency of destiny. Knemon is not the only character to be affected by the mention of a name, as Theagenes and Charikleia are surprised by the mention of Pytho (2.11.5). The technique is therefore a favourite of Heliodorus; these surprise developments in the narrative reveal the inscrutable potency of destiny in guiding the lives of the human players in the drama (cf., e.g., 7.8.1).

Naber (1873, 163) suggests of ἐκπλάγην (ἐκπλήσσω) for ἐπάγην (πήγνυμι). The participial forms of ἐκπλήσσω are quite common in the romances (Hld. 1.2.8; 5.7.2; 5.15.1; 10.15.1; 10.30.7; Ach. Tat. 3.18.5; 4.15.2; Ch. 4.3.8; L. 4.18.2) but Heliodorus uses πήγνυμι in this sense twice elsewhere (2.23.2, 4.13.3; ἐπάγη)—a usage perhaps borrowed by Michael Psellus (*Chronographia* 7.77.7; 7.7.1: ἐπάγην ἀκούσας).

οὐδὲν ἀδικοῦσα, παιδίον, . . . ἀπεκρυσάμην: Colonna (1987b) abandons his earlier (1938) preference for ὄτε (VM), which would result in an anacoluthon: 'that, when I exposed you . . . and did not hide you . . . doing nothing wrong, let Helios be called as witness', in favour of οὐτω ('that I did nothing wrong when I exposed you, born like this, and that I did not conceal you from your father, Hydaspes', sight'). However, RL's choice of οὐτω (CB) is difficult because the circumstances of the birth have not yet been explained (although, if there were something strange about the heroine's birth that would be immediately obvious to the reader of the band, this would make good sense) and because this would mean that in strict logic only ἐξεθέμην should be taken with ἀδικοῦσα (however, Maillon translates RL's text as though ἀπεκρυσάμην is also linked to the participle). It becomes clear subsequently that Persinna told Hydaspes that the child was still-born (10.13.4) and that she therefore did conceal the child from him. This leaves Koraes' suggestion οὐτε . . . οὐτε ('that I did no wrong, my child in exposing you at birth and hiding you from the sight of your father Hydaspes, let Helios be called as witness'), which gives the best sense. I suspect, though, that this is too neat for the bizarre circumstances of the case; οὐτω σε γενομένην at least explains why Persinna thought she was justified in exposing her child (οὐτω should be taken with γενομένην not with ἐξεθέμην [Lamb] since it makes no sense to refer to the manner of Charikleia's exposure—it is the manner of her birth that is at stake). Persinna's self-justification here is especially relevant in view of her later statement of

horror at her deed (cf. 4.8.6, λάθρα καὶ ἀπορρήτως ἐξεθέμην).

The practice of exposing babies at birth became a crime in 374 AD (*Cod. Just.* 8.51.2, *unusquisque subolem suam nutriat*), though doubtless the practice persisted. Once exposed, the natural parents of the infant could not ask for it to be returned (*Cod. Just.* 8.51.3). Infanticide was condemned by both pagans (e.g. *Oracula Sybillina* 2.280; 3.762; Musonius Rufus p. 80 [Hense]) and Christians (*Didache* 2.2) but continued throughout antiquity because of poverty (Cameron 1932, 105-114). In some cases the decision to expose the child may have been taken by the mother (as in Persinna's case), but the decision was often taken by the father (cf., e.g., Ter. *Heaut. Tim.* 627; Ovid *Met.* 9.666-797 [Iphis and Ianthe]; Apuleius *Met.* 10.23; *POx.* 4.744). For Trajan's ruling allowing exposed children brought up as slaves to be emancipated, see Pliny *Ep.* 10.65, 66. The practice is discussed *inter alias* by Egger (1988, 46 n. 42); Pomeroy (1983, 207-222); Dickison (1973, 159-166).

Persinna's case is rather different from the norm and much more detailed; her child has as yet no name (4.8.1), in consequence of the fact that the infant has not been recognised by Hydaspes and thus stands to lose her status and inheritance (cf. 4.12.1; 4.13.2). The queen is aware that her daughter's chances of survival are very slim (4.8.2; 4.8.7; 4.8.8); subject to the inscrutable will of chance (4.8.6; 4.8.8) and actively opposed by hostile forces (4.8.8). Persinna gives her child every chance of survival (although this could undo the purpose of her exposure) by laying out with the child money, a band containing the story of her birth, and the magic ring which her husband had given her during their courting, because of her motherly love for her daughter (4.8.6-7). For the pathos of the queen's predicament, see 4.8.1 above, and note.

At the same time, the exposure of Charikleia is the result of a miracle and is clearly the result of divine intervention (Merkelbach 1962, 238 n. 3: 'mystisch'; Winkler 1982, 119-120: 'a marvel which cannot adequately and plausibly be conveyed in ordinary terms'). The reaction of the gymnosophist Sisimithres when he found the exposed infant (2.31.2) shows that opposition to the practice of child exposure is part of the moral sensibility of the work. The present passage is unique in Greek literature as an expression of a mother's grief at having to part with her new-born child (the sorrow of Creusa in Euripides' *Ion* is rather different since it is directed chiefly at Apollo and involves a male child). For the thesis that the high mortality rate in Greece resulted in the insensibility of parents to the deaths of their children, see Garland (1985, 80); Hopkins (1983, 225); *contra* Golden (1990, 87-100); and, for a recent overview, Garland (1995, 13-18). Circumstances

in the fourth century were very different from those of Classical Athens and the composition and preservation of medical treatises such as Soranus' *Gynaecology* provides evidence of a concern to promote the well-being of the new-born child, although only those who were physically normal and capable of feeling pain (10).

For the theme of child exposure in the ancient novel, cf. Kudlien (1989, 25-44, esp. 37-39). Apart from Heliodorus, who is an unusual case (Hefti 1950, 67-68), only Longus makes use of it. Longus treats the exposures of Daphnis and Chloe as myths—Daphnis is found and suckled by a goat (1.2.2) and Chloe by a sheep (1.5.2). However, he later reveals the harsh reality that lay behind this façade. Chloe's natural father, Megakles, later explains that he exposed her out of poverty brought on by having to pay for choruses and warships (4.35.3), and Dionysophanes exposed Daphnis because he already had a son and a daughter and did not want to split his estate (4.24.1; Rohde [1914³, 534 [502]). Dionysophanes intended infanticide rather than child exposure (4.24.1) and only regretted his action because of the death of his eldest son and daughter. He asks Daphnis not to bear a grudge against him for the exposure. Megakles' comment that many people found children from exposed babies provides a further realistic detail about the practice (4.35.3). Megakles regretted his action, as he proved unable to have any more children. Literary convention confronts reality starkly in this aspect of the romance (Kudlien 1989, 39-42). Nevertheless, the theme of child-exposure in Longus also constitutes an intrinsic part of the interplay between town and country in the romance. By way of contrast, Heliodorus neglects the mythical dimensions of the theme of child-exposure and uses the incident as a narrative device to initiate the complex interaction between Sisimithres, Charikles and Kalasiris that is only resolved at the conclusion of the romance (Hefti 1950, 68).

There are traces of the theme of child exposure in Apollonius of Tyre and the account by Ctesias of the exposure of Semiramis by her mother Derketo in the story of Ninus, as related by Diodorus (2.4.2-6). Derketo exposed her daughter out of shame for her seduction by a Syrian youth and threw herself into a lake. Aphrodite changed her into a mermaid but her daughter was kept alive by doves and later married the Assyrian king, Ninus.

παῖδιον . . . σε: The use of the second person throughout the rest of letter makes it a dramatic, personal confession of Persinna to her daughter.

πατέρα τὸν σὸν Ὑδάσπην: For the Persian name (Hdt. 1.209.6) given to an Ethiopian king, see Morgan (1979, at 9.1.2). Hydaspes is also found as the name of a river in India (Arr. *Alex. Anab.* 5.4.2.2; ps.-Plut. *De Fluv.* 1.1.8) and as a personal name (*Hist. Alex.* [rec. A]

1.39.7; 2.10.4). It occurs often in Nonnus (e.g., 21.225) as does the name Thyamis (26.181).

ἐπικεκλήσθω μάρτυς ὁ γενεάρχης ἡμῶν Ἥλιος: the Persian royal family claimed descent from Helios, whom they sometimes called Mithras (Strab. 15.3.13.5-7, τιμῶσι δὲ καὶ ἥλιον, δὲν καλοῦσι Μίθρην, καὶ σελήνην καὶ Ἀφροδίτην). In Chariton (6.1.10), the Persian king also claims descent from the Sun and Plutarch (*Artaxerxes* 1.2) states that the first Cyrus was descended from the Sun and that the Persians used his name for the solar deity. The worship of Helios was widespread, however, and was also practised by the Massagetae, who sacrificed a horse to the god, since they thought it appropriate to sacrifice the fastest of creatures to the fastest of gods (Hdt. 1.216—the story of Cyrus' dream about the son of Hystaspes occurs immediately before this passage). Heliodorus was evidently aware of Herodotus' anecdote as he transfers the practice of the Massagetae to the Ethiopians (10.6.5). Strabo (1.2.27) locates the stables of Helios in Ethiopia, which was said to be the first land to exist, the first to worship the gods and the first to respect the laws given to them by the Ethiopians Mithras and Phlegyas (Steph. Byz. *ad* αἰθίωψ). For the pious reputation of the Ethiopians, see Morgan (1979, at 9.6.2). The worship of Helios and Selene is also ascribed to the Libyans by Herodotus (4.188.3-4). The Greeks generally located the Ethiopians to the south of Libya and Egypt and thought that what lay beyond this region was the domain of Helios (Eur. *fr.* 771 Nauck; Strabo I, p. 33, citing Aesch. *fr.* 192). For the role of Helios in the romance, see the introduction.

The expression ἐπικεκλήσθω μάρτυς adds a atmosphere of decisive legal formality to the queen's story: cf. Goodwin §1274. RL prefer the form γενεάρχης (VCZ) rather than γενάρχη (MBA) or γεννάρχη (PT). Cf. 10.6.3, γενεάρχας (VZAT), γενάρχας (MP); 10.11.3, γενεάρχα (VZT), γενάρχα (MPA); 10.24.1 γενεάρχαι (VZAT), γενάρχαι (MP).

εἰ τινά σοι θεὸς ἐπιστήσειε: a further reference to divine intervention in the story. 'The god' does send Charikleia a rescuer in the form of gymnosophist Sisimithres, whose religion prevents him from forsaking the child (2.31.2).

ἀλλ' ὅμως ἀπολογοῦμαι πρὸς τε σέ ποτε, θύγατερ . . . πρὸς τε αὐτὸν ὅλον τὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίον: in the final book (10.12-16) it is Charikleia, Sisimithres and the band itself that tell the story of her miraculous conception—Persinna remains silent throughout the exposition. The queen's undertaking to defend her actions before humanity in general is, of course, hyperbolic, but at the same time universalises the story.

πρὸς τε τὸν ἀναιρησόμενον: ἀναιρέω has the special meaning 'to take up a child', and is also used of exposed children (LSJ⁹ B4; Plut. *Ant.* 36; Men. *Sam.* 159).

εἴ τινα σοι θεὸς ἐπιστήσειε: for θεός used without an article meaning ‘God’, cf. also ἕως ἄν τι τέλος τῶν κατὰ σε δεξιώτερον ὑποφάνη θεός 7.5.5.

4.8.3 Ἡμῖν πρόγονοι θεῶν μὲν Ἥλιός τε καὶ Διόνυσος: Morgan (1979, 10.2.2) has an extensive discussion of Heliodorus’ treatment of Meroitic religion. For the gods worshipped at Meroë, cf. Hdt. 2.29; Diod. Sic. 3.9; Strabo 17.2.3. Selene is also mentioned as an Ethiopian goddess (10.2.2), but she is excluded here because she is a virgin goddess and so cannot be a πρόγονος. While Selene is conventionally coupled with Helios in the literary sources (cf., e.g., Hdt. 4.188.3-4; Strab. 15.3.13.5) it is worth noting that Charikleia is compared with the moon in the earlier books (3.6.3; 5.8.5) and that the astrological and magical influence of the moon is often mentioned in the romance (5.22.8, the right time to sail; 6.14.2, 6.14.4, the necromancy of the witch of Bessa; 7.8.4, the sacrifice of Thyamis). While this does not show that there is a consistent religious or allegorical dimension to the romance, it does indicate something of the intricate symbolic web woven by Heliodorus.

For Helios, cf. 4.8.2 above, and note. The origins of Dionysus are discussed by Diodorus Siculus (4.66.4-5), who mentions a claim by ‘the Libyans who live near the Ocean’ τῶν τὴν Λιβύην νεμομένων οἱ παρὰ τὸν ὠκεανὸν οἰκοῦντες, which was opposed by the Greeks. Hydaspes later also refers to Dionysus as one of the ancestral gods of Ethiopia (10.2.2). Heliodorus says that the Ethiopians sacrificed animals to Dionysus because of his benevolence to all, regardless of class (10.6.5). Those who fail the chastity test and are incinerated are consecrated to Dionysus (10.8.2), since his victims do not have to be pure (10.7.7). Greeks such as Knemon and Nausicles thought of Dionysus as the familiar god of literature (2.23.5; 2.24.4) and, of course, wine (5.15.3; 5.16.1).

ἡρώων δὲ Περσεύς τε καὶ Ἀνδρομέδα: Images of Perseus, Andromeda and Memnon are ensconced on a dais in a pavilion during the celebrations of Hydaspes’ victory, since the Ethiopian kings regarded them as the founders of their line (10.6.3: cf. Hdt. 7.61.12-15; Morgan 1979, at 10.6.3). For general accounts of the myth, see Apollod. *Bib.* 2.43-46; *AP* 16.147; Hyg. *Astron.* 2.9.1; Ov. *Met.* 4.668-705; Lib. *Progymn.* 2.35, 36).

Both Sophocles and Euripides composed plays with the title *Andromeda* (Soph. fr. 122-132; Eur. fr. 114-156 [Nauck]; *fr. pap.* 2.11), which probably inspired the representations of the heroine in Roman wall paintings (cf. *LIMC s.v.* ‘Andromeda’ I: 32, 35, 40, 53, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71). At least one vase painting, dated to about 450 BC, shows the princess accompanied by negroid attendants (cf. *LIMC s.v.* ‘Andromeda’ I:3), if this is indeed Andromeda and not Phineus, as Petersen (1904, 99-112) argues. However, Andromeda’s

attendants are clearly black on the pelike in the Boston Museum of Fine Art (63.2663, *Para.* 448: cf. *LIMC s.v.* 'Andromeda' I:2), which is also dated to the middle of the fifth century BC. The dramatists, who must have composed these tragedies towards the end of the fifth century, therefore probably envisioned Andromeda as a white princess in Oriental dress among the Ethiopians (Snowden 1970, 157-159). A possible exception to this rule is a South Italian hydria in Berlin (3238) on which Andromeda has negroid features but a 'white' skin (*LIMC s.v.* 'Andromeda' I:17). Cf. also the South Italian krater (*LIMC* 'Andromeda' I: 11), where the heroine's skin is painted in added white, although she has frizzy-looking short hair (I owe this reference to Professor Anne Mackay). It is conceivable that the myth of Kepheus and his daughter Andromeda concerned the exposure of an albino, not least because the reasons for the sacrifice of the daughter of the king are otherwise unexplained, whereas the exposure and sacrifice of albinos is well attested (see introduction on albinism; 4.8.5 below and note). The uncertainty about the skin colour of the princess persists in the later sources: Andromeda is described as having an emphatically white skin by Achilles Tatius (3.7.3 ἀλλ' οὔτε τῶν παρειῶν τὸ ὄχρὸν τέλειον ἀφοίνικτον ἦν) and Philostratus (*Imag.* 1.29.3 ἡ κόρη δὲ ἠδεῖα μὲν, ὅτι λευκὴ ἐν Αἰθιοπία) but she is also described as dark 'fusca' by Ovid *Her.* 15.35-38; *Ars Am.* 1.53, 3.191; cf. Snowden (1970, 151-155). Andromeda's father Kepheus is depicted as a mulatto (Snowden 1983, 95 and n. 172).

Most later authorities place the myth in the east: in Phoenicia (Joppa, Strabo 1.2.35.15; 16.2.28.3; Plin. *HN* 5.128; Jos. *BJ* 3.420), India (*AP* 5.132.8), Babylon (Hellanicus *apud* Seph. Byz. *Χαλδαῖοι*) or Persia (Hdt. 7.61.10-17; 7.150.6-8). But evidence for the location of the myth in Ethiopia may also be found in the astronomical and astrological writers such as Eudoxus ([4th century B.C.] 1.341-35.5); Aratos ([3rd century B.C.] 1.197-204); and Vettius Valens ([2nd century A.D.] 1.12.10-1.12.26). Valens says that the star Andromeda is associated with the zodiacal sign Aquarius, which lies opposite to (and thus exerts astrological influence on) Egypt and the Red Sea. This clearly suggests that the astrologers associated the myth with this region. Cf. also Andromeda's association with Memnon (discussed below).

The uncertainty over the original location of the myth of Perseus and Andromeda may be resolved by the hypothesis that the myth was transferred from eastern Ethiopia to western Ethiopia as geographical knowledge about Africa expanded (Lesky 1969, 27-38; Morgan 1989c, 433 n. 114). The distinction between eastern Ethiopia and western Ethiopia goes back to Homer; in the *Odyssey* (1.22-23) Poseidon goes to visit the remote Ethiopians

(ἔσχατοι ἀνδρῶν), who are divided into those near the rising and those near the setting sun. The Ethiopians are called 'blameless' (*Il.* 1.423, ἀμύμονας) and entertain the gods with abundant sacrifices (*Od.* 4.84, 5.282-287; *Il.* 23.206). The Greeks had earlier, more extensive, and longer knowledge of the 'eastern Ethiopians' (i.e. Indians) than of the western variety (cf., e.g., Karttunen 1989, *passim*; Doshi 1985, *passim*, and Sedlar 1980, *passim*). For the transition from a mythical to a geographical Ethiopia, see Snowden (1970, *passim* esp. 151-155 [Memnon and Andromeda]), Romm (1992, 45-60), Lesky (1959, 27-38).

καὶ Μέμνων ἐπὶ τούτοις: On the question of Memnon's geographical origins, the evidence is confused and vague. To Hesiod he is the son of Dawn and the king of the Ethiopians (*Theog.* 984-5) as he was to Callimachus (*Aet.* 4.110.52-3). As the son of Dawn he was naturally thought to have come from the east, more specifically from Susa (Hdt. 5.54; 7.151; Aesch. *apud* Strabo 15.3.2 [his mother, Kisseia, was from Susa]; Simonides *apud* Strabo 15.3.2 [he was buried in Susa]; Paus. 10.31.7; Ael. *Nat. Anim.* 5.1; *Suda* sv. Μέμνων; Steph. Byz. sv. Σοῦσα; Hyg. *Fab.* 223; Isid. *Etym.* 15.1.10; Lucan 3.284). Cf. Goossens (1939, 336-339), who believes that the Greeks confused Kush in Babylonia with the region of the same name south of Egypt and that Memnon originated in the Elamite god, Humban, from Susa. Other evidence places him in Africa (Curt. 4.8.3; Agatharchides *De Mar. Erythr.* 29). The cult of Memnon had strong links with Egypt (Dio Chrys. *Or.* 11.114, Ethiopian; *Or.* 31.92 statue in Egypt; Ath. 15.680b, wreaths put out for Memnon at Abydos in Egypt; Strabo 17.1.42, 17.1.46). The history of the famous statue, which was general located in Egypt (Paus. 1.42.3; Plin. *HN* 36.58; Juv. 15.5; Luc. *Toxar.* 27; *Philops.* 33; Callistrat. *Descr.* 1.5, 9 [in Ethiopia]; Philostrat. *Heroicus* 167-8K [in Meroë and Memphis]), is discussed by Gardiner (1961, 91-99) and Bowersock (1984, 21-32). Some of the evidence is ambivalent: according to Pliny (*HN* 6.182) Memnon was a member of the Ethiopian empire which included Syria; and Diodorus Siculus (2.22) makes him the general an Assyrian-Ethiopian army. These versions may be an attempt to reconcile the two main theories of Memnon's origins (Snowden 1970, 153).

The myth of Memnon was used by Arctinus in the lost *Aethiopsis*, by Aeschylus in his plays *Memnon* and *Psychostasia* (Nauck fr. 127-130, 279-280) and in the *Aethiopes* of Sophocles (Nauck fr. 25-30). He plays an important and positive part in the later epic of Quintus Smyrnaeus (2.43, 100, 101, 146, 212, 287, 295, 307, 353, 357, 370, 377, 391, 453) in which he and his Ethiopians represent new hope for Troy—his death is yet another tragedy for the city. However, according to Philostratus, Memnon died after ruling in Ethiopia for five generations but the Memnon who died at Troy was a Trojan (*VA* 6.4;

Her. 3.4).

Representations of Memnon are given in *LIMC* (s.v. 'Memnon' 448-461) and discussed in Snowden (1983, 48, 53, 55, 79, 80, 95; 1970, 151-153); Morgan (1979, at 10.6.3); and Robertson (1959, 67), who argues that Memnon was painted white because the Greeks disliked negroid features. He appears as a conventional Greek hero accompanied by negroid companions on a neck-amphora in New York (MMA 1898.8.13, *ABV* 149) and the same subject appears on a neck-amphora attributed to Exekias (London B209, *ABV* 144.8). A volute crater in the British Museum (E468, *ARV²* 206.132) from Caere shows Memnon (fighting Achilles) with a rounded nose and pointed beard. In the Latin tradition Memnon is always black (Cat. 66.52; Verg. *Aen.* 1.489; Ovid *Amores* 1.8.3-4; 1.13.33-34, Memnon's father was black; Manilius 1.767; Seneca *Agamemnon* 212; Gellius 19.7.6 [Laevius]; *Anth. Lat.* 189 [Luxorius]). However in art Memnon's father, Tithonos, is always white (cf. *LIMC* s.v. 'Eos'). Pausanias (10.31.7) says that Polygnotus painted Memnon with a white skin but with a negroid companion to indicate his country of origin. Philostratus discusses artistic representations of Memnon (*Imag.* 1.7 [Memnon]; 2.7 [Antilocheus]).

The ambiguities in the tradition concerning Andromeda and Memnon certainly made them suitable ancestral heroes for the enigmatic heroine of Heliodorus' romance.

Οἱ δὴ τὰς βασιλείους ἀυλὰς κατὰ καιροῦς ἰδρυσάμενοι: Colonna's (1938) retention of the relative pronoun οἱ (mAT) is unlikely in view of Koraes' argument that κατὰ καιροῦς 'from time to time' cannot refer to the original founders of the Ethiopian royal house, Helios, Dionysus, Perseus, Andromeda and Memnon. In his later edition he follows RL and Koraes here, punctuating as a new sentence.

τὰς μὲν δὴ τῶν ἄλλων εἰκόνας τε καὶ πράξεις ἀνδρῶσί τε καὶ περιδρόμοις ἐνέγραφον: Open colonnades, such as the Stoa Poikile in Athens, were commonly decorated with paintings. Philostratus (*VA* 1.25) describes the paintings in the bedrooms of the palaces of Babylon that included representations of 'Andromedas'.

The word εἰκών means 'likeness' or 'physical image' (Hdt. 2.130) but also 'phantom' (Luc. *DMort.* 16.1) and 'mental image', 'imaginary form' (Plat. *Rep.* 588b; *Phlb.* 39c). The word carries religious and philosophical overtones: Plato, for example, uses the word of his famous cave analogy (*Rep.* 515a, 517a). Kerényi (1962, 145) seeks to link the word to representations of Isis, but the term seems to be neoPlatonic: cf. Coulter (1976, 32-72), who discusses the use of εἰκών and σύμβολον in the theories of literary interpretation of the later neoPlatonists and their predecessors. See also the note on

ἄγαλμα (3.4.2 above). Such religious or philosophical shading is appropriate to the prominence of icons in the *Ethiopian Story*: cf., e.g., the icons of the Ethiopian gods and heroes in a pavilion at Meroë (10.6.3) and the picture of Andromeda which caused Charikleia to be born white (10.15.1). This suggests that Charikleia and her lineage are in some sense sacred or sacrosanct: cf. 3.4.1 above and note. A somewhat different, but related, use of εἰκόν as ‘symbolic representation’ occurs in the proemium of Longus (line 3) where it is used of the painting which the author saw in a grotto on Lesbos, on which he modelled his romance; for the possible philosophical tone of the word here, cf. Hunter (1983, 43-44).

The word περίδρομος in the sense of a ‘gallery’ is unusual, cf. Xen. *Cyr.* 6.1.53. In Heliodorus, cf. 10.15.2 (the mark on Charikleia’s arm; Walter Stephens 1994, 72); 1.18.4 (the confused movements of people in Thyamis’ dream).

4.8.4 ἡρεμεῖν τὸ μεσημβρινὸν συνέβαινεν: The most appropriate time for sexual intercourse to take place was the subject of serious discussion in antiquity. Plutarch reports a discussion on the most suitable time for intercourse (*Table Talk* 3.6 [653C-655D]), based on a debate in the *Symposium* of Epicurus (cf., frag. 61 [Usener]), that concludes that day time is best because then the process of digestion is completed. One of the participants in Plutarch’s dialogue, Soclarus, disagrees, arguing that night was a more modest time for sex, since then vision could not excite lust (654E)—Homer’s description of Paris leaving the battlefield for Helen being an exception (*Il.* 3.441-447). Medical opinion in antiquity held that the time between sleep and wakefulness was most conducive to successful conception since then apparitions (φάσματα) were likely to be experienced (Rufus of Ephesus *Medical Questions* 6.28). Some awareness of the medical, moral and psychological doctrines in these passages may have suggested the choice of midday as the appropriate time for the conception of Charikleia, but, in addition, the verb μεσημβριάζω denotes the culmination of the cycle of the sun and therefore may have an astrological significance (Poll. 4.157-158; Porph. *Antr.* 27; LSJ⁹ 2), especially as the time of conception was vital for determining a horoscope.

ἔπνου θερινοῦ κατακλίναντος: Soranus (*Gyn.* 1.41) states that summer is not a good season for conception, since the body at that time is weak (a medical commonplace: cf. also, e.g., Celsus 1.3.36). However, the astrological significance of the conception of the heroine at noon on a summer’s day, when the power of the Sun, the progenitor of the heroine, was at its height, cannot be entirely ignored. The coincidence between the reference to summer (θερινοῦ here) and Charikleia’s return to Ethiopia at the summer solstice (9.9.2) is certainly striking and suggests that her journey may be connected with

the seasonal cycle of the growth and return of the Nile (Winkler 1982, 151-152).

ὄναρ αὐτῷ τοῦτο κελεύειν ἐπομνύμενος: the action of the romance is therefore indisputably divinely motivated. However, the birth of a child as a result of a dream is a common motif in Egyptian *Königsnovelle* such as the *Dream of Nektanebos* (Koenen 1985, 186-187). The birth of Alexander as a result of Olympias' dream, following the 'prophecy' of Nektanebos (*Alexander Romance* 1.1-1.8) belongs to the same tradition. There is a close relationship between the *Ethiopian Story* and the *Alexander Romance* not least because both mention the significance of a magic, royal ring in the context of the birth of a child as the result of a dream.

ἡσθόμην δὲ παραχρήμα κυοφορήσασα τὴν καταβολήν: καταβολή 'seed thrown down from above', is used to refer to the time of conception generally (cf. 3.15.1 [the miraculous conception of Homer]; Lucian *Am.* 19; LSJ 1a) but can also be employed in a specifically astrological sense (e.g., Vettius Valens 220.29; LSJ 1c). The word is frequently used in the New Testament of the Creation (cf., e.g., Matthew 25.34 κληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου).

4.8.5 τοὺς δὲ θαλάμους τοῖς Ἀνδρομέδας τε καὶ Περσέως ἔρωσιν ποικίλλων: The story of Perseus' rescue of Andromeda is suited to romance: cf. the erotic *ekphrasis* by Achilles Tatius (3.7); Philostr. Jun. (*Imag.* 1.29); Philostr. *Ep.* 28; Lucian (*Dom.* 22.1-15; *D. Mar.* 14 [esp. 14.3.1-4]; Lucian (*De Salt.* 44 [suitable for pantomime]). Photius provides an account of the myth which reads much like a romance (*Bib.* 186.138b.24-139a.11 [Bekker]).

The *ekphrasis* of Andromeda is the real beginning of the *Ethiopian Story*, although it has been postponed for four books. Paintings are often used as introductions to Achilles Tatius, Longus, and Lucian's *Herakles* and *Slander*, for example (Bartsch 1989, 48).

χαριστήριοι θυσίαι: Heliodorus uses the adjective form of χαριστήριος here and at 9.22.2, 10.2.2, 10.6.2, but the noun form at 4.14.5, 5.12.3, 5.15.3, 5.27.9). Cf. LSJ⁹ s.v. χαριστήριος.

ἐπειδὴ δὲ σε λευκὴν ἀπέτεκον, ἀπρόσφυλον Αἰθιοπῶν χροῖαν ἀπανγάζουσαν: cf. 10.14.4-5. The story of Charikleia's birth belongs to the genre of paradoxography which originated among the Alexandrian poets and which became particularly popular in the second and third centuries A.D. (cf. Rommel 1923, *passim* [59-64 Hld.]; Giannini 1964, 99-138; Scobie 1969, 43-46; Wolff 1912, 210-221). Rommel discusses the following examples: 1.18 (why the cock crows at dawn); 2.28 (the Nile); 3.7 (the plover's ability to cure the 'eye of envy'); 5.13 (the amethyst ring); 9.18 (the use of elephants in battle); and 10.27

(the giraffe). Further examples in Heliodorus are: the domestic tragedy of Charikles which brought about his greatest happiness (2.29); the great wealth given to Charikles to in payment for the astoundingly beautiful Charikleia (2.30); and the naval battle on land during the siege of Syene (9.4-5). For discussion of the theory that Charikleia's paradoxical skin colour is related to albinism, see the Introduction.

The birth of a white child to black parents may have an antecedent in the story of Delphos (Schol. in Eur. *Or.* 1094; Paus. 10.6.3-4), who was the son of Poseidon by Melantho, Melaena, Melanis, or Thyia (the name varies but clearly means 'black'). However, the colours are normally inverted as in the myth of Kelaino, the daughter of Atlas, was said to have presented Argos with four Ethiopian children. One child, perhaps Delphos, is represented on fifth-century coins of Athens and Delphi (unless this is a depiction of Aesop; Snowden 1970, 150-151 and n. 46). Aristotle tells the story of a white woman, whose adultery with an Ethiopian resulted in a white child but a black grandchild (*HA* 586a2-4; *Gen. An.* 722a9-11). This story is repeated in Antigonos fr. 112b (Giannini), where the woman is said to have been from Elis. Plutarch gives the story of a Greek woman accused of adultery because she produced a black child—she successfully pleaded a black great grandparent (*God's Slowness to Punish* 563a6-8). Pliny relates how a boxer from Byzantium produced an Ethiopian child through an adulterous relationship with a woman of Ethiopian descent but of 'normal' appearance (*NH* 7.51.7-10, *indubitatum exemplum est Nicaei nobilis p<y>ctae Byzanti geniti, qui, adulterio Aethiopsis nata matre nihil a ceteris colore differente, ipse avum regeneravit Aethiopem*). These accounts have little to do with the circumstances of Charikleia's birth, which is presented in a far more enigmatic and paradoxical manners. For discussion of the possibility that albinism lies behind this paradox, see the introduction.

LSJ cite ἀπρόσφυλον 'not belonging to the tribe' as a *dubia lectio*. The MSS are equally divided between this reading (VMCZ) and ἀπρόσφιλον 'hostile' (BPAT). The latter is inappropriate here but it is suited to 5.7.3, πρὸς τὴν ἐράσμιον θέαν καὶ ἀπρόσφιλος ὀφθαλμὸς ἡμεροῦται 'even the eye of an enemy is tamed at the sight of something lovely', which is the more authoritative reading of MCBPAT (cf. also LSJ), although VZ have ἀπρόσφυλος here as well (the meaning of this would be 'even a barbarian's eye is tamed at the sight of something lovely'). In an appendix RL (Vol. 1, lxxii) favour ἀπρόσφυλος in both instances and their reading at 5.7.3 gets some support from the immediately preceding context (τοὺς γὰρ καλοὺς καὶ βάρβαροι χεῖρες ὡς ἔοικε δυσωποῦνται: cf. 3.4.8 above and note). Hesychius has an entry for ἔκφυλον· τὸ μὴ συγγενές. ἀλλόφυλον, which is

clearly the more normal word. That ἀπρόσφυλος is the correct reading is clear from 10.14.3 where Charikleia is described as πρὸς γὰρ τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ χροιά ξένη τῆς Αἰθιοπίδος λαμπρόνη.

A white skin is conventionally a mark of feminine beauty in the romances. Cf. Ach. Tat. 1.4.3; Long. 1.17.3, 4.32.1). Cf. also Theocr. 11.19-20; Lucian *D.Mar.* 1.2; Ath. 608d, quoting from Chaerephon's drama *Alphesiboea*; Jax 1933, 168-170. This feature is not restricted to women, since Theagenes' skin too is described as being very white (1.2.3). Nevertheless, skin colour has no ideological significance in the romances: In the *Alexander Romance* (3.18.3), the Queen of Ethiopia, Kandake, writes to Alexander asking him not to misjudge Ethiopians because of the colour of their skin. Moreover, the gymnosophist Sisimithres notes that character is more important than skin-colour (10.10.4). In any case, an aesthetic preference for white skin is more a reflection of a cultural norm than an indication of a racist mentality (Snowden 1983, 63) and the general acceptance of interracial marriage in the *Ethiopian Story* is a strong indication that Heliodorus was not racially prejudiced against Blacks (Snowden *loc. cit.*, p. 95). There are even touches of humour; Meroebos' blush is like flame passing over soot (10.24.2). For the symbolic value of the colours black and white, cf. Snowden (1983, 82-5, 100-101; 1970, 177-179: the symbolic significance of white and black is universal; Radke, Diss. Berlin 1936). The colour black was often associated with the underworld; in Heliodorus, Charikleia mistakes the black pirates with the ghosts of those she and Theagenes had killed in the battle at the Heracleotic mouth of the Nile (1.3.1; Winkler 1979, 160-165; Henrichs 1972, 63-66: referring to the *Phoinikika* of Lollianus).

The birth of an anomalously white daughter to an Ethiopian queen is a feature which Tasso borrowed from Heliodorus in his *Gerusalemme liberata* (cf. 12.21-40; Walter Stephens 1994, 68). Stephens (*loc. cit.* 71-73) treats the white skin of Charikleia as a literary motif. From this point of view, Charikleia herself becomes a text on which the evidence of the adultery of the queen is written. The paradox clearly has many facets that would have appealed to a sophist (Anderson 1993b, 148).

ἐγὼ μὲν τὴν αἰτίαν ἐγνώριζον ὅτι . . . ὁμοιοειδὲς ἐκείνῃ τὸ σπαρὲν οὐκ εὐτυχῶς ἐμόρφωσεν: later Charikleia is found to be an exact likeness (ἀρχέτυπον) of the painting of Andromeda: cf. 10.14.7.

For the theory of maternal impression, which is clearly deeply rooted in ancient confusion about sexual reproduction and genetics: cf. Reeve (1989, 81-112); Dilke (1980, 264-271); Morgan (1979, at 10.14.7); and Rohde (1914, 476 [447 n. 4]). The earliest

occurrence of the idea of maternal impression is philosophical in character (Aetius 5.12 [Diels 423], τῆι κατὰ τὴν σύλληψιν φαντασῆσαι τῆς γυναικὸς μορφοῦσθαι τὰ βρέφη πολλάκις γὰρ ἀνδριάντων καὶ εἰκόνων ἠράσθησαν γυναῖκες καὶ ὅμοια τούτοις ἀπέτεκον), where Empedocles suggests that a woman may fall in love with a picture or statue and that her offspring may resemble the image. The Empedocles passage is also mentioned in Pseudo-Plutarch (*Doctrines* 906e). Diotima's idea that contemplating beautiful boys and holding dialogue with them produces beautiful thoughts (Plato *Symp.* 201d1-12c3; 210a4-d8) may be related to the notion of maternal impression (Reeve 1989, 100). The idea is also discussed by rhetoricians: Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*De Imitat.* fr. 31.1) tells of an ugly man who made his wife look at pictures of handsome youths during intercourse; Quintilian's *controversia* on the subject is lost. The subject is naturally a favourity of medical writers; for example, conception is discussed by Pseudo-Galen (*To Gauros on how embryos take on souls* 5-6). In Galen (*Peri tou heriakou biblion* 946; *De Theriaca* 11, 14.253 [Kühn]) an ugly but rich man wanted a handsome son and so he commissioned a painting of such a boy and told his wife to look at it while they were making love; the woman gave birth to a boy resembling the picture rather than her husband. Soranus (*Gyn.* 1.39) relates how women seeing monkeys during intercourse produce simian children; how the tyrant of Cyprus had handsome children by forcing his wife to look at beautiful paintings at the time of conception; and how horse-breeders place noble horses in front of mares during coupling. Reeve (1989, 84-85) notes that the motif was well-established in the later literature on horse-breeding.

Pliny broadens the idea to include a wide variety of factors as agents of the 'impression': sight, sound, memory and 'images taken in at the moment of conception' (*HN* 7.52). Such stories derive ultimately from belief in fertility magic, such as the belief that tail hairs from a copulating mule promote conception in humans when twisted together during intercourse (Pliny *HN* 30.49.142). Pliny notes the interest of philosophers, including Plato, in magic (*HN* 30.2.3-9). Cf. Anderson (1993a, 66).

A similar story—Jacob's deception of Laban—is to be found in the Old Testament (*Gen.* 30.37-41; Jerome *Hebr. Quaest. in Gen* 30.32.33; Apocryphal Testament of 12 Patriarchs *Reuben* 5.6). When Jacob left Laban he made an agreement that he would get all the animals that were partly white in the flock which he had built up. He ensured that there would be many such animals, despite the fact that Laban had removed all animals with any white in them before entrusting them to Jacob's care, by putting sticks with white streaks in them in the drinking water of the ewes. Augustine, perhaps under the influence of the

neoPlatonists (Watson 1985, 139-140), explains the story by reference to the psychology of perception (*On the Trinity* 11.2), in which the will combines the image of the perceived object with the senses so powerfully that the body of the perceiver can be affected. Augustine cites the process of conception as an example of how the powerful longings of the mother often affect the appearance of their offspring. The will of the mother, acting on what she has seen (a *phantasia*), affects the form of the foetus, as in the case of the ewes gazing on sticks floating in the water trough in the story of Jacob's deception of Laban. Augustine (*Civ.* 18.5) also relates how demons in Egypt ensured that a phantom of the Apis bull, with the same colouring, was presented to a pregnant cow so as to produce a replacement for the sacred animal after its death. Similar stories can be found in the apocryphal gospel of Philip, who states that if a woman sleeps with her husband from compulsion, when her heart is with her lover, the child she will bear will look like the lover.

παρασχοῦσα καὶ πανταχόθεν ἐπιδείξασα γυμνήν: in Achilles Tatius (3.7), Andromeda is dressed in a wedding robe, whereas Perseus is naked. This is in keeping with the erotic character of the Andromeda myth (cf. the note on 4.8.5 above).

ἄρτι γὰρ αὐτήν ἀπὸ τῶν πετρῶν ὁ Περσεὺς κατήγευ: the aorist must be translated as a pluperfect tense.

ὁμοιοειδές: the more normal form is ὁμοειδές. See, for example, Iamblichus *De Mysteriis* 3.21.6-8: Εἰ γὰρ πού τι ἐκ δυοῖν ἐν ἀποτελοῖτο, ὁμοιοειδές τοῦτο καὶ ὁμοφυές πᾶν ἐστὶ καὶ ὁμοούσιον.

4.8.6 Ἔγνω . . . τὴν σὴν χροιάν μοιχείαν ἐμοὶ προσάψουσαν: cf. Calp. Flacc. *Declam.* 2, *Matrona Aethiopem peperit. arguitur adulterii*. According to the *Lex Julia de Adulteriis*, which was operational throughout the empire, a husband was entitled to put to death a wife and lover taken in adultery.

οὐ γὰρ πιστεύσειν οὐδένα λεγούση τὴν περιπέτειαν: cf. Arist. *Poet.* 1452a23, Ἔστι δὲ περιπέτεια μὲν ἢ εἰς τὸ ἐναντίον τῶν πραττομένων μεταβολή. Charikleia too appears to be aware of Aristotle's *Poetics* when she discusses the complexity of the plot of their story (9.24.4). The recognition scene in the final book of the *Ethiopian Story* conforms to the Aristotelian model, since it is accompanied by a sudden change in fortune; Charikleia escapes death to take up her position as Ethiopian princess (cf. Heiserman 1977, 198). The complexity of human life and the difficulty of understanding the convolutions of destiny are thematic in the romance (cf. Winkler 1982: 97, 104, 112, 120; Paulsen 1992 *passim*).

σοὶ τὸ ἐκ τῆς τύχης ἀμφίβολον χαρίσασθαι: the expression recalls Sisimithres'

description (to Charikles at Katadoupoi in Egypt) of how Persinna exposed her daughter (τύχης ἀμφιβολία τὰ κατ' αὐτήν ἐπιτρέψασα 2.31.1). The phrase is borrowed from Thucydides (οἵτινες τὰγαθὰ ἐς ἀμφίβολον ἀσφαλῶς ἔθεντο 4.18.4) and became something of a cliché in historical writing (cf. Polyb. 15.25.31; Appian 4.16.124; Herodian 7.5.5). Heliodorus uses ἀμφίβολον of what is obscure and unclear (cf. the intentions of Thermouthis in the cave, 2.13.3; Kalasiris in two minds about what to do, 4.9.3; boys doubtfully ephebes, 4.21.2; the obscure answers of the dead son of the witch of Bessa, 6.14.6; Achaimenes' vague memory of Theagenes, 7.15.3; the disputed ownership of Philai, 8.1.2; the danger to the Syenians not doubtful, 9.6.3; no doubt that the band was embroidered by Persinna, 10.14.1).

Τύχη plays an important part in the *Ethiopian Story*, as it does in the romances and in Hellenistic literature generally. Generally, τύχη affects the characters in a random way but mostly to their detriment: cf. 1.13.2; 1.15.2; 1.22.4; 2.21.4; 4.8.6; 4.8.8; 5.6.1; 5.6.2; 5.7.1; 5.18.2; 5.29.2; 6.8.5; 7.21.5; 7.26.2; 7.27.2; 8.6.4; 9.2.1; 9.5.1; 9.6.3; 9.11.6; 9.20.6; 9.26.1; 9.26.2; 10.2.1; 10.7.4; 10.13.5; 10.16.3; 10.34.6. Persinna's pessimistic comment on the unpredictability of fortune and destiny (cf. 4.5.1 above, and note) detracts from the view that the romance was written to illustrate the power of Helios in the world (see introduction).

ἄσπον πλεῖστον ἡδυνάμην πλοῦτον τῷ περισώζοντι μισθὸν συνεκθεμένη: περισώζω occurs frequently in Heliodorus: cf., e.g., 2.1.2, 2.12.2, 5.7.1, 5.26.3, 6.8.6, 7.14.6, 9.6.6, 9.20.6, 9.21.1, 10.20.1, 10.22.2, 10.29.3, 10.29.4, 10.34.3, and in Xenophon (*Hell.* 2.3.33; 6.2.25; 4.8.21; Baumgarten 1932, 22-23). Xenophon was used as a model of Attic Greek by the writers of the Second Sophistic, but, of course, the word occurred often after Xenophon.

ἄλλοις τέ σε κοσμήσασα καὶ ταινία τῆδε, [καὶ] ἐλλεινῶ διηγῆματι τῷ σῶ τε κάμαντιης: for the band, cf. 4.5.1 above, and note. It is important to add that the use of the words κοσμήσασα and διηγῆματι indicates that Heliodorus is toying with a metaliterary conceit: Charikleia is wrapped in her own story as the content of the book is contained within its words, and just as Persinna dresses her tiny baby up in fine clothes so the author embellishes his narrative stylistically (cf. Walter Stephens 1994, 72).

ἦν ἀπὸ δακρῶν τῶν ἐπὶ σοὶ καὶ αἵματος ἐχάραττον: a psychologically convincing conceit, which reinforces the queen's pessimism (cf. 4.8.8 below, and note). The hyperbolic proverbial expression 'to weep tears of blood' was used in rhetoric according to the *Suda* (s.v. Αἷματι κλαίειν: καθ' ὑπερβολήν, οὐ δάκρυσιν. ἐφ' ὧν μὴ δύναιντο πείσαι πάντα πρᾶττοντες, οὕτως ἔλεγον οἱ ἀρχαῖοι. οὐδ' ἂν πείση αὐτόν, οὐδ' αἷματι κλαίων).

the paradox contained in the prophesy of Kalasiris: παντάρβην φορέουσα πυρὸς μὴ τάρβει ἐρωήν, / ῥήϊδι' ὡς μοίραις χᾶ τ' ἀδόκητα πέλει (8.11.2) and remains somewhat sceptical of Charikleia's statement (8.11.8) that her father's engagement gift to her mother had saved her from death by fire: « Ταῦτα μὲν εἰκότα καὶ ὄντα, πλέον καὶ τοῖς ὑπεργμμένοις συμβαίνοντα » ἔφη ὁ Θεαγένης· « ἐκ δὲ τῶν εἰς αὔριον κινδύνων ποία τις ἄρα παντάρβη ἄλλη ἐξαίρησεται; » (8.11.10). The pantarb jewel plays an important part in the recognition of Charikleia as the daughter of Hydaspes; the king recognises the jewel as one he had given Persinna during their courtship (4.8.7; 10.14.3). In the present passage the ring serves a number of functions: (a) as an engagement ring, thus informing the reader of the loving relationship between Persinna and Hydaspes; (b) as a seal and so an reminder of the queen's royal status; and lastly (c) as an apotropaic amulet and consequently an indication of the dangerous future which awaits the infant (for this last use, cf. Bonner [1950, 4-5]). Heliodorus has thus carefully woven this thread into the fabric of his narrative and at the same time justified Charikleia's belief in its supernatural powers.

The account of the pantarb stone is clearly influenced by Plato's account of the ring of Gyges (Hdt. 1.8-12; Plato *Rep.* 359d2-360d7), the attractive property of magnets (*Ion* 533d4; cf. Eur. fr. 567.2—often used as a metaphor of desire: cf. Eubolus in Ath. 3.78.25-26; Ach. Tat. 1.17.2; Lucian *Philopseud.* 17.7-10), and the uncorrupted stones in the mountains of the 'real' earth (*Phaedo* 110e). For magic stones in the head of a mountain-snake with magic power like that of the ring of Gyges, cf. Phil. VA 3.8. Ctesias relates that pantarb stones had the power of attracting others to them (Jacoby F.3c688.F fr. 45.11-13 = Photius *Bib.* 72.45a28 [Bekker]); Philostratus relates that the stone is elusive but sheds a brilliant light and has the ability to draw anything nearby towards it (VA 3.46.10-18).

Interest in magic stones persisted into the fourth century; a poem with the title *Lithika*, by a certain Orpheus, celebrated the magic powers of stones and decried the persecution of paganism and the execution of Maximus the neoPlatonic teacher of Julian (Barb 1963, 117). The neoPlatonist, Damascius, also wrote about moon-stones, which changed with the phases of the moon, and sun-stones that appeared have fire shining from them (*Vit. Is.* 119W). His description of this stone recalls the amethyst which Kalasiris gave to Nausicles as the price of her release (5.13.3), which came from the pile of Ethiopian stones given to Charikles by Sisimithres (2.30.3; cf. also the jewellery of Kalligone in Achilles Tatius 2.11.3). Interest in gem stones is apparent also in the dispute over the emerald mines between Persia and Ethiopia that led to the war between these two countries (2.32.2, 8.1.3). Syria was noted for its litholatry (Strömberg 1946, 189-190).

