CHAEREAS, HIPPOLYTUS, THESEUS: TRAGIC ECHOES, TRAGIC POTENTIAL IN CHARITON
Scourfield, J H D
Phoenix; Fall 2010; 64, 3/4; Literature Online
pg. 291

CHAEREAS, HIPPOLYTUS, THESEUS: TRAGIC ECHOES, TRAGIC POTENTIAL IN CHARITON

J. H. D. Scourfield

The affinities of Chariton's romantic fiction *Chaereas and Callirhoe*[1] with the ancient theatre have often been remarked. Two important scenes—the plot in the first book where one of the unsuccessful and aggrieved suitors of the beautiful Callirhoe schemes to dupe her husband Chaereas into believing that she has a lover, and the moment of high emotion in the law-court at Babylon, where Chaereas, whom Callirhoe had believed dead, suddenly appears to her, her new husband Dionysius, and the whole gathering, to general astonishment—are presented in explicitly theatrical terms.[2] At the same time, the history of criticism on this text has sought to emphasize its dramatic character. A century ago Richard Reitzenstein, building on associations between narrative and drama found in ancient rhetorical theory and elsewhere, offered an analysis of the work dividing it into five sections; the conception thus formed of *Chaereas and Callirhoe* as a kind of drama in five acts—a highly subjective way of looking at the text—was seized on by later scholars and developed further.[3] Reacting to this, but nonetheless thinking in the same kind of orbit, Bryan Reardon suggestively saw the work as structured around a series of *agones* between Chaereas and his several

This article has its roots in a series of papers given some years ago in different fora, beginning with the Colloquium on Aspects of Anger in Antiquity held at the University of Heidelberg in September 1999; thanks are due to Susanna Braund and Glenn Most for inviting me to take part in that event, and to all the participants for their contributions to the discussion. Later versions were presented at the Dublin Classics Seminar in October 1999, and at the Third International Conference on the Ancient Novel (ICAN 2000) held in Groningen in July 2000; the constructive observations of Catherine Connors and Saundra Schwartz on the latter occasion were especially helpful. I am also grateful to Douglas Cairns and John R. Morgan for valuable comments on a near-final draft of the developed article; the anonymous referees for various good suggestions; and especially Monica Gale, who discussed with me many individual points and helped to shape my thinking on intertextuality.

[1] I retain what might be called the received title, against the recent tendency to prefer the shorter *Callirhoe*; the case for the latter as more accurately reflecting the original title is strong, but the issue is not as simple or settled as is often supposed. For argument in favour of *Callirhoe* see, for example, Plepelits 1976: 28–29, Reardon 1996: 315–316; for full discussion of the (problematic) evidence concerning the titles of all the Greek novels, with generic implications, see Whitmarsh 2005. Tilg 2010, an important book which interestingly proposes the title *Narratives about Callirhoe* (see esp. 214–217), appeared too late for me to be able to take full account of it in this article.

[2] See *Chaereas and Callirhoe* (*C&C*) 1.4.1–3, 8–9; 5.8.2; also, for example, 4.4.2, 6.3.6.

[3] Reitzenstein 1906: 95–96 (with background from 84), followed notably by Perry (1967: 141–142), and Schmeling (1974, esp. 49, 80–81); the perceived dramatic character of the work is particularly prominent in Schmeling's analysis. For criticism of Reitzenstein and Perry, see esp. Müller 1976: 118–121.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

rivals.[4] Again, the high proportion of direct speech in the text has seemed to some a dramatic feature—though this could equally (or better) be associated with its epic quality, or even its affinities with historiography.[5]

More valuable for interpretation have been those approaches which have sought to establish firm and clear connections with dramatic genres. New Comedy in particular has been seen as one of the formative influences on *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and indeed the Greek novel generally.[6] Euripidean "melodrama" or "tragicomedy" is frequently invoked similarly,[7] but this apart, tragedy has tended to be regarded as a genre of relatively minor significance in the multiplicity of generic models lying behind the novel.[8] This is not altogether surprising: as a whole, and with regard especially to the way in which they conclude—the "happy end"—the extant Greek novels are far from tragic as the *Agamemnon* or the *Antigone* or the *Bacchae* are tragic, and, as far as Chariton's novel is concerned, it is hard to argue with the judgement of Massimo Fusillo that it has a "strong consolatory character"—which, for Fusillo, means "on the thematic level, an absence of tragic conflicts, of problematic ambiguities and ideological depths, and a concentration on private values and erotic passions, destined to an optimistic triumph."[9] It may be, however, that this essential rejection of tragic influence in favour of the much more apparent influence of comedy has resulted in the eliding of, or the straightforward failure to notice, intertextual relations between passages in the Greek novels and tragedy of the "tragic" type.[10] In this article I argue for the presence of a tragic intertext in two scenes in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, one