λέγουσι δὲ καί, οὐδ' ἄν αἵματι στένων πείσειεν), but Persinna is not using a rhetorical cliché here—real tears and blood would have been shed in giving birth to her daughter. The expression is striking and strengthens the idea that this passage must be interpreted on the metadiegetic, as well as the diegetic level, especially if it is taken together with the repetition of the verb χαράττω (4.8.1) and the innovative word χαρακτηρίζει (4.8.7). Just as the queen records the story of her suffering and her daughter's birth on the band with her own hand (10.14.1) so Charikleia's moral life is shaped by her commitment to chastity (cf. 4.8.1 above and note).

ὄμοῦ πρωτοτόκος καὶ πολύθρηνος γενομένη: πρωτοτόκος is found in Homer *Il.* 17.5 (of a heifer) and Plato *Theaet.* 151c (μὴ ἀγρίαινε ὥσπερ αἱ πρωτοτόκοι περὶ τὰ παιδιά). The medical writers observe that first-time mothers experience more pain than others (Hippocrates *On the Nature of the Child* 30; *On the Feelings of Women* 72). Πολύθρημος is used again in the *Ethiopian Story* 5.2.9 (αἰχμάλωτος καὶ πολύθρημος) to describe 'Thisbe' alias Charikleia singing a lament like a nightingale (Philomela) in the darkness. The word is poetic (cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 711; 714) and is used by Euripides of Itys, the son of Tereus (fr. 773 Ἴτυν πολύθρημον).

4.8.7 σωφροσύνην, ἣ δὴ μόνη γυναικείαν ἀρετὴν χαρακτηρίζει: Chastity (σωφροσύνη) for males as well as females is thematic in the novel (Hefti 1950, 68-69 calls it '*das ethische Leitmotiv der Aethiopica*'). Key passages in the following list of references are cited in bold numbers: Cf. 1.3.1 (Charikleia); 1.8.3 (Charikleia); 1.9.3 (Demainete); 1.10.4 (Knemon); 1.12.2 (Aristippos); 1.20.2 (Charikleia); 1.24.3 (Thyamis); 1.25.4 (Charikleia); 2.4.2 (Charikleia); 2.7.1-2 (Charikleia and Theagenes); 3.6.1 (Charikleia); 3.17.4 (Theagenes); 4.8.7 (Persinna to Charikleia); 4.10.5-6 (Kalasiris to Charikleia); 4.18.4-6 (the oath of chastity); 5.4.5 (Charikleia to Theagenes); 5.22.3 (Penelope); 5.29.6 (Kalasiris and Charikleia); 7.2.2-3 (Thyamis); 8.6.4 (Theagenes); 8.9.22 (Theagenes and Charikleia); 8.11.1 (Theagenes to Charikleia); 8.13.2 (Theagenes and Charikleia); 10.7.7-10.9.4 (the gridiron test). Virginité (παρθενεία) is also highly esteemed (1.18.5 (Charikleia); 2.33.4-5 (Charikleia); 4.10.3-6 (Charikleia); 5.4.5 (Theagenes); 6.8.6 (Charikleia); 10.8.2 (Theagenes and Charikleia); 10.21.2 (Charikleia).

Virginité is naturally of great importance to romance heroines in general, which makes Kerényi's contention (1962, 220 and n. 56) that the theme is connected with the chastity of Isis after the death of Osiris very unlikely. Leukippe's mother, for example, deplores her daughter's supposed loss of virginité (2.24). Leukippe herself has a dream in which Artemis tells her that she will remain a virgin until she is married (Ach. Tat. 4.1.4).

Her virginity and Melite's are put to the test in the cave of Pan and in the waters of the Styx respectively (8.11-14). In Chariton, Callirhoe is persuaded to marry Dionysius despite her relationship with Chaereas but only for the sake of her child (Char. 3.11.5). Male chastity is less highly prized. Kleitophon is unfaithful to Leukippe with Melite (5.27) and Ninus claims to have remained chaste through all his conquests but also states that most boys have sex before they turn fifteen (*Ninus Romance* fr. A2). Heliodorus is unusual in insisting on the virginity of Theagenes (4.18.4 below, and note; 5.4.5). Cf. Goldhill (1995), who discusses σωφροσύνη in general (pp. 1-45) and in Heliodorus specifically (pp. 35-36, 118-121); Sissa (1990) *passim*; Rattenbury (1926a, 59-71). Virginity and chastity were virtues greatly valued in Syrian proto-monastic ascetism as Ephrem's *Hymns on Virginity* show (Brock 1985, 131-141).

Χαρακτηρίζει is a highly unusual verb (cf. Naber 1873, 155; LSJ⁹ who quote Plotinus *Enn.* 1.8.3: τὴν τοῦ κακοῦ ἐχαρακτήριζε φύσιν).

φρόνημα βασιλείον καὶ πρὸς τοὺς φύντας ἀναφέρον: ἀναφέρον is active for middle (Barber 1962, 5) but the sense here is 'trace descent to' as in Plato *Theaet.* 175a6, προγόνων σεμνυνομένων καὶ ἀναφερόντων εἰς Ἡρακλέα.

For Heliodorus' frequent use of the solecism φύντας meaning 'parents', cf. Introduction: Language (participles).

μεμνήση δὲ πρὸ πάντων τῶν συνεκτεθέντων σοι κειμηλίων: For Heliodorus' fondness for the word κειμήλιον, see Morgan (1979, at 9.23.1). The importance of the birth-tokens in the *Ethiopian Story* is an indication of the fact that New Comedy had as much influence on Heliodorus as Tragedy (Hefti 1950, 113). Merkelbach's view (1962, 308) that the κειμήλια represent the σύμβολα of mystic initiates (cf. the hymn to the soul in the *Acts of Thomas* 4-8) is a distortion of this tradition.

δακτύλιόν τινα: the ring given to Persinna by Hydaspes (8.11.8) is later used as a token of recognition between Theagenes and Charikleia (5.5.2), saves Charikleia from being burnt at the stake (8.11.2), and finally ensures that she is recognised by her father (10.14.3). The message of the queen is therefore not in vain. The ring was not part of the jewels mentioned by the Ethiopian ambassador (2.31.2) and Heliodorus probably mentions it here to provide some new mystery to compensate for the release of information concerning Charikleia's birth (Hefti 1950, 69). If so, the proleptic comment on the ring's efficacy only exerts its power to save Charikleia at a much later stage (8.10.2).

βασιλείῳ μὲν συμβόλῳ . . . καθιερωμένον: Παντάρβη means 'all-fear' as Theagenes says: Τοῦνομα μὲν γὰρ ἡ παντάρβη πάντα φοβουμένη δηλοῖ (8.11.4). Theagenes is confused by

the paradox contained in the prophesy of Kalasiris: παντάρβην φορέουσα πυρὸς μὴ τάρβει ἐρώην, / ῥήϊδι' ὡς μοίραις χά τ' ἀδόκητα πέλει (8.11.2) and remains somewhat sceptical of Charikleia's statement (8.11.8) that her father's engagement gift to her mother had saved her from death by fire: « Ταῦτα μὲν εἰκότα καὶ ὄντα, πλέον καὶ τοῖς ὑπηργμένοις συμβαίνοντα » ἔφη ὁ Θεαγένης: « ἐκ δὲ τῶν εἰς αὐριον κινδύνων ποία τις ἄρα παντάρβη ἄλλη ἐξαίρησεται; » (8.11.10). The pantarb jewel plays an important part in the recognition of Charikleia as the daughter of Hydaspes; the king recognises the jewel as one he had given Persinna during their courtship (4.8.7; 10.14.3). In the present passage the ring serves a number of functions: (a) as an engagement ring, thus informing the reader of the loving relationship between Persinna and Hydaspes; (b) as a seal and so an reminder of the queen's royal status; and lastly (c) as an apotropaic amulet and consequently an indication of the dangerous future which awaits the infant (for this last use, cf. Bonner [1950, 4-5]). Heliodorus has thus carefully woven this thread into the fabric of his narrative and at the same time justified Charikleia's belief in its supernatural powers.

The account of the pantarb stone is clearly influenced by Plato's account of the ring of Gyges (Hdt. 1.8-12; Plato *Rep.* 359d2-360d7), the attractive property of magnets (*Ion* 533d4; cf. Eur. fr. 567.2—often used as a metaphor of desire: cf. Eubolus in Ath. 3.78.25-26; Ach. Tat. 1.17.2; Lucian *Philopseud.* 17.7-10), and the uncorrupted stones in the mountains of the 'real' earth (*Phaedo* 110e). For magic stones in the head of a mountain-snake with magic power like that of the ring of Gyges, cf. Phil. VA 3.8. Ctesias relates that pantarb stones had the power of attracting others to them (Jacoby F.3c688.F fr. 45.11-13 = Photius *Bib.* 72.45a28 [Bekker]); Philostratus relates that the stone is elusive but sheds a brilliant light and has the ability to draw anything nearby towards it (VA 3.46.10-18).

Interest in magic stones persisted into the fourth century; a poem with the title *Lithika*, by a certain Orpheus, celebrated the magic powers of stones and decried the persecution of paganism and the execution of Maximus the neoPlatonic teacher of Julian (Barb 1963, 117). The neoPlatonist, Damascius, also wrote about moon-stones, which changed with the phases of the moon, and sun-stones that appeared have fire shining from them (*Vit. Is.* 119W). His description of this stone recalls the amethyst which Kalasiris gave to Nausicles as the price of her release (5.13.3), which came from the pile of Ethiopian stones given to Charikles by Sisimithres (2.30.3; cf. also the jewellery of Kalligone in Achilles Tatius 2.11.3). Interest in gem stones is apparent also in the dispute over the emerald mines between Persia and Ethiopia that led to the war between these two countries (2.32.2, 8.1.3). Syria was noted for its litholatry (Strömberg 1946, 189-190).

Finally, the allegorical interpretation of the romance by Philip (ll. 119-131) interprets the pantarb stone as meaning ‘that which fears all’ (τὸ πᾶν ταρβοῦσα) or ‘that which is afraid’, suggesting that it stands for fear of God, because God is all (τὸ πᾶν). The change from Theagenes’ reading πάντα φοβουμένη to Philip’s neoPlatonic and pantheistic τὸ πᾶν ταρβοῦσα is drastic (Tarán 1992, 226-227).

The motif of the pantarb stone in the *Ethiopian Story* therefore reflects the widespread use of magic stones in the philosophy and literature of the third and fourth centuries. Heliodorus uses the motif to reinforce the reader’s impression of Charikleia as a unique individual with supernatural powers and the heir to immense wealth and influence. The proleptic reference to the ring with its precious stone leads the reader to anticipate spectacularly dramatic scenes in the remainder of the work.

4.8.8 τοῦ δαίμονος στερήσαντος: the δαίμων here appears to be a powerful and hostile being: cf. 3.14.2 above, and note.

τάχα μὲν κωφὰ καὶ ἀνήνυτα τάχα δὲ καὶ εἰς ὄφελός ποτε ἦξοντα: For κωφά, cf. Sophocles *O.T.* 290, Καὶ μὴν τά γ’ ἄλλα κωφὰ καὶ παλαί’ ἔπη; Porphyry, *Vit. Pyth.* 46.6-7, νοῦς γὰρ κατ’ αὐτὸν πάνθ’ ὄρα καὶ πάντ’ ἀκούει, τὰ δ’ ἄλλα κωφὰ καὶ τυφλά. Koraes discusses the wide range of meanings of the word (for example, ‘deaf, blind, dumb, foolish, ineffectual’) and its relationship to κουφός, κοῖλος and κόφινος (‘coffin’ derives from the last of these). The Homeric κωφὸν βέλος (*Il.* 11.390) conveys the idea of κωφά here well.

ᾧ μάτην ὥραία: cf. 10.16.9, ᾧ μάτην μὲν ὥραία μάτην δὲ ἀνευραμένη τοὺς γεννήσαντας. The echo is one of many which link the events of book 10 with those of book 4.

ἐπιτύμβια καὶ μητρὸς ἐπικήδεια δάκρυα: The band functions as a recapitulation of the plot, a token of recognition and as a funeral inscription (Létoublon 1995, 14). For epitaphs written by mothers to their children: cf. IG 9.1.163.5-6 (Phokis 3rd c. BC), πολλάκι δ’ ἀμφὶ τεδὸν μάτηρ τάφον οἰκτρὸν ἄνυσεν / Δεξῶ, στενάζουσ’ ὀρφανὰν τέκνου χάριν, quoted by Lattimore (1942, 172-214).

4.9.1 τὴν ἐκ θεῶν οἰκονομίαν ἐθαύμαζον: the word οἰκονομία is common among Christian writers in the sense ‘providence’ (Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* 1.1.2.8-10, ἀπὸ πρώτης ἀρξομαι τῆς κατὰ τὸν σωτήρα καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκονομίας)—the synonymous term διοίκησις is used at 10.38.1. Koraes (*ad loc.*) discusses a number of passages in which Heliodorus shows a knowledge of the Christian scriptures. These were collected by Rohde (1914³, 462 [433 n. 1]) to give proof of ‘der völligen Nichtigkeit’ of Koraes’ argument (it was important for Rohde’s theory of a second century date for Helio-

dorus to discount the presence of Christianity in the work). However, further evidence has been supplied by Cataudella (1975, 172-174) and general discussions of the relationship between Christianity and the ancient romances are to be found in Edwards (1987, 9-14) and Dörrie (1938, 273-276). There seems to be no reason to doubt Heliodorus' knowledge of Christian writings (see introduction). Elsewhere in the romance fate rather than providence governs the destiny of the characters (5.4.7; 6.8.5; 7.6.4; 10.16.3) but this may be attributed to the influence of New Comedy (Eur. *Orest.* 981) or drama (Paulsen 1992 *passim*). Such 'moments poétiques' as this (Feuillâtre 1966, 26; cf. 7.8), particularly reflections on the uncertainty of human existence, were also a commonplace of historiography since Herodotus (cf. 7.46, Xerxes' reflections on the brevity of human life; Tac. *Ann.* 1.61).

Of course, knowledge of Christian terms does not mean that Heliodorus was committed to Christian doctrines. Throughout the romance, the guiding deity is Helios, but both here and at 10.38.1, the gods are referred to in the plural, which suggests that Helios-Apollo, operating through τύχη (Rohde 1914³, 464-465 [436-437]; cf. Morgan 1979, at 10.16.3), is not thought of as the only deity in the work (Keydell 1966, 349; cf. *contra* Kerényi 1962², 57, who notes that a similar expression can be found in the Greek legend of Tefnut, which paraphrases a demotic text).

On the narratological level, the philosophical reflection on the power of fortune here outweighs the ambiguity Hefti (1950, 75) sees in these words (is Kalasiris amazed at the discovery of Charikleia through the providence of the gods or at how the gods had involved him in the execution of Persinna's request?). There is a remarkable coincidence between the reactions of Kalasiris and the reader here, especially in the words ταῦτα. . . ὡς ἀνέγνων (Morgan 1991, 101). In both cases, though, the reader does not yet know the full extent of Kalasiris' involvement in the search for Charikleia (see following note).

ἡδονῆς δὲ ἅμα καὶ λύπης ἐνεπλήσθην: a somewhat different expression of tragic emotion from the Aristotelian idea of tragedy as a purgation of the emotions of pity (ἔλεος) and fear (φόβος) but perhaps owing something to it nonetheless (cf. Heiserman 1977, 201). Kalasiris appears to give expression to his understanding of the mysterious mixture of tragedy and comedy in life—a view well suited Heliodorus' central metaphor of life as stage drama (cf. Anderson 1982, 39 and n. 69: 'Heliodorus can neither resist the trickery of comedy nor the grandiosity of tragedy, and never wants to commit himself.')

The passage is clearly to be located in the romantic topos of the conflict of the emotions, well treated by Fusillo (1990, 201-221), who notes with regard to the present

passage (p. 218) that Kalasiris' emotional reaction to the letter is caused by his identification of Charikleia with the lost daughter of Persinna—information that the reader does not yet possess. The use of the topos here underlines the significance of the passage. For other instances in the romance: cf. 1.23.1 (the feelings of Thyamis on the postponement of his proposed marriage to Charikleia); 4.11.1 (Kalasiris reveals to Charikleia his knowledge of her love for Theagenes); 7.7.3 (Thyamis and Petosiris recognise their father Kalasiris); 10.13.1 (Persinna recognises Charikleia's swaddling band); 10.38.4 (the final resolution of the plot). For examples in the other romances, see Char. 3.5.3, 3.7.6, 5.8.2, 6.6.1, 8.5.8; X. Eph. 1.9.1, 1.11.1, 2.5.5, 3.7.1, 5.13.3; Ach. Tat. 1.4.5, 2.29.1, 5.19.1, 5.24.3, 7.1.1.

διαχειομένης μὲν τῆς ψυχῆς: For the metaphor, cf. 3.7.5 above; Feuillâtre 1966, 77. For the homoioteleuton, cf Wolff (1912, 231).

τῶν ἀγνοουμένων εὕρεσιν: for the discovery (εὕρεσις) of Charikleia, cf. 3.15.3; 3.16.5. Merkelbach (1962, 246 and n. 1) attaches great importance to these words for his view that Charikleia is a personification of the human soul, who has fallen into the material world and has forgotten her true home. According to this view, it is the duty of Kalasiris to instruct Charikleia to flee this world and to return to her spiritual home.

τὴν ἐπίλυσιν: cf. 4.5.1 above, and note.

καὶ τὸν ἀνθρώπινον βίον οἰκτειρούσης ὡς ἄστατόν τι: a fairly conventional expression: cf. Aes. *Fab.* 13.2.10-11, ὁ μῦθος δηλοῖ, ὅτι οὐ δεῖ λυπεῖσθαι ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀτυχίαις γινώσκοντας τὸ τοῦ βίου ἄστατον; Plutarch 103f2-3 (Stephanus), οὐκ ἐνθυμούμενοι τὸ τῆς τύχης ἄστατον καὶ ἀβέβαιον; Philo *That God is Unchangeable* 4.9-10, ἀνίδρυτον καὶ ἄστατον κατείδε τὴν γένεσιν; Iamblichus *On the Mysteries* 2.4.80-82, τὸ δ' αὖ τῶν ἀγγέλων μονίμως κινούμενον ἄστατόν γε μὴν τὸ τῶν δαιμόνων.

4.9.2 κεκλήρωτο δὲ θυγατρὸς ὄνομα νόθον: Naber (1873, 163) rightly notes the typographical error νόθου for νόθον.

Kalasiris tells Charikleia to admit to what is troubling her and advises her to marry

4.9.3 ἀμελεῖν: RL wrongly adopt ἀμελεῖν 'be neglectful' (C) in preference to διαμέλλειν 'delay' (VBMZ) here. Although ἀμελεῖν occurs also at 2.36.2 and 6.15.2, where the notion of 'neglect' is appropriate, there is no suggestion here of Kalasiris' lack of care. Rather, he reproaches himself for delaying the fulfilment of the divine plan. For a similar use of διαμέλλω, cf. 6.8.2 (διαμελλήσας).

ἔργου ἔχεσθαι: Reeve (1971, 520) notes the irregular hiatus and compares 9.3.8, ἔργου εἶχετο.

ἀπειρηκυῖαν ἤδη . . . καὶ ἀντέχειν ἀσθενήσαντι πρὸς τὸ δεινόν: Charikleia here shows one of the conventional Hellenistic symptoms of love—physical sickness (cf., e.g., Callimachus *AP* 12.71 and the well-known story of Antiochus and Stratonike, 4.7.4 above, and note). Heliodorus gives a psychologically plausible description of love-sickness and makes Charikleia a stronger heroine than usual, particularly in her mature advice to Theagenes (1.26.2-6; cf. 3.4.1 above, and note; Maehler 1990, 11-12).

4.10.1 ἄνδρα σοὶ τε εὔνουν καὶ γινῶναι τὰ πάντα καὶ σιωπῶσης οὐκ ἀδύνατον: This extravagant claim to omniscience is in keeping with others made by Kalasiris in the romance. He says that he is able to recognise the gods (3.12.1; 3.13.2) and has access to true wisdom and knowledge of the future from astrology (3.16.4) in addition to book learning (2.28.2; 3.8.1 above, and note). It was, after all, because of his certain knowledge of the future feud of his two sons that he left Memphis (3.16.5). He also tells Theagenes that he knew what was troubling him since nothing was beyond the range of his knowledge, although the context suggests that this was a fraudulent claim (3.17.2). He later repeats to Charikleia his claim to know the cause of her distress (4.10.4) and states that he learnt of Charikleia's whereabouts in Delphi from the gods and told Persinna of them (4.12.3).

On the other hand, Kalasiris tells Knemon that he did not know how to bring about the escape of the lovers from Delphi or where to take them (3.12.1; 3.15.3; 4.4.5; 4.5.1; 4.9.1). It is clear that in the passage under discussion Kalasiris wants to compel Charikleia to confess her love for Theagenes (4.5.7) and speaks of this as a matter of conscience (4.6.1, τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ αἰδοῦμενον) and gives her a day in which to come to terms with herself on the matter (4.6.1-2). His claim to know what troubles her is simply a way of applying pressure on her in order to obtain her confession. Charikleia resists this pressure, and comments ironically on the priest's claim to prophetic knowledge (4.6.1). In fact, the closest Charikleia comes to a confession is to say that she is not sure whether 'the enemy' would 'come to terms' (4.11.1, τὸν ἐμοὶ πολέμιον ἀντιποιησόμενον). A confession from Charikleia is in any case not entirely necessary at this point—Kalasiris' pretence of ignorance and Charikleia's qualified admission is enough to advance the story-line while maintaining a certain amount of tension in the reader to discover more (Hefti 1950, 71).

4.10.2 καὶ τὴν γοῦν αἰσχύνην κερδαίνειν, κρύπτουσαν ἃ καὶ πάσχειν αἰσχρὸν καὶ ἐκλαλεῖν αἰσχρότερον: Cf Soph. *OT* 1409. The silence of the man or woman suffering from a tragic love relationship is a part of the topos (Mesk 1913, 380; Nutton 1978, 197).

4.10.3 ἡ νόσος: a topos: cf. 7.10.6; Soph. *Trach.* 445.

ἀπειρημένου: a word normally confined to the political sphere, i.e. ‘illegal’ (cf., e.g., Hdt. 3.52; Feuillâtre 1966, 86). Here perhaps best translated as ‘taboo’.

τὸ παρθενίας ὄνομα σεμνότατον: RL suggest that Heliodorus wrote ὄνομα σεμνότατον ὄν (cf. 3.11.1, δῆλον ὄν) and that the ὄν subsequently fell away, but cf. 2.27.3 for the omission of the copulative (after ἐπαγωγότατον). The repetition of the syllable ov three times in as many words might be considered an unacceptable jingle, but cf., e.g., 1.1.1 (. . . πλεόμενον, ἐπὶ τὸν πλησίον αἰγιαλὸν). However, the presence of the participle is unnecessary here.

Naber (1873, 339) finds Heliodorus’ use of the comparative and superlative degrees of comparison of adjectives often unnecessary as here (cf. also εὐπρεπέστερον 4.10.4; σοφώτατον 4.10.6; φοβερότεροι 4.17.5) but this is a feature of Heliodorus’ atticist style (Fritsch 1901, 22-23).

4.10.4 Ἐπιρρωννὺς οὖν αὐτήν: this is far from an absolution by Kalasiris for the initiate, Charikleia, as Merkelbach claims (1962, 246 and n. 2).

ἐρυθριῶσα λέγειν ἃ γυναιξὶ κρύπτειν εὐπρεπέστερον: cf. κρύπτουσ’ ἃ κρύπτειν ὄμματ’ ἄρσένων χρεῶν, Eur. *Hek.* 570 (the dying Polyxena takes care to preserve her modesty); οὐδὲν φροντίζουσα κρύπτειν ὅσα γυνὴ μὴ ὀρᾶσθαι θέλει, Ach. Tat. 4.9.3 (Leukippe in a fit fails to preserve her modesty); Neimke (1889, 14, 54-55). The contrast between the present passage (a confession of love) and the similar expressions in Euripides and Achilles Tatius (the unwitting display of the female body) is marked, but Heliodorus has a strong sense of propriety: cf. 3.4.5 above and note.

4.10.5 τοῦτο γὰρ ὀμφὴ μοι θεῶν ἐμήνυσε: ὀμφὴ is a Homeric word which evokes the grandeur of epic here: cf. *Il* 2.41, θεῖη δέ μιν ἀμφέχυτ’ ὀμφὴ.

σὺ μὲν ἴσθι μὴ μόνη . . . τῶν τὰ ἄλλα σωφρόνων: cf. Euripides *Hipp.* 437-9, οὐ γὰρ περισσὸν οὐδὲν οὐδ’ ἔξω λόγου / πέπονθας ὄργαι δ’ ἐς σ’ ἀπέσκηψαν θεᾶς. / ἐρᾶς τί τοῦτο θαῦμα; σὺν πολλοῖς βροτῶν. In Heliodorus, Kalasiris makes the additional point that Charikleia’s passion is one shared by other noble and virtuous women, thus clearly revealing the importance attached to social class and moral sensibility in the romance (cf. 3.3.8 above and note). A parallel is provided by Dodds (1951, 133-136), who interprets a papyrus fragment (P. Mich. 5) as part of a romance in which a girl has fallen in love with a young man who appears in her dreams. An anxious parent asks a magician for a remedy, but the magician declines saying that the girl would not be the first to whom this happened (πόσοι δὲ ἄλλοι παραλόγων [ῆ]ρά[σθ]η[σα]ν σωμαίων).

ὁ Ἔρως καὶ ἤδη καὶ θεῶν αὐτῶν ποτε κρατεῖν λεγόμενος: for the commonplace sentiment

that Eros is the most powerful of the gods: cf. Eur. *fr.* 431 (Nauck); *fr.* 136; Char. 6.3.2; Petron. *Sat.* 83.4; Long. 2.7.2; Ach. Tat. 1.5.7.

4.10.6 Ἐπισκόπει δὲ ὅπως ἄριστα διαθήσῃ τὰ παρόντα: to some extent the contrast between Kalasiris, who seemingly allows Charikleia freedom of choice here, and Charikles who is said to be insisting on the marriage with Alkamenes (cf. 4.13.2) is a misrepresentation (cf. Winkler 1982, 131-132). Charikles is modest about his ability to persuade Charikleia into the match (4.7.9) and Kalasiris knows that there is no real chance of Charikleia disagreeing with her ‘father’ on this issue.

For the expression τὰ παρόντα, cf. τὰ παρόντα θέσθαι καλῶς (Ach. Tat. 5.11.4; Neimke 1889, 52).

ὡς τὸ μὲν ἀπείρατον γενέσθαι τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔρωτος εὐδαιμον, τὸ δὲ ἀλόντα πρὸς τὸ σῶφρον τὸ βούλημα περιποιῆσαι σοφώτατον: these words were chosen by Koraes as a quotation on the title page of the first volume of his commentary. Heliodorus uses ἀπείρατον in this sense on other occasions also (7.25.7; 10.33.2), cf. also Gregory of Nyssa (*De Virg.* 8.1.39; Eusebius *Praep. Evang.* 2.2.41.4, ἀπείρατον ἀφροδισίων). For the idea that virginity is the ideal state and that marriage is merely respectable, cf. Paul 1 *Cor.* 7.25-40.

τὸ βούλημα περιποιῆσαι σοφώτατον: Koraes suspects that περιποιῆσαι is not Greek and prefers περιστήσαι, but cf. 1.15.2; 2.19.3; 4.8.7; 5.30.2; 10.34.3. The use of unusual compound verb forms is a feature of Heliodorus’ language (see Introduction).

ὁ δὲ καὶ σοὶ βουλομένη πιστεύειν ἔξεστι . . . τρέψαι τὴν νόσον: cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 477, νοσοῦσα δ’ εὖ πως τὴν νόσον καταστρέφου. Kalasiris’ advice is similar to that of Akesinos—to seek the cure for the malady in the man who is causing it (cf. 4.7.7 above, and note). The passage underlines the importance of marriage in the *Ethiopian Story*. Goldhill (1995, 120-121) takes Kalasiris’ words here as an indication that Heliodorus was in tune with the Christian view of marriage as a sacrament. Cf. also Morgan (1989a, 320); Cancik (1976, 48-68).

Naber (1873, 340) prefers καταστρέψαι to τρέψαι but cf. 5.34.2.

4.11.1 Ἰδρῶτι πολλῶ διερρεῖτο: cf. ἰδρῶτι διερρεῖτο (10.131; Morgan 1979, *ad loc.*). The expression is not necessarily unromantic (Feuillâtre 1966, 28), cf. Sappho fr. 31.13 (μ’ ἰδρῶς ψυχρὸς κακχέεται) and cf. Plato *Phaedr.* 254c, where the good horse in Plato’s charioteer analogy breaks into a sweat on seeing chaste beauty. Heliodorus is clearly concerned to underline the emotional significance that marriage has for Charikleia (cf. Fusillo 1990, 201-221).

RL tentatively suggest that the reading of C (περιερρεῖτο) may be correct and cite

Plut. *Aem.* 25 (ἵππους ἰδρῶτι πολλῶ περιρροομένους) in support, but διερρεῖτο is repeated at 10.13.1 (ἰδρῶτι διερρεῖτο), where there is no suggestion of a textual difficulty. Nevertheless, διερρεῖτο is rather unusual and περιερρεῖτο seems to be the correct word: cf. John Chrysostom's homily on St. Stephen (περιεῤῥεῖτο τοῖς τῶν αἱμάτων ρεύμασιν, 63.931). Heliodorus appears to be out on a limb linguistically again; he envisages his heroine exuding sweat in the intensity of her feelings rather than being bathed in light perspiration, but this is no reason to amend the text.

δήλη παντοίως ἦν χαίρουσα μὲν ἐφ' οἷς ἤκουεν: Colonna (1938) reads ἤκουσεν but subsequently reverts to ἤκουεν (1987b). The durative use of the imperfect seems quite natural here and Barber (1962, 208) gives other instances of the imperfect tense of verbs of perception in relative clauses.

Kalasisiris tells Charikleia of the circumstances of her birth

τὸν ἐμοὶ πολέμιον ἀντιποιησόμενον: for the metaphor, cf. 1.26.3, Ὅρμῆν γάρ, ὡς οἶσθα, κρατούσης ἐπιθυμίας μάχη μὲν ἀντίτυπος ἐπιτείνει; 3.7.5, εἰστοξεύοντα; 4.1.1, ἀγωνοθετοῦντος, οἶμαι, καὶ βραβεύοντος Ἔρωτος above, and note; 7.10.2, ἐμοὶ δὲ ἀρχὴ τις ἀληθεστέρου πολέμου.

Colonna (1938) added οὐκ in front of ἀντιποιησόμενον and A omits the second half of the correlative (ἢ τὸν πολέμιον ἀντιποιησόμενον), presumably on the grounds that ἀντιποιέω used absolutely in the middle voice (as here) usually means 'oppose' whereas with a dative complement it means 'contend with one for a thing' (LSJ⁹ *s.v.* ἀντιποιέω). It may be, however, that ἐμοὶ (CPZT) should follow τὸν ἐμον πολέμιον (VMB)—the sense would therefore be: 'as if it were clear that my father would consent or that my enemy will engage with me (sc. for the prize of marriage)'. There is an exact equivalent to this usage in the double meaning of the chivalric word 'engage' ('join in battle with', 'pledge to marry'). This would suit the topos of love as warfare (implicit in πολέμιον) and is in keeping with the element of rivalry in the relationship of Theagenes and Charikleia (cf. 4.1.1 above and 4.18.6 below and notes). Marriage is the prize both are engaged to win in the lists of love. The reduction of this expression to τὸν ἐμοὶ πολέμιον would have resulted from confusion over the somewhat unusual meaning of the phrase. Certainly, the translations offered are vague: cf., e.g., 'or that my adversary would reciprocate' (Morgan); 'or with my enemy's aspirations' (Lamb); 'or that my enemy would reciprocate my feelings' (Hadas); 'or that mine enemie, seeke that' (Underdowne). Colonna (1987b) has now withdrawn his earlier addition of οὐκ and translates: 'e che il mio nemico avrà anche lui questa intenzione', which removes the essential element of rivalry implied by

πολέμιον.

4.11.2 *κᾶκεῖνος ἐάλωκεν*: for the metaphor, cf. Plato *Phaedr.* 252c; Feuillâtre (1966, 86).

τὸ ἴσον πάθος: cf. 3.5.4 above, and note.

ἐπέτεινα δὲ αὐτῷ κἀγὼ σοὶ χαριζόμενος σοφίᾳ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν: cf. 4.7.8 above, and note.

It is not true, of course, that Kalasiris exerted magic over Theagenes to make him love Charikleia more. Kalasiris is an inveterate manipulator, despite the fact that Charikleia sees through his hocus-pocus (4.5.4). Here too, she ignores Kalasiris' claim. It is therefore unnecessary to argue that the deception is motivated by a need for Kalasiris to put Charikleia under an obligation to him by means of this lie (Hefti 1950, 72). This approach detracts from the complexity of Kalasiris' character (cf. 3.1.2, 4.7.2 above, and notes there).

ὁ δὲ νομιζόμενός σοι πατὴρ ἄλλον εὐτρεπίζεται νυμφίον: cf. 4.3.4 above, and note. By using the word *νομιζόμενός*, Kalasiris hints to Charikleia that he knows of her background. Charikleia's question below about how Kalasiris came to know this implies that she assumed that previously he had not known of her adoption. Moreover, Charikles' action in locking the band away implies that he had not told her the circumstances of her adoption, although he had already quite openly explained to Kalasiris how he came to be her guardian. The reader is not told whether she herself suspected that she was not the natural daughter of Charikles (one rather suspects that she would have since she knew of the band—an obvious birth-token [4.11.3]). There is no doubt, however, that the use of the word *νομιζόμενος* here would have had great psychological impact on Charikleia.

4.11.3 *Ἄλκαμένει μὲν ἔφη τάφον . . . τὸ τῆς εἰμαρμένης*: Charikleia is not praying for Alkamenes' death here, so much as her own (*τὸ τῆς εἰμαρμένης*), if she has to marry someone other than Theagenes (Morgan 1989, 108 n. 33). For other expressions of fidelity between the lovers in the romance: cf. 1.8.3; 1.26.1; 2.4.2; 4.13.4; 5.29.4; 7.21.5; 7.25.5; 7.26.3; 10.33.2. Threats of suicide abound in the genre, see MacAlister (1996, 19-83) for a theoretical discussion.

« Ἐκ ταύτης » *ἔφην ἐπιδείξας τὴν ταινίαν*: cf. 4.5.1 above and note. The band is important for the development of the plot: (a) it reveals the secret of her birth; (b) it explains the instructions of Apollo and Artemis; (c) it helps Kalasiris persuade Charikleia to flee Delphi; and (d) for Charikles, it makes the cure of his daughter possible (Hefti 1950, 67; Futre Pinheiro 1991b, 80). Kalasiris is not being entirely candid here—he first heard that Charikleia was not the natural daughter of Charikles from Charikles himself (2.30-32).

ἐξ οὗ γὰρ με κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον . . . ἀφελόμενος εἶχεν ἀποκειμένην: Charikleia immediately recognises the band and tells Kalasiris that Charikles had taken it from her when he adopted her from her foster father in Egypt (one of Sisimithres' shepherds, ποιμέσιν ἐμαντοῦ, 2.31.2) when she was seven years old (2.30.6) and kept it locked away in a casket so that it would not be damaged. There is much that is left unexplained here: Why, for example, does Sisimithres, an Ethiopian gymnosophist, have an Egyptian sheep farm? How much did Charikleia know of her origins? Why does Charikles lock the band away? Charikleia must have known that she was not the shepherd's natural daughter; that her real parents were wealthy (the band was silk, 2.31.2); and that they were not Egyptian (the band was woven with 'native characters', γράμμασιν ἐγχωρίοις, 2.31.2 [for the writing on the band, see 4.8.1 above and note]). The reader must assume that Charikleia would have been able to read simple demotic at the age of seven; that she would have recognised that the script was not Egyptian; and that she could not tell that the script was Ethiopian or royal. She certainly did not know what was written on the band (4.11.4) and learns of her royal status for the first time from Kalasiris (4.12.1).

The reason Charikleia gives for the concealment of the band by Charikles (to prevent damage to it) does not ring entirely true. Charikles does not make any effort to discover what was written on the band (see 4.8.1 above and note) and the reader must infer that he hides the band to avoid losing his adopted daughter. He had after all lost his own wife and daughter in a tragic accident (2.29.4) and was very attached to Charikleia and wished to be recognised as her true father (cf., e.g., 2.33.1-3, 4.19.8, 10.34.4).

ἐν κοιτίδι: cf. Hesychius, κοιτίς ἢ μικροτέρα κίστη, ἐν ἣ ὁ γυναικεῖος κόσμος ἀπετίθετο; *Suda*, Κοῖτις: ἢ μικρὰ κίστη, Ἀττικῶς. τὴν γὰρ κίστην κοῖτιν λέγουσιν. ἔστι δὲ ἐν αἷς κοιταζόμεναι γυναῖκες ἀπετίθεντο τὰ χρυσία. RL also note the use of κοιτίς in Menand. *Epitrep.* 164 and Philostr. *VA* 4.39. Merkelbach (1962, 246 n. 3) adds a reference to κοιτίς in Eunapius *Vit. Soph.* 6.7.8. On balance, κοιτίς appears to be better than κιστίδι here: Josephus (*Ant. Jud.* 2.220, 2,224) uses κοιτίς as the basket in which Moses was exposed (this answers Koraes' objection that a κιστίς would have had more space than a κοιτίς). Moreover, the *Suda* passage shows that a κοιτίς would naturally be used for jewellery and valuables.

For the orthography and meaning of κιστίς, cf. Aristophanes *Pax* 666, σπονδῶν φέρουσα τῇ πόλει κίστην πλέαν, with the comment of the scholiast: κίστην πλέαν: πλήρη κυτίδα. τὰς κυτίδας ἐκάλουν κίστας; Eur. *Ion* 37, κύτος; Lucian *Saturnalia* 21.18-19, ἐν ταῖς κοίταις καὶ κίσταις εὐρῶτι πολλῶ κατασαπῆναι.

4.11.4 Τῆς δὲ οὐκ εἰδέναι, πόθεν; ὁμολογούσης: RL read πόθεν rather than ποθεν and taking this word as a parenthesis, which Heliodorus made use of (cf. the section on language and style in the introduction). A parenthetical question within a genitive absolute is extraordinary, but the context is one of direct speech and ποθεν makes little sense.

4.12.1 καὶ τὸ φρόνημα διανιστᾶσα πλέον τῷ γένει: a remarkable statement to make of a young lady raised in seclusion in Delphi (3.6.1) and quite ignorant of the circumstances of her birth (4.11.4 above, and note). Presumably, Kalasiris' detailed exposition (ἐν μέρει καὶ πρὸς ἔπος ἐρμηνεύων) of Persinna's humane letter would have softened the shock that the news must have brought to the young girl, and Charikleia was intelligent (3.4.1) and calm in adversity (8.8.4 but cf. 7.14.5). Nevertheless, the rapidity with which she discards her past and embraces an unknown future in the remotest regions of the earth is hardly plausible. The issue of race does not appear to be relevant here (cf. Goethals 1959, 261-62).

Koraes took τῷ γένει as a causal dative with διανιστᾶσα but διαναστᾶσα (cf. Char. 4.1.4) is clearly preferable to διανιστᾶσα. For the thought, cf. 1.20.1: τὸ φρόνημα πρὸς τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀναφέρει τύχην.

τότε ἤδη συμβουλῆς τῆς φανερωτέρας ἠρχόμην, ἅπαντα ὡς ἔσχεν ἀνακαλύπτων: Kalasiris finally drops his duplicitous and ironic pose. Why does he do so at all? Why now and why to Charikleia (and Knemon)? In Book 10, Kalasiris is not mentioned and Persinna does not appear to be aware of the possibility that her daughter might return. Is Kalasiris lying to Charikleia here to win her confidence? This seems unlikely in view of her determination to die rather than not marry Theagenes (4.11.3)—these are not the words of a young woman who needs to be tricked into leaving home (see further 4.13.1 below and note). In addition, some mention of the oracle and vision of Apollo and Artemis would have helped to reassure her. The fact that Kalasiris does not mention these suggests that his aim is not to persuade her to leave (cf. Hefti 1950, 72). Alternatively, is he lying to Knemon to increase the suspense of his tale? But there is no indication that these words are directed at Knemon so much as a direct response to Charikleia's question. Had this been the reason for the lie, the reader would at least expect this to be signalled by an objection from the young Athenian.

The implication of Kalasiris' words are more interesting than speculation on their intent. Kalasiris states, in effect, that he has been operating under cover in Delphi, and that he has understood the situation (ὡς ἔσχεν) all along (see also 4.13.1 below and note). His words echo those of Persinna (4.8.2, ἀνακαλύπτουσα τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς ἐκθέσεως)—an echo

which suggests the conflation of the ‘omniscient-author’ and ‘ego-narrative’ modes in the romance.

Kalasis tells Charikleia of his interview with Persinna and his mission in Delphi

ἦλθον καὶ εἰς Αἰθίοπας ἐπιθυμία τῆς παρ’ ἐκείνοις σοφίας: cf. Philostratus VA 6.6, where the claim is made that the wisdom of Ethiopia was greater than that of Egypt but inferior to that of India. Kalasis here mentions part of itinerary, which he had omitted entirely before (2.26.1), but much remains unexplained about his journey to Ethiopia (Hefti 1950, 72).

εἶχόν τι καὶ δόξης πλέον τὴν Αἰγυπτίων σοφίαν προσθήκη τῆς Αἰθιόπων ἐκθειάζων: On Kalasis’ Egyptian character, cf. 3.1.2 above, and note.

4.12.2 οἴκαδε: This must mean Egypt, but not Memphis, Kalasis’ hometown, which he left to go into exile (φυγή) because of the temptations presented by Rhodopis (2.25.4). Persinna felt unable to approach the gymnosophists about her daughter and her own attempts to locate her had failed. She therefore approaches Kalasis in confidence before his departure and requests him, as an Egyptian wise man, to divine Charikleia’s whereabouts. When the omniscient Kalasis informs her that Charikleia is in Delphi, she asks him to find her and to bring her home. Kalasis agrees and goes to Delphi to fulfill his oath to Persinna (4.13.1, although he also says that his discovery of Charikleia in Delphi was merely incidental). The inconsistency with his earlier explanation for his presence at the shrine (2.26.1) is no sooner introduced than it is qualified. For a full discussion of this problem see 4.13.1 below and note.

οὐ γὰρ πυθέσθαι κατὰ τὸ ἔθνος οὐδεμίαν τοιαύτην, πολλὰ περιεργασαμένη: reading περιεργασαμένη to agree with the subject in indirect speech, Persinna. Persinna’s desire to want to learn the fate of her lost daughter, now that the immediate danger of misunderstanding was over, is psychologically convincing (Morgan 1979, at 10.14.5). Heliodorus later appears to forget the request Persinna makes to Kalasis (10.36.4, and Morgan’s note *ad loc.*).

4.12.3 Ἔμοῦ δὲ ἅπαντα μαθόντος ἐκ θεῶν: is this yet another misrepresentation of the truth by Kalasis for the sake of his own aggrandisement in the eyes of Charikleia as Bevilacqua argues (1990, 248) on the basis of 3.17; 4.5-7; 5.12-13? Yet Charikleia was shrewd enough to see through such pretence earlier (4.5.4) and such boasting appears to be part of Kalasis’ character (he also, by implication, claims omniscience to Persinna 4.12.3). Kalasis’ categorical statement here (especially ἅπαντα) also undermines the argument of Futre Pinheiro (1991b, 79-80) that Kalasis only gradually became aware of

the truth as events at Delphi unfolded.

καὶ εἶναί τε καὶ ὅπου φράσαντος: the narrative is at three removes from authorial narration; Heliodorus relates how Kalasiris told Knemon what he told Charikleia he had said to Persinna. A narratological situation of similar complexity occurs at 2.30; Heliodorus relates how Kalasiris told Knemon what Charikles told him Sisimithres had related to him about Charikleia's exposure. For the latter instance, cf. Futre Pinheiro (1991b, 78).

ἄγονος γὰρ καὶ ἄτεκνος: RL's correction, followed by Colonna (1987b; accusative 1938). The nominative is required because of *ικέτευεν* (line 3).

ὁμολογεῖν τῷ σῷ πατρὶ τὸ συμβεβηκός: the whole of this passage is psychologically remarkably sensitive. The reference sterility of Persinna, Hydaspes' desire for an heir, and the long years of their faithful marriage serve to prepare the reader for the emotional resolution of the plot in book 10. In the final book, Persinna plays a restricted role, but her emotional reaction to the band (10.13.1), the necklaces (10.14.3) and the birthmark of Charikleia (10.16.1) contribute a great deal to the pathos of the drama. Persinna confesses indirectly by presenting Hydaspes with the band woven with the story of the birth and exposure of their daughter (10.13.2). Hydaspes adds that Persinna had told him that the child had been still-born (10.13.4) but he does not react to his wife's deception. When Persinna finally breaks down (10.16.2), however, he is strongly affected by her distress. The present passage is therefore consonant with the tone of the dramatic resolution of the plot in the final book.

4.13.1 ἐπισκήπτουσά μοι πολλὰ τὸν ἥλιον, ὄρκον δὲ οὐδενὶ σοφῶν ὑπερβῆναι θεμιτόν: cf. 4.8. above, and note. NeoPythagoreans were forbidden to swear by the gods but, in addition to the oath that he swears to Persinna, Kalasiris makes Theagenes swear an oath not to violate Charikleia's virginity (4.18.6). Thus, although there are traces of neoPythagorean doctrines in the *Ethiopian Story*, such as Kalasiris' refusal to make blood sacrifices or drink wine (3.11.2, 4.16.4: cf. 10.9.6), they do not appear to be entirely consistent (cf. Feuillâtre 1966, 132).

The double accusative after *ἐπισκήπτουσα* is unparalleled.

ἐγὼ δὲ ἦκω τὴν ἐνώμοτον ἱκεσίαν ἐκτελέσω . . . κερδήσας: This sentence attempts to resolve the conflict between the various reasons Kalasiris has given for his presence in Delphi. Originally, he had told Knemon that he had come to Delphi to seek refuge from the hostility of heaven (variously described as τὸ θεῖον / τὰ πεπρωμένα / ὁ δαίμων / αἰμοῖραι / ὁ ἀστήρ), the sexual depredations of the courtesan Rhodopis and the feuding of his sons in Memphis (2.25.3-5). After informing Knemon that he intends to omit the narrative

of his wanderings after leaving Memphis (2.26.1, ἡ ἐν μέσῳ πλάνη) on the grounds that they were irrelevant, he tells the Athenian that he went to Delphi because it was a holy place and a fitting refuge for a philosopher (2.26.1). Later he says that he knew that his sons would fight each other because of his knowledge of the true science of astrology (ἡ ἀληθῶς σοφία) and that his exile from Memphis was imposed by the gods and fates, apparently (ὡς ἔοικεν) so that he would find Charikleia (3.16.5). He now tells Charikleia that he had learnt that she was in Delphi while he was in Ethiopia (Ἐμοῦ δὲ ἅπαντα μαθόντος ἐκ θεῶν καὶ εἶναί τε καὶ ὅπου φράσαντος, 4.12.3) and that he had come to fulfil his oath to Persinna that he would find her lost daughter and to bring her back to her home. In the present passage Kalasiris adds that his oath to Persinna was not the reason for his journey to Delphi but that finding Charikleia here with the help of the gods had been the most profitable part of his wanderings.

The most recent discussion of this major narrative crux is provided by Fuchs (1996, 174-188), who identifies four logical possibilities: (i) Kalasiris is lying to Charikleia to persuade her to trust him; (ii) Kalasiris is lying to Knemon—all his doubts about what to do and where to go are intended to increase the tension of his tale; (iii) Heliodorus intends both accounts to be accepted as true and either does not notice the inconsistency or included it deliberately; (iv) both Heliodorus and the reader can accept both accounts as true—the inconsistency can be resolved.

The first alternative corresponds with the argument of Bevilacqua (1990, 247), but this theory makes Charikleia weak and impressionable, which is not consistent with what we know of her character elsewhere (cf. 3.4.1, 4.12.1 above and notes). Her determination to die rather than not marry Theagenes (4.11.3) makes it unlikely that Kalasiris would need to trick her into leaving Delphi (see 4.12.1 above and note). Moreover, this would weaken Kalasiris' moral position in encouraging the elopement of his fellow-priest's adopted daughter.

The arguments of Winkler (1982, 93 'mendacity'; 146 'duplicity') and Sandy (1982a, 65 'duplicity') come closest to representing the second possibility, though neither claims that Kalasiris deliberately lied to Knemon. Winkler (1982, 137-151 'What Kalasiris knew') presents an exceptionally subtle analysis (summarised on p. 139 of his article) of how Kalasiris and Knemon differ in respect of their reading of events; whereas the romantic Knemon 'illustrates the comedy of misreading' (p. 143, but see 3.1.1 above and note), Kalasiris, who is concerned to interpret the will of destiny in the love-relationship, is 'a patient and open-minded reader of events' (p. 149). However, Winkler does not

address the question of the different explanations given by Kalasiris for his presence in Delphi directly or explain adequately how they constitute ‘a deliberate narrative strategy’ (p. 93). There is no way around Kalasiris’ own explicit statement that he ‘began to reveal his plan more clearly’ to Charikleia when informing her of his undertaking to Persinna to find her daughter and to bring her back Ethiopia (τότε ἤδη συμβουλῆς τῆς φανερωτέρας ἠρχόμενῃ, ἅπαντα ὡς ἔσχεν ἀνακαλύπτων, 4.12.1—note especially the use of ἅπαντα again), since he and that he had known since his visit to Ethiopia that Charikleia was alive and where she was (Ἐμοῦ δὲ ἅπαντα μαθόντος ἐκ θεῶν καὶ εἶναί τε καὶ ὅπου φράσαντος . . . , 4.12.3). Thus Kalasiris came to Delphi with prior knowledge of Charikleia and it is unlikely that he only realised who Charikleia was when he read Persinna’s band (4.8.1), especially as he was highly skilled at reading the will of the gods (2.25.3-5; 3.16.5; 4.12.3).

The third line of argument is similar to that of Hefti (1950, 72-78) and Reardon (1971, 390-392). Hefti follows the suggestion of Koraes that Kalasiris wanted to go to Delphi before his visit to Ethiopia and suggests the need to supply the word ‘originally’ with σπουδάσας here. He notes further the inexplicable rudeness to Charikleia in the words under discussion and concludes, again with Koraes, that the text is blatantly contradictory. Finally, Hefti remarks that the problem could have been avoided if Kalasiris had never gone to Ethiopia, but that Heliodorus deliberately introduced this complication, knowing that it would produce contradictions in the narrative, because he was more interested in artistic effect than narrative consistency. What Heliodorus gained by including the story of Kalasiris’ journey was the link between the earlier events in Ethiopia and the later ones in Delphi. He was also able to give expression to Persinna’s continuing concern to recover her missing daughter. Similarly, Sandy (1982a, 41) argues that Heliodorus ignored the discrepancy in Kalasiris’ reasons for coming to Delphi because the material ‘enriched the plot’. Futre Pinheiro (1991b, 79) views the apparent contradiction as a ‘device designed to confuse the reader by deliberately mixing up the pieces of the narrative puzzle’, that is typical of Kalasiris who is both ‘saint and impostor’. A similar narrative anacoluthon has been noted with respect to Thyamis’ escape from capture (cf. 4.3.4 above and note).

The final possibility (that the inconsistency can be resolved) confronts the problem most directly. Futre Pinheiro (1991b, 72, 79-81) suggests that Kalasiris was not guilty of lying to Knemon and that he only gradually became aware that Charikleia might be the daughter of Persinna and that he knew for sure for the first time when he read the queen’s swathing band (4.9.1). However, this solution is not entirely satisfactory for the simple reason that Kalasiris tells Charikleia quite explicitly that he had known ‘everything’ in

Ethiopia already (cf. 4.12.3 above, and note). Heliodorus gives no reason why Kalasiris' arrival in Delphi should not have been a consequence of this knowledge. His earlier reasons for being in Delphi (to get away from Rhodopis and his sons) would have been eclipsed by his later discovery that Charikleia lived there (assuming with Koraes [*ad loc.*] that Kalasiris visited Ethiopia during his wanderings after his exile from Memphis). It would, of course, have been highly unlikely that Kalasiris would have visited Ethiopia before his traumatic encounter with Rhodopis, since this would have made his desire to make a philosophical 'retreat' to Delphi entirely pointless. Koraes suggests the deletion of οὐ in the phrase οὐ διὰ τοῦτο but this ignores the logic of the μέν . . . δέ construction. Moreover, the combination of Kalasiris' knowledge that Charikleia was in Delphi and the waking dream in which Apollo and Artemis put Charikleia and Theagenes into his hands (ἐνεχειρίζεν) in person and instruct him to take them to Egypt (3.11.5), can surely have left no doubt in his mind that Charikleia was the daughter of Persinna. Futre Pinheiro also points out that the contradiction is responsible for the unclear structure of the plot of the romance, which can be interpreted to be circular or linear, depending on whichever of Kalasiris' two reasons is accepted (1991b, 79). However, this is true only if Kalasiris is taken to be the most important character in the work, but, as I have argued above (3.1.2, and note), Charikleia, rather than Kalasiris, is the focal point of the plot, which is therefore, strictly speaking, circular (see further the section on openings in the introduction). Futre Pinheiro (1991b, 81) also stresses the presence of two alternative explanations for events in the *Ethiopian Story*—scientific and supernatural—but asserts that the divine explanation usually prevails as it does here. The rather haphazard way in which the revelation is finally made, though, casts considerable doubt on the cogency of this assertion.

The strongest argument for the point of view that the two explanations for Kalasiris's explanation in Delphi can be reconciled lies in the fact that Kalasiris expressly states that he is telling the truth concerning his visit to Ethiopia (4.12.1). Other indications of the prior knowledge of Kalasiris may be seen at 2.35.3; 3.15.3; 4.5.1; 4.8.2; 4.9.1; 4.13.1. It is crucial to Winkler's argument (that Kalasiris is mendacious [1982, 93]) that the distinction between ego-narrator (Kalasiris) and author should be maintained. However, the fact that the reasons given by Kalasiris and Heliodorus for his presence in Delphi are restated and given different nuances in different contexts suggests that these narrative voices are occasionally blurred. For example, Kalasiris states that he left Memphis because he knew that his sons would fight each other: ὁ δέ με πρὸ πάντων καὶ ἐπὶ πάσιν

ἐξήλυνεν οἱ παῖδες ἦσαν, οὓς ἡ ἄρρητός μοι πολλάκις ἐκ θεῶν σοφία ξιφῆρεις ἀλλήλοις συμπεσεῖσθαι προηγόρευε (2.25.5). Later, however, Heliodorus resolves the dispute between the two sons by making Kalasiris the cause of the quarrel: Παῖδες τὸν φύντα μετὰ δεκαετοῦς ἄλης χρόνον ἐκομίζοντο καὶ τὸν αἴτιον τῆς ἐπὶ τῇ προφητεῖα καὶ μέχρις αἵματος στάσεως αὐτοὶ μικρὸν ὕστερον κατέστεφον (7.8.2). The later version does not add significantly to the earlier one concerning Kalasiris' presence in Delphi; it does, however, explain why the unexpected appearance of Kalasiris at Memphis has the effect of resolving the quarrel of the two brothers, whereas he was unable to effect a reconciliation before. In other words, the two statements had to differ *because Heliodorus needed them to* in order to resolve this thread of the plot. The roles of author and ego-narrator are therefore conflated in this case. This suggests that the author is shaping the narrative in the same way with the words οὐ διὰ τοῦτο μὲν τὴν ἐπὶ τάδε σπουδάσας ἀφιξίν θεῶν δὲ ὑποθήκη μέγιστον ἐκ τῆς ἄλης τοῦτο κερδήσας (4.13.1) in order to reconcile the narrative inconsistency, whereas the slight to Charikleia in the words runs directly counter to the purpose of the ego-narrator.

If this argument can be accepted, it suggests the Heliodorus was aware of the narratological problem. That he retained the story of Kalasiris' visit to Ethiopia indicates that he felt that it was nevertheless an important part of the story. In addition to Hefti's suggestions (1950, 72-78) as to why the visit to Ethiopia was important, the competing demands of the main plot and sub-plot need to be taken into account. Effectively, Heliodorus has included a variant narrative line in the *Ethiopian Story* (something unique in Greek literature according to Fuchs 1996, 185; cf. Winkler 1982, 150: 'what had seemed to be two different divine plots were actually *two ways of saying the same thing*' [Winkler's italics]). An explanation for this double narrative line lies in the fact that the story of Kalasiris is not entirely subsumed in the story of Theagenes and Charikleia. It is important to note in this regard that Kalasiris later dies in his home town of Memphis (7.11.4) after the feud between his sons has been resolved (7.8.1), and plays no further part in the story of Charikleia and Theagenes. It is also notable that Persinna makes no acknowledgement of his role in bringing her daughter back to Ethiopia in book 10 and does not intervene during Charikles' condemnation of the Egyptian priest (10.36.4). His story therefore has a circular plot structure, as does Charikleia's; his tale has been told. Destiny plays a role in Kalasiris' thinking from the beginning: after the natural death of his wife, the malevolent eye of Kronos turned on him and brought about a change in his fortunes for the worse (2.24.6); he yielded to the ineluctable power of destiny (of whom Rhodopis was merely the

mask) and handed his fate over to its control (2.25.4), because he knew, by virtue of his prophetic wisdom, that his sons were destined to fight one another (2.25.5). He repeats this claim to certain knowledge of the future combat of his sons that he discovered through his knowledge of astrology at 3.16.5. Again, when Kalasiris arrives at Memphis disguised as a beggar and sees his sons engaged in mortal combat, Heliodorus reminds his readers of this prophecy (7.6.5) and, if this were not enough, reiterates it (7.8.1). It is therefore not entirely surprising that Kalasiris places the request of Persinna in second place to his own spiritual concerns. The sense required by 4.13.1 may therefore be that Kalasiris' promise to fulfil the request of Persinna really is incidental to his search for spiritual refuge in Delphi. For Kalasiris, to stay in the philosophical haven which Delphi offers him is to escape his destiny, if only temporarily. However, the commands of heaven intervene: he cannot ignore the oracles and apparitions sent by the gods and eventually he recalls his interview with Persinna during his long years of wandering and yields to the dictates of the divine. In the story of Kalasiris, the will of destiny overrides the slippage of human affairs.

ὑποθήκη: ὑποθήκη usually means 'advice' (cf., e.g., Hdt. 1.156; LSJ⁹ s.v. ὑποθήκη), but here the financial sense of the word ('pledge', 'security') is natural in view of the commercial metaphor κερδήσας (cf., Hesch. ὑποθήκη . . . ἐνέχυρον). The notion of 'provident guidance' is also possible, however: cf., e.g., the Christian neoPlatonist Synesius of Cyrene: ὑποθήκη φαύλων δαιμόνων, οἱ τὸν τε τρόπον ὑφηγοῦνται, *Aegyptii sive de Providentia* 1.15 (Terzaghi). The translations reflect the range of meanings from 'through an intimation from the gods' (Lamb: cf. Warzewicki's *monitu*) to 'grâce à la providence divine' (Maillon), and 'compensation for my banishment, set in store for me by the gods' (Morgan). I would suggest 'through the undertaking of the gods' to give the nuance of the word (somewhere between 'security' and 'providence'), while remaining reasonably close to the original.

ἐκ πολλοῦ τε ὡς οἶσθα προσεδρεύω χρόνου: This implies that Kalasiris has understood the situation for a long time—for longer clearly than the short period since he read the band (4.8). The expression here suggests that his knowledge may have gone back to the time during which he lived (οἴκησιν οἰκεῖ σοι τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνταῦθα, 2.33.7) near Charikleia (3.6.1) in the temple precinct (see 4.12.1 above and note). The oracle (2.35.5), which Kalasiris implies he alone understood (2.36.1) and his vision of Apollo and Artemis (3.11.5) would then serve more as supernatural promptings rather than as sources of knowledge.

τὴν ταινίαν: cf. 4.5.1 above, and note.

4.13.2 Ὡστε ἔνεστί σοι πειθομένη . . . σὺν τῷ φιλότατῳ βασιλεύουσιν: The MSS read

βασιλεύουσα (mT) with a variant βασιλεύουσαν (BA). Koraes (followed by Hirschig and RL) suggests the accusative βασιλεύουσαν for what should be a dative (agreeing with the antecedent σοί after the impersonal construction ἔνεστι), on the grounds that it was accepted practice among Atticist writers to switch from the dative to the accusative case (e.g., Lucian *Electrum* 3.6, οἷς ἐξῆν πλουτεῖν ἀναλέγοντας τῶν αἰγείρων τὰ δάκρυα). Colonna (1938) retains the reading of the majority of the MSS, βασιλεύουσα but this is clearly incorrect and he later prints the accusative case (Colonna 1987b): cf. the accusative at 8.5.12, ἔνεστι δέ σοι μηδὲ λυπεῖν . . . ἀλλ' παραδοῦσαν . . . In view of the distance (7 lines!) between βασιλεύουσαν and ἔνεστι σοι, the change from dative to accusative is understandable.

ξένου τε καὶ νοθείου γνήσιον καὶ ἄρχοντα βίον ἀνταλλάξασθαι: Merkelbach (1959, 182) suggests νοθείου for ὀθνείου, citing 4.8.6 (ὀνόματος νόθου), 4.9.2 (ὄνομα νόθου), and 10.13.5 (νόθου). With this reading the sense would be 'to exchange the life of a foreigner of illegitimate birth for that of a lawfully born ruler'. Although ὀθνείου is the *lectio difficilior* it is redundant after ξένου and νοθείου results in a sharper antithetical chiasmus with γνήσιον (and ξένου / ἄρχοντα). Merkelbach's suggestion should therefore be accepted.

πρὶν τι καὶ πρὸς βίαν σε τῶν παρὰ γνώμην ὑποστῆναι: on the question of arranged marriages: cf. 4.4.5 above, and note; Winkler (1982, 132). In addition to the recovery of her home and family, Kalasiris offers Charikleia the choice of her own husband (cf. also 4.11.1).

εἶ τι δεῖ θεοῖς τε τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ τῷ χρησμῷ τοῦ Πυθίου καταπιστεῦειν: for the oracle see 2.35.5. The full meaning of the oracle remains unexplained till the end of the novel (10.41.2; cf. Bartsch 1989, 102) but even then its precise meaning remains obscure (what, for example, does μελαινομένων mean? Are the colours black and white symbolic? If so, of what?). The oracle suggests that Theagenes and Charikleia are under the guidance of destiny: cf. also 8.16.-17.

4.13.3 Καὶ ἅμα ὑπεμίμησκον τὸν χρησμὸν . . . καὶ ἄδόμενος: Thuc. 2.8 mentions λόγια ('pronouncements') and χρησμοί ('chants') and Aristoph. *Eq.* 999, 1002 use these terms as synonyms. The oracle is thought of as a chant here (ἄδόμενος). Cf. generally, Plutarch *Why are Delphic oracles no longer given in verse?*

ζητούμενος: this refers to the occasion on which the oracle was first chanted—the bystanders were puzzled and at a loss at how to explain the oracle (2.36.1).

4.13.5 τινὰ προαγορευόμενα μὲν . . . ἐπιτελούμενα δέ: Reeve (1968, 284) notes that τινὰ

must be corrupt, since enclitic τις or its equivalents can only begin sentences when followed by μέν or δέ. For the latter usage, Reeve cites 8.9.19 (τινὲς δέ, wrongly given as 8.19.9 in his article) and 1.19.2 (πῆ μὲν . . . πῆ δέ). He suggests τὰ καινοτόμα for τινά (cf. 4.18.2) which seems rather a lot to have fallen out. It is also possible to account for the text here; the μέν . . . δέ . . . construction is used to contrast the participles προαγορευόμενα and ἐπιτελούμενα while at the same time τινά is required to soften the generalisation. Although the Greek is unusual, there do not seem to be sufficient grounds on which to emend the text.

Ἦνεγκεν and ἠνόσθη are gnomic aorists.

ἄλλα καὶ τὸ παρὸν τῷ Χαρικλεῖ σύντρεχε τὰ πρὸς τὸν γάμον: τὰ πρὸς τὸν γάμον is an accusative of reference rather than a direct object (Barber 1962, 361).

ὡς οὐδὲν ἐκείνου πράξαντος ἄνευ τῆς ἐμῆς ὑφηγήσεως: Koraes rejects πράξαντος in favour of πράξοντος. The aorist participle is in keeping with the fact that Charikles has been following Kalasiris' instructions by summoning doctors to examine Charikleia (4.7.3), by introducing Alkamenes to her (4.7.10) and by giving him the tokens of recognition with which she had been exposed by Persinna (4.8.1). Kalasiris is also not so entirely confident about how things will turn out as to be able to predict Charikles' actions (4.9.1; 4.13.2).

THE ESCAPE FROM DELPHI

Charikles and Kalasiris discuss the significance of a dream

4.14.1 « ὅτε σε ἐχρῆν ἐστέφθαι »: a number of replacements have been suggested for ἐπεσθαι (mA, Colonna 1938). RL read ἐστέφθαι, Koraes and Colonna (1987b) prefer τέρπεσθαι (T), citing Aristoph. *Pax* 291 unconvincingly. Hirschig reads ἤδεσθαι and Naber (1873, 341) proposes σπένδεσθαι. Ἐστέφθαι suits the context of a sacrifice (ἀποθύειν) best, though it is quite far from ἐπεσθαι in form.

σὺν τέχνῃ πολλῇ καὶ σοφίᾳ τῇ ἐμῇ: for Kalasiris' 'art', cf. 3.17.5 above, and note; 4.6.4; 4.14.1; 4.15.3.

4.14.2 τῆς φιλιότητος μοι τὸν βίον τάχα πρότερον μεταστησομένης: RL believe that Koraes' reading τοῦ βίου is not justified, discounting his reference to 8.5.3 and citing 7.12.4 for the accusative case. However, the sense of 7.12.4 is 'get rid of' rather than 'leave' as it is here and at 8.5.3. The close parallel of Euripides for μεθίστημι and the genitive to mean 'die' is striking (*A/c.* 21, θανεῖν πέπρωται καὶ μεταστήναι βίου). Koraes' emendation should

therefore be accepted.

εἴ τι δεῖ προσέχειν ὄνειρασι . . . τῆς παρηκούσης . . . νυκτός: Charikles could not have dreamt this dream in the time available. Charikles had earlier greeted him happily with the news that Charikleia had fallen in love (4.7.1); at midday (περὶ πλήθουσσαν ἄγοράν) he reported that she had reacted badly to Alkamenes (4.7.10); and a little later, after Kalasiris' talk with Charikleia (4.14.1), he related to him the ominous dream, although it is clearly described as nocturnal (cf. Hefti 1950, 79). Heliodorus has not taken sufficient care with the time-frame of his narrative in this instance (cf. 4.8.1 above and note).

CBPZAT read παρηκούσης . . . νυκτός ('last night') for παρούσης . . . νυκτός ('tonight'). The former reading is certain because of the exact same expression at 4.5.2, modelled on τῆς παροιχομένης νυκτός (Hdt. 3.86, 6.107). Παρούσης suggests that the events are unfolding at night and may represent an extremely inept attempt to reconcile the chronology.

ἐκ χειρὸς ἀφεθέντα τοῦ Πυθίου: The inclusion of this detail underlines the sense of the 'omniscient and purposeful guiding hand' of Apollo in the narrative. Cf. 3.11.5 above, and note; Bartsch (1989, 102).

ζοφώδεσσι τισιν εἰδώλοις καὶ σκιάδεσι πλήθον: there may be a covert allusion to the prophecy of the Delphic oracle, which mentions the 'black land of Helios' (2.35.5). Εἴδωλα here means 'ghosts': cf. 1.3.1, the beach; 2.5.2; 2.11.3, the cave, and 3.16.3 above, and note. Ζοφώδης is also used to describe the dark cave in which Thyamis hides Charikleia (1.29.1). Charikles clearly believes that the dream refers to the underworld in the same way that Theagenes associates Ethiopia with the world of the dead (8.11.4) until Charikleia gives a more sanguine interpretation to his dream.

4.15.1 Ταῦτα ὡς εἶπεν, ἐγὼ μὲν ὀπη τείνει τὸ ὄναρ συνέβαλλον: Kalasiris continues to deceive Charikles, as Odysseus deceived his wife. On the problems Heliodorus' characters experience in communicating with each other: cf. Furiani (1990, 221). The interpretation of Kalasiris is clearly ironic.

ὄς: Colonna (1938, 1987b) retains ὡς (mT), perhaps to match καὶ ὡς ἐκ χειρὸς (below, line 8) and avoid the long separation of ὄς (BA) and ἄγανακτεῖς (below, line 9). However, the ὡς (line 8) must be taken closely with ἐκ χειρὸς ('from his hand, as it were'); ὡς (line 5) is unnecessary because of the following genitive absolute, and easily reduplicated from the final syllable of the preceding word (ἐπιτηδείως).

4.15.2 ταῦτα ὡς ἔδνα παρὰ τοῦ νυμφίου πρόσαγε: In the Homeric world, husbands paid a bride-price (cf. the Southern African *lobola* system) a practice that became a legal fiction

in the Classical period (cf. *OCD s.v. 'marriage, law of'*). At this time, the word φερνή (money paid directly to the wife) was more common than ἔδνα (cf. *LSJ s.v. ἔδνον*). Achilles Tatius (1.18.2; 5.5.4) mentions ἔδνα but in mythological or parodic contexts. Longus (3.25.1) uses δῶρον. The word ἔδνα here is therefore a rather loose and poetic, but it surely cannot be intended to be Homeric (cf. Egger 1994, 270). Upper class marriages in the third or fourth century AD would probably have operated on the Roman custom that brides paid a dowry to their husbands.

ἔχει πρὸς γυναῖκα ἴγυγα χρυσὸς καὶ λιθός: ἴγυγα is here used metaphorically. Cf. also 2.33.6; 7.10.3; 8.5.7; Ar. *Lys.* 1110; Soph. *fr.* 474; Theoc. *Id.* 2.17 (refrain); Ael. *De nat. anim.* 1.44.3; Feuillâtre (1966, 88).

4.15.3 ἕως τὸ κατηναγκασμένον τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἀμετάβλητον ἔχει παρὰ τῆς τέχνης ἢ κόρη: for the 'art' of Kalasiris, cf. 3.17.5 above, and note; 4.6.4; 4.6.7; 4.14.1.

4.15.4 ἄπερ ὑπεθέμην οὐδὲν ὑπεθέμενος: Charikles thus ironically entrusts to Kalasiris the tokens which precipitate his daughter's flight from Delphi, while Kalasiris indulges in a little word-play. Although Charikleia asks Charikles for his pardon at the conclusion of the romance, he is not given the chance to grant or withhold it (cf. 10.28.2).

Kalasiris tells Theagenes what to do

4.16.2 παρεγγυήσας: Frequent in Heliodorus (cf. 1.17.3; 2.14.2; 2.30.2; 5.21.2; 7.11.9; 7.12.3; 7.15.5) and in Xenophon (cf., e.g., *Anab.* 4.1.17). The use of the word in a military sense is characteristic of Xenophon (Baumgarten 1932, 26). The kidnapping of Charikleia is described as a military operation.

τὸν ἅμα τοῖς νέοις δρασμὸν ὑπηγήσασθαι χρηστηρίῳ τὸν θεὸν ἱκετεύσων: the use of χρηστήριον here is unique in Heliodorus, who otherwise uses χρησμός (2.36.1; 2.36.2; 3.5.7; 3.11.4; 4.4.5; 4.13.2; 4.13.3; 8.11.3; 8.11.4; 10.41.2).

Phoenician merchants invite Kalasiris to a feast

4.16.3 Ἄλλ' ἦν ἄρα καὶ νοῦ παντὸς ὀξύτερον τὸ θεῖον: What appears to be a chance encounter with the Phoenician sailors is clearly divinely motivated. Moreover, the Phoenicians had only come to Delphi because one of their number had had a dream which prophesied his victory in the Pythian Games (3.16.7): cf. Sandy (1982a, 53); Feuillâtre (1966, 61). For the phrase τὸ θεῖον, cf. 3.18.3 above, and note.

φθάνον τὴν αἴτησιν . . . ἔφθη τὴν ἀπόκρισιν ὁ Πύθιος καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις ἐπεσήμαινε τὴν ὑφήγησιν: RL insert δούς after Πύθιος, following the suggestion of Richards (1906, 111), on the grounds that ἔφθη τὴν ἀπόκρισιν requires a participle governing τὴν ἀπόκρισιν to

make adequate sense, i.e., ‘the Pythian got in first by giving a response’. However, ἔφθη τὴν ἀπόκρισιν means ‘anticipated his (own) answer’ as is clear from τοῖς ἔργοις which follows the phrase. Apollo forestalls the need for a spoken oracle by arranging for the Phoenicians to invite Kalasiris to join their celebrations.

Σύσπενδε ᾧ ἴαθέ: Koraes reads σύσπενδε ‘assist <us>’ (VT: cf. 8.13.2; 10.2.2) for RL’s σύσπενδε ‘join us in making a libation’ (CBA, σὺ σπένδε Z). Lumb prefers σὺ σπεῦδε (MP). The meaning of συσπεύδω is often ‘join us’, ‘help us’ (cf. LSJ *ad loc.*), but Kalasiris later describes their appeal as a religious one (4.16.4, ἱερὰν κλήσιν) and therefore σύσπενδε is to be preferred here.

4.16.4 οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν μοι θεμιτὸν ἱερὰν κλήσιν παραδραμεῖν: Kalasiris here gives testimony that he is essentially a religious man. For the religious sense of κλήσις ‘vocation’: cf. 1 *Ep. Cor.* 7.20.

ἀπέθυσσα (XBZAT): Koraes prefers ἐπέθυσσα (VMP). There is very little to choose between these two readings—the latter appears to be marginally more common in late Greek, but the former more Attic (cf. Xen. *Anab.* 5.1.1) and better supported by the MSS. It seems preferable to retain ἀπέθυσσα. Cf. 4.18.6 below, and note.

κάκειδὴ τοῦ λιβανωτοῦ λαβὼν ἀπέθυσσα καὶ ὕδατος ἔσπεισα: here Heliodorus may have been following Philostratus, who records how Apollonius sacrificed incense to Helios rather than a white horse, as requested by a king (VA 1.31). For sacrifices in antiquity: cf. 3.1.3 above and note.

τὸ πολυτελὲς τῶν ἐμῶν θυμάτων: This is, of course, sarcasm, which RL regard as forced, though they refer to 2.7.3 and 2.11.3 for similar cases (in both instances Theagenes is sarcastic about Knemon's cowardice).

4.16.5 δαιτὸς μὲν ἡδίστης οὐκ ἐνδεής: Δαιτός is Homeric: cf., e.g., Hom. *Il.* 1.468, 9.225. οἵτινες ἢ ὀπόθεν ἐστέ: the question is Homeric but Homer never uses ὀπόθεν. Cf. Hom. *Od.* 9.252, ὦ ξεῖνοι, τίνες ἐστέ; πόθεν πλεῖθ' ὑγρά κέλευθα; 1.170, τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆς; *Od.* 15.424 εἰρώτα δὴ ἔπειτα, τίς εἶη καὶ πόθεν ἔλθοι. Heliodorus uses πόθεν consistently elsewhere (e.g., 2.21.5; 2.32.3; 4.5.5; 7.12.4; 7.16.1) and this form avoids hiatus. Cf. Philostratus *Her.* 660.1 (Olearius), Ἴων εἶ, ξένε, ἢ πόθεν; (Boissonade 1806, 274). Πόθεν should therefore be preferred here.

φιλίας ἀρχὴν ἱεροῦς ἄλας ποιησαμένους: See *Il.* 9.214 πάσσε δ' ἄλως θείοιο; Demosthenes *De Falsa Legatione* 109.5 mentions that hospitality requires the sharing of toasts, table and salt; Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* 685A6-10 refers to the common comparison between the Charites (charm) and salt (taste).

μη οὐχί καὶ τὴν περὶ ἀλλήλων γνῶσιν ἔχοντας ἀπελθεῖν, φιλίας ἀρχὴν ἱεροῦς ἄλας ποιησαμένους: a textually confused passage. Bekker and Colonna (1938) reverse the order of the clauses with VM, but Colonna (1987b) now follows RL's order, which is based on CBPZAT. Of the translators, Lamb and Hadas prefer the latter, Morgan the former alternative. The passage quite clearly reads better with καὶ φιλίας ἀρχὴν . . . preceding μη οὐχί . . . (VM) and should be printed thus. The required sense would therefore be 'I think it vulgar and typical of the unmannered that they share in toasts and table and make offerings of holy salt the beginning of friendship, and then leave without having any knowledge of each other' rather than 'I look upon it as the vulgar way of uncultivated people when, after sharing in the libations and the meal at table, they part without becoming acquainted with one another—after they have partaken of the salt that is sacred to the forming of friendship' (Lamb). The awkward reversal of the clauses may have come about through φιλίας being taken with κοινωνήσαντας, leaving the incomprehensible ἀρχὴν ἱεροῦς ἄλας ποιησαμένους (hence ἄλλας for ἄλας in B).

4.16.6 Ἔλεγον δὴ οὖν εἶναι μὲν Φοίνικες: Heliodorus uses indirect speech and authorial narrative more frequently in the second half of his romance. Here the indirect speech soon shifts into direct speech (4.16.7). The mixture of ego-narrative, indirect speech and authorial narrative as an indication of the mixture of epic and dramatic technique in the *Ethiopian Story* (cf. Wolff 1912, 195; Hefti 1950, 110).

Φοίνικες Τύριοι τέχνην δὲ ἔμποροι: for the role of the Phoenicians in Heliodorus, cf. Briquel-Chatonnet (1987, 189-197). The intervention of Phoenicians is reminiscent of the *Odyssey* (cf. Bérard 1902), in which Odysseus tells Athene that he had fled from Crete with the aid of Phoenicians after killing Orsilochos over a dispute concerning plunder from Troy (*Od.* 13.271-277). Cf. also the story which Odysseus tells to Eumaios concerns the fictitious treachery of Phoenicians towards himself (*Od.* 14.191-359)—in reality, Eumaios had been the victim of Phoenician slave-traders (*Od.* 15.403-484). In Philostratus' *Heroicus* a Phoenician merchant converses with Ampelourgos about the heroes of the Trojan War.

Phoenicia was a favourite location for ancient novels (Char. 6.8.2; Ach. Tat. 1.1.1; Xenophon 3.12.1), although Heliodorus does not make much use of this tradition. Judging from the surviving fragments, Lollianos' *Phoenician Story*, contained much lurid and sensational action (cf. Lucian *Pseudol.* 28; Galen 12.249). Henrichs (1972, 20) comments on the fact that Phoenicia is often the location of erotic tales. In Heliodorus, Kalasiris, Charikleia and Theagenes escape from Delphi with the help of a group of Phoenicians

(4.16.6; the captain 5.20.1; the sailors 5.20.7; the ship 5.1.1; 5.17.1; 5.18.2; 5.20.3). The Phoenicians themselves encounter murderous pirates, an incident which allows Heliodorus to pun on the words φόνω 'blood' φονῶντες 'killing' and Φοίνικες 'Phoenicians' (5.25.1; 5.25.2; 5.25.3).

Heliodorus also does not exploit the connotations of the name 'Phoenician' in mythology, although these are closely related to the *erotika pathemata* made famous by Parthenius. Phoenix is the name given to the old tutor of Achilles in the *Iliad*, who, according to Homer, was the son of Amyntor, king of Argos, by Kleoboule or Hippodamia (*II.* 9.432). When Amyntor deserted Kleoboule for a concubine, the jilted wife persuaded her son to seduce his father's mistress, which he did successfully. When his father discovered the seduction he cursed his son and, in answer to his curse, the gods blinded Phoenix. Phoenix fled to the court of Peleus, king of Phthia. Peleus took him to Chiron, who restored his sight. He then became the tutor of Achilles. During the Trojan War he was asked by Agamemnon to persuade Achilles to rejoin the fight against the Trojans. It is perhaps significant, in the light of Heliodorus' evident love of story-telling, that Phoenix tells a the lengthy tale of Meleagros in *Iliad* 9.

The name Phoenix is also given as the alias of Kinyras of Cyprus (cf. *II.* 11.20), whose daughter fell in love with him and crept into his bed after making him drunk. Adonis was the product of this union (Apoll. *Bib.* 3.182). In Vergil (*Aen.* 4.529) the name Phoenissa is the given to the unhappy Dido, though Phoenix is elsewhere used as the feminine form. There is also the son of Agenor by a nymph Telephassa, who was sent by his father in pursuit of his sister Europa after she had been abducted by Zeus in the shape of a bull. He failed in his task but the country to which he came in his travels was later called Phoenicia after him (Apoll. *Bib.* 3.1-4; Moschos *Europa*). This myth is specifically recalled by Achilles Tatius, who begins his story in Phoenician Sidon with an *ekphrasis* of a votive painting of this *crime passionnelle* (1.1.1, the hero of the romance is, of course, Phoenician). Attempted seduction appears as the core elements in Greek Romance since the time of the affair of Joseph and Potiphar's wife. In the *Ethiopian Story* there are a number of such situations: the supposed infidelity of Persinna to Hydaspes (4.8.1-8); the seduction of Kalasiris by Rhodopis (2.25.1-3); Demainete's advances to Knemon (1.10-14); and Arsake's infatuation with Theagenes (7.20-8.15) are the most important of them.

πλεῖν δὲ ἐπὶ Καρχηδόνα τὴν Λιβύων . . . ὀλκάδα μυριοφόρον Ἰνδικῶν τε καὶ Αἰθιοπικῶν καὶ τῶν ἐκ Φοινίκης ἀγωγίμων φέροντες; Carthage was, of course, a powerful city at the time in which Heliodorus has chosen to set his story. It was also well-known in the fourth

century A.D. Trade with India, Africa and the Middle East had been going on since the first century as the *Periplus Maris Erythraei* shows and in the late Roman Empire, Syria was a trading centre, through which goods such as silk from China (overland from the East) and possibly ivory from Africa (by sea via the Red Sea) passed to the Mediterranean. Both commodities are mentioned in the romance (silk, 10.25.2; ivory, 10.15.2 [Charikleia's arm is like ivory]; elephants are also mentioned in battle, 9.16-18, and are at home in Meroë, 10.5.2). The reference to these traders and the sketch of the merchant Nausicles (6.6.3) suggest that Heliodorus was aware of the commercial activities of Emesa (cf. Altheim 1942, 22) and that the trade motif was not entirely literary as in the figure of Labrax, for example, in the *Rudens* of Plautus (Feuillâtre 1966, 123). The inclusion of these details introduces an element of exoticism into the romance, rather than being used in characterisation.

Ἡρακλεῖ Τυρίῳ: Herakles was frequently identified with the Phoenician god Melkart (Hdt. 2.43-44; Ach. Tat. 2.14; 7.14; 8.18). Cicero knows of six different mythological characters with the name Hercules and mentions the Phoenician god among them (*ND* 3.42). Herakles is also often associated with the holding of games.

στέφανον: cf. 4.2.1 above, and note.

4.16.7 Μαλέαν ὑπερβαλόντες ἀνέμοις τε ἐναντίοις χρησάμενοι: these were notorious waters in antiquity; the fleet of Menelaos was split in two when rounding Cape Malea (*Od.* 3.286-292) and Odysseus was also swept off course here (*Od.* 9.79-81).

ὄναρ αὐτῷ προμαντεύειν τὴν μέλλουσαν Πυθιονίκην: For this secondary divine motivation: cf. 4.16.3 above, and note. Heliodorus implies that the escape of Theagenes and Charikleia from Delphi depends on a complex nexus of divine forces (in this case the god is Herakles, the god of the Tyrians). Cf. Weinstock (1934, 50): *Probationis causa quidem hoc somnium inducitur.*

Rattenbury (1938, 114-115) argues that Πυθιονίκη ('a Pythian victory'), like Ὀλυμπιονίκη ('an Olympian victory'), is questionable Greek but that nevertheless Heliodorus probably did use this word and that the text here and at 5.19.2 should not be emended. Even the rare evidence cited by Rattenbury for the meaning 'an Olympian victory' (Bacch. 4.17, Antiphon fr. 49) has been suspected (Maehler emends the Bacchylides passage to Ὀλυμπιονικίας—although this is a wholly unprecedented form) and Rattenbury suggests that ὕμνος should be understood in Antiphon fr. 49. However, the only indication that there is a difficulty with the text of the *Ethiopian Story* occurs in the variant at 5.19.2, τὴν ἐν Πυθίᾳ νίκην (V^{mg}) and the fact that the word occurs twice should

be convincing evidence that Heliodorus did indeed understand it to mean 'Pythian victory'.
4.16.8 θυσίαν . . νικητήριον . . χαριστήριον . . ἐμβατήριον: For the various forms of sacrifice mentioned here: cf. 5.12.3. (thanksgiving); Phil. VA 5.43; Plut. *Luc.* 24.5-6 (embarkation, cf. Ἐμβάσιος Ἀπόλλων and Ἐκβάσιος Ἀπόλλων, Apoll. *Arg.* 1.404, 966); Thuc. 5.54 (crossing a frontier). Herodotus remarks that the Greeks shared conventional practice with regard to sacrifices (8.143.4-5).

ὦ λῶστε: a common Atticism according to Lucian (*Rhet. prec.* 16). Cf. also 5.18.7.

4.16.9 Εἰ γὰρ βουληθείης: Koraes makes this a wish (cf. 1.11.5). RL take the expression as hypothetical, but cf. 1.11.5, «Εἰ γὰρ οὕτω βουληθείης» ἔφην (clearly a wish).

ἀνδρὶ σοφῷ τε καὶ Ἑλληνι καὶ . . θεοῖς κεχαρισμένῳ: the Tyrians assume that Kalasiris is Greek from his dress (cf. 2.21.2). Ironically, Kalasiris and his charge Charikleia do not bring them luck but are the cause of the Phoenician ship being captured by Trachinos' pirates and her crew being transferred to a dinghy (2.25.3).

εἰ μίαν ἐνδοίητε: Heliodorus uses the Late Greek form εἰ and the optative here (cf. Naber 1873, 159). Cf. also 4.18.5 (πρὶν . . . ἐμπεδοθείη); 4.18.4 (εἰ γένοιτο); 4.18.5 (πρὶν . . . ἐμπεδοθείη).

4.16.10 τὴν αὔριον: The time scheme becomes confused during the escape from Delphi. Here the Phoenicians ask Kalasiris to be ready on the evening of the following day (μόνον εἰς ἑσπέραν γοῦν ἐπὶ θάλατταν εἶναι). However the attack on Charikleia's lodgings occurs on the following night (εἰς τὴν ἐξῆς τοιάδε ἐγένετο· ἐπειδὴ μέσαι νύκτες . . ., 4.17.3; νυκτός . . . ἄωριον, 4.17.5) as does the emergency meeting (νυκτερινόν βουλευτήριον, 4.19.5). During the same night (τῆς νυκτός, 5.1.1) Kalasiris takes Theagenes and Charikleia to the beach from which they finally depart at dawn (ὄρθρου ὑποφαίνοντος, 5.1.1) and the reader is told that the pirates had agreed to wait a day and a night (οἱ Φοίνικες ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα μόνην ἀναμεῖναι συνθέμενοι, 5.1.1). On the similar confusion surrounding the movements of Kalasiris: cf. 4.8.1 above and note.

4.17.1 ὑπὸ πηκτίδων ἐπίτροχον μέλος: the πηκτίς was a triangular instrument with many strings strung in pairs (Pindar fr. 125; Soph. fr. 412 [Pearson]; Ath. 14.625f-626a; 14.635d; 14.636b). It may be the Greek name for the Lydian *magadis* (Aristoxenos in Ath. 635d) and was clearly thought of as a foreign import (according to Telestes in Ath. 14.625f-626a it was brought to Greece from Lydia by Pelops). Sappho (according to Menaechmus in Ath. 14.635e) or Anakreon (fr. 386, 373, 374) may have promoted its use. In Greece the instrument was played by women, since Euripides carries one as part of his female disguise in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazousai* (1217) and Diogenes of Oinomaus states

that Lydian and Bactrian girls used it in the worship of Artemis (Ath. 14.636a). Plato disapproved of it because it was used by virtuoso players to produce polyharmonic and antiphonal music (*Rep.* 399c; *Leg.* 700e). Cf. Aristotle *Pol.* 1341a40.

Confusingly, the name may also have been used of a wind instrument resembling pan-pipes (*Anth. Pal.* 9.586), since Herodotus says that the Lydian king Alyattes marched his soldiers to its accompaniment (1.17) and Anakreon mentions men playing it. Cf. West (1992, 71-74); Maas & Snyder (1989: 40-41, 147-150) and notes; Comotti (1989: 19-20, 66). For Heliodorus' interest in music, cf. 3.2.2; 4.3.1 and notes.

μέλος Ἀσσύριόν τινα νόμον ἐσκίπτων: Phrygian dancing is described by Lucian (*Salt.* 34). Cf. 3.2.2 above, and note; Xen. *Anab.* 6.1.10 (τὸ Περσικόν); Ar. *Thesm.* 1175 (Περσικόν). Koraes notes that the Romans and Greeks confused Syrians and Assyrians, using the latter term for the Syrians proper (Phoenicians like Heliodorus himself), Cappadocians and the White Syrians (Λευκοσύροι).

καὶ στροφὴν ὀλοσώματον ὥσπερ οἱ κάτοχοι δινεύοντες: Koraes notes the Greek propensity for forming words with the prefix ὀλο-. LSJ⁹ *s.v.* ὀλοσώματος suggest that Heliodorus' usage of ὀλοσώματον in the sense 'with the whole body' is a *hapax* in this sense. Cf. Gregory of Nyssa: ὀλοσώματον ποιεῖται αὐτῆς τὸ ἐγκώμιον, *On the Song of Songs* 6.242.15; Didymus Caecus: ὀλοσώματον κάκωσιν, *Commentaries on Job* fr. 359.13 ('wholly, entirely'); Eusebius: τὸν δὲ εἰκόνα τῆς θυγατρὸς ζῶον ὀλοσώματον κατασκευάσαι, *Evangelical Preparation* 9.34.19.2 ('full-length'); Gregory Nazianzenus: ὀλοσώματος, φησὶν, ἢ πληγῆ, *In Patrem Tacentem* 35.956.45 ('comprehensive, fatal').

Kalasisiris tells Charikleia what to do

4.17.2 ἅ τε δεήσει καὶ ὅποτε πράττειν ἑκάτερον ὑποθέμενος: Kalasisiris repeats his instructions to Theagenes, but the reader is not told what they are (Hefti 1950, 116). Cf. 4.16.2.

The kidnapping of Charikleia

4.17.3 ἐπειδὴ μέσαι νύκτες ὕπνω τὴν πόλιν ἐβάπτιζον: The atmosphere is poetic (Feuillâtre 1966, 25) and similar to that created by Vergil's description of Troy before the onslaught of the Greek fleet (*Aen.* 2).

4.17.4 καὶ δούπη τῶν ἀσπίδων τοὺς κατὰ μικρὸν αἰσθομένους ἐμβροντήσαντες: the use of shields in Assyrian dances is described by Xenophon (*Anab.* 6.1.10). Cf. also Ach. Tat. 3.15.6, τὸ κακὸν ἐνεβρόντησέ με.

τῶν κλείθρων . . . ἐπιβεβουλευμένων: ἐπιβεβουλευμένων is a *hapax* in this sense.

4.17.5 τὸν ἐνυάλιον ἀλαλάξαντες: Παιῶνα or something similar is to be understood with ἐνυάλιον: cf. 1.31.3 and Julian Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα Κωνστάντιον 29.12-13, οὐδὲ τὸν ἐνυάλιον παιῶνα τῶν στρατοπέδων ἐπαλαλαζόντων ἀδεῶς ἀκούων. Xenophon similarly omits παιῶνα (Baumgarten 1932, 6): cf. *Anab.* 1.8.18; 5.2.14; Arr. *Ind.* 24.7; *Alan.* 25; Poll. 1.163.

βαρὺν τινα πάταγον ἐκ τῶν ἀσπίδων ἐπικτυποῦντες: cf. *Suda ad* Ἐπιδουπήσαι. The entry equates ἐπιδουπήσαι and ἐπικτυπήσαι and continues to explain the words with reference to the Arab practice of emitting war-cries and striking drums in battle, which the Romans counteracted by doing the same. The *Suda* passage is quoted from a Menander, most probably Menander the Guardsman (the identification of this Menander was made by J.R. Morgan in a personal communication). This extract shows close verbal echoes of the present passage and there must be a connection between the two: καὶ ὅταν αἰσθοῖντο τὸν πάταγον τῶν τυμπάνων, ἀντιπαταγεῖν καὶ αὐτοὺς ταῖς ἀσπίσι καὶ ἐπαλαλάζειν τὸ ἐνυάλιον καὶ παιωνίζειν καὶ τοῖς ὑδροχόοις ἀγγείοις, ξυλίνοις οὖσιν, ἐπικτυπεῖν [*Suda*]; οἱ μὲν τὸν ἐνυάλιον ἀλαλάξαντες καὶ βαρὺν τινα πάταγον ἐκ τῶν ἀσπίδων ἐπικτυποῦντες [*Hld*]). It does not seem likely that both Menander and Heliodorus were using a common source, since the contexts of the two passages are very different. Moreover, the Byzantine lexicographers cited Menander the Guardsman frequently for his Attic style and vocabulary. This Menander also appears to have been a reader of romance, which makes it more likely that there is a direct connection between the two. The citations of Menander the Guardsman in the *Suda* are given in Blockley (1985, 130-133 and p. 267, n. 155), who ascribes the present passage to Menander's description of the siege of Sirmium by the Avars in 568 without noting that Menander was borrowing from Heliodorus. Menander's use of the Heliodorus passage provides further evidence of his popularity with the Byzantine scholars (see 3.2.4 above and note). It also suggests that ἐπικτυποῦντες is the correct reading here, because, although the Menander passage uses both forms, ἐπικτυπεῖν occurs in the part where the echoes of Heliodorus are particularly striking.

καὶ τοῦ Παρνασοῦ . . . συνεπηχοῦντος: Παρνασοῦ refers, of course, to the mountain near Delphi. Cf. 2.26.2, οἷον γὰρ φρούριον ἀτεχνῶς καὶ αὐτοσχέδιος ἀκρόπολις ὁ Παρνασὸς ἀπαιωρεῖται προπόδων λαγόσι τὴν πόλιν ἐγκολπισά. The Homeric Hymn to Apollo (282-285) reinforces the impression of a lofty mountain. Strabo (9.3.3) describes the setting of Delphi as theatrical (πετρῶδες χωρίον θεατροειδές)—a comparison echoed by Justin (*Hist. Phil.* 24.6, *in formam theatri*). Heliodorus gives a convincing description of Delphi and he may easily have visited the site in the opinion of Orlandini (1993, 65-66).