[4] Reardon 1982: 8–11 (= Swain 1999a: 169–172).

[5] Hägg (1971: 91) reckons the proportion of direct speech in *C&C* at 44 per cent; for this as a dramatic feature, see, for example, Goold 1995: 13; Holzberg 2001: 66. For the epic character of the work, see esp. Müller 1976: 126–136; Hirschberger 2001; Scourfield 2003: 166–168, 172–175; and for its connections with historiography, esp. Bartsch 1934 (20–25 on speeches); Papanikolaou 1973: 16–22; J. R. Morgan 1993: 205–208; Hunter 1994; Smith 2007: 153–163, 172–192.

[6] See notably Corbato 1968; Borgogno 1971; Fusillo 1989: 43–55; Mason 2002; interesting observations are also made by Lowe (2000: 223–226).

[7] The play most commonly cited in this connection is Euripides' *Helen*. See, for example, (for the Greek novel in general) Fusillo 1989: 33–34; Reardon 1991: 130–132; (for *C&C* in particular) Marini 1993; Hirschberger 2001: 166–167, 175–176.

[8] See, however, Billault 1998 for a useful survey of points of contact between tragedy and the novel.

[9] Fusillo 1997: 215.

[10] For a recent exception, see Liapis 2006, on a passage in Achilles Tatius. In *C&C*, a few connections only have been observed. Traces of Euripides' *Medea* may be seen in Callirhoe's reference to Medea at 2.9.3–4: see Kaimio (1996: 56), who also notes a situational parallel with the *Hippolytus*, for which see below, 305, n. 65; Hirschberger 2001: 178 (though over-reading on the basis of an unlikely and unacknowledged conjecture; a possible further allusion to the play is identified at 179); Scourfield 2003: 178 with n. 68; Smith 2007: 111–116. Echoes of Soph. *Aj.* 550–553 have been detected at 2.9.4, 3.8.8, and 5.10.3: see Papanikolaou 1973: 16; Gerschmann 1974: 57; Hirschberger 2001: 179 (who also [180], less persuasively, perceives a reminiscence of *Aj.* 567–570 at 8.4.6); Smith 2007: 117–119. Finally, as Gerschmann (1974: 133, n. 23) notes, D'Orville (1750: 64 [Annotationes]) links Chaereas' pleading for his own execution at 1.5.4–5 with Oedipus' words at Soph. *OT* 1410–12;

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of them of central importance to the action of the novel; and then consider the consequences of this identification for our reading and appreciation of this work.

A few initial words of clarification on my position in regard to the discourse of "intertextuality" and on the language I incline to use in expressing intertextual relations may be helpful. My argument will be that Chariton's novel can be shown to be in significant relationship with a fifth-century tragic drama. The existence of this relationship is demonstrable through a complex of verbal, situational, and other connections. My preferred metaphor for referring to this and other, similar, relationships is to say that the later text "echoes" the earlier, though I will sometimes use the expression "allude to," or, effectively looking at the relationship from the opposite pole, say that the earlier text leaves "traces" in the later. My use of one term rather than another at any particular point does not imply an essentially different understanding of the nature of the relationship between the texts concerned, or an unstable attitude towards the question of authorial intention. The problematics of "intention" are well known, and my commitment is to what Stephen Hinds has called "a text-and-reader-oriented intertextuality"; at the same time, Hinds has valuably shown how the language of "allusion" may retain a practical value within a broader "intertextual" discourse,[11] and I have not sought to eliminate the notion of the alluding (real or implied) author from my discussion entirely—in places, indeed, Chariton's text may suggest an "intention" quite strongly.[12] Nonetheless, my approach is fundamentally reader-based; I take the view that whatever the author may or may not have "intended," the intertext for whose presence I argue is in principle identifiable by any reader, modern or ancient.