Συνεπηχοῦντος occurs quite commonly elsewhere: cf. Arist. *De mundo* 6.20; Plut. *Mor.* 44D; Maxim. Tyr. *Diss.* 1.117; Lucian *De domo* 3; Dio 100.39.9; 56.35; 73.13; Plot. 208D. For the usage of Xenophon, cf. *Cyr.* 3.3.58; 9.2.15; Baumgarten (1932, 21).

4.18.1 ἐπὶ τὰ Λοκρῶν ὄρη καὶ Οἰταίων ἀφιππάσαντο: the people of Oita later disown Theagenes and condemn him to death for his actions (10.36.4)—a further realistic detail concerning Delphi (Feuillâtre 1966, 46).

For ἀφιππάσαντο, cf. 7.29.2 (ἀφιππάσατο); Char. 3.7.2 (ἀφιππασάμενος for ἀφιππευσάμενος). Ἀφιππεύειν is normally active, e.g. Plutarch *Pyrrh.* 34.2.3; Xen. *Anab.* 1.5.12, but the Atticisers frequently confounded the active and middle voice. Cf. Baumgarten (1932, 23-24). Naber (1873, 167) suggests ἀφιππάσαντο.

Theagenes and Charikleia appeal to Kalasiris for help

Σῶξε πάτερ: for Kalasiris' role as the protector of Theagenes and Charikleia, cf. 4.3.4 above and note.

4.18.2 ἴν' ἐκ πάντων μόνους ἀλλήλους κερδήσωσι: spiritual values are frequently contrasted with the desire for gain in the *Ethiopian Story*. The pirates value money more than the lives of their friends or other people (1.1.8; 1.32.4; 1.33.3; 5.30.1), though naturally the Phoenicians (5.25.3) and the Syenians (9.5.7) hold their own lives to be more valuable. Nausicles' guide in life is the god of Profit, Hermes (6.7.1) and he has a rather unusual idea of what true gain is, namely giving gifts at no cost to the donor (5.15.2). By contrast the lovers profit only from having each other (6.9.3; 8.9.20; 8.9.22) or their modesty (4.10.2) and consider death a profit by comparison with a life without chastity (5.29.6), although Charikleia values the lives of others, unlike Cybele (8.8.4). Theagenes is more despondent in adversity than Charikleia, however (5.6.2). Kalasiris values foreknowledge (2.24.7; 3.16.4) and the mission he is entrusted with by Persinna (4.13.1).

σῶξε τύχης λοιπὸν ἀγώγιμα σώματα: Philostratus has a similar expression (*Her.* 740 [Olearius], τὰ γὰρ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγώγιμα ἡδῖω τέ μοι): cf. Plato (*Prot.* 313c, ὁ σοφιστὴς τυγχάνει ὢν ἔμπορος τις ἢ κάπηλος τῶν ἀγωγίμων, ἀφ' ὧν ψυχὴ τρέφεται). The word σώμα was frequently used to mean 'slave': cf. 9.23.5; Plb. 12.16.5; Feuillâtre (1966, 85).

φυγάδας ἀυθαίρετους μὲν ἀλλ' ἀνευθύνους: cf. Luc. *Pro Imaginibus* 18.7, Καίτοι παλαιὸς οὔτος ὁ λόγος, ἀνευθύνους εἶναι ποιητὰς καὶ γραφέας. The word ἀνεύθυνος is popular among the Christian writers, e.g., Gregory of Nyssa *Orationes vii de beatudinibus* 44.1233.54, τιμωροῦτό τε τοὺς ἀξίους, καὶ τὴν σώζουσαν ψῆφον πρὸς τοὺς ἀνευθύνους φέροι.

Theagenes' appeal for help to Kalasiris is rather pointless since Kalasiris has already agreed to arrange their escape from Delphi: cf. Sandy (1982a, 91). This passage

resembles some of the numerous laments in the work (cf. Birchall 1996, 1-17).

4.18.3 **Συνεχέθην τοῖς εἰρημένοις**: the MSS show a variety of forms: **συνεχέθην** (CPA), **συνεσχέθην** (BT), and **συνεχύθην** (VMZ). A similar variation between **συνεχέθη** and **συνεχύθη** occurs at 7.4.1. In both cases, RL prefer **συνεχέθην** / **συνεχέθη**, following the MSS they prefer (Introduction Vol. 1, p. lxii), but cf. Ach. Tat. 5.17.7, **ὡς οὖν ταῦτα ἠκούσαμεν, ἐγὼ μὲν συνεχύθην**.

νῶ πλέον ἢ ὀφθαλμῶ τοῖς νέοις ἐπιδακρύσας: Koraes disparages the metaphor (that Kalasiris can ‘weep mentally’) but the expression points to the strong influence of neoPlatonist ideas on Heliodorus. Cf. also Kalasiris’ moral struggle with Rhodopis, in which he pits the eyes of his soul against the eyes of his body (2.25.2: cf. also Eusebius *Commentaries on the Psalms* 24.12.1, **νῶ δὲ καὶ ψυχῆς ὀφθαλμοῖς**) and Theagenes imagining Charikleia in the cave (2.2.2, **τῶ νῶ περιέβλεπε**). The body and soul are frequently contrasted in the *Ethiopian Story*: **οὕτω τοῖς ἐχθίστοις ψυχὴν τε ἅμα καὶ σῶμα τεθηγμένοι συμπίπτωμεν** (1.29.6); **τέχνη σώματος πάθη θεραπεύειν ἐπαγγέλλεται ψυχῆς δὲ οὐ προηγουμένως** (4.7.5); **σῶζε τύχης λοιπὸν ἀγῶγιμα σώματα** (4.18.2 above, and note); **ἱκανῶς γε ἔχειν ψυχῆς τε ἅμα καὶ σώματος πρὸς τὰς τῆς ἱερωσύνης λειτουργίας** (7.8.7); **τὸ μὲν σῶμα καταπονούμενος τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν ἐπὶ σωφροσύνη ῥωννύμενος** (8.6.4); **τὴν ἐνθένδε ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος ἀπαλλαγὴν** (8.11.4); **τοῖς μὲν σώμασιν ἐπὶ περιεστηκόσι δεινοῖς κάμνοντες ταῖς ψυχαῖς δὲ τῆς περὶ τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβείας ἐκ τῶν ἐνότων οὐκ ἀμνημονοῦντες** (9.10.2).

ἀνίστων: Here **ἀνίστων** (as if from **ἀνιστάω**) stands for Classical Greek **ἀνίστην** (1ps Imp. Indic. Act.: cf. **ἀνελάμβανον**); Naber (1873, 153): cf. also X. Eph. 3.8.3.

Charikleia demands that Theagenes take an oath to preserve her virginity

4.18.4 **καταιδέσαι**: **καταιδέομαι** is passive in form but active in meaning in Classical Greek. In late Greek the active form is used, as here: cf. LSJ⁹ *s.v.* **καταιδέομαι**; Naber (1873, 157).

4.18.5 **Ἀναφλέγεται γάρ**: a common metaphor: cf., e.g., 4.4.4; Ach. Tat. 6.18.1.

ὅταν ἀπρόσμαχον βλέπη τὸ ποθοῦμενον προκείμενον: Colonna (1938, 1987b) retains the reading of the codices, **ἀπρόσμαχον**, which RL emend to **ἄνευ προμάχου**. The adjective is a favourite of Heliodorus (cf. 2.1.1, the irresistible brilliance of the sun; 2.25.1, the irresistible net of desire; 5.22.7, the irresistible power of a storm; 8.15.4, irresistible beauty; 8.16.3, the irresistible numbers of the Troglodytes; 9.1.2, the irresistible numbers of the Ethiopians). The connection between the adjective and beautiful women is particularly relevant for the present instance (2.25.1; 8.15.4) and is related to the metaphor of love as

warfare (cf. 4.1.1 above, and note). Adjectives with the prefixes ἀπροσ- are common in Heliodorus (cf. introduction, n. 44). The sense here would be ‘when he looks on the irresistible object of his desire lying before him’ rather than the usual interpretation ‘when he sees his beloved defenseless, with none to protect her’ (Morgan; cf. also Lamb, Hadas). πρὶν ὄρκῳ πρὸς Θεαγένην τὸ ἀσφαλὲς ἐμπεδοθεῖη ὡς οὔτε ὀμιλήσει τὰ Ἀφροδίτης: Female chastity is stressed throughout the romance (cf. 4.8.7 above, and note; 4.13.4, where Charikleia emphasises her fidelity to Theagenes) but here the heroine insists on the chastity of her partner, at least before marriage. Not only does Theagenes swear an oath to remain chaste but he also undergoes a chastity test (which only a minority of young women passed: cf. 10.8.2), just as the heroines do in Achilles Tatius (8.13) and Heliodorus (10.9). In Achilles Tatius (8.5.7), Kleitophon claims that he and Leukippe ‘acted like philosophers’ (ἐφιλοσοφήσαμεν)—a somewhat equivocal term—during their travels, during much of which the two were separated. However, Kleitophon notoriously ‘provided a remedy for an ailing soul’ (φάρμακον ὡσπερ ψυχῆς νοσοῦσης, 5.27 [Winkler’s translation]: referring to his adultery with Melite). Male chastity is advocated in Plato *Laws* 837c8 and in the Enkratite and later ascetic literature (cf. Kerényi 1962², 226 n. 88) but what is stressed in this passage is the conventional connection between chastity and marriage, at least among the aristocracy. In Chariton, Kallirhoe finds herself in a similar predicament to Charikleia—she is at the mercy of Dionysius’ power and the object of his desire. She too insists on marriage (3.1.8, εἰ μὴ θέλει πατὴρ γενέσθαι, μηδὲ ἀνὴρ ἔστω), in order that Hermocrates should have a legitimate descendant. Male fidelity is mentioned in Longus when Chloe asks Daphnis to swear to remain faithful to her for as long as she stayed faithful to him (2.39.1, εἰς ὄρκων πίστιν προήλθον; 2.39.4, μὴ καταλιπεῖν Χλόην, ἔστ’ ἂν πιστὴ σοι μένη) but, of course, Daphnis was educated in sex by Lykainion (3.18). Nevertheless, Daphnis and Chloe do not make love to each other until they are married.

RL note that this long sentence contains an ‘anacoluthic hardie’ but not one so severe that the text should be suspected. The syntax of ὡς οὔτε ὀμιλήσει . . . πρότερον ἢ . . . ἀπολαβεῖν ἢ . . . γυναῖκα ποιεῖσθαι ἢ μηδαμῶς is normal, although the subject changes from Charikleia (with ἀπολαβεῖν) to Theagenes (with ποιεῖσθαι which is in the middle voice). The structure of the sentence is also disturbed by the parenthetical expression ἀλλ’ οὖν γε πάντως βουλομένην (which should be marked as such by dashes or brackets) especially as it comes directly after the subordinate conditional clause εἴπερ τοῦτο κωλύει δαίμων. The particle cluster ἀλλ’ οὖν γε marks the parenthesis as exclamatory. Here Charikleia breaks off her train of thought after mentioning words of ill omen—that a

daimon will prevent her from returning to her homeland—to express her passionate desire for Theagenes to make her his wife, despite her insistence on the oath. Heliodorus has neatly expressed the ambivalence of Charikleia here; she is concerned to preserve her chastity, following the injunction of her mother (4.8.7) but also wants to consummate her marriage. For the particle cluster ἀλλ' οὖν γε: cf. Denniston (*GP*).

εἶπερ τοῦτο κωλύει δαίμων: once again the term δαίμων is used to refer to a powerful and hostile being. Cf. 3.14.2 above, and note.

πάντως βουλομένην γυναῖκα ποιεῖσθαι ἢ μηδαμῶς: cf. 1.25.4, where Charikleia assures Theagenes that she has preserved her chastity, even from him, until her marriage-day. On Knemon's wedding day, Charikleia tells Kalasiris that her emotional breakdown is not due to carnal desire for Theagenes but chaste longing (6.9.4, οὐ . . . δημῶδης οὐδὲ νεωτερίζουσά τις ἐπιθυμία . . . ἀλλὰ καθαρὸς τε καὶ σωφρονῶν ἀπειράτου μὲν ἀλλ' ἔμοιγε ἀνδρὸς πόθος). The importance of marriage is stressed by Kalasiris also (4.10.6 above, and note) and is highlighted by the contrast between the chaste love of Theagenes and Charikleia and the immoral behaviour of Demainete: cf. Morgan (1989b, 110).

In Classical literature, marriage is highly prized especially by the females. Chariton has Kallirhoe make Dionysius swear to marry her (3.2.1-5); Apollonius describes how Jason swears to marry Medea (*Arg.* 4.95-98); and Athenaeus (*Deip.* 14.11.19-20 [Kaibel]) relates the tragic story of Kalyke and Euathlos, which he attributes to Stesichorus. Athenaeus states that the poet stressed the chastity of Kalyke (σωφρονικὸν δὲ πᾶνυ κατεσκεύασεν ὁ ποιητῆς τὸ τῆς παρθένου ἦθος) and her desire to be the lawful wife of Euathlos or to be released from life. The injunction of male chastity is an indication that Heliodorus was aware of Christian views on marriage (Goldhill 1995, 118-121). Chastity until marriage is strongly associated with Christian ethics, and Keydell (1966, 350) suggests that Heliodorus may have read about Moses' abstention from intercourse with women in Philo (*On the Life of Moses* 2.69). However, it is also important to note that Theagenes chastity, although undertaken zealously, is imposed by Charikleia, and that she is following the advice of her mother (4.8.7), whose concern for chastity is directly related to the unusual circumstances of her daughter's conception.

Neither RL nor Colonna (1938, 1987b) follow Richards' (1906, 111) suggestion of the aorist infinitive ποιήσασθαι in view of ἀπολαβεῖν (4.18.5). The present infinitive is logical; Greek marriages were realised by their consummation rather than by a ritual that preceded them. The sense is therefore that Charikleia requests Theagenes not to have sex with her until their wedding night.

4.18.6 τὴν τε ἐστίαν ἐσχάραν εἰς βωμὸν ἀνάψαντος: the use of the adjective suffix -ιος (as here in ἐστίος for the noun form ἐστία) is characteristic of Heliodorus (RL, LSJ *s.v.* ἔστιος). Cf., e.g., 1.30.5, τὸ νησίδιον; 1.12.2, ὁ ἀλιτήριος; 2.11.2, σὺ δὲ καὶ διαπόντιος ἦκεις.

Incense was normally burnt on an altar or portable hearth (cf. LSJ *s.v.* ἐσχάρα II), but here the Kalasiris has to make do with the fireplace in his lodgings to where Theagenes and Charikleia had fled after the kidnapping (cf. 4.17.2; 4.18.1; Maillon *ad loc.*). In Heliodorus, oaths are directed at a variety of gods (not just Zeus, Gê and Helios): e.g., Zeus (cf. 2.19.1, by Knemon), Isis (3.11.1, by Charikleia), Apollo (4.7.9, by Charikles), Helios (4.8.2, by Persinna), Apollo, Artemis, Aphrodite and Eros (the present passage, by Theagenes), Helios (8.9.11, by Charikleia).

ἀποθύσαντος: This form of the verb is used by Xenophon (*Anab.* 3.2.12; 4.8.25; 5.1.1; *Hell.* 3.3.1; 4.3.21; Baumgarten 1932, 21) but also by later writers: cf. Plut. *Sull.* 35; *Crass.* 2; Poll. 1.27. Cf. 4.16.4 above, and note.

οὐ γὰρ ἔχειν ἐπιδείξειν προαίρεσιν φόβῳ τοῦ κρείττονος κατηναγκάσθαι νομιζόμενην: for the late usage τὸ κρείττον, cf. 3.18.6 above, and note. For the specific expression φόβῳ τοῦ κρείττονος, cf. Eus. *Eccl. Hist.* 10.8.14, διὰ τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ κρείττονος φόβον; *Prep. Evang.* 7.22.53, τῷ νικᾶσθαι τῷ φόβῳ δεδουλωμένον πρὸς τινος κρείττονος. The phrase ‘fear of god’, ‘fear of the Lord’ is, of course, Christian and occurs often in the New Testament, e.g., *Acts* 9.31, τῷ φόβῳ τοῦ Κυρίου; *2Cor.* 5.11, τὸν φόβον τοῦ κυρίου; *Eph.* 5.21, ἐν φόβῳ Ἐριστοῦ.

Richards (1906, 111) suggests ἔχων for ἔχειν in view of ἐπιδείξειν (giving Bekker’s order ἐπιδείξειν ἔχειν). Colonna (1938) suggested ἐπιδείξιν ἔχειν but later (1987b) followed RL, who retain the infinitive but transpose the words; the infinitive is helped by the word-order and the preceding infinitive ἀδικεῖσθαι and should therefore be read here.

The codices have νομιζόμενην in agreement with προαίρεσιν (questioned by Richards 1906, 111) but RL accept Hercher’s suggestion νομιζόμενος, which gives better sense (‘if he was thought to have been compelled . . . ’ rather than ‘if his choice was thought [??] to have been compelled . . . ’). In this passage, Heliodorus may have been conscious of the Aristotelian contrast between necessity and free choice (δοκεῖ ἢ ἀνάγκη ἀμετάπειστόν τι εἶναι, ὀρθῶς ἐναντίον γὰρ τῇ κατὰ τὴν προαίρεσιν κινήσει, *Met.* 1015a34).

Ἔρωτα: the codices read Ἔρωτας ‘personifications of love’. RL note that the plural form is rare in the romances. Achilles Tatius uses the plural once and distinguishes it from the singular (1.1.13). The plural is also rare in Classical literature: cf. *Anth. Pal.* 7.25

(Anacreon and Simonides). Philostratus makes Eros the son of Aphrodite and the Erotes the children of the nymphs (Phil. *Imag.* 1.6; Claudian *de Nupt. Honor.* 73 ff.). The singular form is found at 4.1.1 (Ἔρωτος) and 4.10.5 (Ἔρωος). The singular form (Ἔρωτα) is found in Achilles Tatius (1.2.1; 5.26.10; 5.27.2), Chariton (1.2.4; 3.2.5; 6.4.4); Longus (4.16.3; 4.39.1); X. Eph. (1.1.5; 1.4.1); and Heliodorus (2.33.5; 4.2.3). The evidence is therefore overwhelmingly in favour of Ἔρωτα here (cf. Merkelbach 1959, 182-183).

ἦ μὴν ἅπαντα οὕτω ποιήσῃν ὡς ἠβουλήθη Χαρίκλεια καὶ ἐπέσκηψε: RL comment that this submission of the male to the female was unprecedented: cf. the ‘move towards symmetry’ in the history of sexuality discussed by Goldhill (1995, 144-166) and Konstan (1994). On the other hand, the infatuation of the docile lover of Isias of Chemmis is ridiculed (6.3.1).

Kalasisiris advises Charikles to call a general assembly

4.19.1 πολιτῶν εἰς πλῆθος συρρεόντων: for the metaphor in συρρεόντων, cf. 1.29.2; Ach. Tat. 6.5.2, πλῆθος τῶν παννουχιζόντων συνέρρειν; 8.3.1, ὁ ὄχλος συνερρῦη; Neimke (1889, 53).

συνεχομένων: the reading of B (followed by Bekker and RL) refers to the townspeople as opposed to συνεχομένον (mAT; Colonna 1938, 1987b) which refers to Charikles. If the latter reading is retained RL suggest τε for δέ after ἀγνοίᾳ. The immediately following ἄναυδοι καὶ ἄπρακτοι suggests that the plural is correct, though Charikles is similarly incapacitated.

4.19.2 ἄπρακτοι: Heliodorus consistently uses this word rather than ἄπρατος (Mayor 1886b: 172-173, 176).

ἦδη ἐπιδιώξετε: Reeve (1971 519) notes this as an irregular case of hiatus in a reading (from CBT) accepted by RL (VMPZA give ἦδη καὶ ἐπιδιώξετε). Hiatus involving final η and initial ε is quite common in Heliodorus (cf., e.g., 1.3.4; 1.8.4; 1.15.5; 1.15.6). There is no need to emend the text.

4.19.3 εἰς τὸ ἄδυτον ἄωρὶ παρελθὼν εἶδον ὀφθαλμοῖς ἃ μὴ θέμις ὁ θεός μοι προεῖπεν: What did Charikles see that he was not permitted to see? Koraes suggests that Heliodorus here parodies the blinding of Tiresias for seeing Artemis bathing (Apoll. *Bibl.* 3.6.7 [Pherekydes]; Callimachus *Hymn.* 5.57). Charikles’ punishment is similar to that of the myth: he loses the sight of what he loves most dearly—his wife and natural daughter (4.19.8). However, the allusion seems to be too fleeting to be a parody and the context is entirely inappropriate. Moreover, the motif of sinful curiosity leading to punishment (often blinding) is also found in Petronius *Sat.* 17.5; Ovid *Trist.* 3.5.49-50; Apuleius *Met.* 3.21-24;

Lucian *Ass* 12; and Plut. *Alex.* 3 (Philip was destined to lose an eye for peeping through a chink at the god Ammon in the form of a serpent fathering Alexander on Olympias). This statement suggests that the flight of Charikleia from Delphi was divinely sanctioned indirectly, even if the oracle of Apollo were discounted (2.35.5), since Charikles accepts the elopement as the will of the gods (Hefti 1950, 120). Charikles' statement sheds much light on his persistently superstitious view of religion (Anderson 1982, 126 n. 20).

οὐδὲν κωλύει καὶ πρὸς δαίμονα, φασί, μάχεσθαι: this appears to be an echo of Homer (cf. *Il.* 17.103-4, where Menelaus is contemplating whether to fight Hector, who he knows is supported by Apollo). The expression is almost proverbial; for Heliodorus' use of proverbs, see 3.1.1 above and note.

For δαίμων as a powerful and hostile being, cf. 3.14.2 above, and note.

τὸν βαρὺν τοῦτον ἐπενεγκῶν πόλεμον: reading πόλεμον (CBPZAT) rather than κίνδυνον (VM). Cf. 4.21.2, τὸ δὲ θέατρον εἰς τὸν πόλεμον διελύετο.

4.19.4 οἱ . . . μείρακες: in Attic usage, this word is feminine ('lasses') μειράκιον was used to refer to a boy (Naber 1873, 155)—a clear transgression of Attic language.

οὐκ οὖν εὐροῖς ἂν τινα τούτων κατὰ τὴν πόλιν: the optative is not indefinite but specific (Barber 1962, 175).

ὥστε ἀνίστασο καὶ εἰς βουλήν κάλει τὸν δῆμον: Kalasiris is not content with deceiving the priest of Apollo in Delphi but also turns the entire city upside down in order to facilitate their escape (Anderson 1982, 35).

Charikles' speech at the general assembly

4.19.5 Ἐγίνετο ταῦτα καὶ οἱ τε στρατηγοὶ σύγκλητον ἐκκλησίαν ἐκήρυττον: the scene resembles an assembly in Athens; an emergency assembly would be called by the generals (Dem. *Cor.* 37; 73) and would be held in the theatre (Thuc. 8.93; Lysias *Agor.* 32; Athenaeus 213d). At the dramatic date of the romance, Delphi would have been governed by the Amphictyonic League—a coalition of states in central Greece. In an emergency, representatives of the Amphictyonic League would have had to be assembled from the member states. For the composition of the Amphictyonic League, see Roux (1979, 3 and *passim*). Clearly, this would be inappropriate for Heliodorus' dramatic purpose, for which an immediate convocation of the outraged populace was required. Consequently, the crisis unfolds as if it were taking place in an autonomous city-state like Athens. However, Herodotus speaks of Delphi as a πόλις in crisis during the Persian invasion of Greece (8.36) and Catullus refers to the oracle (χρηστήριον) as an *urbs* (64.392). These loose usages are similar to Heliodorus' own description of Delphi as a πόλις (cf., e.g., 2.26.1-2).

The speech of Charikles is echoed in book 10, when the old priest demands the return of his daughter in Meroë (10.35.2 and Morgan's note *ad loc.*).

τὸ θέατρον ἐγένετο νυκτερινὸν βουλευτήριον: the theatre at Delphi was capable of seating five thousand people and occupied a spectacular location. A clandestine nocturnal meeting in the theatre of Dionysus is described in Andocides *On the Mysteries* 38.

ἐσθῆτα [τε] μέλαιναν ἀμπεχόμενος καὶ κόνιν . . . καταχεάμενος: RL exclude τε, whereas Bekker adds καί before τοιάδε. Heliodorus made use of polysyndeton on occasion (see the introduction on style) but here the use of τε appears unnecessary and easily reduplicated from ἐσθῆτα.

Heliodorus appears to be thinking of the famous incident in Homer, in which Achilles first hears of the death of Patroclus in battle (*Il.* 18.23-24; cf. *Od.* 24.316-317):

ἀμφοτέρησι δὲ χερσὶν ἐλὼν κόνιν αἰθαλόεσσαν
χεύατο κακῆ κεφαλῆς, χαρίεν δ' ἥσχυνε πρόσωπον.

The lines were used by Chariton to express intense grief: cf., e.g., Kleitophon on being told (falsely) that Leukippe was unfaithful (1.4.6 [direct quotation]); Leukippe on hearing of Kleitophon's supposed death (3.10.4 [indirect quotation]); and Kleitophon on being told by Mithridates that he must remain silent during the latter's trial (5.2.4 [direct quotation]). It was commonplace for Greeks to pour dust over themselves to excite pity (cf., e.g. the Sicilian tyrant, Dionysius, Polyæn. *Rhet.* 5.1.4) and, indeed, this is what Aristippus did at the trial of his son, Knemon, for attempted parricide (1.13.1). These were the kind of scenes of self-indulgent grief that Plato wanted to exclude from literature (*Rep.* 388b2).

4.19.6 A lament recapitulating part of the narrative: cf. 4.8.1 above, and note; Birchall (1996, 1-17). In the *Odyssey* (24.426-437), Eupheithes laments for his son Antinoos and urges the people of Ithaca to take revenge for his death and to prevent Odysseus' escape (Feuillâtre 1966, 110). However, there is also a general similarity with the chorus in *Oedipus at Colonus* 1045-1100, describing the pursuit of the daughters of Oedipus, who had been kidnapped by Creon.

προσαγγεῖλαί με βουλόμενον ἑμαυτὸν ἦκειν 'that I have come wanting to give reasons why I should kill myself': the word προσαγγέλλειν earlier meant 'denounce', cf. *Plut. Marc.* 2, ὁ Μάρκελλος προσήγγειλε τῇ βουλῇ τὸν ἄνθρωπον 'Marcellus denounced the man to the council'; *Lucian Tox.* 32, προσαγγέλλει ἑαυτὸν ἐλθὼν πρὸς τὸν ἄρμοστήν 'he came to the governor and denounced himself'. However, Loenertz (1959-60, 1-6) has shown that the reflexive usage later meant 'give reasons for a suicide'. The evidence for this meaning comes from the titles of fictitious speeches in Libanius, in which the speakers are men

driven to suicide: a misanthropic lover, an unhappily married man, an unsuccessful parasite, a parasite forced to listen to philosophy, a man jealous of his neighbour's success, and a miser in love with a hetaira (Lib. *Decl.* 12t, Τίμων ἐρῶν Ἀλκιβιάδου ἑαυτὸν προσαγγέλλει; 26t; 28t; 29t; 30t; 32t). The expression was something of a commonplace among the rhetoricians (Sopater *Διαίρεσις Ζητημάτων* v.8 p.309 l.12; Apsines *Ars Rhet.* p.345 l.10; Hermogenes *Περὶ ἰδεῶν λόγου* 2.8.66). This meaning explains the interpolation in the *Suda*, in which the correct rhetorical expression is substituted for a circumlocution, Προσαγγέλλει « ὁ δὲ ἑαυτὸν προσαγγέλλει » ἀντὶ τοῦ « μηνύει ἑαυτὸν ἄξιον θανάτου »: “he gives reasons why he should kill himself” rather than “he declares that he deserves to die” (Loenertz' punctuation). For a theoretical study of suicide in the ancient romances, cf. MacAlister (1996, 17-83).

ἔρημος καὶ θεήλατος: cf. Eur. *Androm.* 851-855: Τρ. τί ταῦτα μοχθεῖς; συμφοραὶ θεήλατοι / πᾶσιν βροτοῖσιν ἢ τότε ἦλθον ἢ τότε. / Ερ. ἔλιπες ἔλιπες, ὦ πάτερ, ἐπακτίαν / [ῶσει] μονάδ' ἔρημον οὔσαν ἐνάλου κόπας.

4.19.7 ἢ τε κοινὴ πάντων ἀπάτη καὶ μάταιος ἐλπίς: The sentiment seems to be drawn from the words of Diodotus concerning the fate of Mytilene in 427 (Thuc. 3.45.5) to the effect that the passions of hope and desire are responsible for great calamities in human society. Hope is one of mixed emotions listed by Chariton (3.5.4) and mocked by Achilles Tatius (2.10.3).

τιμωρίαν εἰσπεπραγμένην παρὰ τῶν ἐξυβρισάντων ἀναμένω: Charikles duly appears in Meroë, seeking revenge (10.34-36). He tells Hydaspes and his council that he had pursued Theagenes and the Thessalians to Oita, where the citizens of the town gave him authority to execute the young man. He then left for Memphis, the home town of Kalasiris (the reader presumes that Charikles obtained this information on their meeting the Egyptian priest [2.29.1] but Kalasiris does not explicitly mention the place of his birth to Charikles), where he found that the priest had died. However, Thyamis directed him to Oroondates who in turn sent him on to Meroë. Charikles' appearance here precipitates the final recognition of Charikleia's identity (10.38), which overshadows Charikles' demands for justice. Charikles evidently abandons his suit and joins the final procession in a chariot he shares with Sisimithres (10.41).

4.19.8 οἴχονται . . . πατήσαντες: the participle makes the action of the verb more specific. Χαρικλείας οἴμοι τῶν ἐμῶν ὀφθαλμῶν: Kerényi (1962², 51-53) argues that there is a religious idea underlying the connection between Charikles' ‘punishment’ and his ‘sin’: ‘Wer mit den augen sündigt, wird an den Augen bestraft’ (p. 52). He also connects the

statement here with the dream of Charikleia (2.16) that she has had her right eye stabbed by a wild man with a bloody sword and goes on to suggest that the imagery derives from the Egyptian story about the eye of the sun. According to this story, the eye of Re—the sun, or the right eye of the god of heaven—became disconnected and was later found. The eye was also the daughter of the sun-god, Hathor, whom he lost. Again, the left eye of the old god of heaven, the world, became the eye of Horus in Egyptian mythology, which Seth lost, but which Thoth restored. According to Kerényi, the description of Charikleia's eyes as ἡλιακὰς ἀκτῖνας connects the story of lovers who lose and find each other with the Egyptian stories. The human story is 'plamatisch . . . eingekleidet' with the myth (p. 53). However, while it is clear that eyes and vision play a significant part in the romance (see introduction), the expression here is entirely conventional: cf. 2.16.4, Theagenes is Charikleia's 'eye'; 3.6.3 above, and note (Charikleia was the 'eye' of Delphi); Aesch. *Choeph.* 934, ὀφθαλμὸν οἴκων μὴ πανώλεθρον πεσεῖν; Eur. *Andr.* 406, εἷς παῖς ὄδ' ἦν μοι λοιπὸς ὀφθαλμὸς βίου.

ᾠ τῆς ἀμειλίκτου καθ' ἡμῶν τοῦ δαίμονος φιλονεικίας: ἀμειλίκτου is Homeric: cf. *Il.* 11.137; 21.98, ἀμειλίκτον δ' ὄπ' ἄκουσε. The term δαίμων is again used of a powerful and hostile being. Cf. 3.14.2 above, and note.

ὡς ἴστε, θυγατέρα ταῖς νυμφικαῖς λαμπάσι συναπέσβεσε: cf. 2.1.3; 2.29.4 which also mentions the wedding torches. Achilles Tatius 1.13.5 also exploits the topos. Cf. also *Anth. Gr.* 7.367. For the theme of a bride dying on her wedding day, cf. Morgan (1979, at 10.16.10); Szepessy (1972, 341). Morgan distinguishes the topos from that of the marriage to Hades (cf. Rehm 1994 *passim*). The topos may be connected with the practice of bride kidnapping, which sometimes involved the death of one of the parties involved and which is mentioned by Achilles Tatius as a legal form of marriage in Byzantium (2.13.3). The action of Theagenes in kidnapping Charikleia may also be explained on the basis of this practice.

συναπήγαγεν: cf. Xen. *Cyr.* 8.3.23; *Hell.* 5.1.23; Baumgarten (1932, 19). The word also occurs in the *Septuagint*, *New Testament* and patristic authors.

4.19.9 Χαρίκλειά μοι βίος ἦν: Theagenes also calls Charikleia his ζῶή (8.6.4).

ἐλπίς καὶ διαδοχὴ τοῦ γένους, Χαρίκλεια μόνη παραψυχὴ καὶ ὡς εἰπεῖν ἄγκυρα: cf. 7.14.7, where Charikleia describes Kalasiris as her anchor in life. For the metaphorical use of ἄγκυρα: cf. Soph. fr. 623 (Nauck); Eur. *Hel.* 277; Feuillâtre 1966, 78. Heliodorus apologises for the usage here but ὡς εἰπεῖν is normally only used with a superlative or with πᾶς, οὐδεὶς and so on. Cf. 6.15.4 where Heliodorus employs the usage correctly.

The speech of Hegesias

4.20.1 ὁ στρατηγὸς Ἡγησίας: Hegesias is another etymological name, this time formed from ἡγεῖσθαι 'to lead'. This is also the name of Hegesias of Magnesia, a historian, and Hegesias, a philosopher from Cyrene (cf. *OCD s.v.* 'Hegesias').

ἡμεῖς δὲ μὴ συμβαπτίζομεθα τῷ τούτου πάθει μηδὲ λάθωμεν ὥσπερ ῥεύμασι τοῖς τούτου δάκρυσιν ὑποφερόμενοι: RL follow Koraes in commenting on the bad taste of this metaphor, which the former ascribe to an ill-judged attempt to imitate Homer *Il.* 16.3, δάκρυα θερμὰ χέων ὡς τε κρήνη μελάνυδρος (Patroclus); *Od.* 19.207, τηκομένης δ' ἄρα τῆς ποταμοὶ πλήθουσι ῥέοντες (Penelope). The metaphor is certainly extended too far, but this may have been done deliberately by Heliodorus to convey something of the macho toughness of Hegesias. For overindulgence in the description of tears: cf. Ach. Tat. 3.11.1; 6.7.1-7; 7.4.1-6.

Συμβαπτίζομεθα is a hapax in this sense. The word is normally used to mean 'be baptised together with someone': cf. ἀπόχρη καὶ μόνον αὐτῆς ἢ ἀξίωσις τοῦ συμβαπτισθῆναι αὐτῇ τὴν ξενοδόχον καὶ εὐεργέτιν, Ps-Clem. epitome 107.2-3 (Symeon Metaphrasta); Greg. Naz. *Or.* 40 (36.396.46).

τὸν καιρὸν προΐεμενοι, πράγμα δὲ μεγίστην ἐν ἅπασιν ἔχει καὶ πολέμοις οὐχ ἥκιστα τὴν ῥοπήν: for the view that 'There is a tide in the affairs of men, / Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune; / Omitted, all the voyage of their life / Is bound in shallows and in miseries' (Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar* 4.3.217-221), cf. Thuc. 1.41.2; Dem. *OI.* 2.22.

4.20.2 γυναικιζόμενοι: although the women participate in the pursuit, they are forced to admit their inherent weakness and to give up the chase (4.21.3 below, and note). The word is late in form but is also found in Polybius (32.15.8). For the sexist comment, cf. 4.21.3 below and note.

ὡς ὅτι τάχιστα: For the use of ὡς ὅτι, cf. Plato *Laws* 908a; Ach. Tat. 3.21.2; 5.17.2. Heliodorus also uses this expression at, e.g., 1.17.4; 2.6.1.

ἀνασκολοπίσαι: In a similar context, the Taurian king, Thoas, threatens to impale Orestes, Pylades and Iphigeneia, who are attempting to flee to Athens with the image of Artemis (Eur. *IT* 1430). Impalement was a Persian practice (Hdt. 3.132, 4.43, 9.78) which Euripides mentions in order to show the barbaric cruelty of Thoas (cf. also the punishment of Prometheus in Lucian *Prom.* 2, 7) and the effect could be similar here. Heliodorus does not inform his readers whether this threat was ever carried out (Morgan 1979, at 10.36.4) but the threat evokes the atmosphere of a public meeting dominated by the expression of violent sentiments.

4.20.3 πρὸς ἀγανάκτησιν κινήσαιμεν Θετταλούς: Hegesias was evidently successful in this, since the people of Oita granted Charikles the authority to execute Theages for the kidnapping of Charikleia (10.36.4).

ἀπειπόντες αὐτοῖς ἐκ ψηφίσματος τὴν θεωρίαν . . . ἐπικρίναντες: This detail was doubtless included in the narrative to explain why the ritual of purification, which Heliodorus has attributed to the Thessalians for the purpose of explaining Theagenes' presence at the oracle of Apollo, was managed later by the people of Delphi. The logic of the accounts that have survived concerning the death of Neoptolemus show that the sacrifice should not have been undertaken initially by the Thessalians, who, in any version, are the aggrieved party (cf. 3.1.1 above, and note).

4.21.1 μηκέτι τὴν ζάκορον ἀναφαίνειν τοῖς τὸ ἐνόπλιον τρέχουσιν: Heliodorus has doubtless included this decree to explain why, although he has made his heroine officiate at the games, the acolyte of Artemis was in reality not normally present (cf. 3.5.3; 4.1.2 above, and notes; Morgan 1989, 444 n. 126). The proposal is certainly quite out of place in the emotional debate about the capture of Charikleia.

καλὸν οὖν περιγράψαι τῶν ἐξῆς χρόνων τὴν ὁμοίαν τινῶν ἐπιχείρησιν: the use of the genitive to indicate duration is not classical. Cf. 8.1.4; Phil. VA 6.17; X. Eph. 3.1.3; Ach. Tat. 3.9.1.

τὴν ἀρπαγὴν, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐκ τῆς πρώτης θεᾶς ἐνεθυμήθη: Ironically, this is true, since Theagenes did fall in love with Charikleia at first sight (3.5.4) but the incident is not a rape but an elopement. Charikles comes close to guessing the truth here, but remains ignorant of his daughter's love and Kalasiris' deception.

The people of Delphi pursue the Thessalian youths

4.21.2 πολλοὶ μὲν παῖδες . . . Πολλαὶ δὲ γυναῖκες . . . καὶ πρεσβύτου πρὸς τὸ γῆρας μάχην: cf. 9.3.8 (the siege of Syene) and the note of Morgan for the use of the women, children and old men in a crisis. Heliodorus may have been thinking of the siege of Selinus in Diodorus Siculus 13.56.7, τὰ πλήθη τῶν γυναικῶν καὶ παίδων ἔφευγον ἐπὶ τὰς οἰκίας, καὶ τοὺς τε λίθους καὶ τὰς κεραμίδας ἔβαλλον ἐπὶ τοὺς πολεμίους.

4.21.3 ἀνήνυτα καὶ τὸ θῆλυ καὶ οἰκεῖον ἀσθενὲς ὑστερίζουσαι τῶν ἔργων ἐγνώριζον: This rather ungracious statement is in keeping with similar comments in the rest of the romance (although at times these statements are ambivalent) as cannot therefore be taken as characterisation of Kalasiris: cf. 1.21.3 (Charikleia states that women should not speak in the company of men—but proceeds to do just that); 1.22.6 (a woman is lucky to be thought worthy of her master's bed and even luckier to become the wife of a high priest—

though this has an ironic ring under the circumstances); 1.29.6 (Thyamis argues that wives and children are easily replaced [cf. Hdt. 2.30]); 10.4.4-5 (women, except for the priestess of the Moon, were excluded from the sacrifice to the Sun and Moon—cf. Morgan [1979 *ad loc.*]); 10.29.5 (Persinna sententiously remarks that sympathy between women may hide another woman's sin (τὸ θῆλυ συμπαθὲς τὸ παῖσμα τὸ γυναικεῖον οἶδεν ἐπισκιάζειν). But Heliodorus may simply have had Thucydides' comment on the women of Corcyra in mind here (αἶ τε γυναῖκες αὐτοῖς τολμηρῶς ξυνεπελάβοντο βάλλουσαι ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκιῶν τῷ κεράμῳ καὶ παρὰ φύσιν ὑπομένουσαι τὸν θόρυβον, Thuc. 3.74.1). The entire crisis scene depends much on the historian and, as in the case of 1.29.6, the sentiment is largely determined by the source passage. Charikleia herself resembles the strong female characters of late antiquity in many respects (cf. 3.4.1 above, and note).

ὥσπερ ἔλκουσαν τὸ σῶμα τὴν διάνοιαν: for the body/mind dichotomy in Heliodorus: cf. 4.18.3 above, and note.

ἐπαφῆκεν: the usage is in line with that of Xenophon (*Cyr.* 4.1.3; Baumgarten 1932, 22).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: HOMER AND HELIODORUS

A number of studies of the relationship between Homer and Heliodorus have left little doubt that it was a close and important one. Keyes (1922, 42-51) has pointed out the similarity between the opening *in medias res* of the *Odyssey* and the *Ethiopian Story*, the use of the νόστος theme and the assimilation of the heroine Charikleia to Odysseus. Feuillâtre (1966, 105-114) arranges a full catalogue of allusions to the epic poet into a rough summary of the intricate plot of the romance, and gives a short analysis of the dignity, mystery and charm of the association between these two authors. Sandy (1982, 83-89) produced a brief but telling account of the ‘wealth of . . . Homeric reminiscences . . . swarming around the brain’ of Heliodorus (p. 84), which he concluded by citing Gabert’s estimate (1974, 87) that ‘an Homeric borrowing occurs on average approximately once every 1.2 pages of a modern edition’ of the romance (p. 88). Hägg (1983, 110-111) provides some brief but suggestive comments on the functional and structural inheritance Homer bequeathed to the novel. Finally, Fusillo (1989, 24-31) describes the story of Theagenes and Charikleia as a ‘profane epic’ (p. 24) whose connections with the *Odyssey*, in particular, affect the whole structure of the work and which are therefore of a hypertextual rather than an intertextual nature. Fusillo goes on to note (p. 24) that the transposition of the mythical world of Odysseus into the very different spatio-temporal setting of the *Ethiopian Story* produces a heterodiegetic text with some extremely interesting resonances. These accounts rightly stress the debt Heliodorus owed to Homer but in doing so they imply a lack of originality in the romance which is, in my view, unjustified. This appendix explores the way in which Heliodorus makes use of Homeric material in his romance generally, and then proceeds to investigate the use of naming and the dream of Charikles in particular.

Consideration of the usage of the four other major writers of narrative fiction, Xenophon of Ephesus, Longus, Achilles Tatius and Chariton, may help to accentuate the epic voice of Heliodorus. Xenophon is furthest removed from the Homeric narrative models; the intertextual references he makes, such as the comparison between Habrokomes and Ares (*Od.* 8.266-332; *Xen.* 1.8) and the use of the Anteia-Bellerophon theme (*II.* 6.163-

165; Xen. 2.5), are highly mediated and stereotypical. Ironically, this is what is to be expected if O'Sullivan's thesis (1995), that the *Ephesian Tale* is an orally composed story, is accepted, although, in my view, the narratological compression of the work makes this theory unlikely. Longus too avoids making allusions to epic except in a very few passages, such as his brilliant rewriting of Homer's description of the garden of Alkinoos (*Od.* 7.114-132; L. 4.2) which serves to reinforce the pastoral imagery of the work rather than to increase the epic grandeur of its narrative. In the case of Achilles Tatius, Homeric allusions are few in number, confined mainly to the earlier books, and largely decorative and incidental; typically, he uses Homer's comparison between a crimson-coloured ivory cheekpiece for horses crafted by Maionian or Karian women and the bloody wound on the thigh of Menelaos (another cliché of romance) to convey an evocative triptych with the redness of Leukippe's lips against the whiteness of her cheeks (*II.* 4.141-142 [Ach. Tat. 1.4]). Lastly, but most substantively, Chariton uses the romantic love of Achilles for Patroclus throughout the *Callirhoe* to reinforce and to give depth to the emotions of the heroine and her various admirers (cf., e.g., *II.* 18.22-24 [Char. 1.4, 1.5, 5.2]; *II.* 23.66-67 [Char. 2.9]; *II.* 23.71 [Char. 4.1]; *II.* 23.389-390 [Char. 5.10]; *II.* 24.10-11 [Char. 6.1]; *II.* 19.302 [8.5]), while Homeric descriptions of the beauty of Helen (*II.* 3.146 [Char. 5.5]), Penelope (*Od.* 1.366, 18.213 [Char. 5.5]; *Od.* 15.21 [Char. 4.4]; 17.37; 19.54 [Char. 4.7]); *Od.* 23.296 [Char. 8.1]), Nausicaa (*Od.* 6.102-104 [Char. 6.5]) and sundry goddesses (Char. 4.2) are introduced to enhance the beauty of his heroine. Chariton presents his readers with Homer in various forms: whole chunks of text, single lines (occasionally modified from memory: cf. Char. 2.3), epithets such as 'the white-armed and fair-ankled goddesses of Homer' (τὴν Λευκόλενον καὶ Καλλίσφυρον τὰς Ὀμήρου, Char. 4.1) and single formulaic phrases such as Οὐ πῶ πάν εἴρητο ἔπος ὄτ' . . . *II.* 10.540 [Char. 3.4]) and ἔνθεν ἐλών . . . (*Od.* 8.500 [Char. 5.7]), which are deployed as continuators.

Chariton uses this material in a rather unconscious and unoriginal manner and I suspect that his allusions to the Homeric epics are intended to elevate the new literary genre of fictional prose narrative, of which he has been thought to be the earliest exponent, to the status of serious literature. By way of contrast, while Heliodorus does make considerable use of Homer, he evidently does not feel overawed by him, since he boldly introduces Odysseus into his narrative (unnamed) and challenges his reader to identify him (5.22). Homer himself is subject to lengthy discussion by Heliodorus' focalised narrator Kalasiris and his Athenian interlocutor Knemon (3.12-14; 4.4.3) during Kalasiris' *mise-en-abysme* narrative of his experiences in Delphi. There Kalasiris quotes an obscure text from

the *Iliad* in which Ajax recognises Poseidon from the appearance of his feet (13.71-72).

ἔχνια γὰρ μετόπισθε ποδῶν ἠδὲ κνημῶν
ῥεῖ' ἔγνων ἀπλέοντος· ἀρίγνωτοι δὲ θεοὶ περ·

The quotation appears to have been included so that Kalasiris can poke fun at the name of his interlocutor (Κνήμων / κνημῶν). Kalasiris shows something of his manipulative Egyptian mind by twisting the word ῥεῖ' from its natural meaning 'I easily recognised' to 'flowed in his going'. But the lines from Homer also performs an important literary function by deepening the reader's understanding of the relationship between the two men. The discussion develops into an irreverent treatment of the τόπος of the origins of Homer, who is said to have been born in Egyptian Thebes (among other places) as the illegitimate son of Hermes. According to Kalasiris, Homer carried a patch of hair on his thigh as proof of his divine but illegitimate birth (whence, of course, his name 'Ο μήρος 'the thigh' [3.14.2-3]). The poet also refused to acknowledge any land as his own in order that he might belong to all lands—an explanation which Knemon accepts on the not altogether logical ground that the poet possesses the typically Egyptian quality of enigma, combined with an ability to give his readers pleasure (τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τὸ ἠνιγμένον τε καὶ ἡδονῆ πάση σύγκρατον, 3.15.1—following the text of RL rather than Colonna [1938, 1987b] in this crucial phrase).²³¹ Heliodorus was fond of enigma and often refers to this quality: cf. 4.2.3 (οἱ γράφοντες ... αἰνιττόμενοι); 4.15.1 (τῶν ἐνυπνίων ... αἰνιττομένων); 10.3.1 (αἰνιττομένου τοῦ ὄνειρατος); Plot. *Enn.* 4.2.2, τὸ θείως ἠνιγμένον. The characterisation of the disputed quality of Homer's poetry as Egyptian suggests that the emendation of RL is correct, since Egyptians had the reputation of being crafty (cf. LSJ *s.v.* αἰγυπτιάζω).

Two points require emphasis here; in the first place, what starts as light-hearted and witty banter ends by making a serious metaliterary point—the qualities that Knemon admires in the bard are observably the same as Heliodorus himself aimed to achieve in his fiction. The narrative of the *Ethiopian Story* frequently seeks to present enigmas and puzzles to its readers and those, like Knemon, who fail to observe the coded references in the text are mildly ridiculed. The deployment of information about the names of the characters is but one example of such mystification. There is also plenty of evidence in the

²³¹ Colonna reads 'the quality of sublimity' τὸ ἀνηγμένον with VMCP¹A, which he glosses as *elatum, excellens* (cf. the following words, τοὺς πάντας ὑπερβαλλόμενον). RL cite Amyot's translation, 'la subtilité mystique' and refer to 3.12.1, 'the wise Homer says in his riddling way, but the puzzle passes most people by' ὁ σοφὸς "Ὀμηρος αἰνιττεται, οἱ πολλοὶ δὲ τὸ αἰνιγμα παρατρέχουσιν.

frequent digressions and *ekphraseis* in the romance to show that Heliodorus aimed to give pleasure to his readers as well as teasing them with conundrums. The second point is that the digression on Homer distracts the attention of both the reader and Kalasiris's interlocutor, Knemon, from a more significant question: If Kalasiris had experienced a real vision (ὕπαρ) of Apollo and not a mere dream (ὄναρ) what does it signify? This question is later taken up indirectly in Heliodorus' treatment of the dream of Charikles, the priest of Apollo in Delphi (see further below).

The Name 'Theagenes'

It is well known that Homer occasionally coins names (using folk etymologies) to suit the individual traits of his characters. The name of the bard Phemios, for example, is based on the root φημή 'voice' (Odysseus describes the bard as 'the polyphonic singer' πολύφημος αἰοιδός [*Od.* 22.376])²³² and his patronymic Τερπιάδης (*Od.* 22.330-331) comes from τέρω 'gladden, cheer'. Heliodorus follows this practice by basing the names of some of his characters on words which suggest their fundamental characteristics. Thus Ormenos comes from the verb ὀρνυμι = 'to stir up, rush furiously', appropriate for a runner; the name of the doctor Akesinos is based on the word ἀκείσθαι 'to heal' (cf. 4.3.3; 4.7.4 above and notes); the pirate Trachinos is suitably τραχύς 'savage'; his comrade Peloros is πέλωρος 'huge, portentous';²³³ Demainete's name is based on μάλωμαι 'rage madly';²³⁴ and lastly Alkamenes may be based on ἀλκή 'strength'. The other romance writers also employ this kind of name, particularly for minor figures whose personalities are not developed much beyond their primary characteristics.²³⁵ Heliodorus usually tries to individualise such characters: for example, Thermouthis meets his death by a bite of an Egyptian asp

²³² Cf. Higbie (*supra*, n. 238) 12.

²³³ Cf. Hom. *Il.* 5.741; *Od.* 10.168; Hes. *Scut.* 223; *Theog.* 845, 856. Strabo 1.1.17; 3.5.5 mentions a memorial of Peloros.

²³⁴ The name is also found in Lucian (*Philops.* 27) belonging to a woman who returns from the dead to instruct her husband to ensure that her missing golden sandal is burnt. Lucian (*Scyth.* 2) tells of a woman of this name who explains to her husband in a dream how to avert a plague. AG 7.434 gives an account of a Demainete who buried 8 children in one grave. Heliodorus may have been aware of these stories. His own Demainete, of course, causes her husband and family a great deal of grief.

²³⁵ Cf. Eudromos, and Lykainion in Longus. The names Philetas and Dionysophanes may have wider symbolic significance in *Daphnis and Chloe*.

(2.20.2)²³⁶ and the young Ionian slave girl who causes Kybele's death is said to have felt compassion for Charikleia (8.9.2). The etymologies of the names of his hero, Theagenes ('goddess-born'), and his heroine, Charikleia (based on χάρις 'grace' and κλέος 'glory') are clearly of much greater importance and are solemnised in the first two lines of the oracle which Kalasiris receives from the priestess of Apollo (2.35.5):²³⁷

Τὴν χάριν ἐν πρώτοις αὐτὰρ κλέος ὕστατ' ἔχουσαν
φράζεσθ', ᾧ Δελφοί, τὸν τε θεᾶς γενέτην·

The goddess from whom Theagenes is descended is Thetis, who is the subject of the choral hymn (3.2.4) during the festival at which the lovers meet. Heliodorus follows Homeric practice again here by citing this genealogy and referring to exploits of his hero's ancestors in order to establish his status in society.²³⁸ However, instead of simply listing a genealogy or narrating heroic exploits, Heliodorus presents the information in a dramatic and nuanced way (2.34). What is particularly noticeable about Heliodorus' dramatic treatment of this Homeric material is the subtle humour of his depiction of the pompous and pedantic priest contrasted with the wry scepticism of the narrator. Heliodorus was rather sceptical about Greek culture as can be seen from his satirical picture of Knemon and his mother-in-law Demainete in Athens and the folly of Charikles in Delphi. In recounting Theagenes' genealogy, Charikles deploys mythology, etymology, the evidence of Homer and local legend in a vain display of erudition.²³⁹ However, Heliodorus' readers,

²³⁶ Aelian *De Nat. Anim.* 10.31.1-17. The name is also that of the Egyptian princess who rescues Moses from the river Nile, according to the story in Josephus (*Jud. Ant.* 2.224.1-237.5). Cf. 3.4.3 above and note.

²³⁷ The oracle is recalled at the conclusion of the romance (10.41.3): cf. Bartsch (1989, 102).

²³⁸ Cf. Higbie (1995, 5, 7-8, 189). Names in Homer have been the subject of a number of recent monographs, such as that of Peradotto (1990); Shive (1987); von Kamptz (1982). Note also the articles of Skutsch (1987, 188-193); Webber (1989, 1-13); Brown (1966, 193-202). For Greek onomastics generally cf. Fraser & Matthews (1987; 1994); Pape & Benseler (1884³). For Xenophon of Ephesus: cf. Hägg (1971, 25-59).

²³⁹ Mythology: he states that the Ainianes literally went back to the Flood—they were descended from Hellen, the son of Deukalion (cf. Thuc. 1.3); etymology: the Thessalians believed that their capital city, Hypata, came from the Greek word meaning 'rule' (2.34.2, ὑπατεύειν), rather than the usual story that the city is situated at the foot of Mount Oita—ὑπὸ τῆς Οἴτης (cf. Hdt. 7.217; Thuc. 3.9.2; Xen. *Hell.* 1.2.18); Homer: the Ainianes do, in fact, occur in the *Iliad* (2.749-750) and Theagenes believed that he was descended from Achilles' grandfather, Aiakos, through Menesthios, the illegitimate son of the river Spercheios by Polydora, the daughter of Peleus (*Il.* 16.173-178);

who would have been used to the allusiveness of the work by this stage, would also have known that there were other, less creditable accounts of the death of Neoptolemos in Delphi than that given here by Charikles (see 3.1.1 and note). The critical reader would also notice that, although the narrator already knew Theagenes well enough to think of him as his charge (he refers to the young man as τὸ μέλημα τὸ ἐμόν 3.3.4), he does not at this point tell Knemon that the young man in question was Theagenes, although Knemon also knew the young man. He does, however, indicate his feelings indirectly by expressing his strong interest in meeting him (ἔγωγε αὐτοῦ μανικῶς ἀνεπτέρωμαι πρὸς τὴν θεάν, 2.34.8 [the word θεάν hints at the concealed name]). Both reader and interlocutor must infer that this is indeed a description of Theagenes through the enigmatic oracle mentioned above, which concludes this part of Kalasiris' narrative. The scene also achieves narratological complexity through the intersection of three implied time frames: the time at which Kalasiris first met Theagenes, the time in Delphi and their subsequent journey to Egypt during which he established a close relationship with the hero, and the time of narration to Knemon.

In the context of the late Empire, however, the choice of the name 'Theagenes' also brings with it heterodiegetic associations with athletics and allegory. Plutarch, whose works Heliodorus had most probably read, records the famous athletic record of a Thasian athlete called Theagenes who won 1,200 crowns in his career.²⁴⁰ Pausanias adds that this Theagenes wished to emulate Achilles by winning the foot race at the Pythian Games (Paus. 6.11.5). Furthermore, Lucian (*Hist. Conscr.* 35.9 [the text is uncertain but the interpretation stands]) notes that this athlete was proverbial for his athletic prowess and that he was impervious to the debilitating effects of love. Heliodorus obligingly not only likens his Theagenes to Achilles but makes this very race take place in his fictional account of the Pythian games in book four (4.3.1-4.4.2). No doubt the figure of the athlete impervious to love would have appealed strongly to the moral austerity of Heliodorus.²⁴¹

local legend: the people of Thessaly acknowledged that the Ainianes had a stronger claim than themselves to be related to Neoptolemos by renouncing their right to host the ceremony.

²⁴⁰ Plut. *Mor.* 811d8-e10 (Stephanus); Paus. 6.6.5.5 (Theogenes), 6.11.2.2 (1,400 crowns); *SIG*³ = *IG* XII.8; Harris (1964, 115-119); Fontenrose (1978, 75-76); Pape-Benseler (1884³, 483).

²⁴¹ The name also occurs as the name of the brother of the heroine Timokleia of Thebes, who fell in the battle of Chaeroneia in 338 BC. When Thebes fell to Alexander in 335 BC, Timokleia displayed exemplary courage after being raped by Thracian troops (Plut. *Alex.* 12.5.2; *Conj. Praec.* 145f2 (Stephanus); *Mul. Virt.* 259d6). The name Theagenes was therefore already associated with a

The name Theagenes was associated with allegory by the third century Neo-Platonist philosopher Porphyry, who deals with a number of the themes of the *Ethiopian Story* in his writings (such as the cult of Helios and virginity).²⁴² This writer, a Syrian like Heliodorus and roughly his contemporary, mentions Theagenes of Rhegium (c. 525 BC), who was the first person to interpret the theomachy in Books 20-21 of the *Iliad* allegorically—for example, fire means Apollo, water Poseidon, air Hera, desire Aphrodite and writing the gift of Hermes—and concludes: ‘This style of writing is quite old and derives from Theagenes of Rhegium, who wrote the first allegories on Homer’ οὗτος μὲν οὖν τρόπος ἀπολογίας ἀρχαῖος ὄν πάνυ καὶ ἀπὸ Θεαγένου τοῦ Ῥηγίνου, ὃς πρῶτος ἔγραψε περὶ Ὅμηρου) (*Quaest. Hom. II.* 241.10-11 [Schrader]).²⁴³ This is our sole reference to Theagenes of Rhegium to my knowledge. However, Porphyry must have based his account on earlier sources which have not come down to us and it is likely that Theagenes would have been quite well known, particularly at a time when interest in allegory was high. An allegorical reading of the role played by Theagenes in the romance gives new depth to the athletic contest in which Theagenes participates in Delphi and to the wrestling match he contests in Meroë—both events which lend themselves readily to metaphorical interpretation as a moral struggle.

The fifth century allegorical interpretation of the *Ethiopian Story* by Philip the Philosopher, which some think was composed in Rhegium, supports this line of argument since it regards the name Theagenes as signifying ‘the vision of true being’. Cf. Tarán (1992, 224)—an interpretation which is based on a second reading of the obscure oracle which Kalasiris receives from the priestess of Apollo at 2.35.5. Philip understands the words θεᾶς γενέτην to mean ‘offspring of sight’ rather than as ‘offspring of a goddess’. The narrator hints at this meaning of the name in his description of the young man:

woman of virtue in the literary tradition before Heliodorus came to use it. The name also carries connotations of military leadership, since it also belonged to the tyrant of Megara (Plut. *Aet. Rom. et Graec.* 295e11 [Stephanus]; Paus. 1.40.1.2-3) and an Athenian general (Front. *Strat.* 4.1.8.1).

²⁴² Cf. Kovendi (1966, 198-243); on the philosophical decor of Heliodorus: cf. Sandy (1982, 141-167); Geffcken (1978).

²⁴³ Cf. Lamberton & Keaney (1992, xi, 31, 70). A fragment of Aristotle (fr. 145 [Rose]) investigates the significance of the simile of the snake devouring a bird and her chicks (discussed at the beginning of this article). The omen was interpreted allegorically as a prophecy concerning the duration of the siege of Troy. The dramatic setting for Philip's discussion of the *Ethiopian Story* is, by coincidence, Rhegium. Cf. Tarán (1992, 209).

τοιούτος ἐστι τὴν μορφήν καὶ τοσοῦτος ἰδεῖν τὸ μέγεθος ὡς βεβαιοῦν τῇ θεῷ τὸ γένος (2.34.4). This interpretation of the name relates to neoPlatonic ideas of vision and contemplation, which may also underlie the scene which describes the first encounter between Theagenes and Charikleia:

ὅτε, φίλε Κνήμων, καὶ ὅτι θεῖον ἢ ψυχὴ καὶ συγγενὲς ἄνωθεν τοῖς ἔργοις ἐπιστούμεθα: ὁμοῦ τε γὰρ ἀλλήλους ἐώρων οἱ νέοι καὶ ἥρων, ὥσπερ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐκ πρώτης ἐντεύξεως τὸ ὅμοιον ἐπιγνούσης καὶ πρὸς τὸ κατ' ἀξίαν οἰκεῖον προσδραμούσης. (Hld. 3.5.4).

Philip also explains the name Kalasiris as meaning 'the one who draws towards beauty' ὁ πρὸς τὰ καλὰ σύρων, since the Egyptian priest is the one who leads the soul, Charikleia, over the sea (which represents matter) to divine knowledge despite the opposition of strife (the pirate Trachinos) (ll. 109-119). Cf. Tarán (1992, 225); in addition, Charikleia's name has the numerical value of 777 which represents a Platonic triad of νοῦς, ψυχὴ and σῶμα—mind, soul and body (ll. 79-92): 700 signifying the perfect mind; 70 the soul; and 7 the body. Cf. Tarán (1992, 216).

Tarán's argument is borne out by fact that all three of the characters who escape from Delphi (Kalasiris, Charikleia and Theagenes) are identified with Odysseus, whose escape from Circe signified the escape of the soul from matter in neoPlatonist philosophy. Charikleia behaves like Odysseus on a number of occasions (see Introduction).

The Dream of Charikles

The dream of Charikles (4.14.2) should be compared with the famous and much-discussed passage of the *Odyssey*, in which a sorrowful Penelope asks her disguised husband to interpret her dream of an eagle who descends from a mountain to break the necks of her flock of 20 geese (*Od.* 19.535-569) and whose veracity she doubts.²⁴⁴ Despite the uncertainty of the Budé editors as to whether Heliodorus was thinking of Penelope's dream in his account of what Charikles saw, these two dreams are in essence the same. There are, it is true, few superficial connections between the two, apart from the eagle—a very common dream-agent in antiquity. Artemidorus (2.20), for example, affirms that ἀετὸς

²⁴⁴ For the allusion to the gates of horn and ivory: cf. Plato *Charm.* 173a; Soph. *El.* 645; AP 7.42; Verg. *Aen.* 6.893-898 (most famously); Hor. *Carm.* 3.27.41; Prop. 5.7.87; Luc. *Somn.* 6; *VH* 2.32; Macrobian *Somn.* 1.3.20; Tert. *De Anima* 46; Philostr. *Imag.* 3.3.3.1-3; Bab. *Fab.* 30.8; Julian *Ep.* 17; Nonn. *Dion.* 34.90; 44.53. Modern scholarship on the subject is also plentiful: cf., e.g., van Lieshout (1980, 38-39); Kessels (1978, 129-131); Amory (1966, 3-57).

ἀπελών ἀνδρὸς δυνατοῦ ἀπειλὴν προσημαίνει, 1.20).²⁴⁵ Nevertheless an abstract structural analysis of the two passages shows a striking symmetry:

(a) both dreamers are dejected: Charikles is πρὸς ὑπερβολὴν περίλυπον καὶ ὄλης κατηφείας ἀνάπλεων (4.14.1); Penelope is described as follows (*Od.* 19.512-517):

αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ καὶ πένθος ἀμέτρητον πόρε δαίμων
ἦματα μὲν γὰρ τέρπομ' ὄδυρομένη γοώουσα,
ἔς τ' ἐμὰ ἔργ' ὀρώουσα καὶ ἀμφιπόλων ἐνὶ οἴκῳ
αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν νύξ ἔλθη, ἔλθῃσι τε κοῖτος ἅπαντας,
κεῖμαι ἐνὶ λέκτρῳ, πυκινὰ δέ μοι ἀμφ' ἀδινὸν κῆρ
ὄξεϊται μελεδῶναι ὄδυρομένην ἐρέθουσιν.

(b) both dreamers are sceptical about dreams; Charikles says εἴ τι δεῖ προσέχειν ὄνειρασι (4.14.2) and Penelope ξεῖν', ἦ τοι μὲν ὄνειροι ἀμήχανοι ἀκριτόμυθοι / γίγνοντ' (19.560-561) and expounds the well-known doctrine of the gates of horn and ivory.

(c) the dreamers both interpret their dreams negatively: Charikles believes that the dream presages the death of his daughter (the shadows stand for the afterlife [cf. 1.3.1]). Penelope's fears are vague and less easy to define; perhaps she fears some imminent disaster to her home—the geese representing her family and estate.

(d) the dreams concern the loss of something loved, in the case of Charikles, his daughter, for Penelope, her geese or whatever they represent.²⁴⁶

(e) deceitful interpreters supply positive interpretations for the dreams: Kalasiris has disguised his true intentions, which are to assist Charikleia and Theagenes to elope from Delphi, in accordance with the oracle of Apollo and the mandate of Persinna; Odysseus is disguised as a beggar and conceals the details of his plans from his wife.

(f) the reader or audience suspects and the re-reader knows that in fact the dreamers' interpretations are false and that the apparently false interpretation is true: Charikles' fear that his daughter will die is false, but it is true that she will marry; Penelope's premonitions are unfounded and Odysseus does return and kill the suitors.

²⁴⁵ In the present passage, the image of the eagle is chosen, according to Koraes, to suggest that the kidnapping of Charikleia is imminent because the Greek word for eagle, αἰετός, meant 'first year' (α = 1 + ἐτός). Cf. Artemidorus 2.20, Σημαίνει ὁ αἰετός καὶ τὸν ἐνεστώτα ἐνιαυτόν· ἔστι γὰρ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ γραφὴν οὐδὲν ἄλλο, ἢ πρῶτον ἔτος. Given Heliodorus' propensity for numerology this is not entirely fantastic.

²⁴⁶ Cf. Weinstock (1934, 49), who suggests that the dream expresses the fears of a lover that he would lose, or be separated from, his beloved.

(g) in both dreams the interpreters also play a role in the dream. The eagle becomes Odysseus and assures Penelope that Odysseus will return and kill the suitors—a prophecy which the real Odysseus fulfils. In the *Ethiopian Story* Kalasiris takes on the role of the dream-eagle, when he assists Theagenes and Charikleia to elope.

(h) both dreams foreshadow the future. Messer observes that Penelope's dream (*Od.* 19.535-569) does not shape the narrative, as did that of Agamemnon, which precipitates the disastrous assembly in which the Greek leader tests the will of his troops. Instead, the dream creates atmosphere and prepares the reader for further developments in the plot (pp. 31-32). Similarly, the dream of Charikles is closely followed by the elopement of the two lovers from Delphi. The words which refer to the immense intervening distance (τοῦ μεσεύοντος ἀπείρου διαστήματος, 4.14.2) between Charikles and his daughter suggest an extremely remote country, such as Ethiopia where the novel ends.

(i) structurally, both dreams concern death and marriage: Charikles fears his daughter's death but hopes for her happy marriage; Penelope fears remarriage and the loss of her estate but hopes for the deaths of the suitors.

However, the dream of Charikles differs from that of Penelope in that it makes more extensive use of allegory. Messer (1918, 30-47) notes that Penelope's dream is the first in European literature for which an allegorical interpretation is provided, but argues that the return of the eagle to expound the dream is a reversion to the more typically Homeric dreams, which are normally objective, external and personal phenomena (cf., e.g., the dream of Agamemnon, *Il.* 2.1-34). The dream of Charikles on the other hand is more susceptible to allegorical reading on a number of levels: it could foretell Charikleia's death, her intended marriage with Alkamenes, her elopement with Theagenes, or a spiritual journey (in which the eagle of Apollo that leads her to a distant and physically unobservable land represents philosophy, Charikleia represents the soul, and the distant land represents the enlightened kingdom of the sun).

Heliodorus also deepens the irony of his dream. In the Homeric dream, the irony lies in the fact that Penelope's cleverness and mistrustfulness cause her to disbelieve a dream which is, in fact, soon to come true. Further irony lies in the fact that the eagle-Odysseus tells Penelope, who was conscious in her dream that she was asleep all the time (19.541), that the dream (ὄναρ) was in fact a waking vision (ὄψαρ, 19.547). However, in Heliodorus,²⁴⁷ the irony is both overt and covert; overtly Kalasiris notes that, although

²⁴⁷ Cf. Morgan (1979, at 9.25.1) who points out that Heliodorus uses the dream of Charikles to give ironic depth to his narrative.

Charikles is the priest of Apollo, the god of prophecy, he is unable to construe the dream. The reader's attention is therefore drawn to the covert irony in the dream—that Kalasiris' interpretation is ambiguous and can also refer to a bridegroom other than Alkamenēs, namely Theagenēs, and that the god Apollo, whom Charikles serves, himself directs the elopement of his daughter, thus confirming Kalasiris' two earlier dreams and the oracle of the Delphic priestess (3.11.5). Heliodorus has specifically sign-posted this interpretation by referring to the 'flight' of the eagle in words which suggest elopement (4.14.2, συνεκδραμεῖν). Kalasiris' interpretation of the dream is therefore clearly proleptic and anticipates the unfolding of the plot. Bartsch (1989, 104) also observes that it is Kalasiris' false interpretation of the dream that leads Charikles to relax his guard, thinking that the dream portended the marriage of his daughter to Alkamenēs. He even supplies Charikleia with her birth tokens, which finally convince Kalasiris that Charikleia is the daughter of Persinna, who had asked him to bring her back to Ethiopia, and that he has a duty to ensure that she returns to her parents' kingdom. Charikleia is kidnapped that night and her journey to Ethiopia begins. Finally, if the dream can be read as a spiritual allegory and as a cipher of the *Ethiopian Story*, as a whole as my discussion of the name of Theagenēs suggests, a further level of metadiegetic irony can be observed, since Kalasiris' purpose in interpreting the dream was to deceive, not to enlighten, as was Odysseus' intention. This is consonant with the pessimistic view of dreams in the *Ethiopian Story*. Kalasiris, for example, says: χρησμοὶ γὰρ καὶ ὄνειροι τὰ πολλὰ τοῖς τέλεσι κρίνονται (2.36.2); Heliodorus comments on Thyamis' interpretation of a dream: Καὶ τὸ μὲν ὄναρ τοῦτον ἔφραζε τὸν τρόπον οὕτως αὐτῷ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἐξηγουμένης (1.19.1); and finally Charikleia tells Theagenēs: ἡ συνήθειά σε τῶν δυστυχημάτων πάντα πρὸς τὸ φαυλότατον νοεῖν τε καὶ εἰκάζειν παρεσκεύασε, φιλεῖ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος πρὸς τὰ συμπίπτοντα τρέπειν τὴν γνώμην (8.11.5).²⁴⁸

Thus, Heliodorus makes creative and original use of traditional epic material in his romance. By dramatising his presentation of epic material imaginatively and by his choice of significant names he manages to achieve an enigmatic and understated narrative

²⁴⁸ There is a later parallel in the *Ethiopian Story* to the pessimism of Charikles, interpreted more optimistically by Kalasiris, in the dream of Theagenēs (8.11), which he takes as a bad omen but which Charikleia views more sanguinely. Cf. also the dream of Thyamis concerning Charikleia, which he interprets overoptimistically at first, and then overpessimistically (1.18.5; 1.30.4). In Philostratos (*VA* 1.23) Apollonios similarly gives a more sanguine interpretation to a dream of fish beached by dolphins, which Damis thought fearful.

complexity and an allegorical suggestiveness that is unique and goes considerably further than his Homeric model. The technique and motifs are traditional but their application reflects contemporary literary concerns. Similarly, his application of the formula of Penelope's dream to that of Charikles pays tribute to the power and subtlety of Homer's art but also introduces something of his own, creating a sylleptic and open-ended allegorical dream which ultimately, however, in its complex narrative context, bears the undertone of a more pervasive and polyvalent sense of irony.

APPENDIX 2 : THE MEANING OF *ANTITHEOS* (4.7.13)

Maillon (1938) translates ἀντίθεος in the sentence ἀλλά μοι ἀντίθεός τις ἔοικεν ἐμποδίζειν τὴν πρόξιν καὶ διαμάχεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἐμοὺς ὑπηρέτας as ‘quelque dieu ennemi’, but Puiggali (1984, 275) states categorically that ἀντίθεος never carries this sense.²⁴⁹ He maintains that ‘il faut toujours partir du sens premier, «semblable à un dieu», i.e. the Homeric meaning of the word (e.g., Hom. *Il.* 5.663, ἀντίθειον Σαρπηδόνα ‘the godlike Sarpedon’). As Koraes noted, Amyot was thinking of the similar Homeric form ἦθεος ‘a young man on the verge of manhood’ (cf., e.g., *Il.* 22.127, παρθένος ἦθεός τε) in his translation (‘Mais il me semble qu’il y a quelque jeune homme, qui empêche mon entreprise et combat à l’encontre de mes ministres’.) LSJ provide some corroboration for this translation, since they observe that ἀντί in the sense of ‘like’ continued to be used productively in compounds such as ἀντίπαις (Luc. *Am.* 2; *Somn.* 16, ‘like a child’) and ἀντίδουλος (Aesch. *Ch.* 135, ‘like a slave’; Aesch. *fr.* 194, ‘instead of a slave’). Philo also uses ἀντίθεος as an adjective to mean ‘in the place of god, godlike’ (*De somniis* 2.183.1; *De confusione linguarum* 88.1, ὁ ἀντίθεος νοῦς; *De posteritate Caini* 123.4, τὸν ἀντίθειον καιρόν). Philo commonly uses compounds of ἀντι-, such as ἀντίμιμος, in this sense (*De Vita Mosi* 2.195.4). However, the Homeric meaning is clearly not the primary one required here, although it lends more than a touch of ambiguity to the expression.

Maillon’s translation is supported by LSJ, who cite the passage under discussion, Iamblichus *De Myst.* 3.31.38-40, and a magical papyrus in the British Museum (*Pmag. Lond.* 121.635-636²), as examples of the disputed second meaning ‘contrary god’. Puiggali

²⁴⁹ Maillon refers to Iamblichos *De Mysteriis* 3.31 (cf. LSJ *ad loc.*) in support of his translation, which has been widely accepted; e.g., by Altheim (1942, 31). Maillon follows the Latin of Warszewicki (1552) ‘contrarius quispiam deus’; and that of Smith (1855) ‘some opposing deity’. He is in turn followed by Hadas (1957) ‘some counterdeity’; Lamb (1961) ‘some hostile deity’. Puiggali does not venture an explicit translation of the Heliodorus passage himself, although in a footnote he allows «rival d’un dieu», «ennemi d’un dieu» to be derived from the primary sense «semblable à un dieu» (p. 275 n. 41). Underdowne (1865) is somewhat free, perhaps to avoid blasphemy: ‘I suppose that some God taketh on him to hinder this businessse’. Morgan (1989) renders the words as ‘divine counter-power’, which, although it falls foul of the criticism of Puiggali, conveys something of the subtle ambiguity in the Greek of Heliodorus, as I shall argue further in this appendix.

(1984, 271) contends that the relevant passage of the magical papyrus (τινὸς ἀντιθέου πλανοδαίμονος) and Iamblichus (δαίμονας πονηροὺς ἀντὶ τῶν θεῶν εἰσκρίνοντα, οὗς δὴ καὶ καλοῦσιν ἀντιθέους) do not require this meaning. He would translate ἀντίθεος in these passages as ‘faussetment semblables aux dieux’ (p. 272). Puiggali’s interpretation of the papyrological passage is bolstered by Arnobius’ description of the spirits who pretend to be gods, whom *magi* may summon inadvertently (4.12 [Reifferscheid], *magi suis in accitionibus memorant antitheos saepius obrepere pro accitis, esse autem hos quosdam materiis ex crassioribus spiritus qui deos se fingant, nesciosque mendaciis et simulationibus ludant*). It is noticeable, however, that in all these passages the nominal usage of ἀντίθεος (and in the *Ethiopian Story* the word τις emphasises that ἀντίθεος is a noun) is considered unusual and requiring explanation, which suggests that this form was used in a new and unfamiliar sense.

Puiggali acknowledges that the phrase in Iamblichus is influenced by Persian Zoroastrian dualism (‘Jamblique fait allusion à la religion perse’, p. 275) but denies Cumont’s assertion (1911, 152 n. 36) that the passage in Heliodorus under discussion also reveals a knowledge of ‘Mazdean beliefs’.²⁵⁰ Puiggali (1984, 274) argues that translators have confused good and evil in this passage. In his view, the powers which Kalasiris initially brought to bear against Charikleia (4.5.3) were malign and the power now blocking them must therefore be good. His arguments are discussed below:

- (1) *Kalasiris uses the words ὀχλεῖται and καταναγκάσαι of the powers (δυνάμεις) he first raised against Charikleia (4.7.12). Therefore they cannot be good.*
- (2) *Kalasiris only presents the ἀντίθεος as malign for the sake of his deception of Charikles. The whole performance is a spoof (4.5.3), since Kalasiris disapproves of the lower forms of magic (3.16.3).*
- (3) *The ἀντίθεος is not a god or a demon because it is called an ἐχθρὸς τις later in the same paragraph and is portrayed as a γόης.*
- (4) *The ἀντίθεος is, in fact, Theagenes.*

With regard to the first argument, neither ὀχλεῖται nor καταναγκάσαι is strong enough to characterise the powers first invoked by Kalasiris as evil. These forces were, after all, originally invoked to counter the effects of the ‘eye of envy’ (ὄφθαλμὸς βάσκανος), which Kalasiris suggested to Charikles had been put on Charikleia during the procession. The scene in which the powers are invoked does not give the impression of a maleficent ritual

²⁵⁰ See also Nilsson (1974, 565-567 [542-544]); Sandy (1982, 141-167).

although it conveys the atmosphere of a magical rite. I would suggest, indeed, that neither *δυνάμεις* nor *βασκανία* carry a positively evil connotation in Heliodorus (cf. 3.7.2 above, and note). The second of Puiggali's arguments effectively concedes that the *ἀντίθεος* is presented as malign to Charikles. This is, after all, the superficial sense required by the context, whatever the sub-text in the mind of the author may have been. Furthermore, this supernatural power need not be identified with the *ἐχθρός* (Puiggali's third argument), which could have been a hostile power invoked by the rival sorcerer to blight Charikleia's life and to leave her childless. Puiggali's last argument is, of course, part of the irony of the situation and Heliodorus may even be playing with the Homeric meaning of the word ('resembling a god'). This would have been entirely in keeping with his characterisation of his hero as a second Achilles (cf. 3.3.5 and note) and also with his tendency to play on words (cf. the section on *Language and Style* in the introduction). There is much evidence in the text to show that Heliodorus frequently echoes Homeric vocabulary (cf., e.g., 3.1.3 and note, 3.2.1 and note). But, while this may be the latent meaning in this passage, the overt sense must be 'hostile god' to suit the demands of the context. It is worth noting that Cumont (1911, 267-268 n. 39) mentions that Porphyry (*De Abstin.* 2.37-43) refers to a power commanding evil spirits and that sacrifices of victims in Mithraism are reserved for the demons. The aversion to blood sacrifices mentioned a number of times in the *Ethiopian Story* may be informed by this sentiment.

There is no doubt that the meaning of the prefix *ἀντί* had changed by the second century A.D., since the sophist Apollonius records the views of those who believed that *ἀντίθεος* Πολύφημος in Homer meant that the Cyclops was the enemy of Zeus (*Lexicon Homericum sub ἀντί* [Bekker]: ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ Κύκλωπος, ὅτε φησὶν “ἀντίθεον Πολύφημον” θέλουσιν ἀκούειν ἔνιοι τὸν ἐναντιούμενον τοῖς θεοῖς· οὗτος γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ λέγων “οὐ γὰρ Κύκλωπες Διὸς μεγάλου ἀλέγουσιν” τὰς δὲ ἀντιανείρας Ἀμαζόνας ὁ μὲν Ἀρίσταρχος ἰσάνδρους, ἔνιοι δὲ τὰς ἀντιαζούσας, οἷον ἐναντιουμένας, ἀνδράσι· πολεμικαὶ γάρ. In the fifth century, the original meaning of the word required explication. The philosopher Ammonius, for example, felt the need to remind his readers that *ἀντίθεος* was a synonym of *ἰσόθεος* in his commentary on Aristotle's *Categories* (71.2, τὸ γὰρ ἀντὶ παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς τὸ ἴσον σημαίνει, ὥσπερ τὸ ἀντίθεον ἰσόθεον καὶ ἀντιάνειρα τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν ἴσῃν δύναμιν τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἔχουσαν).

Lastly, it is important to note that the word was also extensively used by the Christian writers to refer to the enemy of God (e.g., Johannes Chrysostomus *In Joannem homiles* 59.140.30, ἵνα μὴ δόξη ὡς ἀντίθεός τις καὶ ἐξ ἐναντίας ἦκων τῷ Πατρὶ ταῦτα

ποιεῖν). The term 'antiChrist' had been in use since the composition of the *New Testament* (cf., e.g., 1 *Ep. John* 2.18; 2.22; 2 *Ep. John* 7.3) and was widely used by the theological writers (cf., e.g., Polycarp *Ep. ad Phil.* 7.1). Lactantius uses the same word to refer to Satan (*Inst. Divin.* 2.9.13 [Brandt], *nox quam pravo illo antitheo dicimus attributam*). The prefix was used productively in the sense 'opposed to' in Latin (cf., e.g., Suet. *Jul.* 56.5, *AntiCatones*; *Tib.* 11.3, *antisophistas*) and the Latin usage may have influenced the later Greek writers, since bilingualism increased greatly in the later Roman Empire. Morgan (1979, at 9.9.3) comments that the sentiment of Heliodorus here is not unsuited to that of a Christian bishop. For discussion of the possibility that Heliodorus was a Christian, or at least knew Christian doctrines, see Cataudella (1975, 172-174).

In conclusion: while there may be an underlying awareness of the Homeric meaning of ἀντίθεος in Heliodorus, which lends a degree of ambiguity and irony to the phrase, the primary meaning must be 'opposing god'. I translate 'some godlike opposing force' to bring out the nuance in the expression.

APPENDIX 3: AMPHIBOLIES IN THE *ETHIOPIAN STORY*

Morgan (1981, 229) views alternative explanations in the *Ethiopian Story* as part of a 'historical pose' adopted by Heliodorus to make his narrative appear to be more realistic, but Winkler (1982, 135), after pointing out the similarity between Heliodorus and Herodian in respect of dual explanations, whether historiographic (Her. 6.6.1; 7.10.5) or contrasting natural and supernatural causes (Her. 1.9.5; 8.3.9), goes on to classify the double explanations as 'amphibolies' for which 'a providential explanation is unlikely or even foolish' (p. 123). Winkler groups these 'amphibolies' into four categories. These categories increase in complexity and decrease in number in a range from (1) to (4). They are (1) 'those which leave the question open or (more often) seem to weight the scales in favour of the more supernatural alternative' (p. 122); (2) 'those which are so phrased as to suggest that a providential explanation is unlikely or even foolish' (p. 123); (3) 'Three amphibolies are employed to celebrate what we might call an aesthetic of Mind-Boggling Variety' (p. 126); (4) 'The most extended example of such naturalism is found in the fourth group of amphibolies, those uttered by Kalasiris' (p. 128). By 'naturalism' Winkler means that the plot of the romance is 'naturalistic' and that there is no god controlling the fortunes of the main characters. Winkler's classification of these amphibolies, on which his interpretation of the romance is largely based, is unsatisfactory. His analysis is open to the following objections:

(1) The categories are ill-defined; in particular, how do open alternatives differ from those in which a supernatural explanation is unlikely? What is 'an aesthetic of Mind-Boggling Variety'? They also contain instances that do not differ so markedly from one another—it is difficult, for example, to see how 1.18.3 (a conventional explanation for cocks crowing at dawn contrasted with Heliodorus' own theory) differs from 2.34.2 (a conventional speculation about the etymology of the name, Hypata, contrasted with that put forward by the people of town itself) or why 9.8.2 (the collapse of the dike at Syene) does not belong in the first category.

(2) The fourth category is different in type from the other three, in being highly rhetorical. The explanation given for the 'illness' of Charikleia—that it was a case of spiritual recognition, as Kalasiris tells Knemon (3.5.5)—changes into a case of the 'eye of envy' when Kalasiris is talking to the superstitious Charikles (3.7.2-8).

(3) The impression is given that all these amphibolies relate to the contrast drawn by Kalasiris between the higher and lower wisdom of Egypt which Winkler takes as the

'basic structuring principle behind Kalasiris' Delphic narrative' (p. 132). Yet of the twenty cases under consideration twelve are the thoughts of Heliodorus himself, five belong to Kalasiris, a couple to Charikles, and one to Hydaspes. Some amphibolies, sometimes uttered by different narrators, are strikingly similar to others (e.g. 7.11.4, 10.22.4, 5.4.1-2 all mention excess of joy) and the expressions used are occasionally formulaic (7.6.4 and 5.4.1-2, *τι δαιμόνιον*; 8.9.2, *δαιμονία βουλήσει*; 2.20.2, *μοιρῶν τάχα βουλήσει*).

(4) No attempt is made to distinguish between trivial comment and serious reflection. Thus consideration of the religious and ideological framework of the romance is tied to Heliodorus' off-hand comments about why a cock crows at dawn (where the contrasting explanations are not those of 'spiritual providence and material desire', p. 121). Terms like *θεῶν ὀρμηῆ*, *δαιμονία βουλήσει*, *τύχης τινὸς βουλήματι*, which feature in these amphibolies as supernatural agencies, are not differentiated from each other.

(5) Not all the instances are truly alternative explanations. For example, the true cause of Thermouthis' death is said to have been the bite of an asp—the comment that this was his destiny is an additional speculation tied to the pun on his name, which is also the word used for a kind of Egyptian snake (2.20.2). The discussion of the higher and lower forms of Egyptian wisdom is not an explanation for anything (3.16.3-4). Finally, when Kalasiris arrived at the very moment when his two sons were engaged in mortal combat, the amphiboly is only about whether it was a divine power or fortune which was giving the drama a new twist (7.6.4). These instances should therefore be left out of consideration.

(6) The eighteen instances are not exhaustive. Add, e.g., 2.29.4 (Charikles' daughter died in a fire that was either the will of heaven or deliberately started) and 8.9.3 (the slave-girl mistakenly poisoned Arsake because of the seriousness of what she was doing or because Kybele told her to serve Charikleia first).

These amphibolies can be more simply assigned to two categories. (1) Two rationalistic explanations are contrasted. By 'rationalistic' I mean 'not attributable to intervention by a supernatural agency': e.g., 1.18.3 (cocks crow at dawn because—so the conventional explanation goes—a natural perception of the sun moves them to greet the god or because of a combination of warmth and hunger); 1.30.6 (Thyamis tried to kill Charikleia because barbarians mistakenly think they will see their loved ones in the next world or to save them from violence at the hands of their enemies); 2.34.2 (the etymology of the name, Hypata, is either from a word meaning 'rule' or—as is generally thought to be the case—from a phrase *ὑπὸ τῆς Οἴτης* 'at the foot of Mt. Oita'); 3.14.4 (Homer kept his birthplace secret either from shame at his illegitimate birth or because he cleverly wanted

to avoid the jealousy and rivalry of different cities wanting to claim him as a citizen). (2) A rationalistic explanation is contrasted with a supernatural one: e.g., 2.29.4 (Charikles' daughter died in a fire that was either the will of heaven or deliberately started); 3.7-8 (the souls of Charikleia and Theagenes recognised each other from a previous existence or Charikleia was under the influence of an 'eye of envy'); 5.4.1-2 (Knemon swooned on learning that Thisbe was not dead either because a supernatural power was not allowing him to feel joy without some pain or because human nature is simply not capable of pure joy); 5.23.2 (the wind died down because the sun was setting or because the wind was helping the pirates); 5.27.1 (the sea became rough spontaneously or at the will of fate); 7.11.4 (Kalasiris died from excess of joy or the gods were granting him what he had asked them for); 8.9.2 (Arsake's slave-girl wept for Charikleia either out of friendship or because she was carrying out the will of the gods); 8.9.3 (the slave-girl mistakenly poisoned Arsake because of the seriousness of what she was doing or because Kybele told her to serve Charikleia first—this is really a continuation of 8.9.2); 9.9.3-4 (the Nile is considered divine in Egypt either because it combines moist and dry elements and human life depends on this combination—this is the common view—or because the land is Isis and the river Osiris—and this is really the truth of the matter as only initiates know); 9.8.2 (the dike around Syene collapsed because the earth had not been compacted or because it had been undermined or the levels of the ground had been disturbed or else some god had intervened); 10.22.4 (Hydaspes thought his daughter deranged because a god had taken possession of her or because she was overcome by an excess of joy); 10.28.4 (Theagenes fought the bull because he was brave or because a god inspired him); 10.38.3 (the Ethiopian crowd applauded a story told in Greek either because they guessed what was going on or because of some divine power).

It is a striking fact that the 'rationalistic' type of amphiboly occurs in the early books whereas the 'rationalistic-supernatural' type congregates towards the end of the work (except 8.9.3, which comes immediately after the expected type at 8.9.2). This is in keeping with the greater part played by supernatural powers in the second half of the work (cf. the section on the structure of the plot); the apparent exceptions in the earlier books (the death of Charikles daughter and the 'eye of envy') are rhetorical and sophistic in character, unlike the more abstract amphibolies in the later ones.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note

Asterisked items represent works which I have not seen but which are relevant to the study of books 3 and 4 of the *Ethiopian Story* or which are cited as sources of information in the introduction and/or commentary. Abbreviations of journal titles follow the conventions of *L'Année Philologique*.

ABBREVIATIONS

- ABV* = J.D. Beazley, *Attic Black-figure Vase Painters* (Oxford 1956).
ARV² = J.D. Beazley, *Attic Red-figure Vase Painters* (Oxford 1963 [1st ed. 1942]).
Ach. Tat. = Achilles Tatius.
Ancient Novel = J. Tatum and G.M. Vernazza (edd.), *The Ancient Novel: Classical Paradigms and Modern Perspectives* (Hanover 1990).
ANRW = W. Haase and H. Temporini (edd.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (Berlin 1972—).
Beiträge = H. Gärtner (ed.), *Beiträge zum griechischen Liebesroman* (Hildesheim 1984).
Chantraine = P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris 1968).
Char. = Chariton.
Der antike Roman = *H. Kuch (ed.), *Der antike Roman: Untersuchungen zur literarischen Kommunikation und Gattungsgeschichte* (Berlin 1989).
Erotica Antiqua = B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Erotica Antiqua: Acta of the International Conference on the Ancient Novel* (Bangor 1977).
GCN = *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* (Groningen 1988-1995).
GG = W.W. Goodwin, *A Greek Grammar* (London 1894).
GP = J.D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford 1954).
GPS = J.D. Denniston, *Greek Prose Style* (Oxford 1952).
Greek Fiction = J.R. Morgan and R. Stoneman (edd.), *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context* (London and New York 1994).
Greek Novel = R. Beaton (ed.), *The Greek Novel AD 1-1985* (London 1988).
Hld. = Heliodorus.
Il romanzo greco = *P. Janni (ed.), *Il romanzo greco: guida storica e critica* (Rome 1987).
Lampe = G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Lexicon* (Oxford 1961).
Le Monde du Roman = M-F. Baslez, P. Hoffmann and M. Trédé (edd.), *Le Monde du Roman Grec* (Paris 1987).
Leutsch & Schneidewin = E. Leutsch and F.G. Schneidewin, *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum. 2 Vols.* (Hildesheim 1965). First published: Göttingen 1839.
LGNP = P.M. Fraser and E. Matthews (edd.), *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names Vol. I: Aegean Islands, Cyprus, Cyrenaica* (Oxford 1987) *Vol. II: Attica* (Oxford 1994).
LIMC = *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (Zürich and Munich 1988 and 1990).
LSJ⁹ = H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford 1940[9]).
Long. = Longus.
MCSN = *Materiali e contributi per la storia della narrative greco-latina.*
Namenbuch = F. Preisigke, *Namenbuch, enthaltend alle griechischen, lateinischen,*

ägyptischen, hebräischen, arabischen und sonstigen semitischen und nichtsemitischen Menschnamen, soweit sie in griechischen Urkunden Ägyptens sich vorfinden (Heidelberg 1922).

OCD = N.G.L. Hammond and H.H. Scullard (edd.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford 1970).

Pape & Benseler = W. Pape and G.E. Benseler (edd.), *Wörterbuch der Griechischen Eigennamen* (Braunschweig 1884³).

Para = J.D. Beazley, *Paralipomena* (Oxford 1971).

Piccolo mondo = P. L. Furiani and A.M. Scarcella (edd.), *Piccolo mondo antico: le donne, gli amori, i costumi, il mondo reale nel romanzo antico* (Perugia 1989).

Progress = J. Radford (ed.), *The Progress of Romance: the Politics of Popular Fiction* (London 1986).

RE = Pauly and Wissowa (edd.), *Realencyclopädie der Altertumwissenschaft* (Berlin).

RL = R. M. Rattenbury, T. W. Lumb (edd.) & J. Maillon (tr.), *Heliodore: Les Éthiopiennes (Theagene et Chariclée) 3 Vols.* (Paris 1935-1943).

Search = J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (Baltimore 1994).

SEG = *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (Lugduni Batavorum 1923).

Semiotica = *L. Pepe (ed.), *Semiotica della novella latina*. Atti del seminario interdisciplinare 'La novella latina' (Perugia 1985).

SMT = W.W. Goodwin, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb* (London 1889).

TLG = *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae 'D' CD ROM*.

Wörterbuch = F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyruskunden* (Berlin 1925-1931).

X. Eph. = Xenophon Ephesius.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC SURVEYS OF THE ANCIENT NOVELS

- [1.] E.L. Bowie & S.J. Harrison, 'The Romance of the Novel', *JHS* 113 (1993) 159-178.
- [2.] E.H. Haight, 'Notes on Recent Publications about the Ancient Novel', *The Classical Weekly* 46.16 (1953) 233-237.
- [3.] R. Johne, 'Übersicht über die antiken Romanautoren bzw. -werke mit Datierung und weiterführender Bibliographie' in *Der antike Roman* (1989) 198-230.
- [4.] O. Mazal, 'Die Griechische und Byzantinische Roman in der Forschung von 1945 bis 1960', *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft* 11-12; 13; 14 (1962-1963; 1964; 1965) 9-55; 29-86; 83-124.
- [5.] G.N. Sandy, 'Recent Scholarship on the prose fiction of Classical Antiquity', *CW* April-May (1974) 321-359.

COLLECTIONS OF TRANSLATIONS OF THE ANCIENT NOVELS

- [6.] B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1989).
- [7.] B. Kytzler (ed.), *Im Reiche des Eros* (Munich 1983).
- [8.] Q. Cataudella (ed.), *Il romanzo classico* (Rome 1958).