The key scene occurs at the end of the sequence of events that stem from the desire of Callirhoe's defeated suitors for revenge on Chaereas. The plot mentioned above results in Chaereas' being persuaded that Callirhoe is unfaithful to him. Pretending to go to the country, he keeps watch on his house after dark; and on seeing a man, dressed in the fine clothes of a lover, enter the house—admitted, in reality, by Callirhoe's maidservant, whom he has seduced as part of the plot[13]—Chaereas assumes that what he has been told about his wife is true, and loses control:

ταῦτα θεασάμενος Χαιρέας οὐκέτι κατέσχεν ἀλλὰ εἰσέδραμεν ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ τὸν μοιχὸν ἀναιρήσων. ὁ μὲν οὖν παρὰ τὴν αὔλειον θύραν ὑποστὰς εὐθὺς ἐξῆλθεν,

---

the inclusion in both petitions of a request to be thrown into the sea and Chaereas' reference to his having committed an act worse than parricide offer good grounds for supposing a direct echo.

[11] Hinds 1998, esp. 17–51; quotation at 49. My understanding of and approach to intertextuality owe most to work done in the field of Latin literature, especially poetry; in addition to Hinds, see particularly Fowler 1997.

[12] For example, the programmatic quality of the passage at 1.1.3 where Chaereas is first introduced (see below, 296–297) suggests design in the text.

[13] The maid and the seducer can both be regarded as New Comedic character types, and the scene at this point as having a strong comic flavour; cf. Mason 1998: 2 and 2002: 21–22.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ἡ δὲ Καλλιρόη καθῆστο ἐπὶ τῆς κλίνης ζητοῦσα Χαιρέαν καὶ μηδὲ λύχνον ἅψασα διὰ τὴν λύπην· ψόφου δὲ ποδῶν γενομένου πρώτη τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ᾔσθετο τὴν ἀναπνοὴν καὶ χαίρουσα αὐτῷ προσέδραμεν. ὁ δὲ φωνὴν μὲν οὐκ ἔσχεν ὥστε λοιδορήσασθαι, κρατούμενος δὲ ὑπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς ἐλάκτισε προσιοῦσαν. εὐστόχως οὖν ὁ ποὺς κατὰ τοῦ διαφράγματος ἐνεχθεὶς ἐπέσχε τῆς παιδὸς τὴν ἀναπνοήν, ἐρριμμένην δὲ αὐτὴν αἱ θεραπαινίδες βαστάσασαι κατέκλιναν ἐπὶ τὴν κοίτην.

Seeing this, Chaereas could no longer restrain himself but rushed in to kill the adulterer in the act. He, however, had hidden by the courtyard door, and made his exit immediately. But Callirhoe was sitting on her couch longing for Chaereas, and was so unhappy that she had not even lighted a lamp. There was the sound of footsteps; she was the first to recognize her husband by his breathing, and joyfully ran to meet him. But he could find no voice to revile her with, and, overcome by anger, kicked at her as she ran towards him. His foot struck her right in the diaphragm and stopped the girl's breathing. She collapsed, and her maidservants picked her up and laid her on the bed. (1.4.10–12)[14]

This is the critical moment in the setting-up of the plot of the novel: the separation of the lovers, which is both the engine of the story and, in a sense, what it is about, depends on Callirhoe's apparent death[15] and burial, and her subsequent rescue from the tomb by robbers who carry her off from Syracuse (where the initial events have occurred) to Miletus. The situation is that of the classic love triangle, or rather, suspected triangle: a husband believes that his wife is engaging in an adulterous relationship, and, enraged, attacks her. Nearly forty years ago Borgogno suggested that this scene owed a debt to the *Perikeiromene* of Menander.[16] This play of course survives incomplete, but it is clear that the situation from which the action derives is roughly as follows. Glycera, mistress of the soldier Polemon, is seen by his slave, Sosias, in an embrace with her neighbour, Moschion. Sosias reports the incident to Polemon, who has just returned from military campaigning. Moschion is in fact Glycera's brother, but this is known to no one but Glycera herself, and, put into a jealous rage by the news Sosias brings him, Polemon assaults Glycera and cuts off her hair. Though none of this was necessarily represented on stage,[17] in essentials the situation is very like that in Chariton: we have an apparent love triangle, misleading information, and a consequent assault critical in the development of the plot. While there is little more concrete evidence to underpin the identification of this episode as a model for Chariton,[18] I have no wish to dispute it: the "openness" of the Greek novel as a

[14] I follow the text of Reardon 2004; translations are my own, though debts to those of Reardon, in Reardon 1989: 17–124, and Goold 1995, will be apparent in places.