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Racial Attitudes and Ethiopianism

- [9.] S. Doshi, *India and Greece* (Bombay 1985).
- [10.] K. Karttunen, *India in Early Greek Literature* (Helsinki 1989).
- [11.] A. Lesky, 'Aithiopika', *Hermes* 87 (1959) 27-38.
- [12.] J.S. Romm, *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought* (Princeton 1992).
- [13.] T. Säve-Söderbergh, 'Zu den äthiopischen Episoden bei Herodot', *Eranos* 44 (1946) 68-80.
- [14.] J.W. Sedlar, *India and the Greek world. A study in the transmission of culture* (Totowa 1980).
- [15.] F.M. Snowden, *Blacks in Antiquity: Ethiopians in the Greco-Roman Experience* (Cambridge, Mass. 1970).
- [16.] F.M. Snowden, *Before Color Prejudice: The Ancient View of Blacks* (Cambridge, Mass. 1983).

The Ethiopian Language and Script

- [17.] D. Diringer, *The Alphabet. Two Vols.* (New York 1948).
- [18.] J. Drucker, *The Alphabetic Labyrinth: The Letters in History and Imagination* (London 1995).
- [19.] J.H. Greenberg, *The Languages of Africa* (The Hague 1963).
- [20.] F.L.I. Griffith, *Meroitic Inscriptions. 2 Vols.* (London 1912).
- [21.] F. Hintze, *Die sprachliche Stellung des Meroitischen* (Berlin 1955).
- [22.] W. Senner (ed.), *The Origins of Writing* (Lincoln & London 1989).
- [23.] B. Trigger, 'The Languages of the Northern Sudan: an Historical Perspective', *Journal of African History* 7 (1966) 19-25. Also in *Kush* 12 (1964) 188-194.
- [24.] E. Zyhlarz, 'Das Meroitische Sprachproblem', *Anthropos* 25 (1930) 409-463.

The Late Roman Empire

- [25.] A. Alföldi, *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome*, tr. H. Mattingly (Oxford 1948).
- [26.] G.W. Bowersock, 'The Emperor Julian on his Predecessors', *YCIS* 27 (1982) 159-162.
- [27.] P. Brown, *The World of Late Antiquity* (London 1971).
- [28.] A. Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire* (London 1991).
- [29.] A. Cameron, *The Later Roman Empire* (Glasgow 1993).
- [30.] J.D. Grainger, *The Cities of Seleucid Syria* (Oxford 1990).
- [31.] F. Millar, *The Roman Near East: 31 BC—337 AD* (Cambridge, Mass. 1993).
- [32.] R. Stoneman, *Palmyra and its Empire: Zenobia's Revolt against Rome* (Ann Arbor 1992).
- [33.] H. Winnefeld, 'Zur Geschichte des Syrischen Heliopolis', *RM* 69 (1914) 139-159.

Gender

- [34.] G. Clark, *Women in Late Antiquity* (Oxford 1993).
- [35.] G. Cloke, *This Female Man of God: Women and Spiritual Power in the Patristic Age AD 350-450* (London 1995).
- [36.] S. Dickison, 'Abortion in Antiquity', *Arethusa* 6 (1973) 159-166.

- [37.] M. Dzielska, *Hypatia of Alexandria* (Cambridge, Mass. 1995).
 [38.] C. Sourvinou-Inwood, 'Reading' *Greek Culture* (Oxford 1991).

RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND

General

- [39.] W. Burkert (tr. J. Raffan), *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical* (Oxford 1985).
 [40.] W. Burkert (tr. P. Bing), *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial RITUAL and Myth* (Berkeley & Los Angeles 1983).
 [41.] F. Cumont, *Lux perpetua* (Paris 1949).
 [42.] F. Cumont, *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (Chicago 1911).
 [43.] E.R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley 1951).
 [44.] G. Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind* (Cambridge 1986).
 [45.] J. Gwyn Griffiths, *The Isis Book* (Leiden 1975).
 [46.] M.P. Nilsson, *Greek Popular Religion* (New York 1940).
 [47.] M.P. Nilsson, *A History of Greek Religion. 2 Vols.*, tr. F. J. Fielden (Oxford 1949²).
 [48.] M.P. Nilsson, *The Minoan-Mycenean Religion and its Survival in Greek Religion* (New York 1971).
 [49.] A.D. Nock, 'Religious Attitudes of the Ancient Greeks', *TAPhA* 85 (1942) 472-482.

Astrology

- [50.] T. Barton, *Ancient Astrology* (London and New York 1994). .
 [51.] T. Barton, *Power and Knowledge: Astrology, Physiognomics and Medicine under the Roman Empire* (Ann Arbor 1994). .
 [52.] F. Bouché-Leclerq, *L'Astrologie grecque* (Paris 1899).

Demonology

- [53.] W. Bousset, 'Zur Dämonologie der späteren Antike', *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 18 (1915).
 [54.] F. Brenk, 'In the Light of the Moon: Demonology in the Early Imperial Period' in *ANRW* 2.16.3 (Berlin 1986) 2068-2145.
 [55.] P. Brown, 'Sorcery, Demons and the Rise of Christianity' in M. Douglas (ed.), *Witchcraft: Confessions and Accusations* (London 1970) 17-45.
 [56.] M. Detienne, *La notion de Daimon dans le pythagorisme ancien* (Paris 1963).
 [57.] *J. Geffcken, 'Βόσκωνος δαίμων' in *Charisteria Alois Rzach* (Reichenberg 1930).
 [58.] K. Kerényi (tr. M. Stein), *Hermes: Guide of Souls* (Dallas 1976).
 [59.] E.C.E. Owen, 'DAIMON and cognate words', *JThS* 32 (1931) 133-153.
 [60.] J. Puiggali, 'Études de démonologie, I: La démonologie dans les romans grecs ainsi que chez certains épistolographes', *Annales de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences humaines de l'Université de Dakar* 11 (1981) 57-69.
 [61.] J.Z. Smith, 'Towards Interpreting Demonic Powers in Hellenistic and Roman Antiquity' in *ANRW* 2.16.1 (Berlin 1978) 425-439.

The Sun Cult

- [62.] F. Altheim, *Helios und Heliodor von Emesa* (Amsterdam-Leipzig 1942).
 [63.] A. von Domaszewski, 'Die politische Bedeutung der Religion von Emesa', *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 11 (1908) 223-242.

- [64.] D. Kovendi, 'Der arabische Sonnengott' in F. Altheim and R. Stiehl (edd.), *Die Araber in der alten Welt* III.8 (Berlin 1966) 125-135.
- [65.] D. Rosalie, *Cult of the Sun: Myth and Magic in Ancient Egypt* (London 1980).
- [66.] *O. Rühle, *Sonne und Mond im primitiven Mythos* (Tübingen 1925).

Albinism

- [67.] A.-I. Berglund, *Zulu Thought-Patterns and Symbolism* (Cape Town 1975).
- [68.] A.T. Bryant, *The Zulu People: As They Were before the White Man Came* (Pietermaritzburg 1949).
- [69.] L. de Heusch (tr. L. O'Brien & A. Morton), *Sacrifice in Africa: A Structuralist Approach* (Manchester 1985).
- [70.] R.G. Harris, 'The San Blas Indians', *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 9.1 (1926) 17-63.
- [71.] A. Hrdlička, 'The Indians of Panama: Their Physical Relation to the Mayas', *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 9.1 (1926) 1-15.
- [72.] C.E. Keeler, 'The Cuna Moon-child syndrome', *Dermatologica Tropica* 3 (1964) 1ff.
- [73.] S. Jones, *In the Blood: God, Genes and Destiny* (London 1996).
- [74.] N.G. Manganyi, J.G.R. Kromberg & T. Jenkins, 'Studies on Albinism in the South African Negro I: Intellectual Maturity and Body Image Differentiation', *Journal of Biosocial Science* 6 (1974) 107-112.
- [75.] J.G.R. Kromberg & T. Jenkins, 'Prevalence of Albinism in the South African Negro', *South African Medical Journal* (1982) 383-386.
- [76.] J.G.R. Kromberg & T. Jenkins, 'Albinism in the South African Negro III: Genetic Counselling Issues', *Journal of Biosocial Science* (1984) 99-108.
- [77.] V. Magnus, 'Albinism in Man', *Journal of the Annals of the Medical Association* (1922).
- [78.] K. Pearson, E. Nettleship, & C.H. Usher, *A Monograph on Albinism in Man. Drapers' Company Research Memoirs: Biometric Series 9*. Text Vols. 1,2,4; Atlas Vols. 1,2,4. (London 1911-1913).
- [79.] G. Sebestyen, *A Man too White* (Riverside 1993).
- [80.] *Tenements of Clay: An Anthology of Medical Biographical Essays*, ed. A. Sorsby (New York 1974).
- [81.] H.S. Stannus, 'Anomalies of Pigmentation among the Natives of Nyasaland', *Biometrika* 9.3-4 (1913) 333-365.
- [82.] D.B. Stout, 'Further Notes on Albinism among the San Blas Cuna, Panama', *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 4 (1946) 483-490.
- [83.] A.J.N. Tremearne, *Hausa Superstitions and Customs: An Introduction to the Folklore and the Folk* (London 1913).
- [84.] L. Wafer, *A New Voyage and Description of the Isthmus of America (1699)*, ed. G.P. Winship (Cleveland 1903).
- [85.] C.M. Woolf & R.B. Grant, 'Albinism among the Hopi Indians in Arizona', *American Journal of Human Genetics* 14 (1962) 391-400.

Ecclesiastical Histories

- [86.] W. Eltester, 'Socrates', *RE* IIIA.1 (1927) 893-901.
- [87.] *F.X. Murphy, *Rufinus of Aquileia (345-411): His Life and Works. A Dissertation* (Washington 1945).
- [88.] B.R. Voss, 'Socrates' in *RE, Der Kleine Pauly* (Munich 1975).

Magic

- [89.] D.E. Aune, 'Magic in Early Christianity' in *ANRW* 2.23.2 (Berlin 1980) 1507-1557.
- [90.] A. Barb, 'The Survival of Magic Arts' in A. D. Momigliano (ed.), *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (Oxford 1963) 100-125.
- [91.] A.A. Barb, 'Diva Matrix: A Faked Gnostic Intaglio in the Possession of P.P. Rubens and the Iconology of a Symbol', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 16 (1953) 193-238.
- [92.] C. Bonner, 'A Papyrus describing Magical Power', *TAPhA* 52 (1921) 112-118.
- [93.] C. Bonner, 'Witchcraft in the Lecture Room of Libanius', *TAPhA* 63 (1932) 34-44.
- [94.] C. Bonner, *Studies in Magical Amulets chiefly Graeco-Roman* (Ann Arbor 1950).
- [95.] G. Contenau, *La magie chez les Assyriens et les Babyloniens* (Paris 1947).
- [96.] J. Evans, *Magical Jewels of the Middle Ages* (Oxford 1922).
- [97.] E.E. Evans-Pritchard, *Witchcraft, Oracles and Magic among the Azande* (Oxford 1937).
- [98.] C.A. Faraone and D. Obbink, *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion* (New York 1991).
- [99.] J.M. Hull, *Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition* (London 1974).
- [100.] H.C. Kee, *Miracle in the Early Christian World: A Study in Socio-Historical Method* (New Haven and London 1983).
- [101.] H.C. Kee, *Medicine, Miracle and Magic in New Testament Times* (Cambridge 1986).
- [102.] *F. Lexa, *La Magie dans l'Égypte antique de l'ancien Empire jusqu' à l'époque copte. 3 Vols.* (Paris 1925).
- [103.] G. Luck, *Arcana Mundi: Magic and the Occult in the Greek and Roman Worlds* (Baltimore 1985).
- [104.] *F. Martroye, 'La Répression de la magie et le culte des gentils au IV^e siècle', *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 9 (1930) 669ff.
- [105.] *J. Maurice, 'Le Terreur de la magie au IV^e siècle', *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 6 (1927) 108ff.
- [106.] K. Preisendanz, 'Dans le monde de la magie grecque', *Chronique d'Égypte* 10 (1935) 335-342.
- [107.] *K. Preisendanz, 'Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der spätantiken Magie' in *Aus der Welt des Buches. Festgabe für G. Ley* (Leipzig 1950).

Paganism and Christianity

- [108.] F. Altheim, *Der unbesiegte Gott: Heidentum und Christentum* (Hamburg 1957).
- [109.] F. Cumont, *After Life in Roman Paganism* (New Haven 1922).
- [110.] F. Cumont, *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (New York 1956).
- [111.] E.R. Dodds, *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety* (Cambridge 1965).
- [112.] R. Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians in the Mediterranean World from the Second Century AD to the Conversion of Constantine* (Harmondsworth 1986).
- [113.] J. Geffcken, *The Last Days of Greco-Roman Paganism* (Amsterdam 1978).
- [114.] R. MacMullen, *Paganism in the Roman Empire* (New Haven 1981).

Sacrifice

- [115.] S. Bradbury, 'Julian's Pagan Revival and the Decline of Blood Sacrifice', *Phoenix* 49 (1995) 331-356.
- [116.] E. Ferguson, 'Spiritual Sacrifice in Early Christianity and its Environment' in *ANRW* 2.23.2 (Berlin 1980) 1151-1189.
- [117.] A. Henrichs, 'Human Sacrifice in Greek Religion: Three Case Studies', in *Le*

- Sacrifice dan l'antiquité*, edd. O. Reverdin, J. Rudhardt & J.-P. Vernant (Geneva 1981).
- [118.] A. Wypustek, 'The Problem of Human Sacrifices in Roman North Africa', *Eos* 81 (1993) 263-280.
- [119.] F. Young, 'The Idea of Sacrifice in Neoplatonic and Patristic Texts', *Studia Patristica* 11 (1972) 278-281.

Holy Men

- [120.] G. Anderson, *Sage, Saint and Sophist: Holy Men and Their Associates in the Early Roman Empire* (London 1993).
- [121.] E.L. Bowie, 'Apollonius of Tyana: Tradition and Reality' in *ANRW* (Berlin 1978) 1652-1699.
- [122.] S. Brock, *The Luminous Eye: The Spiritual World of Saint Ephrem* (Kalamazoo, Michigan 1985).
- [123.] P. Brown, 'The Rise and Function of the Holy Man', *JRS* 61 (1971) 80-101.
- [124.] M. Dzielska, *Apollonius of Tyana in Legend and History* (Rome 1986).
- [125.] G. Fowden, 'The Pagan Holy Man in Late Antique Society', *JHS* 102 (1982) 46-48.
- [126.] J.A. Francis, *Subversive Virtue: Asceticism and Authority in the Second Century Pagan World* (Pennsylvania 1995).
- [127.] P. Peeters, 'La légende de saint Jacques de Nisibe', *Analecta Bollandiana* 38 (1920) 285-373.

Symbolism

- [128.] E.J. Bickerman, 'Symbolism in the Dura Synagogue: A Review Article', *Harvard Theological Review* 58 (1965) 127-151.
- [129.] E.R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period. Vols. IX-X: Symbolism in the Dura Synagogue* (New York 1964).
- [130.] *G. Radke, *Die Bedeutung der weissen und der schwarzen Farbe in Kult und Brauch der Griechen und Römer* (Diss. Berlin 1936).

THE LITERARY CONTEXT

History and Theory

- [131.] M. Bakhtin, 'Le Roman Grec' in *Esthétique et théorie du roman* (Paris 1978) 239-260.
- [132.] M.M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed. M. Holquist, tr. C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Austin 1981).
- [133.] J.C. Dunlop, *The History of Fiction* (London 1876).
- [134.] T. Eagleton, *Literary Criticism: An Introduction* (Oxford 1983).
- [135.] E. Fuchs, *PSEUDOLOGIA ΨΕΥΔΟΛΟΓΙΑ: Formen und Funktionen fiktionaler Trugrede in der griechischen Literatur der Antike* (Heidelberg 1993).
- [136.] O. Immisch, 'Wirklichkeit und Literaturform', *RhM* 78 (1929) 113-123.
- [137.] R.O.A.M. Lyne, 'Vergil's *Aeneid*: Subversion by Intertextuality—Catullus 66.39-40 and other examples', *Greece & Rome* 41.2 (1994) 199-200.
- [138.] D.L. Madsen, *Rereading Allegory: A Narrative Approach to Genre* (Houndmills and London 1995).
- [139.] I. Nolting-Hauff, 'Märchenromane mit leidenden Helden', *Poetica* 6 (1974) 417-455.
- [140.] A.D. Nuttall, *Openings: Narrative Beginnings from the Epic to the Novel* (Oxford 1992).

- [141.] M. Ragussis, *Acts of Naming: The Family Plot in Fiction* (Oxford 1986).
- [142.] B. Romberg, *Studies in the Narrative Technique of the First-Person Novel* (Stockholm 1962).
- [143.] C. Ruiz Montero, 'The Structural Pattern of the Ancient Greek Romances and the Morphology of the Folktale of V. Propp', *Fabula* 22 (1981) 228-238.
- [144.] D.L. Selden, 'Genre of Genre' in *Search* (1994) 39-64.
- [145.] S. Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature* (Copenhagen 1955-1958).
- [146.] C. Thurston, *The Romance Revolution* (Urbana and Chicago 1987).

Description

- [147.] M. Aygon, 'L'ecphrasis et la notion de description dans la rhétorique antique', *Pallas* 41 (1994) 41-56.
- [148.] A.S. Becker, *The Shield of Achilles and the Poetics of Ekphrasis* (Lanham 1995).
- [149.] A. Billault, 'L'inspiration de Ἐκφράσεις d'œuvres d'art chez les romanciers grecs', *Rhetorica* 8 (1990) 153-160.
- [150.] D.P. Fowler, 'Narrate and Describe: The Problem of Ekphrasis', *JRS* 81 (1991) 25-35.
- [151.] J. Geffcken, 'Ein Prinzip antiker Erzählungs- und Darstellungskunst', *Hermes* 62 (1927) 1-23.
- [152.] J. Kestner, 'Ekphrasis as a Frame in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*', *CW* 67 (1973-1974) 166-177.
- [153.] M.C. Mittelstadt, 'Longus: Daphnis and Chloe and Roman Narrative Painting', *Latomus* 26 (1967) 752-761.
- [154.] J. Palm, 'Bemerkungen zur Ekphrase in der Griechischen Literatur' in *A.-A. J. Kungl. Hum. Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala* (Stockholm 1967) 108-211; 183-196.
- [155.] E. Simon, 'Der Schild des Achilleus' in G. B. H. Pfothenauer (ed.), *Beschreibungskunst-Kunstbeschreibung: Ekphrasis von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich 1995) 123-142.
- [156.] K. Stanley, *The Shield of Homer: Narrative Structure in the Iliad* (Princeton 1993).
- [157.] G. Zanker, 'Enargeia in the Ancient Criticism of Poetry', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 124 (1981) 297-311.

Allegory

- [158.] A. Cameron, *Mysteriously Meant: The Rediscovery of Pagan Symbols and Allegorical Interpretation in the Renaissance* (Baltimore & London 1970).
- [159.] D. Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* (Berkeley 1992).
- [160.] A. Fletcher, *Allegory: The Theory of a Symbolic Mode* (Ithaca 1970).
- [161.] R. Hoistad, 'Was Antisthenes an Allegorist?', *Eranos* 49 (1951) 16-30.
- [162.] J. MacQueen, *Allegory* (London 1970).
- [163.] J. Pépin, *Mythe et allégorie: Les origines grecques et les contestations judéo-chrétiennes* (Paris 1958).
- [164.] P. Rollinson, *Classical Theories of Allegory and Christian Culture* (Pittsburgh 1981).
- [165.] J. Tate, 'The beginnings of Greek Allegory', *CR* 41 (1927) 214-215.
- [166.] J. Tate, 'Cornutus and the Poets', *CQ* 23.1 (1929) 41-45.
- [167.] J. Tate, 'Plato and Allegorical Interpretation', *CQ* 23, 24 (1929, 1930) 142-154, 1-10.
- [168.] J. Tate, 'Socrates and the Myths', *CQ* 27.2, 3-4 (1933) 74-80, 158-161.
- [169.] J. Tate, 'On the History of Allegorism', *CQ* 28.2 (1934) 105-114.
- [170.] J. Whitman, *Allegory: The Dynamics of an ancient & Medieval Technique* (Oxford

1987).

The Second Sophistic

- [171.] F. Altheim, *Literatur und Gesellschaft im ausgehenden Altertum* (Halle 1948-50).
[172.] G. Anderson, *Lucian's Comic Fiction* (Leiden 1976).
[173.] G. Anderson, *Philostratus: Biography and Belles Lettres in the Third Century AD* (London 1986).
[174.] G. Anderson, *The Second Sophistic: A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire* (London 1993).
[175.] W.G. Arnott, 'Imitation, Variation, Exploitation: A Study in Aristaenetos', *GRBS* 14 (1974) 197-211.
[176.] G.W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (London 1969).
[177.] G.W. Bowersock (ed.), *Approaches to the Second Sophistic* (Pennsylvania 1974).
[178.] E.L. Bowie, 'Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic', *P&P* 46 (1970) 1-41.
[179.] E.L. Bowie, 'The Importance of Sophists', *YCIS* 27 (1982) 29-59.
[180.] E.L. Bowie, 'Greek Sophists and Greek Poetry in the Second Sophistic' in *ANRW* 2.33.1 (Berlin 1989) 209-258.
[181.] E.L. Bowie, 'Philostratus: Writer of Fiction' in *Greek Fiction* (1994) 181-202.
[182.] J.D. Derrett, 'The History of "Palladius on the Races of India and the Brahmans"', *C&M* 20-22 (1959-1961) 64-135.
[183.] A. Dihle, *Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire: From Augustus to Justinian*, tr. M. Malzahn (London 1994).
[184.] B.A. van Groningen, 'General Literary Tendencies in the Second Century AD', *Mnemosyne* 18 (1965) 41-56.
[185.] C.P. Jones, *Culture and Society in Lucian* (Harvard 1986).
[186.] J.F. Kindstrand, *Homer in der zweiten Sophistik: Studien zu der Homer lektüre und dem Homerbild bei Dion von Prusa, Maximus von Tyros und Ailios Aristeides* (Uppsala 1973).
[187.] *A. Lesky, *Aristaenetos: Erotische Briefe* (Zürich 1951).
[188.] B.E. Perry, 'Literature in the Second Century', *CJ* 50 (1955) 295-298.
[189.] B.P. Reardon, *Courants littéraires grecs des IIe et IIIe siècles après J.-C.* (Paris 1971).
[190.] B.P. Reardon, 'The Second Sophistic and the Novel' in G. W. Bowersock (ed.), *Approaches to the Second Sophistic* (Pennsylvania 1974) 23-29.
[191.] *K. Reyhl, *Antonios Diogenes* (Diss. Tübingen 1969).
[192.] D.A. Russell (ed.), *Antonine Literature* (Oxford 1990).
[193.] S. Swain, 'Dio and Lucian' in *Greek Fiction* (1994) 166-180.

ANCIENT FICTION

General Studies

- [194.] F. Altheim, *Roman und Dekadenz* (Tübingen 1951).
[195.] G. Anderson, *Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play* (California 1982).
[196.] G. Anderson, *Ancient Fiction: the novel in the Graeco-Roman world* (London 1984).
[197.] A. Billault, *La création romanesque dans la littérature grecque à l' époque impériale* (Paris 1991).
[198.] E.L. Bowie, 'The Greek Novel' in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature. Vol. I: Greece* (Cambridge 1985) 683-699.
[199.] M. Braun, *Griechischer Roman und Hellenistische Geschichtschreibung* (Frankfurt-

- am-Main 1934).
- [200.] M. Braun, *History and Romance in Graeco-Oriental Literature* (Oxford 1938).
- [201.] K. Bürger, 'Der antike Roman vor Petronius', *Hermes* 27 (1892) 345-358.
- [202.] E. Cizek, 'Le Roman "moderne" et les structures du roman antique', *BAGB* 33 (1974) 421-444.
- [203.] O. Schissel von Fleschenberg, *Die griechische Novelle: Rekonstruktion ihrer literarische Form* (Halle 1913).
- [204.] O. Schissel von Fleschenberg, *Entwicklungsgeschichte des griechischen Romanes im Altertum* (Halle 1913).
- [205.] M. Fusillo, *Il romanzo greco: Polifonia ed Eros* (Venice 1989).
- [206.] M. Fusillo, 'Le conflit des émotions: un topos du roman grec érotique', *MH* 47 (1990) 201-221.
- [207.] T. Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity* (Berkeley 1983).
- [208.] E.H. Haight, *Essays on Ancient Fiction* (New York 1936).
- [209.] E.H. Haight, *More essays on Greek Romances* (New York 1945).
- [210.] A. Heiserman, *The Novel before the Novel: Essays and Discussions about the Beginnings of Prose Fiction in the West* (Chicago 1977).
- [211.] R. Helm, *Der Antike Roman* (Göttingen 1956).
- [212.] N. Holzberg, *The Ancient Novel: An Introduction* (London and New York 1995).
- [213.] R. John, 'Zur Figurencharakteristik im antiken Roman' in *Der antike Roman* (1989) 150-177.
- [214.] K. Kerényi, *Der Antike Roman: Einführung und Textauswahl* (Darmstadt 1971).
- [215.] B. Kytzler, 'Zum utopischen Roman der klassischen Antike', *GCN* 1 (1988) 7-16.
- [216.] B. Lavagnini, *Studi sul Romanzo Greco* (Messina 1950).
- [217.] F. Létoublon, *Les Lieux Communs du Roman: Stéréotypes Grecs d' Aventure et d' Amour* (Leiden 1993).
- [218.] F. Létoublon, 'Le roman grec, un océan ou un essaim d'histoires' in *Lalies: Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature 13* (Paris 1994) 157-173.
- [219.] S. MacAlister, *Dreams and Suicides: The Greek Novel from Antiquity to the Byzantine Empire* (London and New York, 1996).
- [220.] G. Most, 'The Stranger's Strategem: Self-Disclosure and Self-Sufficiency in Greek Culture', *JHS* 109 (1989) 114-133.
- [221.] L. Pepe, *Per una storia della narrative latina* (Naples 1959).
- [222.] J.S. Phillimore, 'The Greek Romances' in G. S. Gordon (ed.), *English Literature and the Classics* (Oxford 1912) 87-117.
- [223.] B.P. Reardon, 'The Greek Novel', *Phoenix* 23 (1969) 291-309.
- [224.] B.P. Reardon, 'Novels and Novelties: or Mysteriuser and Mysteriuser' in *The Mediterranean World: Essays presented to Gilbert Bagnani* (Peterborough, Ontario 1975) 78-100.
- [225.] B.P. Reardon, 'Aspects of the Greek Novel', *G&R* 23 (1976) 118-131.
- [226.] B.P. Reardon, 'The Greek Novels: état de la question' in *Erotica Antiqua* (1977) 14-19.
- [227.] B.P. Reardon, 'The Form of Ancient Greek Romance' in *The Greek Novel* (1988) 205-216.
- [228.] B.P. Reardon, *The Form of Greek Romance* (Princeton 1991).
- [229.] G.N. Sandy, 'The diversity of Romance', *AJP* 100 (1979) 369-376.
- [230.] A.M. Scarcella, 'Metastasi narratologica del dato storico nel romanzo erotico greco.' *MCSN* 3 (1981) 341-367.
- [231.] E. Schwartz, *Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman* (Berlin 1896).
- [232.] J. Schwartz, 'Quelques observations sur des romans grecs', *L'antiquité classique* 36 (1967) 536-552.
- [233.] A. Scobie, *Aspects of the Ancient Romance and its Heritage* (Meisenheim-am-Glan

1969).

- [234.] A. Scobie, *More Essays on the Ancient Romance and its Heritage* (Meisenheim-am-Glan 1973).
- [235.] I. Stark, 'Strukturen des griechischen Abenteuer- und Liebesromans' in *Der antike Roman* (1989) 82-106.
- [236.] S.A. Stephens & J.J. Winkler, *Ancient Greek Novels: The Fragments* (Berkeley 1995).
- [237.] A. Szastynska-Siemionwa, 'La nouvelle antique', *Zagadnienia Rodzajow Literackich* 7.2 (1965) 103-110.
- [238.] T. Szepessy, 'The Ancient Family Novel: A Typological Proposal', *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 31 (1985-1988) 357-365.
- [239.] F.A. Todd, *Some Ancient Novels: Leucippe & Cleitophon; Daphnis & Chloe; The Satyricon; The Golden Ass* (London 1940).
- [240.] S. Trenkner, *The Greek Novella in the Classical Period* (Cambridge 1958).
- [241.] G.J. de Vries, 'Novelistic Traits in Socratic Literature', *Mnemosyne* 16 (1963) 35-42.
- [242.] O. Weinreich, *Die griechischen Liebesroman* (Zürich 1962). Also appeared as a *nachwort* in Heliodor, *Aithiopika: Die Abenteuer der schönen Charikleia*, tr. R. Reymer (Zürich 1950) and has been reprinted in *Beiträge* (1984, 408-431).
- [243.] M. Williamson, 'The Greek Romance' in *Progress* (1986) 23-45.
- [244.] J.J. Winkler, *Auctor & Actor* (Berkeley 1985).

Related Articles on other Greek Romances and Fragments

- [245.] D. Durham, 'Parody in Achilles Tatius', *CP* 33 (1938) 1-19.
- [246.] B. Egger, 'Looking at Chariton's Callirhoe' in *Greek Fiction* (1994) 31-48.
- [247.] A. Henrichs, *Die Phoinikika des Lollianos: Fragmente eines neuen griechischen Romans* (Bonn 1972).
- [248.] R.L. Hunter, *A Study of Daphnis & Chloe* (Cambridge 1983).
- [249.] B.P. Reardon, 'Achilles Tatius and Ego-Narrative' in *Greek Fiction* (London and New York 1994) 80-96.
- [250.] R. Stoneman, 'The *Alexander Romance*: From History to Fiction' in *Greek Fiction* (London and New York 1994) 117-129.
- [251.] T. Szepessy, 'Zur Interpretation eines neuentdeckten griechischen Romans', *AAntHung* 26 (1978) 29-36. .
- [252.] J.J. Winkler, 'Lollianos and the Desperadoes' *JHS* 100 (1980) 155-181. .

Language and Style

- [253.] F. Conca, E. de Carli, & G. Zanetto, 'Lessico dei romanzieri greci. Saggio di lemmatizzazione.' *QUCC* 37 (1981) 117-132.
- [254.] M.F. Ferrini, 'Le Parole e il Personaggio: Monologhi nel Romanzo greco', *GIF* ns 21 (1990) 45-85.
- [255.] P.L. Furiani, 'Metodi e Mezzi di Comunicazione Interpersonale nella Societa dei Romanzi Greci d' Amore', *GIF* ns 21 (1990) 199-232.
- [256.] S. Saïd, 'Les langues du roman grec' in *Le Monde du Roman Grec* (1987) 169-186.
- [257.] G. Zanetto, 'La Lingua dei Romanzieri Greci', *GIF* ns 21 (1990) 233-242.

Literary Origins

- [258.] J.W.B. Barns, 'Egypt and the Greek Romance' in Gerstinger (ed.), *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrus-sammlung der Oesterreich. Nationalbibliothek. 5. Folge* (Vienna 1956) 29-36.
- [259.] *Chassang, *Histoire du Roman et des ses rapports avec l'histoire dans l'antiquité*

grecque et latine (Paris 1859).

- [260.] G. Giangrande, 'On the origins of the Greek Romance: the birth of a literary form', *Eranos* 60 (1962) 132-159.
- [261.] F. Ll. Griffith, *Stories of the high priests of Memphis: The Sethon of Herodotus and the demotic tales of Khamuas* (Oxford 1900).
- [262.] C. Grottanelli, 'The Ancient Novel and Biblical Narrative', *QUCC* 27 (1987) 7-34.
- [263.] T. Hägg, 'Callirhoe and Parthenope: the beginnings of the Historical Novel', *Classical Antiquity* 6.2 (1987) 184-204.
- [264.] T. Hägg, 'The beginnings of the Historical Novel' in *The Greek Novel* (1988) 169-181.
- [265.] *P.D. Huetius, *Liber de origine fabulae romanensis* (The Hague 1682).
- [266.] H. Kuch, 'Die Herausbildung des antiken Romans als Literaturgattung: Theoretische Positionen, historische Voraussetzungen und literarische Prozesse' in *Der antike Roman* (1989) 11-51.
- [267.] H. Kuch, 'Funktionswandlungen des antiken Romans' in *Der antike Roman* (1989) 52-81.
- [268.] B. Lavagnini, 'Alle origini del romanzo greco', *Annali della Scuola Norm. Sup. di Pisa* 28 (1922) 9-104.
- [269.] M. Orlandini, 'Note sul romanzo greco: il paesaggio urbano tra retorica e storiografica', *Atene e Roma* ns 38.2-3 (1993) 57-78.
- [270.] B.E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances: A Literary-historical Account of their Origins* (Berkeley and London 1967).
- [271.] R. Reitzenstein, *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen* (Leipzig 1906). Reprinted Stuttgart 1963.
- [272.] E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (Darmstadt 1914³). 1st edition 1876.
- [273.] J. Tait, 'Egyptian Fiction in Demotic and Greek' in *Greek Fiction* (1994) 203-222.
- [274.] F. Wehrli, 'Einheit und Vorgeschichte der griechisch-römischen Romanliteratur', *MH* 22 (1965) 133-145.
- [275.] L.M. Wills, 'The Jewish Novellas' in *Greek Fiction* (1994) 223-238.
- [276.] J.J. Winkler, 'The Invention of Romance' in *Search* (1994) 23-38.

Realism

- [277.] M.-F. Baslez, 'L'idée de noblesse dans les romans grecs', *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 16.1 (1990) 115-128.
- [278.] F. Briquel-Chatonnet, 'L'image des Phéniciens dans les romans grecs' in *Le Monde du Roman Grec* (1987) 189-197.
- [279.] M. Futre Pinheiro, 'Aspects de la problématique sociale et économique dans le roman d' Héliodore' in *Piccolo mondo* (1989) 15-42.
- [280.] H. Kuch, 'Die "Barbaren" und der antike Roman', *Das Altertum* 35 (1989) 80-86.
- [281.] J.R. Morgan, 'Make-believe and Make Believe' in C. Gill and P. Wiseman (edd.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* (London 1993) 175-229.
- [282.] A.M. Scarcella, 'Nomos nel romanzo greco d'amore', *GIF* ns 21 (1990) 243-266.
- [283.] K. Treu, 'Der Realitätsgehalt des antiken Romans' in *Der antike Roman* (1989) 107-125.

Cult Texts

- [284.] A. Geyer, 'Roman und Mysterienritual: Zum Problem eines Bezugs zum dionysischen Mysterienritual im Roman des Longos', *WJA* nf 3 (1977) 179-196.
- [285.] K. Kerényi, *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur in religions-geschichtlicher Beleuchtung* (Darmstadt 1962²). 1st edition 1927.

- [286.] R. Merkelbach, *Roman und Mysterium in der Antike* (Munich and Berlin 1962).
 [287.] I. Stark, 'Religiöse Elemente im antiken Roman' in *Der antike Roman* (1989) 135-149.
 [288.] R. Turcan, 'Le roman « initiatique » : A propos d'un livre récent', *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 163 (1963) 149-199.

Christianity

- [289.] D.E. Aune, *Graeco-Roman Literature and the New Testament* (Atlanta 1988).
 [290.] Q. Cataudella, 'Spunti e motivi cristiani nella poesia pagana antica', *Vigiliae Christianae* 29 (1975) 161-190, esp. 172-174.
 [291.] H. Dörrie, 'Die griechischen Romane und das Christentum', *Philologus* 93 (1938) 273-276.
 [292.] D.R. Edwards, 'The New Testament and the Ancient Romance: A Survey of Recent Research', *Petronian Society Newsletter* 17.1-2 (1987) 9-14.
 [293.] M.J. Edwards, 'The *Clementina*: A Christian Response to the Pagan Novel', *CQ* 42.2 (1992) 459-474.
 [294.] R.F. Hock, 'The Greek Novel' in D. Aune (ed.), *Graeco-Roman Literature and the New Testament* (Atlanta 1988) 127-146.
 [295.] G.A. Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors* (Princeton 1983).
 [296.] J. Perkins, 'Representation in Greek Saints' Lives' *Greek Fiction* (1994) 255-274.
 [297.] R.I. Pervo, 'Early Christian Fiction' in *Greek Fiction* (1994) 239-254.

Narratology

- [298.] B. Effe, 'Entstehung und Funktion 'Personaler' Erzählweisen in der Erzählliteratur der Antike', *Poetica* 7 (1975) 135-157.
 [299.] M. Fusillo, 'Textual Patterns and Narrative Situations in the Greek Novel' *GCN* 1 (1988) 17-31.
 [300.] T. Hägg, *Narrative Technique in the Ancient Greek Romances: Studies of Chariton, Xenophon of Ephesus and Achilles Tatius* (Stockholm 1971).

Epistolography

- [301.] W.G. Arnott, 'Pastiche, Plesantry, Prudish Eroticism: The Letters of "Aristaenetos"', *YClS* 27 (1982) 291-320.
 [302.] J.L. Penwill, 'The Letters of Themistokles: An Epistolary Novel?', *Antichthon* 12 (1978) 83-103.
 [303.] P.A. Rosenmeyer, 'The Epistolary Novel' in *Greek Fiction* (1994) 146-165.
 [304.] S.K. Stowers, *Letter writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Philadelphia 1986).
 [305.] A. Walker, 'Eros and the eye in Philostratus' *Love Letters*', *PCPS* 38 (1993) 132-148.

Rhetoric

- [306.] K. Barwick, 'Die Gliederung der narratio in der rhetorischen Theorie und ihre Bedeutung für die Geschichte des antiken Romans', *Hermes* 63 (1928) 261-287.
 [307.] J. Birchall, 'The Lament as a Rhetorical Feature in the Greek Novel', *GCN* 7 (1996) 1-17.
 [308.] P. Brown, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire* (Madison, Wisconsin 1992).
 [309.] *Eos: An Enquiry into the Theme of Lovers' Meetings and Partings at dawn in Poetry*, ed. A.T. Hatto (The Hague 1965).
 [310.] K. Jax, 'Τόποι', *WS* 54 (1936) 43-51.

- [311.] J. Knoles, 'The spurned doxy and the dead bride: Some ramifications of ancient topoi', *CW* 74 (1981) 223-225.
- [312.] R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana 1942).
- [313.] F. Létoublon, 'Said Over the Dead or *Tant de marbre parlant sur tant d'ombres*', *Arethusa* 28.1 (1995) 1-19.
- [314.] R. Rehm, *Marriage to Death: The Conflation of Wedding and Funeral Rituals in Greek Tragedy* (Princeton 1994).
- [315.] C. Sittl, *Die Gebärden der Griechen und Römer* (Leipzig 1890).
- [316.] T. Szepessy, 'The Story of the Girl who died on the Day of her Wedding', *AAnthung* 20 (1972) 341-357.

Hymns

- [317.] J. Bremer, 'Greek Hymns' in H. S. Versnel and F. T. v. Straten (edd.), *Faith, Hope and Worship* (Leiden 1981) 193-215.
- [318.] A. Cameron, *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford 1993).
- [319.] L. de Lannoy, 'La structure métrique de l'Hymne à Thétis et de l'Ode à l'Écho: Philostrate *Héroïkos* 68.1-9 et 72.20-73.4', *AC* 50 (1981) 166-175. .
- [320.] W. Furley, 'Types of Greek Hymns', *Eos* 81 (1993) 21-41.
- [321.] D.A. Russell, 'Aristides and the prose hymn' in D. A. Russell (ed.), *Antonine Literature* (Oxford 1990) 199-219.

Paradoxography

- [322.] *A. Giannini, 'Studi sulla Paradosografia Greca I', *Instituto Lombardo Rend. Lett.* 97 (1963) 247-266.
- [323.] *A. Giannini, 'Studi sulla Paradosografia Greca II', *Acme* 17 (1964) 99-138.
- [324.] H. Rommel, *Die naturwissenschaftlich-paradoxographischen Exkurse bei Philostratos, Heliodorus und Achilleus Tatios* (Stuttgart 1923).

Gender

- [325.] B. Effe, 'Der griechische Liebesroman und die Homoerotik', *Philologus* 131 (1987) 95-108.
- [326.] B.M. Egger, 'Women in the Greek Novel: Constructing the Feminine', *GCN* 1 (1988) 33-66.
- [327.] P.L. Furiani, 'Di donna in donna. Elementi "femministi" nel romanzo greco d'amore' in *Piccolo mondo* (1989).
- [328.] R. Johne, 'Vergleich und Analogie bei Frauengestalten in der Neuen Komödie und im antiken Roman', *WZRoStock G Reihe* 37 (1988) 2, 12-15.
- [329.] M. Lefkowitz, 'Did ancient Women Write Novels?' in A.-J. Levin (ed.), *Early Judaism and its Literature* (Atlanta 1991) 199-219.
- [330.] H. Montague, 'Sweet and Pleasant Passion: Female and Male Fantasy in Ancient Romance Novels' in *Pornography* (1992) 231-249.
- [331.] S. Wiersma, 'The Ancient Greek novel and its Heroines: a Female Paradox', *Mnemosyne* 43 (1990) 109-123.

Sexuality

- [332.] M. Boylan, 'Galen's Conception Theory', *Journal of the History of Biology* 19 (1986) 44-77.
- [333.] P. Brown, *The Body and Society: Men Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York 1988).
- [334.] H. Cancik, 'Zur Entstehung der christlichen Sexualmoral' in B. Gladigow (ed.),

Religion und Moral (Düsseldorf 1976) 48-68.

- [335.] A. Carson, *Eros the Bittersweet: An Essay* (Princeton 1986).
- [336.] H. Elsom, 'Callirhoe: Displaying the Phallic Woman', in A. Richlin (ed.), *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome* (New York 1992).
- [337.] *E. Fehrle, *Die kultische Keuschheit im Altertum* (Giessen 1910).
- [338.] M. Foucault (tr. R. Hurley), *The Care of the Self: The History of Sexuality Vol. 3* (London 1986).
- [339.] D.E. Gerber, 'The Female Breast in Greek Erotic Literature', *Arethusa* 11 (1978) 203-4.
- [340.] S. Goldhill, *Foucault's Virginity: Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality* (Cambridge 1995).
- [341.] D.M. Halperin, J.J. Winkler and F.I. Zeitlin, *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World* (Princeton 1990).
- [342.] K. Jax, *Die weibliche Schönheit in der Griechischen Dichtung* (Innsbruck 1933).
- [343.] D. Konstan, 'La rappresentazione dei rapporti erotici nel romanzo greco', *MD* 19 (1987) 9-27.
- [344.] D. Konstan, 'Love in the Greek Novel', *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 2 (1990) 185-205.
- [345.] D. Konstan, *Sexual Symmetry: The Representation of Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres* (Princeton 1994).
- [346.] R.M. Rattenbury, 'Chastity and chastity ordeals in the ancient Greek Romances', *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society: Literary and History Section* 1 (1926) 59-71.
- [347.] A. Rouselle, *Porneia: on desire and the body in antiquity* (Oxford 1988).
- [348.] A.M. Scarcella, 'Cronaca dell' amore e degli amori nelle storie d'amore' in *Piccolo mondo* (1989).
- [349.] G. Sissa, *Greek Virginity*, tr. A. Goldhammer (Cambridge, Mass. 1990).
- [350.] J.J. Winkler, *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece* (London 1990).

Readership

- [351.] E. Bowie, 'The Readership of Greek Novels in the Ancient World' in *Search* (1994) 435-459.
- [352.] D.N. Levin, 'To Whom did the Ancient Novelists address Themselves?', *RSC* 25 (1977) 18-29.
- [353.] M.D. Reeve, 'Hiatus in the Greek novelists', *CQ* ns 21 (1971) 514-539.
- [354.] S.A. Stephens, 'Who Read Ancient Novels?' in *Search* (1994) 405-418.
- [355.] K. Treu, 'Der antike Roman und sein Publikum' in *Der antike Roman* (1989) 178-197.

Editions of Works Cited

- [356.] E. Abel (ed.), *Orpheus: Lithica, accedit Damigeron de Lapidibus* (Berlin 1881).
- [357.] N. Avigad & Y. Yadin (edd.), *A Genesis Apocryphon* (Jerusalem 1956).
- [358.] A.R. Benner & F.H. Fobes (ed. & tr.), *Alciphron, Aelian and Philostratus: The Letters* (Cambridge, Mass. 1949).
- [359.] J. Bidez (ed.), *L'Empereur Julien: Oeuvres Complètes* (Paris 1963-1964).
- [360.] R.C. Blockley (ed.), *The History of Menander the Guardsman* (Liverpool 1985).
- [361.] J.F. Boissonade (ed.), *Philostratus: Heroica* (Paris 1806).
- [362.] Q. Cataudella (ed.), *La novella Greca: prolegomeni e testi in traduzioni originali* (Naples 1956).
- [363.] F. Conca (ed.), *Narratio: Nilus Ancyranus* (Leipzig 1983).

- [364.] A.R. Dyck (ed.), Michael Psellus, *The essays on Euripides and George of Pisidia and on Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius* (Vienna 1986).
- [365.] T. Eide, T. Hägg, R.H. Pierce & L. Török (edd.), *Fontes Historiae Nubiorum I-II* (Stockholm 1994-1996).
- [366.] A.J. Festugière (tr.), *Artémidore: La Clef des Songes* (Paris 1975).
- [367.] R. Foerster (ed.), *Scriptores Physiognomonici Graeci et Latini. 2 Vols.* (Leipzig 1893).
- [368.] R. Foerster (ed.), *Libanius: Orationes 1-64* (Leipzig 1903-1908).
- [369.] A. Giannini (ed.), *Paradoxographorum Graecorum Reliquiae* (Milan 1965).
- [370.] G.P. Goold (ed. & tr.), *Chariton: Callirhoe* (Cambridge, Mass. 1995).
- [371.] F.Ll. Griffith (ed.), *The Nubian texts of the Christian period* (Berlin 1913).
- [372.] P. Grimal (ed.), *Romans grecs et latins* (Paris 1958).
- [373.] A.M. Harmon (ed.), *Lucian Works. Vol. 1.* (Cambridge Mass. 1913).
- [374.] R. Henry (ed.), *Photius: Bibliotheca. 8 vols.* (Paris 1959-1977).
- [375.] P. Henry & H.-R. Schwyzer (ed.), *Plotini Opera* (Leiden 1951).
- [376.] R. Hercher, 'Τῆς Χαρικλείας ἐρμῆνευμα τῆς σάφρονος ἐκ φωνῆς Φιλίππου τοῦ φιλοσόφου', *Hermes* 3 (1869) 382-388.
- [377.] U. Klein (ed.), *Iamblichus: De Vita Pythagorica* (Leipzig 1937).
- [378.] L. de Lannoy (ed.), *Flavius Philostratus: Heroicus* (Leipzig 1977).
- [379.] R. Lawrence (tr.), *The Book of Enoch the Prophet* (Oxford 1838³).
- [380.] L. Lerat (ed.), *Fouilles de Delphes* (Paris 1934-1935).
- [381.] M.D. Macleod (ed.), *Lucian Works. Vol. 8.* (London 1967).
- [382.] M.D. Macleod (ed.), *Luciani Opera* (Oxford 1974).
- [383.] H.A. Musurillo (ed.), *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs* (Oxford 1954).
- [384.] H.A. Musurillo (ed.), *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford 1972).
- [385.] A. Nauck (ed.), *Porphyrii philosophi Platonici opuscula selecta* (Leipzig 1886).
- [386.] A.F. Norman (ed.), *Libanius: Selected Works. 3 Vols.* (Cambridge, Mass. 1909).
- [387.] V. Nutton (ed.), *Galen: On Prognosis* (Berlin 1978).
- [388.] R.A. Pack (ed.), Artemidorus Daldianus, *Onirocriticon Libri V* (Leipzig 1963).
- [389.] M. Preisendanz (ed.) & A. Henrichs (rev.), *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri. 2 Vols.* (Stuttgart 1973-1974).
- [390.] W.C. Wright (ed.), *The Works of the Emperor Julian* (Cambridge, Mass. 1962).