[15] The next sentence reads: Καλλιρόη μὲν οὖν ἄφωνος καὶ ἄπνους ἔκειτο νεκρᾶς εἰκόνα πᾶσι παρέχουσα, "So Callirhoe lay without speech or breath, presenting to all the appearance of a corpse" (1.5.1).

[16] Borgogno 1971: 257–258; see also Laplace 1980: 111; Hunter 1994: 1064. In referring below to specific passages of the play I follow the line-numbering of Arnott 1996.

[17] See Arnott 1996: 375–376.

[18] There are, of course, explicit references to Polemon's anger, jealousy, and abusive behaviour (Men. *Pk.* 163, 723, 987–988), and, if the lacuna at 723 is correctly filled by Sudhaus (ἑκούσιον; see

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

literary form has become part of critical orthodoxy, and it is entirely appropriate to see *Chaereas and Callirhoe* as a palimpsestic text, displaying numerous overlapping debts.[19] My contention, however, is that a closer and more significant connection can be observed with a scene in tragedy, with important implications.

In Euripides' *Hippolytus*, when Theseus returns from Delphi to find Phaedra dead, and reads the wax tablet on which she has accused Hippolytus of raping her, he immediately curses his son:

Θη. τόδε μὲν οὐκέτι στόματος ἐν πύλαις
καθέξω δυσεκπέρατον ὀλοὸν
κακόν· ἰὼ πόλις.
Ἱππόλυτος εὐνῆς τῆς ἐμῆς ἔτλη θιγεῖν
βίᾳ, τὸ σεμνὸν Ζηνὸς ὄμμ' ἀτιμάσας.
ἀλλ', ὦ πάτερ Πόσειδον, ἃς ἐμοί ποτε
ἀρὰς ὑπέσχου τρεῖς, μιᾷ κατέργασαι
τούτων ἐμὸν παῖδ', ἡμέραν δὲ μὴ φύγοι
τήνδ', εἴπερ ἡμῖν ὤπασας σαφεῖς ἀράς.

Th. No longer shall I hold within the gates of my mouth this ruinous evil, whose utterance brings me pain. Citizens! Hippolytus has dared to lay hands on my marriage-bed by force, dishonouring the holy eye of Zeus! But, father Poseidon, those three curses which you once promised me—with one of these destroy my son, and may he not get beyond this day, if indeed the curses you granted me are sure. (882–890)[20]

The chorus of women of Troezen instantly urge Theseus to withdraw the curse (891–892), and at Hippolytus' entry moments later they press him to "relax [his] evil anger," ὀργῆς δ' ἐξανεὶς κακῆς (900). What we have here is again—like the assault episode in the *Perikeiromene*—closely parallel to the situation in Chariton: a rash act committed in anger by a husband on the basis of false information about transgressive sexual behaviour involving his wife. The obvious differences in the Euripidean situation, such as the family relationships between the three principals, the abnormal desires of Hippolytus and Phaedra, Phaedra's role in providing the false information, and the fact that she is dead, should not obscure the common

Borgogno 1971: 258; Arnott 1996: 438), a close parallel to Hermocrates' exculpation of his son-in-law Chaereas (see below, 299).