Translations of Works Cited

- [391.] H.D. Betz (tr.), *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation including the Demotic Spells* (Chicago 1986).
- [392.] P.V. Davies (tr.), *Macrobius: The Saturnalia* (New York 1969).
- [393.] J. Herschbell (tr.), *Iamblichus: On the Pythagorean Way of Life with an introduction by J. Dillon* (Atlanta 1991).
- [394.] R. Lambertson (tr.), *Porphyry on the Cave of the Nymphs* (Barrytown 1983).
- [395.] J.B. Pritchard (ed.) & W. F. Albright (tr.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton 1969).
- [396.] D.A. Russell & N.G. Wilson (edd. & trr.), *Menander Rhetor* (Oxford 1981).
- [397.] P. Schaff & H. Wace (edd.), *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church* (Michigan 1979). 2nd series.
- [398.] R. Schlunk (tr.), *Porphyry: The Homeric Questions: A Bilingual Edition* (New York 1993).
- [399.] O. Temkin (tr.), *Soranus of Ephesus: Gynecology* (Baltimore 1991).
- [400.] R.J. White (tr.), *Artemidorus: The Interpretation of Dreams* (New Jersey 1975).

THE ETHIOPIAN STORY

Bibliographical Survey of Heliodorus

- [401.] *M. Futre Pinheiro, 'Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*: A Bibliographical Survey' in *ANRW* 2.34.4 (Berlin forthcoming).

General Studies of Heliodorus

- [402.] 'Early Greek Romances: the *Ethiopics* of Heliodorus', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 54 (1843) 109-120.
- [403.] W. Fauth, 'Heliodorus von Emesa' in Bredich (ed.), *Enzyklopädie des Märchens* (Berlin 1989) 791-794.
- [404.] E. Feuillâtre, *Études sur les Éthiopiennes d'Héliodore: contribution a la connaissance du roman grec* (Paris 1966).
- [405.] M.P. Futre Pinheiro, 'Pour une Lecture Critique des *Éthiopiennes* d'Héliodore', *BAGB* (1991) 359-381.
- [406.] *E. Conde Guerri, 'Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*' in *ANRW* 2.34.4 (Berlin forthcoming).
- [407.] D. Kovendi, 'Heliodorus *Aithiopika*: Eine literarische Würdigung' in F. Altheim and R. Stiehl (edd.), *Die Araber in der alten Welt* III.9 (Berlin 1966) 136-197.
- [408.] M. Laplace, 'Les *Éthiopiennes* d'Héliodore ou la Genèse d'un Panégyrique de l'Amour', *Revue des Études Anciennes* 94 (1992) 199-230.
- [409.] J.R. Morgan, 'Reader and audiences in the *Aithiopika* of Heliodorus', *GCN* 4 (1991) 85-103.
- [410.] Münscher, 'Heliodorus' in *RE* 8.1 (Berlin 1912) 20-28.
- [411.] G.N. Sandy, *Heliodorus* (New York 1982).
- [412.] T. Szepessy, 'Die *Aithiopika* des Heliodorus und der griechische sophistische Liebesroman', *AAntHung* 5 (1957) 241-259.
- [413.] T. Szepessy, 'Heliodorus und der griechische Liebesroman.' *Homonoia* 3 (1981) 203-207.

Philip the Philosopher's Allegorical Interpretation of the *Ethiopian Story*

- [414.] B. Lavagnini, 'Filipo-Filagato Promotore degli Studi di Greco in Calabria', *Bolletino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata* 28 (1974) 3-12.
- [415.] F. Mosino, 'Una ipotesi sul codice Marciano greco 410', *RCCM* 21-22 (1979-1980) 207-208.
- [416.] G.N. Sandy, 'Characterization and Philosophical Decor in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', *TAPhA* 112 (1982) 141-167.
- [417.] C. Schlam, 'Allegory in the *Ethiopica* of Heliodorus' in *Erotica Antiqua* (1977) 73-4.
- [418.] L. Tarán, 'The Authorship of an Allegorical Interpretation of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*' in *SOFIHS MAIHTORES 'Chercheurs de sagesse' Hommage a Jean Pépin* (Paris 1992) 203-230.
- [419.] N.G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (London 1983) 216-217.

Heliodorus' Knowledge of Ethiopia

- [420.] *S.Ja. Berzina, 'Les *Éthiopiennes* d'Héliodore en tant que source sur l'histoire de Méroé.' in *Méroé: L'histoire, l'histoire de la culture, la langue du Soudan antique* (Moscow 1977) 146-190.
- [421.] S.M. Burstein, 'Axum and the Fall of Meroë', *Journal of the American Research*

Center in Egypt 18 (1981) 37-50.

- [422.] S.M. Burstein, 'The Axumite Inscription from Meroë and late Meroitic Chronology', *Meroitica* 7 (1984) 220-221.
- [423.] Z.A. Glava, *A Study of Heliodorus and his Romance, the Aethiopica* (New York 1937). In summary only.
- [424.] T.R. Goethals, *The Aethiopica of Heliodorus* (Diss. Columbia 1959).
- [425.] T. Hägg, 'A New Axumite Inscription in Greek from Meroë', *Meroitica* 7 (1984) 436-441.
- [426.] R. Lonis, 'Les Éthiopiens sous le regard d'Héliodore' in *Le Monde du Roman Grec* (1987) 233-241.
- [427.] S.A. Naber, 'Observationes criticae in Heliodorum', *Mnemosyne 2nd series* 1 (1873) 145-169, 313-353.
- [428.] B. Thorlacius, *Symbolae ad antiquitates ex Heliodoro* (Hauniae 1823).
- [429.] B. Thorlacius, *De Sacris et Sapientia Aethiopum iuxta Heliodorum* (Hauniae 1825).
- [430.] L. Török, 'Geschichte Meroës', *ANRW* 2.10.1 (1988) 107-341.
- [431.] R.T. Updegraff, 'The Blemmyes I: The Rise of the Blemmyes and the Roman Withdrawal from Nubia under Diocletian', *ANRW* 2.10.1 (1988) 44-106.

The character of Charikleia

- [432.] J. Hani, 'Le personnage de Charikleia dans les *Éthiopiennes*: incarnation de l'idéal moral et religieux d'une époque', *BAGB* (1978) 268-273.
- [433.] R. Johne, 'Dido und Charikleia: Zur Gestaltung der Frau bei Vergil und im griechischen Liebesroman', *Eirene* 24 (1987) 21-33. Also in *Die Frau in der Antike. Kolloquium der Winkelmann-Gesellschaft* (Stendal 1989) 75-82.
- [434.] L. Pernot, 'Chariclée la sirène' in *Le Monde du Roman Grec* (1987) 43-51.

Realism in the *Ethiopian Story*

- [435.] L. Bucher, 'Rhodopis, Héliodore et les Perses' in M. Pierart and O. Curty (edd.), *Historia Testis: Melanges à Zawadski* (Fribourg, Switzerland 1989) 159-166.
- [436.] P. Cauderlier, 'Réalités Égyptiennes chez Héliodore' in *Le Monde du Roman Grec* (1987) 221-231.
- [437.] R.L. Kowarna, *Das Weltbild Heliodors in den 'Aithiopischen Geschichten* (Vienna 1959).
- [438.] J.R. Morgan, 'Realism and the Historiographical Pose in Heliodorus' in *Erotica Antiqua* (1977) 128-129.
- [439.] J.R. Morgan, 'History, Romance and Realism in the *Aithiopika* of Heliodorus', *CIAnt* 1 (1982) 221-265.
- [440.] R.M. Rattenbury, 'An Ancient Armoured Force', *CR* 56 (1942) 113-116.
- [441.] P. Robiano, 'Les gymnosophistes Éthiopiens chez Philostrate et chez Héliodore', *REA* 94.3-4 (1992) 413-428.
- [442.] A. Rogier, 'Le Roi d'Éthiopie et les Syénéens chez Héliodore', *REG* 95 (1982) 453-467.
- [443.] C. Conti Rossini, 'Meroë ed Aksum nel romanzo di Eliodoro', *Rivista di studi orientali* 8 (1919-1920) 233-239.
- [444.] A.M. Scarcella, 'Testimonianze della Crisi di un Eta nel Romanzo di Eliodoro', *Maia* 24 (1972) 8-41.
- [445.] A.M. Scarcella, 'Aspetti del diritto e del costume matrimoniali nel romanzo di Eliodoro', *MSCN* 1 (1976) 59-95.

Religion in the *Ethiopian Story*

- [446.] A. Colonna, 'La incarnazione dell' anima nel romanzo di Eliodoro', *Sileno* 7 (1981)

203-4.

- [447.] M.P. Futre Pinheiro, 'Fonctions du Surnaturel dans les *Éthiopiennes* d' Héliodore', *Euphrosyne* 20 (1992) 283-294.
- [448.] D.N. Levin, 'Aethiopica III-IV: Greek Dunces, Egyptian Sage', *Athenaeum* ns 70.2 (1992) 499-506.
- [449.] P. Liviabella, 'L'astrologia nelle *Etiopiche* di Eliodoro', *Giornale italiano di filologia* 31 (1979) 311-324.
- [450.] C. Meillier, 'Note sur l'arithmologie des *Éthiopiennes* d'Héliodore', *Kentron* 2.5 (1986) 110-113.
- [451.] P. Robiano, 'La notion de tyché chez Chariton et chez Héliodore', *Journal des Savants* (1983) 259-286.
- [452.] G. Ronnet, 'Interet esthétique et religieux des *Éthiopiennes* d'Héliodore', *Pallas* 42 (1995) 55-68.

The Nachleben of the *Ethiopian Story*

- [453.] J. Balinski, 'Heliodoros Latinus: die humanistischen Studien über die *Aithiopika*—Politianus, Warszewicki, Guillonius, Laubanus', *Eos* 80 (1992) 273-289.
- [454.] *G. Berger, 'Legitimation und Modell. Die *Aithiopika* als Prototyp des französischen heroisch-galanten Romans.' *A&A* 30 (1984) 177-189.
- [455.] *G. Berger, *Rhetorik und Leserlenkung in der Aithiopika-Epitome des Martin Crusius* (1988).
- [456.] A. Billault, 'Cervantès et Héliodore' in *Le Monde du Roman Grec* (1987) 307-314.
- [457.] W. Boehlich, 'Heliodoros Christianus' in *Freundesgabe für E.R. Curtius* (Bern 1956) 103-124.
- [458.] R. Browning, 'An Unpublished Epigram on Heliodoros' *Aethiopica*', *CR* ns 5 (1955) 141-143.
- [459.] *A.J. Cascardi, 'Reason and Romance: an Essay on Cervantes' *Persiles*', *MLN* 106.2 (1991) 279-293.
- [460.] *J-P. Collinet, 'Racine lecteur et adapteur d'Héliodore', *Papers on French 17th century Literature* (1988) 399-415.
- [461.] *A.K. Forcione, *Cervantes, Aristotle and the 'Persiles'* (Princeton 1972).
- [462.] *A. Garcia Galiano, 'Cervantes y Heliodoro: un nuevo ejemplo de imitacion', *Letras de Densto* 19.44 (1989) 81-90.
- [463.] H. Gärtner, 'Charikleia in Byzanz', *Antike und Abendland* 15 (1969) 47-69.
- [464.] G. Highet, *The Classical Tradition* (London 1967).
- [465.] G.R. Hocke, *Die Welt als Labyrinth* (Munich 1957).
- [466.] G.R. Hocke, *Manierismus in der Literatur* (Munich 1959).
- [467.] *C. Lacombrade, 'Aux origines de l'hellénisme racinien. Le roman d'Héliodore.' *BSTEC* 181-182 (1980-1982) 33-53.
- [468.] *J.J. Lynch, 'Romance Conventions in Voltaire's *Candide*', *South Atlantic Review* 50.1 (1985) 35-46.
- [469.] J.J. Lynch, *Henry Fielding and the Heliodoran Novel: Romance, Epic and Fielding's new province of writing* (Rutherford 1986).
- [470.] S. MacAlister, 'Byzantine Developments' in *Greek Fiction* (1994) 275-287.
- [471.] M. Oeftering, *Heliodor und seine Bedeutung für die Litteratur* (Berlin 1901).
- [472.] *C. Prosch, *Heliodoros Aithiopika als Quelle für deutsche Drama des Barockzeitalters* (Diss. Vienna 1956).
- [473.] S. Rabau, 'Héliodore d'Émèse et Barbey d'Aureville: curiosité, exhibition, silence' in *Lalies: Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature 13* (Paris 1994) 175-191.
- [474.] *A. Rallo Grus, 'La distorsion dramática de un texto narrativo: los hijos de la

fortuna: Teagenes y Chariclea de Calderon' in G. Lorenzo (ed.), *Calderon: Actas del Congreso internacional sobre Calderon y el teatro español del siglo de oro* (Madrid 1983) 561-577.

- [475.] G.N. Sandy, 'Ancient prose Fiction and minor early English novels', *A&A* 25 (1979) 41-55.
- [476.] G.N. Sandy, 'Classical forerunners of the theory and practice of prose romance in France. Studies in the narrative form of minor French romances of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.' *A&A* 28 (1982) 169-191.
- [477.] A. Schneider, 'Von Heliodors *Äthiopika* zu Wielands *Oberon*', *Das Altertum* 22 (1976) 49-55.
- [478.] W. Stephens, 'Tasso's Heliodorus and the World of Romance', in *Search* (1994) 67-87.
- [479.] D.V. Stump, 'Greek and Shakespearean Tragedy: Four Indirect Routes from Athens to London' in D. V. Stump, J. A. Arieti, L. Gerson and E. Stump (edd.), *Hamartia: The Concept of Error in the Western Tradition* Texts and Studies in Religion 16 (New York 1983) 211-246.
- [480.] R. Utter & G. Needham, *Pamela's Daughters* (New York 1936).
- [481.] S.L. Wolff, *The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction* (Diss. Columbia 1912).

ASPECTS OF THE COMMENTARY

Art and Ekphrasis

- [482.] S. Bartsch, *Decoding the Ancient Novel: The Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius* (Princeton 1989).
- [483.] S.M. Beall, 'Word-Painting in the *Imagines* of the Elder Philostratus', *Hermes* 121.3 (1993) 350-363.
- [484.] S. Dubel, 'La description d'objets d'art dans les *Éthiopiennes*', *Pallas* 36 (1990) 101-115.
- [485.] B.H. Fowler, *The Hellenistic Aesthetic* (Bristol 1989).
- [486.] R.P. Hinks, *Myth and Allegory in Ancient Art* (London 1939).
- [487.] K. Lehmann-Hartleben, 'The *Imagines* of the Elder Philostratus', *Art Bulletin* 23 (1941) 16-44.
- [488.] A. Lesky, 'Bildwerk und Deutung bei Philostrat und Homer', *Hermes* 75 (1940) 38-53.
- [489.] J. Onians, *Art and Thought in the Hellenistic Age: The Greek World View 350-50 BC* (London 1979).
- [490.] J.J. Pollitt, *Art in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge 1986).
- [491.] M. Robertson, *Greek Painting* (Geneva 1959).
- [492.] W. Stechow, 'Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* in Art', *Journal of the Warburg Institute* 16 (1953) 144-152.

Birds

- [493.] J.R.T. Pollard, *Birds in Greek Life and Myth* (London 1977).
- [494.] D'A.W. Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds* (Oxford 1936).

Delphi

- [495.] P. Amandry, *La mantique apollinienne à Delphes: essai sur le fonctionnement de l'oracle* (Paris 1950).

- [496.] A. Colonna, Review of Feuillâtre, *Athenaeum* ns 45 (1967) 249-251.
- [497.] J. Defradas, *Les Thèmes de la Propagande Delphique* (Paris 1954).
- [498.] M. Delcourt, *L'oracle de Delphes* (Paris 1981).
- [499.] G.W. Elderkin, 'The Natural and the Artificial Grotto', *Hesperia* 10 (1941) 128-129.
- [500.] L.R. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States: Vol. IV* (London 1907).
- [501.] J. Fontenrose, *Python: A Study of Delphic Myth and its Origin* (Berkeley 1959).
- [502.] J. Fontenrose, *The Cult and Myth of Pyrrhos at Delphi* (Berkeley 1960).
- [503.] J. Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations* (Berkeley 1978).
- [504.] J. Fontenrose, 'The Cult of Apollo and the Games at Delphi' in W. J. Raschke (ed.), *The Archaeology of the Olympics: The Olympics and Other Festivals in Antiquity* (Madison 1988) 121-140.
- [505.] F. Hiller von Gaertringen, 'Delphoi' in *RE* IV (Berlin 1901) 2517-2583.
- [506.] L.B. Holland, 'The Mantic Mechanism at Delphi', *AJA* 37 (1933) 201-214.
- [507.] K. Latte, 'The Coming of the Pythia', *HTR* (1940) 9-18.
- [508.] A.P. Oppé, 'The Chasm at Delphi', *JHS* 24 (1904) 214-240.
- [509.] H.W. Parke, *History of the Delphic Oracle* (Oxford 1939).
- [510.] H.W. Parke, 'A Note on the Delphic Priesthood', *CQ* 34 (1940) 85-89.
- [511.] H.W. Parke, *Greek Oracles* (London 1967).
- [512.] H.W. Parke and D.E.W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle. 2 Vols.* (Oxford 1966).
- [513.] R. Parker, 'Greek States and Greek Oracles' in Cartledge and Harvey (edd.), *Crux: Essays presented to G.E.M. de Ste. Croix* (London 1985) 298-326.
- [514.] J. Perret, 'Néoptolème et les Molosses', *REA* (1946) 5-28.
- [515.] J. Pouilloux, 'Delphes dans les *Éthiopiennes* d' Héliodore', *JS* (1983) 259-286.
- [516.] J. Pouilloux, 'Roman grec et réalité. Un épisode delphique des *Éthiopiennes* d'Héliodore' in H. Walter (ed.) *Hommages à Lucien Lerat* (Paris 1984) 691-703.
- [517.] F. Poulsen, *Delphi* (London 1920).
- [518.] S. Price, 'Delphi and Divination' in P. Easterling and J. Muir (edd.), *Greek Religion and Society* (Cambridge 1985) 128-154.
- [519.] L. Robert, *Thymélé* (Paris 1939).
- [520.] L. Robert, 'Deux épigrammes de Philippe de Thessalonique', *Journal des Savants* (1982) 149-151.
- [521.] G. Rougemont, 'Delphes chez Héliodore' in *Le Monde du Roman Grec* (1987) 93-99.
- [522.] G. Roux, *Delphes: son oracle et ses dieux* (Paris 1976).
- [523.] G. Roux, *L'amphictionie, Delphes et le temple d'Apollon au IV^e siècle* (Lyons-Paris, 1979).
- [524.] C.R. Whittaker, 'The Delphic Oracle: Belief and Behaviour in Ancient Greece—and Africa', *Harvard Theological Review* 58 (1965) 21-47.
- [525.] A. Wiechers, *Aesop at Delphi* (Meisenheim-am-Glan 1961).
- [526.] L. Woodbury, 'Neoptolemus at Delphi: Pindar Nem. 7.30', *Phoenix* 33 (1979) 95-134.

The Pythian Games

- [527.] J. Fontenrose, 'The Hero as Athlete', *CSCA* 1 (1968) 75-76.
- [528.] E.N. Gardiner, *Athletics of the Ancient World* (Oxford 1930).
- [529.] H.A. Harris, *Greek Athletes and Athletics* (London 1964).
- [530.] H.A. Harris, *Sport in Greece and Rome* (London 1972).
- [531.] *J. Jüthner, *Philostratos über Gymnastik* (Leipzig 1909).
- [532.] *J. Jüthner, *Körperkultur im Altertum* (Jena 1928).
- [533.] J. Jüthner (ed.), *Die athletischen Leibesübungen der Griechen* (Vienna 1965).
- [534.] D.G. Kyle, *Athletics in Ancient Athens* (Leiden 1987).

- [535.] C. Morgan, *Athletes and Oracles: The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the 8th century BC* (Cambridge 1990).
- [536.] V. Olivová, *Sport and Games in the Ancient World* (London 1984).
- [537.] W.J. Raschke (ed.), *The Archaeology of the Olympics: The Olympics and Other Festivals in Antiquity* (Madison 1988).
- [538.] D. Sansone, *Greek Athletics and the Genesis of Sport* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1988).
- [539.] B. Schröder, *Der Sport in Altertum* (Berlin 1927).
- [540.] W.E. Sweet (ed.), *Sport and Recreation in Ancient Greece: A Sourcebook with Translations* (Oxford 1987).
- [541.] T. Yiannakis, 'The Relationship between the Underground Chthonian world and the PanHellenic Games', *Nikephoros* 111 (1990) 23-30.

The Theatre and Dancing

- [542.] W. Beare, *The Roman Stage* (London 1968).
- [543.] M. Bieber, *The History of the Greek and Roman Theatre* (Princeton, New Jersey 1961).
- [544.] O.A.W. Dilke, 'The *Aethiopica*: A Classical Melodrama', *CW* (1969) 353-354.
- [545.] L.B. Lawler, *The Dance in Ancient Greece* (London 1964).
- [546.] S.H. Lonsdale, *Dance and Ritual Play in Greek Religion* (Baltimore 1993).
- [547.] W. Mullen, *Choreia: Pindar and Dance* (Princeton, New Jersey 1982).
- [548.] T. Paulsen, *Inszenierung des Schicksals: Tragödie und Komödie im Roman des Heliodor* (Trier 1992).
- [549.] J.W.H. Walden, 'Stage Terms in Heliodorus's *Aethiopica*', *HSCP* 5 (1895) 1-43.

Dreams

- [550.] A. Amory, 'The Gates of Horn and Ivory', *YCIS* 20 (1966) 3-57.
- [551.] G. Björck, 'ONAR IDEIN: De la perception de rêve chez les anciens', *Eranos* 44 (1946) 306-314.
- [552.] *C. Blum, *Studies in the Dream-Book of Artemidorus* (Diss. Uppsala 1936).
- [553.] A. Brelich, 'The Place of Dreams in the Religious World Concept of the Greeks' in G. E. v. Grunebaum and R. Caillois (edd.), *The Dream in Human Societies* (Berkeley & Los Angeles 1966) 293-301.
- [554.] *C. Brillante, *Studi sulla rappresentazione del sogno nella Grecia antiqua* (Palermo 1991).
- [555.] J.S. Hanson, 'Dreams and Visions in the Graeco-Roman World and Early Christianity' in *ANRW* 2.23.2 (Berlin 1980) 1395-1427.
- [556.] *J. Hundt, *Der Traumglaube bei Homer* (Diss. Greifswald 1934).
- [557.] A.H.M. Kessels, *Studies on the Dream in Greek Literature* (Utrecht 1978).
- [558.] L. Koenen, 'The Dream of Nektanebos', *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 22 1-4 (1985) 171-194.
- [559.] R.G.A. van Lieshout, *Greeks on Dreams* (Utrecht 1980).
- [560.] C.A. Meier, 'The Dream in Ancient Greece and its Use in Temple Cures' in G. E. V. Grunebaum and R. Caillois (edd.), *The Dream in Human Societies* (Berkeley & Los Angeles 1966) 303-319.
- [561.] W. Messer, *The Dream in Homer and Greek Tragedy* (New York 1918).
- [562.] S.M. Oberhelman, 'Dreams in Graeco-Roman Medicine' in *ANRW* 2.37.1 (Berlin 1993).
- [563.] J. van Ooteghem, 'Somni Portae', *Les Études Classiques* 16 (1948) 386-390.
- [564.] V.A.L. Oppenheim, 'The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East', *TAPhA* ns 46 (1956) 189ff.

- [565.] R.A. Pack, 'Artemidorus and his Waking World', *TAPhA* 86 (1955) 280-290.
- [566.] A.V. Rankin, 'Penelope's Dreams in Books 19 and 20 of the Odyssey', *Helikon* 2 (1962) 617-624.
- [567.] H.D. Rankin, 'Dream/Vision as Philosophical Modifier in Plato's *Republic*', *Eranos* 62 (1964) 75-83.
- [568.] J. Russo, 'Interview and Aftermath: Dream, Fantasy and Intuition in *Odyssey* 19 and 20', *AJP* 103 (1982) 4-18.
- [569.] J.H. Waszink, 'Die sogenannte Fünfteilung der Träume bei Chalcidius und ihre Quellen', *Mnemosyne* 9 (1941) 65-85.
- [570.] F. Weinstock, 'De somniorum visionumque in amatoriiis Graecorum fabulis vi atque usu', *Eos* 35 (1934) 29-72.
- [571.] J.G. Wetzel, *Quomodo poetae epici et Graeci et Romani somnia descripserint* (Diss. Berlin 1931).

Costume

- [572.] T. Hopes, *Costumes of the Greeks and Romans* (New York 1962). Reprint of 1812, 1841 edition.
- [573.] M.G. Houston, *Ancient Greek, Roman and Byzantine Costume and Decoration* (London 1947²).
- [574.] G. Losfeld, *Essai sur le costume grec* (Paris 1991).
- [575.] C. Picard, *La Vie dans la Grèce classique* (Paris 1930).

Child Exposure

- [576.] A. Cameron, 'The Exposure of Children and Greek Ethics', *CR* 46 (1932) 105-114.
- [577.] D. Engels, 'The Problem of Female Infanticide in the Greco-Roman World', *CPhil* 75 (1980) 112-120.
- [578.] R. Garland, *The Greek Way of Death* (London 1985).
- [579.] R. Garland, *The Eye of the Beholder: Deformity and Disability in the Graeco-Roman World* (London 1995).
- [580.] M. Golden, *Children and Childhood in Classical Athens* (Baltimore and London 1990).
- [581.] W.V. Harris, 'The Theoretical Possibility of Extensive Infanticide in the Graeco-Roman World', *CQ* ns 32 (1982) 114-116.
- [582.] K. Hopkins, *Death and Renewal* (Cambridge 1983).
- [583.] F. Kudlien, 'Kindesaussetzung im antiken römischen: ein Thema zwischen Fiktionalität und Lebenswirklichkeit', *GCN* 2 (1989) 25-44.
- [584.] E. Norden, *De Geburt des Kindes: Geschichte einer Religiösen Idee* (Darmstadt 1958).
- [585.] S.B. Pomeroy, 'Infanticide in Hellenistic Greece' in A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt (edd.), *Images of Women in Antiquity* (London 1983) 207-222.
- [586.] D.B. Redford, 'The Literary Motif of the Exposed Child', *Numen* 14 (1967) 209-228.
- [587.] E. Weiss, 'Kindesaussetzung', *RE* XI.1 (1921) 463-471.

Intertextuality

- [588.] E. Bowie, 'Names and a Gem: Aspects of Allusion in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*' in D. Innes, H. Hine and C. Pelling (edd.), *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (Oxford 1995) 269-280.
- [589.] W. Capelle, 'Zwei Quellen des Heliodor', *RhM* 96 (1953) 166-180.
- [590.] *F. Gabert, *Roman et épopée dans les Éthiopiennes d'Héliodore* (Diss. Paris 1974).
- [591.] R.W. Garson, 'Notes on Some Homeric Echoes in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', *Acta*

Classica 18 (1975) 137-140.

- [592.] C.W. Keyes, 'The Structure of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', *Studies in Philology* 19 (1922) 42-51.
- [593.] F. Létoublon, 'Surimpression: Sophocle entre Homère et Héliodore', *IL* (1990) 3-6.
- [594.] R. Merkelbach, 'Heliodor 1.10: Seneca und Euripides', *RhM* 100 (1957) 99-100.
- [595.] P. Neimke, *Quaestiones Heliodoreae* (Diss. Halle 1889). Traces the influence of Greek drama on Heliodorus, as well as the relationship between *Leukippe and Kleitophon* and the *Ethiopian Story*.
- [596.] R. Rocca, 'Eliodoro e i due Ippoliti euripidei.' *MCSN I* (1976) 23-31.
- [597.] R. Roncali, 'Una combinazione omerica in Seneca e Heliodoro', *Sileno* 4 (1978) 251-253.
- [598.] M. Brioso Sánchez, 'Mosco y Heliodoro: el simil de Etiopicas 2.22.4', *Habis* 17 (1986) 117-121.
- [599.] A.M. Scarcella, 'Gli amori di Fedra fra tragedia e romanzo' in R. Uglione R. (ed.) *Atti delle giornate di studio su Fedra, Torino 7-8-9 maggio 1984* (Turin 1985) 213-239.
- [600.] P. von der Mühl, 'Direkte Benützung des Ephoros und des Theopomp bei Plutarch', *MH* 11 (1954) 243-244.
- [601.] E.W. Whittle, 'A quotation from Menander', *CP* 56 (1961) 178-179.
- [602.] F. Bevilacqua, 'Finzione e realta nel racconto di Calasiri', *Sileno* 16 (1990) 247-249.

Homer

- [603.] T.W. Allen, 'The Homeridae', *CQ* 1 (1907) 134-143.
- [604.] V. Bérard, *Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssee. Tomes 1-2.* (Paris 1902).
- [605.] H. Clarke, *Homer's Readers: A Historical Introduction to the Iliad and Odyssey* (Newark 1981).
- [606.] G. Curtius, *De nomine Homeri* (Kiel 1855).
- [607.] A.F. Dekker, *Ironie in de Odyssee* (Leiden 1965).
- [608.] P. Gilbert, 'Homère et l'Égypte', *Chronique d'Égypte* 14 (1939) 47-61.
- [609.] C. Higbie, *Heroes' Names, Homeric Identities* (New York and London 1995).
- [610.] R. Lamberton, 'The NeoPlatonists and the Spiritualisation of Homer', in R. Lamberton & J.J. Keaney (ed.), *Homer's Ancient Readers: The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes* (Princeton 1992) 115-133.
- [611.] R. Lamberton, *Homer the Theologian* (Berkeley 1986).
- [612.] A. Leroy-Molinghen, 'Homère et Thèbes aux cent portes', *Chronique d'Égypte* 60 119-120 (1985) 131-137.
- [613.] *P. von der Mühl, *Kritisches Hypomnema zur Ilias* (Bâle 1952).
- [614.] *L.P. Rank, *Etymologiseering en verwante verschijnselen by Homerus* (Assen 1951).
- [615.] Th. Sinko, 'De Homero Aegyptio', *Eos* 13 (1906) 12-20.
- [616.] H. Thesleff, 'Notes on the Name of Homer and the Homeric Question' in *Studia in Honorem Iiro Kajanto Arctos Supplementum II* (Helsinki 1985) 293-314.
- [617.] O. Tsagarakis, 'Odysseus's story-telling and the European novel', *Archaïgnosia* 1 (1980) 253-365.

Plato

- [618.] J. Arieti, *Interpreting Plato: The Dialogues as Drama* (Savage 1991).
- [619.] A. Cook, 'Dialectic, Irony and Myth in Plato's *Phaedrus*', *AJP* 106 (1985) 427-441.
- [620.] G.J. de Vries, *A Commentary on the Phaedrus of Plato* (Amsterdam 1969).
- [621.] J.M. Dillon, 'A Platonist Ars Amatoria', *CQ* 44.2 (1994) 387-392.

- [622.] J.M. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists: A Study of Platonism, 80 B.C. to A.D. 220* (London 1977).
- [623.] E.R. Dodds, 'Plato and the Irrational', *JHS* 65 (1945) 16-25.
- [624.] G.R.F. Ferrari, *Listening to the Cicadas: a Study of Plato's Phaedrus* (Cambridge 1987).
- [625.] C.L. Griswold, *Self-Knowledge in Plato's Phaedrus* (Yale 1986).
- [626.] W.K.C. Guthrie, 'Rhetoric and Philosophy: The Unity of the *Phaedrus*', *Paideia* 5 (1976).
- [627.] D.M. Halperin, 'Plato and Erotic Reciprocity', *Classical Antiquity* 5 (1986) 60-80.
- [628.] R. Mortley, 'The Ignorance of Lovers' in *SOFIHS MAIHTORES 'Chercheurs de sagesse' Hommage a Jean Pépin* (Paris 1992) 263-274.
- [629.] M. Nussbaum, *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy* (Cambridge 1986). Pp. 200-234 (*Phaedrus*); pp. 165-199 (Symposium).
- [630.] C. Osborne, *Eros Unveiled: Plato and the God of Love* (Oxford 1994).
- [631.] R. Patterson, 'The Platonic Art of Comedy and Tragedy', *Philosophy and Literature* 10 (1982) 76-93.
- [632.] A.W. Price, *Love and Friendship in Plato and Aristotle* (Oxford 1989).
- [633.] G.X. Santas, 'Passionate Platonic Love in the *Phaedrus*', *Ancient Philosophy* 2 (1982) 105-114.
- [634.] J. Smith, 'Plato's Myths as "likely accounts", "worthy of belief"', *Apeiron* 19 (1985) 24-42.
- [635.] J.A. Stewart, *The Myths of Plato* (London & New York 1905).
- [636.] D. Tarrant, 'Plato's Use of Quotation and Other Illustrative Material', *CQ* 45 (1951) 59-67.
- [637.] H. Thesleff, 'Notes on Eros in Middle Platonism', *Arctos* 28 (1994) 115-128.
- [638.] M.B. Trapp, 'Plato's *Phaedrus* in Second-century Greek Literature' in D. A. Russell (ed.), *Antonine Literature* (Oxford 1990).
- [639.] G. Vlastos, 'The Individual as Object of Love in Plato' in *Platonic Studies* (Princeton 1973) 3-42.
- [640.] G. Vlastos (ed.), *Platonic Studies* (Princeton 1981).
- [641.] D. White, *Rhetoric and Reality in Plato's Phaedrus* (New York 1993).

NeoPlatonism

- [642.] R. Asmus, 'Zur Rekonstruktion von Damascius' Leben des Isidorus (I)', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 18 (1909) 424-480.
- [643.] R. Asmus, 'Zur Rekonstruktion von Damascius' Leben des Isidorus (II)', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 19 (1910) 265-284.
- [644.] A. Colonna, 'Teofane Cerameo e Filippo Filosofo', *BPEC* ns 8 (1960) 25-27.
- [645.] J.A. Coulter, *The Literary Microcosm: Theories of Interpretation of the later neoPlatonists* (Leiden 1976).
- [646.] M.J. Edwards, 'The Oracle of Apollo in the Life of Plotinus', *CQ* 38 (1988) 509-521.
- [647.] M.J. Edwards, 'Scenes from the Later Wanderings of Odysseus', *CQ* 38.2 (1988) 509-521.
- [648.] E.K. Emilsson, *Plotinus on Sense-Perception: A Philosophical Study* (Cambridge 1988).
- [649.] D. Kovendi, 'Porphyrios Schrift über die Sonne' in F. Altheim and R. Stiehl (edd.), *Die Araber in der alten Welt* III.10 (Berlin 1966) 198-243.
- [650.] D.J. O'Meara, *Plotinus: An Introduction to the Enneads* (Oxford 1995).
- [651.] P.N. Singer, 'Aspects of Galen's Platonism' in J. A. L. Ferez (ed.), *Galeno: obra pensamiento e influencia* (Madrid 1991) 41-55.

- [652.] R. Strömberg, 'Damascius: His Personality and Significance', *Eranos* 44 (1946) 175-192.
- [653.] G. Watson, 'The Concept of "Phantasia" from the Late Hellenistic Period to Early NeoPlatonism' in *ANRW* 2.36.7 (Berlin 1994) 4766-4810.

Medicine

- [654.] D.W. Amundsen, 'Romanticizing the Ancient Medical Profession: The Characterization of the Physician in the Graeco-Roman Novel', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 48 (1974) 333-337.
- [655.] J.F. Dobson, 'Erasistratus', *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine* 20 (1927) 825-832.
- [656.] E.C. Evans, 'The Study of Physiognomy in the Second Century AD', *TAPhA* 72 (1941) 96-108.
- [657.] I.M. Lonie, 'Erasistratus, The Erasistrateans, and Aristotle', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 38 (1964) 426-463.
- [658.] H. Maehler, 'Symptome der Liebe im Roman und in der griechischen Anthologie', *GCN* 3 (1990) 1-12.
- [659.] A.M.G. Mcleod, 'Psychology and Medicine in a Greek Novel: Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon', *JHS* 89 (1969) 97-105.
- [660.] J. Mesk, 'Antiochos und Stratonike', *RhM* 68 (1913) 366-394.
- [661.] J. Mesk, 'Die Beispiele in Polemons Physiognomik', *WS* 50 (1932) 51-67.
- [662.] J. Mesk, 'Aegritudo Perdicae', *WS* 57 (1939) 166-172.

The theory of maternal impression

- [663.] O.A.W. Dilke, 'Heliodoros and the Colour Problem', *PP* 35 (1980) 264-271.
- [664.] *F. Kahn, *Das Versehen der Schwangeren in Volksglaube und Dichtung* (Diss. Frankfurt-am-Main 1912).
- [665.] M.D. Reeve, 'Conceptions', *PCPhS* 215 (1989) 81-112.

Music

- [666.] G. Comotti, *Music in Greek and Roman Culture* (Baltimore 1989).
- [667.] P. L. Furiani, 'La musica nel romanzo erotico greco tra natura e cultura', *QIFP* I (1984) 27-43.
- [668.] E.A. Lippman, *Musical Thought in Ancient Greece* (London 1964).
- [669.] M. Maas and J. M. Snyder, *Stringed Instruments of Ancient Greece* (New Haven 1989).
- [670.] S. Michaelides, *The Music of Ancient Greece: An Encyclopaedia* (London 1978).
- [671.] M.L. West, *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford 1992).
- [672.] R.P. Winnington-Ingram, *Mode in Ancient Greek Music* (Cambridge 1936).

Mythology

- [673.] A. Billault, 'Le mythe de Persée et les *Éthiopiennes* d'Héliodore: Légendes représentations et fiction littéraire', *REG* 94 (1981) 63-75.
- [674.] G.W. Bowersock, 'The Miracle of Memnon', *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 21 1-4 (1984) 21-32.
- [675.] C.A. Faraone, 'Aphrodite's Kestos and Apples for Atalanta: Aphrodisiacs in Early Greek Myth and Ritual', *Phoenix* 44 (1990) 219-238.
- [676.] A. Gardiner, 'The Egyptian Memnon', *JEA* 47 (1961) 91-99.
- [677.] G. Goossens, 'Memnon était-il Éthiopien ou Susien?', *Chronique d'Égypte* 14 (1939) 336-339.

- [678.] J. Hubeau and M. Leroy, *Le mythe de Phénix dans les Littératures Grecques et Latine* (Liège-Paris 1939).
- [679.] F. Knatz, *Quomodo Persei Fabulam Artifices Graeci et Roman Tractaverint* (Bonn 1893).
- [680.] J. Pépin, *Mythe et Allégorie* (Paris 1976).
- [681.] E. Petersen, 'Andromeda', *JHS* 24 (1904) 99-112.
- [682.] K.M. Phillips, 'Perseus and Andromeda', *AJA* 72 (1968) 1-23.
- [683.] E. Phinney, 'Perseus' Battle with the Gorgons', *TAPhA* 102 (1971) 445-463.
- [684.] W. Richter, 'Zwei spätantike Gedichte über den Vogel Phoenix', *RhM* 136.1 (1993) 62-90.
- [685.] K. Schauenburg, *Perseus in der Kunst des Altertums* (Bonn 1960).
- [686.] E. Simon, 'Andromeda auf einem spätantiken Stoff' in E. B. W. Martini (ed.), *Studien zur Mythologie und Vasenmalerei: Konrad Schauenburg zum 65. Geburtstag am 16. April 1986* (Mainz am Rhein 1986).
- [687.] A. Théodorides, 'Pèlerinage au Colosse de Memnon', *Chronique d'Égypte* 64 127-128 (1989) 267-282.
- [688.] K. Wernicke, *Andromeda* (Berlin 1894).
- [689.] J. Woodward, *Perseus: A Study in Greek Art and Legend* (Cambridge 1937).

Narratology

- [690.] A. Billault, 'Présentation des *Éthiopiennes*', *IL* 39.1 (1987) 25-30.
- [691.] M. Futre Pinheiro, 'Time and Narrative Technique in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*' in *ANRW* 2.34.4 (Berlin forthcoming).
- [692.] *M.P. Futre Pinheiro, *Estructuras técnico-narrativas nas Etiopicas de Heliodoro* (Diss. Lisbon 1987).
- [693.] M.P. Futre Pinheiro, 'Calasiris's Story and its Narrative Significance in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', *GCN* 4 (1991) 69-83.
- [694.] V.L. Hefti, *Zur Erzählungstechnik in Heliodors Aethiopica* (Vienna 1950).
- [695.] J.R. Morgan, 'A sense of the ending: the conclusion of Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*', *TAPhA* 119 (1989) 299-320.
- [696.] J.R. Morgan, 'The story of Knemon in Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*', *JHS* 109 (1989) 99-113.
- [697.] J.R. Morgan, 'The *Aithiopika* of Heliodorus: Narrative as Riddle' in *Greek Fiction* (1994) 97-113.
- [698.] J.J. Winkler, 'The Mendacity of Kalasiris and the Narrative Strategy of Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*', *YCIS* 27 (1982) 93-158.
- [699.] M. Woronoff, 'L'art de la composition dans les *Éthiopiennes* d'Héliodore' in *Le Monde du Roman Grec* (1987) 33-42.
- [700.] N.P. Zembatova, 'Les deux plans des *Éthiopiennes* d'Héliodore.' in *Mélanges Petrovskij* (1996) 285-290.

The Evil Eye

- [701.] G. Bataille, *Histoire de l'oeil* (Paris 1927).
- [702.] P. Boileau and N. Thomas, *The Evil Eye* (London 1961).
- [703.] W. Bühler, 'Das Element des Visuellen in der Eingangsszene von Heliodors *Aithiopika*', *WS* ns 10 (1976) 177-185.
- [704.] O.G.S. Crawford, *The Eye Goddess* (London 1957).
- [705.] M. DeForest, 'Clytemnestra's Breast and the Evil Eye' in M. DeForest (ed.), *Woman's Power, Man's Game: Essays on Classical Antiquity in Honor of Joy K. King* (Wauconda 1993).
- [706.] W. Deonna, *Le symbolisme de l'oeil* (Paris 1965).

- [707.] M. Dickie, 'Heliodorus and Plutarch on the evil eye', *CP* 86.1 (1991) 17-29.
- [708.] R. Dionisopoulos-Mass, 'The Evil Eye Bewitchment in a Peasant Village' in C. Maloney (ed.), *The Evil Eye* (New York 1976) 42-62.
- [709.] F.T. Elworthy, *The Evil Eye: The Origin and Practices of Superstition* (London 1895).
- [710.] J. Engemann, 'Zur Verbreitung magischer Übelabwehr in der nichtchristlichen und christlichen Spätantike', *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 18 (1975) 22-48.
- [711.] E.S. Gifford, *The Evil Eye: Studies in the Folklore of Vision* (New York 1958).
- [712.] O. Jahn, 'Über den Aberglauben des bösen Blicks bei den Alten', *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Philologisch-historische Classe* 7 (1855) 28-110.
- [713.] J. Lacan (ed. J.-A. Miller, tr. A. Sheridan), *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-analysis* (Harmondsworth 1979).
- [714.] V. Limberis, 'The Eyes Infected by Evil', *HTR* 84.2 (1991) 163-184.
- [715.] C. Maloney (ed.), *The Evil Eye* (New York 1976).
- [716.] R.B. Peake, *The Evil Eye* (London 1884).
- [717.] T. Rakoczy, *Böser Blick, Macht des Auges und Neid der Götter: Eine Untersuchung zur Kraft des Blickes in der griechischen Literatur* (Tübingen 1996).
- [718.] J. Rousset, *Leurs yeux se rencontrèrent: la scène de première vue dans le roman* (Paris 1981).
- [719.] R. Schlesier, 'Mythenwahrheit versus aberglaube: Otto Jahn und der Böse Blick' in W. M. Calder, H. Cancik and B. Kytzler (edd.), *Otto Jahn (1813-1868): Ein Geisteswissenschaftler zwischen Klassizismus und Historismus* (Stuttgart 1991) 234-255.
- [720.] B. Schmidt, 'Der böse Blick und ähnlicher Zauber in neugriechischen Volksglauben', *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum Geschichte und deutsche Literature* 31 (1913) 574-613.
- [721.] S. Seligmann, *Der böse Blick und Verwandtes* (Berlin 1910).
- [722.] B. Spooner, 'The Evil Eye in the Middle East' in C. Maloney (ed.), *The Evil Eye* (New York 1976) 76-84.
- [723.] M.-L. Thomsen, 'The Evil Eye in Mesopotamia', *JNES* 51.1 (1992) 19-32.
- [724.] P. Walcot, *Envy and the Greeks* (Warminster 1978).
- [725.] A. Walker, 'Enargeia and the Spectator in Greek Historiography', *TAPhA* 123 (1993) 353-377.
- [726.] G. Watson, *Phantasia in Classical Thought* (Galway 1988).
- [727.] J.C. Woods, *The Evil Eye* (London 1903).
- [728.] Y. Yatromanolakis, 'Baskanos Eros: Love and the Evil-Eye in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*' in *The Greek Novel* (1988) 194-204.

THE DATE OF THE *ETHIOPIAN STORY*

- [729.] G.W. Bowersock, *Fiction as History: Nero to Julian* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1994) 149-160.
- [730.] P. Chuvin, *Chronique des derniers païens* (Paris 1991²). With an appendix on the date of Heliodorus (pp. 321-325), omitted in the English translation by B.A. Archer, *A Chronicle of the Last Pagans* (Cambridge, Mass. 1990).
- [731.] A. Colonna, 'L'Assedio di Nisibis del 350 D.C. e la cronologia di Eliodoro Emiseno', *Athenaeum* ns 28 (1950) 79-87.
- [732.] A. Colonna, 'La Cronologia dei romanzi greci: Le *Etiopiche* di Eliodoro', *Il Mondo Classico* 18 (1951) 143-153.
- [733.] R. Keydell, 'Zur Datierung der *Aithiopika* Heliodors' in P. Worth (ed.),

Polychronion: Festschrift Franz Dölger (Heidelberg 1966) 345-350.

- [734.] C. Lacombrade, 'Sur l'auteur et la date des *Éthiopiennes*', *REG* 83 (1970) 70-89.
- [735.] C.S. Lightfoot, 'Facts and Fiction—the Third Siege of Nisibis: AD 350', *Historia* 37 (1988) 105-125.
- [736.] M. Maróth, 'Le siège de Nisibe en 350 ap. J.-C. d'après les sources Syriennes', *AAnthung* 27 (1979) 239-243.
- [737.] R.M. Rattenbury, 'Heliodorus: The Bishop of Tricca', *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society: Literary and History Section* 1 (1926) 168-178.
- [738.] T. Sinko, 'De ordine quo erotici scriptores Graeci sibi successisse videantur', *Eos* 41.1 (1940-46) 23-45.
- [739.] *J. Straub, 'Aurelian und die Aksumiten' in *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1972-1974*, ed. J. Straub (Bonn 1976) 239-267.
- [740.] S. Swain, *Hellenism and Empire* (Oxford 1996).
- [741.] T. Szepessy, 'Die "Neudatierung" des Heliodoros und die Belagerung von Nisibis' in *Eirene: Actes de la XIIème Conférence Internationale d' Études Classiques* (Amsterdam 1975) 279-287.
- [742.] T. Szepessy, 'Le siège de Nisibe et la chronologie d'Héliodore', *AAnthung* 24 (1976) 247-276.
- [743.] H. van der Valk, 'Remarques sur la date des *Éthiopiennes* d'Héliodore', *Mnemosyne* 3rd series 9 (1941) 97-100.

The Sphragis

- [744.] W. Aly, Σφραγίς *RE* III.A.2 (1929) 1757-1758. .
- [745.] *J. Diehl, *Sphragis* (Diss. Giessen 1938).
- [746.] *F.J. Dolger, *Sphragis. Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums* 5.3-4 (1911). Reprinted in 1967.
- [747.] E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford 1963) 362-363, 407.
- [748.] W. Kranz, 'Sphragis: Ichform und Namensiegel als Eingangs- und Schlußmotiv antiker Dichtung', *RhM* 104 (1961) 3-46.

THE LANGUAGE OF HELIODORUS

- [749.] W.G. Arnott, 'WSPER LAMPADION DRAMATOS', *Hermes* 93 (1965) 235-255.
- [750.] F. Barber, *The syntax of the verb in the 'Aethiopica' of Heliodorus* (Diss. London 1962).
- [751.] D. Baumgarten, 'Quid Xenophonti debeat Heliodorus Emisenus', *Studia Leopolitana* 4 (1932) 1-36.
- [752.] P. Caudelier, 'Héliodore et le vocabulaire de l'arithmétique = Ethiop. IX.22', *REG* 101 (1988) 181-183.
- [753.] H.H.O. Chalk, 'Heliodorus, *Ethiopian Story*, tr. W. Lamb', *CR* ns 12 (1962) 169-170.
- [754.] C.G. Cobet, 'Heliodori ἀκυρολογία', *Mnemosyne* 6 (1857) 454.
- [755.] A. Colonna, 'Volgarismi in Eliodoro', *Paideia* 37 (1982) 86.
- [756.] A. Colonna, 'Sugli hapax in Eliodoro', *Paideia* 41 (1986) 213-214.
- [757.] J. Fritsch, *Der Sprachgebrauch des griechischen Romanschriftstellers Heliodor und sein Verhältnis zum Atticismus* (Kaaden 1901, 1-33; 1902, 1-34).
- [758.] M. P. Futre Pinheiro, 'Essai littéraire et stylistique d'Héliodore: Les *Éthiopiennes* V.14', *Euphrosyne* 11 (1981-2) 102-110.
- [759.] R.-J. Loenertz, 'PROSANGELLEIN HEAUTON', *Byzantion* 29-30 (1959-1960) 1-6.
- [760.] J.E. Mayor, 'Ἡ Ἐνεγκοῦσα in Heliodorus', *JP* 15 (1886) 174-176.
- [761.] J.E. Mayor, 'APRAKTOS—APRATOS', *JP* 15 (1886) 171-173.

- [762.] O. Mazal, *Der Stil des Heliodor von Emesa* (Diss. Vienna 1954).
 [763.] O. Mazal, 'Die Satzstruktur in den *Aithiopika* des Heliodor von Emesa', *WS* 71 (1958) 116-131. Also in *Beiträge* (1984, 451-466).
 [764.] K. Nawratil, 'Βαθύκολλος', *WS* 72 (1959) 165-168.
 [765.] J. Puiggali, 'Le sens du mot ἀντίθεος chez Héliodore 4.7.13', *Philologus* 128.2 (1984) 271-275.
 [766.] W. Schmid, *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halkarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostrat Vol. I-IV* (Stuttgart 1887-1896).
 [767.] A. Wifstrand, 'EIKOTA. Emendation und Interpretationen zu griechischen Prosaikern der Kaiserzeit. V. Zu den Romanschriftstellern', *Bulletin de la société royale des lettres de Lund* (1944-1945) 69-110.

TRANSLATIONS OF THE *ETHIOPIAN STORY*

Latin

- [768.] S. Warschewiczki (tr.), *Heliodori Aethiopicorum libri decem nunc primum in Latinum translati, S. Warschewiczki interprete* (Warsaw 1552).

English (listed by date)

- [769.] J.R. Morgan (tr.), *Heliodorus: An Ethiopian Story*, in B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1989).
 [770.] W. Lamb (tr.), *Heliodorus: Ethiopian Story* (London 1961).
 [771.] M. Hadas (tr.), *Heliodorus: An Ethiopian Romance* (Ann Arbor 1957).
 [772.] F.A. Wright (tr. & rev.), *Heliodorus: An Aethiopian Romance translated by Thomas Underdowne anno 1587* (London 1923).
 [773.] R. Smith (tr.), *Heliodorus: The Ethiopics or Adventures of Theagenes and Chariclea* (London 1855).
 [774.] *Winter-Evenings Entertainment. Consisting of the best Novels and Histories That have been written in most languages. Being such, as at the same Time they most agreeably amuse, enlarge the Ideas of the Mind, set virtue before the Eyes of the Reader in all its loveliness, and excite an almost irresistible Emulation of great and good actions* (London 1752).
 [775.] *The Triumphs of Love and Constancy—a Romance, Containing the Heroick Amours of Theagenes and Chariclea: in Ten Books, the First Five rendred by a person of quality, the last five by Nahum Tate* (London 1687).
 [776.] W. Lisle (tr.), *Famous Historie of Heliodorus* (London 1638).
 [777.] A. Fraunce (tr.), *The Countess of Pembroke's Ivy Church* (London 1591).
 [778.] T. Underdowne (tr.), *An Aethiopian history written in Greek by Heliodorus, no less wittie than pleasaunt: Englished by Thomas Underdowne anno 1587 with an introduction by Charles Whibley* (London 1895).

French

- [779.] J. Amyot (tr.), *L'Histoire Aethiopique de Heliodorus* (Paris 1547).

German

- [780.] H. Gasse (tr.), *Heliodorus Emesenus, Aithiopica* (Karlsruhe 1985).
 [781.] R. Reymer (tr.), *Heliodor: Aithiopika with an afterword by O. Weinreich* (Zurich 1950).

Spanish

- [782.] E. Crespo Güemes (tr.) & C. Ruiz Montero (rev.) *Las Etiópicas o Teágenes y Cariclea* (Madrid 1979).
[783.] F.D. Mena (tr.), *Heliodorus: Historia etiopica* (Madrid 1954).

Danish

- [784.] E. Harsberg (tr.) & T. Hägg (ed.), *Heliodorus Emesenus: Fortællingen om Theagenes og Charikleia—Aithiopica* (Copenhagen 1978).

Slovenian

- [785.] P. Simoniti (tr.), *Heliodorus Emesenus: Aethiopica* (Ljubljana 1977).

COMMENTARIES ON THE ETHIOPIAN STORY

- [786.] J. Birchall, *A Commentary on Book 1 of Heliodorus' Aithiopika* (Diss. London 1996).
[787.] D. Koraes (ed.), Ἡλιοδώρου Αἰθιοπικῶν βιβλία δέκα (Paris 1804-1806).
[788.] J.R. Morgan, *A Commentary on the Ninth and Tenth Books of the Aithiopika of Heliodorus* (Diss. Oxford 1979).

MANUSCRIPTS AND EDITIONS

- [789.] H.A. Dörrie, *De Longi, Achillis Tati, Heliodori memoria: Dissertatio inauguralis* (Göttingen 1935).
[790.] O. Mazal, 'Die Textausgaben der *Aithiopika* des Heliodors von Emesa', *Guttenburg-Jahrbuch* (1966) 182-191.
[791.] R.M. Rattenbury, 'The Manuscripts and Editions of Heliodorus', *CQ* 19 (1925) 177-181.
[792.] R.M. Rattenbury, 'Two More Manuscripts of Heliodorus', *CQ* 20 (1926) 36-40.
[793.] L.D. Reynolds & N.G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (Oxford 1974²).
[794.] G.N. Sandy, 'Jacques Amyot and the Manuscript Tradition of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', *Revue d'Histoire des Textes* 14-15 (1984-1985) 1-22.

Textual Criticism

- [795.] G. Anderson, 'Two notes on Heliodorus', *JHS* 99 (1979) 149.
[796.] W.G. Arnott, 'Three Conjectures', *Philologus* 109 (1965) 308-309.
[797.] Q. Cataudella, 'Un' aporia in Eliodoro iv.4.3' in *Scritti in onore di Cleto Carbonara* (Napoli 1976) 157-161.
[798.] A. Colonna, 'Per una edizione critica delle *Etiopiche* di Eliodoro', *Rendiconti della R. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* 7 (1931) 285-301.
[799.] A. Colonna, 'Su un nuovo epigramma al romanzo di Eliodoro', *BPEC* ns 4 (1956) 25-27.
[800.] A. Colonna, 'Note critiche al testo di Eliodoro', *Atti della academia della scienza di Torino* 116 (1982) 37-43.
[801.] A. Colonna, 'La variatio in Eliodoro', *Paideia* 42 (1987) 224-225.
[802.] F. Conca, 'Scribi e lettori dei romanzi tardoantichi' in *Metodologie della ricerca sulla tarda antichità*, ed. A. Garzya (Naples 1991) 223-246.

- [803.] J. Jackson, 'The Greek Novelists', *CQ* 29 (1935) 52-57.
 [804.] D.A. van Krevelen, 'Bemerkungen zu Heliodor', *Philologus* 105 (1961) 157-160.
 [805.] D.N. Levin, 'Two notes on Heliodorus', *LCM* 13 (1988) 64.
 [806.] D.N. Levin, 'Dormitant commentatores Heliodori', *LCM* 15 (1990) 29.
 [807.] A.M. Masturini, 'Eliodoro *Etiopiche* 2.30', *Sileno* 16 (1990) 221-225.
 [808.] R. Merkelbach, 'Kritische Beitrage' in H. Dahlmann and R. Merkelbach (edd.), *Studien zur Textgeschichte und Textkritik* (Cologne and Opladen 1959) 155-184.
 [809.] J.R. Morgan, 'Noctes Aethiopicae: Notes on the Text of Heliodorus' *Aithiopika* 9-10', *Philologus* 127 (1983) 87-111.
 [810.] J.R. Morgan, 'Two Giraffes Emended', *CQ* ns 38 (1988) 267-269.
 [811.] J.N. O'Sullivan, 'On Heliodorus *Aethiopica* 7.12.6', *CQ* 27 (1977) 239-240.
 [812.] R.M. Rattenbury, 'ἩΛΙΟΔΩΡΟΥ', *CR* (1938) 114-115.
 [813.] M.D. Reeve, 'Notes on Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', *CQ* ns 18 (1968) 282-287.
 [814.] H. Richards, 'Notes on the *Erotici Graeci*', *CR* 20 (1906) 109-113.
 [815.] P.J. Sijpesteijn, 'Heliodorus, *Aethiopica* IX 22,3', *Mnemosyne* 43 (1990) 156-157.
 [816.] C.A. Trypannis, 'The Budé Heliodorus', *CR* 60 (1946) 109-110.
 [817.] M.L. West, 'Ringing Welkins', *CQ* ns 40 (1990) 286-287.

Editions (listed by date)

- [818.] A. Colonna (ed. & tr.), *Le Etiopiche di Eliodoro* (Turin 1987).
 [819.] A. Colonna (ed.), *Heliodori Aethiopica* (Rome 1938). Contains a useful appendix of testimonia.
 [820.] R. M. Rattenbury, T. W. Lumb (edd.) & J. Maillon (tr.), *Heliodore: Les Éthiopiennes (Theagene et Chariclée) 3 Vols.* (Paris 1935-1943).
 [821.] G.A. Hirschig (ed.), *Erotici Scriptores: Achilles Tatius, Chariton, Longus, Heliodorus and Xenophon of Ephesus* (Paris 1856).
 [822.] I. Bekker (ed.), *Heliodori Aethiopicorum libri decem* (Leipzig 1855).
 [823.] C. G. Mitscherlich (ed.), *Heliodori Aethiopica Graece et Latine* (Biponti argentorali 1794).
 [824.] J. P. Schmidius (ed.), 'Ἡλιοδώρου Αἰθιοπικῶν βιβλία δέκα (Leipzig 1772).
 [825.] D. Pareus (ed.), *Heliodori Aethiopicorum libri decem* (Frankfurt 1631).
 [826.] J. Bourdelotius (ed.), 'Ἡλιοδώρου Αἰθιοπικῶν βιβλία δέκα (Paris 1619).
 [827.] H. Commelinus (ed.), *Heliodori Aethiopicorum Libri X* (Heidelberg 1596).
 [828.] V. Obsopoeus (ed.), *Heliodori Historiae Aethiopicae Libri Decem* (Basel 1534).

ALPHABETIC LIST OF AUTHORS

- Abel (1881) [356]
Alföldi (1948) [25]
Allen (1907) [603]
Altheim (1942) [62]
Altheim (1948-50) [171]
Altheim (1951) [194]
Altheim (1957) [108]
Aly (1929) [744]
Amandry (1950) [495]
Amory (1966) [550]
Amundsen (1974) [654]
Amyot (1547) [779]
Anderson (1976) [172]
Anderson (1979) [795]
Anderson (1982) [195]
Anderson (1984) [196]
Anderson (1986) [173]
Anderson (1993a) [120]
Anderson (1993b) [174]
Ano (1752) [774]
Ano (1843) [402]
Arieti (1991) [618]
Arnott (1965a) [749]
Arnott (1965b) [796]
Arnott (1974) [175]
Arnott (1982) [301]
Asmus (1909) [642]
Asmus (1910) [643]
Aune (1980) [89]
Aune (1988) [289]
Avigad & Yadin (1956) [357]
Aygon (1994) [147]
Bakhtin (1978) [131]
Bakhtin (1981) [132]
Balinski (1992) [453]
Barb (1953) [91]
Barb (1963) [90]
Barber (1962) [750]
Barns (1956) [258]
Barton (1994) [50]
Barton (1994) [51]
Bartsch (1989) [482]
Barwick (1928) [306]
Baslez (1990) [277]
Bataille (1927) [701]
Baumgarten (1932) [751]
Beall (1993) [483]
Beare (1968) [542]
Becker (1995) [148]
Bekker (1855) [822]
Benner & Fobes (1949) [358]
Bérard (1902) [604]
Berger (1984) [454]
Berger (1988) [455]
Berglund (1975) [67]
Berzina (1977) [420]
Betz (1986) [391]
Bevilacqua (1990) [602]
Bickerman (1965) [128]
Bidez (1963-1964) [359]
Bieber (1961) [543]
Billault (1981) [673]
Billault (1987a) [456]
Billault (1987b) [690]
Billault (1990) [149]
Billault (1991) [197]
Birchall (1996a) [307]
Birchall (1996b) [786]
Björck (1946) [551]
Blockley (1985) [360]
Blum (1936) [552]
Boehlich (1956) [457]
Boileau and Thomas (1961) [702]
Boissonade (1806) [361]
Bonner (1921) [92]
Bonner (1932) [93]
Bonner (1950) [94]
Bouché-Leclerq (1899) [52]
Bourdelotius (1619) [826]
Bousset (1915) [53]
Bowersock (1969) [176]
Bowersock (1974) [177]
Bowersock (1982) [26]
Bowersock (1984) [674]
Bowersock (1994) [729]
Bowie & Harrison (1993) [1]
Bowie (1955) [588]
Bowie (1970) [178]
Bowie (1978) [121]
Bowie (1982) [179]
Bowie (1985) [198]
Bowie (1989) [180]
Bowie (1994a) [181]
Bowie (1994b) [351]
Boylan (1986) [332]
Bradbury (1995) [115]
Braun (1934) [199]
Braun (1938) [200]
Brellich (1966) [553]
Bremer (1981) [317]
Brenk (1986) [54]
Brillante (1991) [554]
Brioso Sánchez (1986) [598]
Briquel-Chatonnet (1987) [278]
Brock (1985) [122]
Brown (1970) [55]
Brown (1971a) [123]
Brown (1971b) [27]
Brown (1988) [333]
Brown (1992) [308]
Browning (1955) [458]
Bryant (1949) [68]
Bucher (1989) [435]
Bühler (1976) [703]
Bürger (1892) [201]
Burkert (1983) [40]
Burkert (1985) [39]
Burstein (1981) [421]
Burstein (1984) [422]
Cameron (1932) [576]
Cameron (1970) [158]
Cameron (1991) [28]
Cameron (1993) [29]
Cameron (1993) [318]
Cancik (1976) [334]
Capelle (1953) [589]
Carson (1986) [335]
Cascardi (1991) [459]
Cataudella (1956) [362]
Cataudella (1958) [8]
Cataudella (1975) [290]
Cataudella (1976) [797]
Caudelier (1988) [752]
Caudelier (1987) [436]
Chalk (1962) [753]
Chassang (1859) [259]
Chuvin (1991²) [730]
Cizek (1974) [202]
Clark (1993) [34]
Clarke (1981) [605]
Clope (1995) [35]
Cobet (1857) [754]
Collinet (1988) [460]
Colonna (1931) [798]
Colonna (1938) [819]
Colonna (1950) [731]
Colonna (1951) [732]
Colonna (1956) [799]
Colonna (1960) [644]

- Colonna (1967) [496]
 Colonna (1981) [446]
 Colonna (1982) [755]
 Colonna (1982) [800]
 Colonna (1986) [756]
 Colonna (1987a) [801]
 Colonna (1987b) [818]
 Commelinus (1596) [827]
 Comotti (1989) [666]
 Conca (1981) [253]
 Conca (1983) [363]
 Conca (1991) [802]
 Conde Guerri (forthcoming) [406]
 Contenau (1947) [95]
 Conti Rossini (1919-1920) [443]
 Cook (1985) [619]
 Coulter (1976) [645]
 Crawford (1957) [704]
 Crespo Güemes & Ruiz Montero (1979) [782]
 Cumont (1911) [42]
 Cumont (1922) [109]
 Cumont (1949) [41]
 Cumont (1956) [110]
 Curtius (1855) [606]
 D' Thompson (1936) [494]
 Davies (1969) [392]
 Dawson (1992) [159]
 de Heusch (1985) [69]
 de Lannoy (1977) [378]
 de Lannoy (1981) [319]
 de Vries (1963) [241]
 de Vries (1969) [620]
 DeForest (1993) [705]
 Defradas (1954) [497]
 Dekker (1965) [607]
 Delcourt (1981) [498]
 Deonna (1965) [706]
 Derrett (1959-1961) [182]
 Detienne (1963) [56]
 Dickie (1991) [707]
 Dickison (1973) [36]
 Diehl (1938) [745]
 Dihle (1994) [183]
 Dilke (1969) [544]
 Dilke (1980) [663]
 Dillon (1977) [622]
 Dillon (1994) [621]
 Dionisopoulos-Mass (1976) [708]
 Diringer (1948) [17]
 Dobson (1927) [655]
 Dodds (1945) [623]
 Dodds (1951) [43]
 Dodds (1965) [111]
 Dolger (1911) [746]
 Dörrie (1935) [789]
 Dörrie (1938) [291]
 Doshi (1985) [9]
 Drucker (1995) [18]
 Dubel (1990) [484]
 Dunlop (1876) [133]
 Durham (1938) [245]
 Dyck (1986) [364]
 Dzielska (1986) [124]
 Dzielska (1995) [37]
 Eagleton (1983) [134]
 Edwards (1987) [292]
 Edwards (1988a) [646]
 Edwards (1988b) [647]
 Edwards (1992) [293]
 Effe (1975) [298]
 Effe (1987) [325]
 Egger (1988) [326]
 Egger (1994) [246]
 Eide, Hägg, Pierce & Török (1994-1996) [365]
 Elderkin (1941) [499]
 Elsom (1992) [336]
 Eltester (1927) [86]
 Elworthy (1895) [709]
 Emilsson (1988) [648]
 Engels (1980) [577]
 Engemann (1975) [710]
 Evans (1922) [96]
 Evans (1941) [656]
 Evans-Pritchard (1937) [97]
 Faraone (1990) [675]
 Faraone and Obbink (1991) [98]
 Farnell (1907) [500]
 Fauth (1989) [403]
 Fehrlé (1910) [337]
 Ferguson (1980) [116]
 Ferrari (1987) [624]
 Ferrini (1990) [254]
 Festugière (1975) [366]
 Feuillâtre (1966) [404]
 Fletcher (1970) [160]
 Foerster (1893) [367]
 Foerster (1903-1908) [368]
 Fontenrose (1959) [501]
 Fontenrose (1960) [502]
 Fontenrose (1968) [527]
 Fontenrose (1978) [503]
 Fontenrose (1988) [504]
 Forcione (1972) [461]
 Foucault (1986) [338]
 Fowden (1982) [125]
 Fowden (1986) [44]
 Fowler (1989) [485]
 Fowler (1991) [150]
 Fraenkel (1963) [747]
 Francis (1995) [126]
 Fraunce (1591) [777]
 Fritsch (1901-1902) [757]
 Fuchs (1993) [135]
 Furiani (1984) [667]
 Furiani (1989) [327]
 Furiani (1990) [255]
 Furley (1993) [320]
 Fusillo (1988) [299]
 Fusillo (1989) [205]
 Fusillo (1990) [206]
 Futre Pinheiro (1981-2) [758]
 Futre Pinheiro (1987) [692]
 Futre Pinheiro (1989) [279]
 Futre Pinheiro (1991a) [405]
 Futre Pinheiro (1991b) [693]
 Futre Pinheiro (1992) [447]
 Futre Pinheiro (forthcomingA) [401]
 Futre Pinheiro (forthcomingB) [691]
 Gabert (1974) [590]
 Garcia Galiano (1989) [462]
 Gardiner (1930) [528]
 Gardiner (1961) [676]
 Garland (1985) [578]
 Garland (1995) [579]
 Garson (1975) [591]
 Gärtner (1969) [463]
 Gasse (1985) [780]
 Geffcken (1927) [151]
 Geffcken (1930) [57]
 Geffcken (1978) [113]
 Gerber (1978) [339]
 Geyer (1977) [284]
 Giangrande (1962) [260]
 Giannini (1963) [322]
 Giannini (1964) [323]
 Giannini (1965) [369]
 Gifford (1958) [711]
 Gilbert (1939) [608]
 Glava (1937) [423]
 Goethals (1959) [424]
 Golden (1990) [580]
 Goldhill (1995) [340]
 Goodenough (1964) [129]
 Goold (1995) [370]
 Goossens (1939) [677]
 Grainger (1990) [30]
 Greenberg (1963) [19]
 Griffith (1912) [20]
 Grimal (1958) [372]
 Griswold (1986) [625]

- Grottanelli (1987) [262]
 Guthrie (1976) [626]
 Gwyn Griffiths (1975) [45]
 Hadas (1957) [771]
 Hägg (1971) [300]
 Hägg (1983) [207]
 Hägg (1984) [425]
 Hägg (1987) [263]
 Hägg (1988) [264]
 Haight (1936) [208]
 Haight (1945) [209]
 Haight (1953) [2]
 Halperin (1986) [627]
 Halperin (1990) [341]
 Hani (1978) [432]
 Hanson (1980) [555]
 Harmon (1913) [373]
 Harris (1926) [70]
 Harris (1964) [529]
 Harris (1972) [530]
 Harris (1982) [581]
 Harsberg (1978) [784]
 Hatto (1965) [309]
 Hefti (1950) [694]
 Heiserman (1977) [210]
 Helm (1956) [211]
 Henrichs (1972) [247]
 Henrichs (1981) [117]
 Henry & Schwyzer (1951) [375]
 Henry (1959-1977) [374]
 Hercher (1869) [376]
 Herschbell (1991) [393]
 Higbie (1995) [609]
 Hight (1967) [464]
 Hiller von Gaertringen (1901) [505]
 Hinks (1939) [486]
 Hintze (1955) [21]
 Hirschig (1856) [821]
 Hock (1988) [294]
 Hocke (1957) [465]
 Hocke (1959) [466]
 Hoistad (1951) [161]
 Holland (1933) [506]
 Holzberg (1995) [212]
 Hopes (1962) [572]
 Hopkins (1983) [582]
 Houston (1947²) [573]
 Hrdlička (1926) [71]
 Hubeau and Leroy (1939) [678]
 Huetius (1682) [265]
 Hull (1974) [99]
 Hundt (1934) [556]
 Hunter (1983) [248]
 Immisch (1929) [136]
 Jackson (1935) [803]
 Jahn (1855) [712]
 Jax (1933) [342]
 Jax (1936) [310]
 Johne (1987) [433]
 Johne (1988) [328]
 Johne (1989a) [213]
 Johne (1989b) [3]
 Jones (1986) [185]
 Jones (1996) [73]
 Jüthner (1909) [531]
 Jüthner (1928) [532]
 Jüthner (1965) [533]
 Kahn (1912) [664]
 Karttunen (1989) [10]
 Kee (1983) [100]
 Kee (1986) [101]
 Keeler (1964) [72]
 Kennedy (1983) [295]
 Kerényi (1962²) [285]
 Kerényi (1971) [214]
 Kerényi (1976) [58]
 Kessels (1978) [557]
 Kestner (1973-1974) [152]
 Keydell (1966) [733]
 Keyes (1922) [592]
 Kindstrand (1973) [186]
 Klein (1937) [377]
 Knatz (1893) [679]
 Knoles (1981) [311]
 Koenen (1985) [558]
 Konstan (1987) [343]
 Konstan (1990) [344]
 Konstan (1994) [345]
 Koras (1804-1806) [787]
 Kovendi (1966a) [649]
 Kovendi (1966b) [407]
 Kovendi (1966c) [64]
 Kowarna (1959) [437]
 Kranz (1961) [748]
 Kromberg & Jenkins (1982) [75]
 Kromberg & Jenkins (1984) [76]
 Kuch (1989a) [266]
 Kuch (1989b) [267]
 Kuch (1989c) [280]
 Kudlien (1989) [583]
 Kyle (1987) [534]
 Kytzler (1983) [7]
 Kytzler (1988) [215]
 L Griffith (1900) [261]
 L Griffith (1913) [371]
 Lacan (1979) [713]
 Lacombrade (1970) [734]
 Lacombrade (1980-1982) [467]
 Lamb (1961) [770]
 Lambertson (1983) [394]
 Lambertson (1986) [611]
 Lambertson (1992) [610]
 Lane Fox (1986) [112]
 Laplace (1992) [408]
 Latte (1940) [507]
 Lattimore (1942) [312]
 Lavagnini (1922) [268]
 Lavagnini (1950) [216]
 Lavagnini (1974) [414]
 Lawler (1964) [545]
 Lawrence (1838³) [379]
 Lefkowitz (1991) [329]
 Lehmann-Hartleben (1941) [487]
 Lerat (1934-1935) [380]
 Leroy-Molinghen (1985) [612]
 Lesky (1940) [488]
 Lesky (1951) [187]
 Lesky (1959) [11]
 Létoublon (1990) [593]
 Létoublon (1993) [217]
 Létoublon (1994) [218]
 Létoublon (1995) [313]
 Levin (1977) [352]
 Levin (1988) [805]
 Levin (1990) [806]
 Levin (1992) [448]
 Lexa (1925) [102]
 Lightfoot (1988) [735]
 Limberis (1991) [714]
 Lippman (1964) [668]
 Lisle (1638) [776]
 Liviabella (1979) [449]
 Loenertz (1959-1960) [759]
 Lonie (1964) [657]
 Lonis (1987) [426]
 Lonsdale (1993) [546]
 Losfeld (1991) [574]
 Luck (1985) [103]
 Lynch (1985) [468]
 Lynch (1986) [469]
 Lyne (1994) [137]
 Maas and Snyder (1989) [669]
 MacAlister (1994) [470]
 MacAlister (1996) [219]
 Macleod (1967) [381]
 Macleod (1974) [382]
 MacMullen (1981) [114]
 MacQueen (1970) [162]
 Madsen (1995) [138]
 Maehler (1990) [658]
 Magnus (1922) [77]
 Maloney (1976) [715]
 Manganyi, Kromberg & Jenkins

- (1974) [74]
 Maróth (1979) [736]
 Martroye (1930) [104]
 Masturini (1990) [807]
 Maurice (1927) [105]
 Mayor (1886a) [760]
 Mayor (1886b) [761]
 Mazal (1954) [762]
 Mazal (1958) [763]
 Mazal (1962-1963; 1964; 1965) [4]
 Mazal (1966) [790]
 Mcleod (1969) [659]
 Meier (1966) [560]
 Meillier (1986) [450]
 Mena (1954) [783]
 Merkelbach (1957) [594]
 Merkelbach (1959) [808]
 Merkelbach (1962) [286]
 Mesk (1913) [660]
 Mesk (1932) [661]
 Mesk (1939) [662]
 Messer (1918) [561]
 Michaelides (1978) [670]
 Millar (1993) [31]
 Mitscherlich (1794) [823]
 Mittelstadt (1967) [153]
 Montague (1992) [330]
 Morgan (1977) [438]
 Morgan (1979) [788]
 Morgan (1982) [439]
 Morgan (1983) [809]
 Morgan (1988) [810]
 Morgan (1989a) [695]
 Morgan (1989b) [696]
 Morgan (1989c) [769]
 Morgan (1990) [535]
 Morgan (1991) [409]
 Morgan (1993) [281]
 Morgan (1994) [697]
 Mortley (1992) [628]
 Mosino (1979-1980) [415]
 Most (1989) [220]
 Mullen (1982) [547]
 Münscher (1912) [410]
 Murphy (1945) [87]
 Musurillo (1954) [383]
 Musurillo (1972) [384]
 Naber (1873) [427]
 Nauck (1886) [385]
 Nawratil (1959) [764]
 Neimke (1889) [595]
 Nilsson (1940) [46]
 Nilsson (1949²) [47]
 Nilsson (1971) [48]
 Nock (1942) [49]
 Nolting-Hauff (1974) [139]
 Norden (1958) [584]
 Norman (1909) [386]
 Nussbaum (1986) [629]
 Nuttall (1992) [140]
 Nutton (1978) [387]
 O'Meara (1995) [650]
 O'Sullivan (1977) [811]
 Oberhelman (1993) [562]
 Obsopoeus (1534) [828]
 Oeftering (1901) [471]
 Olivová (1984) [536]
 Onians (1979) [489]
 Oppé (1904) [508]
 Oppenheim (1956) [564]
 Orlandini (1993) [269]
 Osborne (1994) [630]
 Owen (1931) [59]
 Pack (1955) [565]
 Pack (1963) [388]
 Palm (1967) [154]
 Pareus (1631) [825]
 Parke (1939) [509]
 Parke (1940) [510]
 Parke (1967) [511]
 Parke and Wormell (1966) [512]
 Parker (1985) [513]
 Patterson (1982) [631]
 Paulsen (1992) [548]
 Peake (1884) [716]
 Pearson, Nettleship, & Usher (1911-1913) [78]
 Peeters (1920) [127]
 Penwill (1978) [302]
 Pepe (1959) [221]
 Pépin (1958) [163]
 Pépin (1976) [680]
 Perkins (1994) [296]
 Pernot (1987) [434]
 Perret (1946) [514]
 Perry (1955) [188]
 Perry (1967) [270]
 Pervo (1994) [297]
 Petersen (1904) [681]
 Phillimore (1912) [222]
 Phillips (1968) [682]
 Phinney (1971) [683]
 Picard (1930) [575]
 Pollard (1977) [493]
 Pollitt (1986) [490]
 Pomeroy (1983) [585]
 Pouilloux (1983) [515]
 Pouilloux (1984) [516]
 Poulsen (1920) [517]
 Preisendanz (1935) [106]
 Preisendanz (1950) [107]
 Preisendanz (1973-1974) [389]
 Price (1985) [518]
 Price (1989) [632]
 Pritchard (1969) [395]
 Prosch (1956) [472]
 Puiggali (1981) [60]
 Puiggali (1984) [765]
 Rabau (1994) [473]
 Radke (1936) [130]
 Ragussis (1986) [141]
 Rakoczy (1996) [717]
 Rallo Grus (1983) [474]
 Rank (1951) [614]
 Rankin (1962) [566]
 Rankin (1964) [567]
 Raschke (1988) [537]
 Rattenbury (1925) [791]
 Rattenbury (1926a) [346]
 Rattenbury (1926b) [737]
 Rattenbury (1926c) [792]
 Rattenbury (1935-1943) [820]
 Rattenbury (1938) [812]
 Rattenbury (1942) [440]
 Reardon (1969) [223]
 Reardon (1971) [189]
 Reardon (1974) [190]
 Reardon (1975) [224]
 Reardon (1976) [225]
 Reardon (1977) [226]
 Reardon (1988) [227]
 Reardon (1989) [6]
 Reardon (1991) [228]
 Reardon (1994) [249]
 Redford (1967) [586]
 Reeve (1968) [813]
 Reeve (1971) [353]
 Reeve (1989) [665]
 Rehm (1994) [314]
 Reitzenstein (1906) [271]
 Reyhl (1969) [191]
 Reymer (1950) [781]
 Reynolds & Wilson (1974²) [793]
 Richards (1906) [814]
 Richter (1993) [684]
 Robert (1939) [519]
 Robert (1982) [520]
 Robertson (1959) [491]
 Robiano (1983) [451]
 Robiano (1992) [441]
 Rocca (1976) [596]
 Rogier (1982) [442]
 Rohde (1914³) [272]
 Rollinson (1981) [164]
 Romberg (1962) [142]

- Romm (1992) [12]
 Rommel (1923) [324]
 Roncali (1978) [597]
 Ronnet (1995) [452]
 Rosalie (1980) [65]
 Rosenmeyer (1994) [303]
 Rougemont (1987) [521]
 Rouselle (1988) [347]
 Rousset (1981) [718]
 Roux (1976) [522]
 Roux (1979) [523]
 Rühle (1925) [66]
 Ruiz Montero (1981) [143]
 Russell & Wilson (1981) [396]
 Russell (1990a) [192]
 Russell (1990b) [321]
 Russo (1982) [568]
 Saïd (1987) [256]
 Sandy (1974) [5]
 Sandy (1979a) [229]
 Sandy (1979b) [475]
 Sandy (1982a) [411]
 Sandy (1982b) [416]
 Sandy (1982c) [476]
 Sandy (1984-1985) [794]
 Sansone (1988) [538]
 Santas (1982) [633]
 Säve-Söderbergh (1946) [13]
 Scarcella (1972) [444]
 Scarcella (1976) [445]
 Scarcella (1981) [230]
 Scarcella (1989) [348]
 Scarcella (1990) [282]
 Scarcella (1985) [599]
 Schaff & Wace (1979) [397]
 Schauenburg (1960) [685]
 Schissel von Fleschenberg (1913a) [203]
 Schissel von Fleschenberg (1913b) [204]
 Schlam (1977) [417]
 Schlesier (1991) [719]
 Schlunk (1993) [398]
 Schmidius (1772) [824]
 Schmid (1887-1896) [766]
 Schmidt (1913) [720]
 Schneider (1976) [477]
 Schröder (1927) [539]
 Schwartz (1896) [231]
 Schwartz (1967) [232]
 Scobie (1969) [233]
 Scobie (1973) [234]
 Sebestyén (1993) [79]
 Sedlar (1980) [14]
 Selden (1994) [144]
 Seligmann (1910) [721]
 Senner (1989) [22]
 Sijpesteijn (1990) [815]
 Simon (1986) [686]
 Simon (1995) [155]
 Simoniti (1977) [785]
 Singer (1991) [651]
 Sinko (1940-46) [738]
 Sissa (1990) [349]
 Sittl (1890) [315]
 Smith (1855) [773]
 Smith (1978) [61]
 Smith (1985) [634]
 Snowden (1970) [15]
 Snowden (1983) [16]
 Sorsby (1974) [80]
 Sourvinou-Inwood (1991) [38]
 Spooner (1976) [722]
 Stanley (1993) [156]
 Stannus (1913) [81]
 Stark (1989a) [235]
 Stark (1989b) [287]
 Stechow (1953) [492]
 Stephens & Winkler (1995) [236]
 Stephens (1994) [354]
 Stephens (1994) [478]
 Stewart (1905) [635]
 Stoneman (1992) [32]
 Stoneman (1994) [250]
 Stout (1946) [82]
 Stowers (1986) [304]
 Straub (1976) [739]
 Strömberg (1946) [652]
 Stump (1983) [479]
 Swain (1994) [193]
 Swain (1996) [740]
 Sweet (1987) [540]
 Szastynska-Siemionowa (1965) [237]
 Szepessy (1957) [412]
 Szepessy (1972) [316]
 Szepessy (1975) [741]
 Szepessy (1976) [742]
 Szepessy (1978) [251]
 Szepessy (1981) [413]
 Szepessy (1985-1988) [238]
 T Sinko (1906) [615]
 Tait (1994) [273]
 Tarán (1992) [418]
 Tarrant (1951) [636]
 Tate (1687) [775]
 Tate (1927) [165]
 Tate (1929) [166]
 Tate (1929-1930) [167]
 Tate (1933) [168]
 Tate (1934) [169]
 Temkin (1991) [399]
 Théodorides (1989) [687]
 Thesleff (1985) [616]
 Thesleff (1994) [637]
 Thompson (1955-1958) [145]
 Thomsen (1992) [723]
 Thorlacius (1823) [428]
 Thorlacius (1825) [429]
 Thurston (1987) [146]
 Todd (1940) [239]
 Török (1988) [430]
 Trapp (1990) [638]
 Tremearne (1913) [83]
 Trenkner (1958) [240]
 Treu (1989a) [283]
 Treu (1989b) [355]
 Trigger (1966) [23]
 Trypannis (1946) [816]
 Tsagarakis (1980) [617]
 Turcan (1963) [288]
 Underdowne (1895) [778]
 Updegraff (1988) [431]
 Utter & Needham (1936) [480]
 van der Valk (1941) [743]
 van Groningen (1965) [184]
 van Krevelen (1961) [804]
 van Lieshout (1980) [559]
 van Ooteghem (1948) [563]
 Vlastos (1973) [639]
 Vlastos (1981) [640]
 von der Mühl (1952) [613]
 von der Mühl (1954) [600]
 von Domaszewski (1908) [63]
 Voss (1975) [88]
 Wafer (1699) [84]
 Walcot (1978) [724]
 Walden (1895) [549]
 Walker (1993a) [305]
 Walker (1993b) [725]
 Warszewiczki (1552) [768]
 Waszink (1941) [569]
 Watson (1988) [726]
 Watson (1994) [653]
 Wehrli (1965) [274]
 Weinreich (1962) [242]
 Weinstock (1934) [570]
 Weiss (1921) [587]
 Wernicke (1894) [688]
 West (1990) [817]
 West (1992) [671]
 Wetzel (1931) [571]
 White (1975) [400]
 White (1993) [641]
 Whitman (1987) [170]
 Whittaker (1965) [524]
 Whittle (1961) [601]

Wiechers (1961) [525]
Wiersma (1990) [331]
Wifstrand (1944-1945) [767]
Williamson (1986) [243]
Wills (1994) [275]
Wilson (1983) [419]
Winkler (1980) [252]
Winkler (1982) [698]
Winkler (1985) [244]
Winkler (1990) [350]

Winkler (1994) [276]
Winnefeld (1914) [33]
Winnington-Ingram (1936)
[672]
Wolff (1912) [481]
Woodbury (1979) [526]
Woods (1903) [727]
Woodward (1937) [689]
Woolf & Grant (1962) [85]
Woronoff (1987) [699]

Wright (1923) [772]
Wright (1962) [390]
Wypustek (1993) [118]
Yatromanolakis (1988) [728]
Yiannakis (1990) [541]
Young (1972) [119]
Zanetto (1990) [257]
Zanker (1981) [157]
Zembatova (1996) [700]
Zyhlarz (1930) [24]

INDEX

The following indexes are provided for convenience only and are not intended to be exhaustive.

abduction, 217
Achilles, 109, 111, 132, 156, 198, 199, 200, 214, 220
Achilles Tatius, 108, 247, 279
acolyte, 193, 197, 295
adultery, 15, 248, 251
Aenianes, 83
albinism (and moon cult), 21
albinism (and sun cult), 20
allegory, 25, 43, 46, 47, 115, 118, 164, 233, 258
amphiboly, 146
Amphictyons, 192
Andromeda, 11, 242, 247, 251
Antiochus, 220
Apollo, 28, 159, 275
Apollo (temple), 215
apples, 113
Apuleius, 289
Aristophanes, 139
Aristotle, 251, 257
Artemis, 28, 55, 114, 120, 126, 159, 197, 295
artistry, 125
assembly, 290
astrology, 182, 259, 268
Athenians (and story-telling), 93
Atticism, 57
basilisk, 151
black, 96
breastband, 117
Carthage, 279
celibacy, 31
Charikleia, 46, 113, 114, 116, 117, 126, 193, 213, 218,
221, 259, 266, 270
Charikles, 133, 138, 141, 176, 226, 230, 233, 276, 289
chastity, 16, 46, 140, 186, 253, 286, 287
child exposure, 15, 239
Christian concepts, 35
Christian martyrs, 36
Christian scriptures, 34
Christianity, 33, 34, 214, 234, 256, 257, 261, 284, 287
class, 112, 142, 260, 276

Clementine Recognitions, 184, 214
cosmopolitanism, 23
curiosity, 289
dancing, 98, 154, 282
Delphi, 23, 50, 54, 88, 89, 128, 133, 212, 268, 283
Delphic oracle, 210
description (of hero and heroine), 52
digressions, 170
Dionysus, 242
doctors, 220
Dogon creation myth, 20
dreams, 18, 48, 159, 187, 203, 276, 293
dress, 140, 281
Egypt, 169
Egyptian wisdom, 19, 30, 180
ekphrasis, 89, 117, 247
enigma, 166
ephebes, 105
Eros, 261, 289
Ethiopia, 46, 241, 248
Euripides, 95, 110, 120, 156, 173, 200, 204, 218
eye of envy, 17, 146
eyes, 18, 19, 135, 149, 150, 165, 224, 293
eyes (and religious taboo), 19
fate, 211, 251, 257, 272
fathers, 221
female beauty, 116
festival, 81
festivals, 128
fiction, 32
fidelity, 263
games (as a metaphor for love), 191
Gorgon, 111
Greece, 192
gymnosophists, 56
Hegesias, 294
Helios, 25, 56, 241
Hermes, 130
Herodotus, 257
Hesiod, 119

holy men, 82, 91, 213
 Homer, 5, 23, 29, 43, 47, 63, 74, 87, 89, 96, 97, 104,
 109, 111, 113, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124,
 125, 130, 131, 152, 161, 162, 167, 168, 169, 171,
 173, 174, 175, 192, 199, 200, 203, 205, 206, 207,
 208, 220, 247, 253, 277, 279, 290, 294
 Homer (miraculous birth), 172
 Homer (name), 173
 Homer (poetic quality of), 175
 homosexuality, 37
 hoplite race, 192, 195
 Hydaspes, 240
 hymns, 101
 illegitimacy, 17, 23, 30, 273
 imagination, 44
 indirect speech, 278
 infanticide, 15
 irony, 135, 188, 189, 276, 281
 Isis, 24, 47, 121, 253
 Julian, 32
 Kalasiris, 90, 176, 178, 184, 188, 208, 210, 211, 215,
 216, 219, 227, 230, 231, 233, 237, 259, 266, 277
 Kalasiris (as father), 87
 Kalasiris (reason for coming to Delphi), 183, 211, 231,
 267
 Kalisiris, 215
 Knemon, 87, 93, 129, 160, 161, 203, 237
 lament, 237, 285
 Lapiths and Centaurs, 109
 learned women of late antiquity, 114
 letters, 234
 locomotion, 161
 love (at first sight), 81
 love at first sight, 207
 lover (compared with inebriate), 155
 love-sickness, 259
 magic, 45, 151, 158, 182, 184, 213, 216, 225, 229, 250,
 255
 Mannerism, 45
 marriage, 17, 33, 137, 194, 217, 261, 276, 287
 marriage (arranged), 208, 217, 226
 marriage to death, 293
 maternal impression, 18, 250
 Memnon, 242
 messenger, 152
 metaliterary conceit, 234, 252
 metre, 102
 minor characters, 23
 money, 284
 music, 153
 names, 116, 200, 220, 237, 279
 narratology, 48, 92, 100, 127, 153, 158, 160, 177, 188,
 190, 206, 267
 narratology (foreshadowing), 182
 neoPlatonism, 25, 46, 56, 116, 142, 208, 285
 Nesaia, 107
 Nile, 47
 Odysseus, 115, 198, 275
 openings (conventional), 51
 openings (false), 49
 oracle, 139, 176, 208, 210, 275
 painting, 245
 palm, 193
 pantarb, 255
 pantarb stone, 45
 paradoxography, 247
 perception, 44, 106, 198, 289
 Perseus, 242, 247
 Persinna, 16, 235, 236, 268
phantasia, 18
 Philomela, 237, 253
 Philostratus, 7, 14, 27, 56, 74, 84, 90, 93, 94, 98, 100,
 102, 103, 106, 107, 109, 111, 113, 118, 126, 132,
 135, 160, 162, 171, 174, 185, 190, 192, 193, 195,
 196, 199, 207, 225, 243, 244, 245, 247, 255, 266,
 277, 284, 289
 Phoenicians, 276, 278
 Plato, 42, 52, 87, 112, 136, 137, 286
 pleonasm, 196
 plot, 48, 87, 190, 263
 plot (divine motivation), 218
 plot (divine motivation), 247, 275, 276, 280, 290
 plot (initiation), 231
 plot (movements), 230
 plot (time), 235
 prizes, 197
 proverbs, 88, 107, 141, 152, 153, 160
 pulse, 223
 Pyrrha, 105
 Pythian Games, 82, 83, 190, 192, 193, 197
 racial prejudice, 249
 readership, 124
 realism, 135, 236, 252
 recognition, 251
 religion, 138
 rhetoric, 86
 sacrifice, 97, 98, 157
 sacrifice (blood), 132
 Selene, 242
 sexuality, 16, 121, 123, 129, 206, 267, 289
 siege of Syene, 38
 silk, 280
 similes, 204
 skin colour (and prejudice), 249
 skin-colour, 249
 snakes, 119, 121, 122
 sophistry, 30
 Sophocles, 111, 200, 201
 spectators, 87, 105, 201
 statues, 166
 stones, 255
 structure, 81
 summer, 246
 symbol, 43
 symbolism, 194
 tears, 294
 Theagenes, 109, 111, 112, 186, 197, 203, 216
 theatre, 213, 291
 theatre imagery, 87
 thematic material, 226
 Theogenes, 196
 Thessaly, 83, 98, 107
 Thetis, 103
 Thisbe, 237

Thucydides, 88, 200
torch, 127, 194, 293
trade, 280
ululation, 131
virginity, 18, 55, 253, 261
white skin (as mark of beauty), 249

women, 295
women (as weaker sex), 294
word-play, 152, 201, 204, 216, 225, 276, 279
writing, 149, 232, 236, 259
Xenophon, 293, 296

GREEK INDEX

έορτή, 52
ένάργεια, 88
έναγισμός, 52, 84
έπίδοξος, 195
έπικραδαίνεσθαι, 96
άκονιτί, 196
άπρόσφυλον, 14
άπρόσμαχον, 285
αίνιττομαι, 199
Αύτοπτήσαι, 88
βαλβίς, 199
Βλοσυρός, 122
χαραδριός, 150
δαίμονες, 219
δαίμων, 290
δαιμονάιν, 227
δημώδης, 112
διαθέσεις, 94
δουριμανή, 104
δύναμις, 228
εϊκών, 43, 245
εϋμενέων, 105
φαντασία, 5, 88
γέρανος, 98

καλλίζωνοί, 97
καταβολή, 247
κειμήλιον, 254
κλύδων, 177
όμφαλός, 55
οί κρείττονες, 183
οίκονομία, 256
πάτερ, 87
πηκτίς, 281
πλάγιος, 99
προσαγγέλλειν, 291
θεολογία, 162
θεωρός, 92
σφριγώντες, 96
σιμοί, 97
ταινία, 210, 229
ταινίαν, 263
τελεσ-θησομένων, 95
τηνάλλως, 213
Τών μειζόνων, 219
τò κρείττον, 288
Τύχη, 211
ΰσπληξ, 201
ζώσμα, 95