[19] On the generic complexity of the Greek novel—its "polyphony"—see esp. Fusillo 1989: 17–109. In the episode of the suitors' plot and Chaereas' assault on Callirhoe the influence of a further text has been detected, namely Lysias 1; for this see recently Kapparis 2000 (who is unaware of having been anticipated by Hammer 1922: 106–107), with the critique of Porter 2003, esp. 433–434, 438–440; Smith 2007: 120–123. For present purposes it suffices to say that, while it is possible that Chariton "borrowed a number of elements" from the Lysias speech (Kapparis 2000: 382; *contra*, Trenkner 1958: 159), important features to which I draw attention below are lacking; in particular, the assailant does not act hastily or under the impulse of uncontrolled anger, the information on which he acts is not false, and the critical action—the killing of the adulterer—is by no means *akousion* (see below, 298–299).

[20] Except where otherwise indicated, the *Hippolytus* is cited according to the text of Diggle 1984 (with iota subscript for adscript); translations are mine.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

pattern which is evident: the vital elements are the anger, its causes, and its consequences. I have written of the importance of anger in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* elsewhere, stressing its epic associations;[21] but it is a characteristic motif of tragedy too,[22] and in the present case the filter offered by the *Hippolytus* changes the complexion of Chariton's text. To pursue for a moment the situational parallelism, though Theseus in Euripides' play seems to doubt the efficacy of his curse, the gift of Poseidon, and imposes also a sentence of exile on his son (893–898), the curse will be, must be, terribly fulfilled. Theseus' utterance is a snap action, like a kick,[23] and it seems that it cannot be revoked;[24] in any event it is not revoked, and the result is Hippolytus' death. Callirhoe's death, the consequence of Chaereas' kick, is only apparent; but to the characters involved, who conduct her funeral and bury her (*C&C* 1.6.2–5), it is real enough. In both cases the angry action leads to desperate loss—temporary, and not in the event catastrophic, in the one, but seemingly so at first; and Theseus' desire to die, on finally hearing the truth (1325; cf. 1408, 1410), is matched by Chaereas' longing to kill himself at the equivalent moment (*C&C* 1.5.2).

There are in my view good grounds for regarding the link between the two texts as more than one of analogy; for, in fact, seeing the assault episode in Chariton as a reworking of the situation in Euripides. The trigger is a passage in the first chapter of the novel, which should put the attentive reader in mind of Euripides' play. Having first described the beauty of Callirhoe, the desire for her of high-ranking men from far and wide, and the wish of Eros to make a match of his own choosing, the narrator introduces Chaereas thus:

Χαιρέας γάρ τις ἦν μειράκιον εὔμορφον, πάντων ὑπερέχον, οἷον Ἀχιλλέα καὶ Νιρέα καὶ Ἱππόλυτον καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδην πλάσται καὶ γραφεῖς <ἀπο>δεικνύουσι.

There was a certain Chaereas, a youth who surpassed all in good looks, like Achilles and Nireus and Hippolytus and Alcibiades as represented by sculptors and painters. (1.1.3)

The precise point of comparison—the handsomeness of the characters—is arguably of much less significance at a place in the text where we might expect to find signs of a literary programme than the generic associations which these particular characters bring to the text.[25] The presence in the comparison of Homeric epic, tragedy, and history is noted by Billault, though he is interested

[21] Scourfield 2003, esp. 166–168, 172–175.

[22] The classic tragedy of anger is of course Euripides' *Medea*; but one might also think (among many examples) of Sophocles' *Antigone* and *Oedipus Tyrannus*, Euripides' *Hecuba*, or (for divine rather than human anger) Aeschylus' *Eumenides*. See generally Harris 2001: 158–165, 168–174, 276–280.

[23] Cf. Artemis' words to Theseus at 1320–24.

[24] See Barrett 1964: 166 (on *Hipp.* 43–46).

[25] In this regard Nireus, a minor figure compared with the rest, and throughout ancient literature little more than a byword for beauty (see *RE* 17.1.708), can be seen as a kind of footnote to the epic Achilles—the best-looking of the Greeks at Troy after Peleus' son (Hom. *Il.* 2.673–674) takes second place behind him here too. On a more specific level, Smith (2007: 100) observes interestingly how the comparison with Achilles, Hippolytus, and Alcibiades can be construed as problematic: all are

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

only in its characterizational use and does not pursue the point further.[26] Hunter too observes the comparison, and points out that Chaereas resembles Hippolytus not only in his beauty but also in the fact that both suffer at the hands of Aphrodite;[27] but it is the novel's relationship with epic and historiography that he highlights,[28] and the hint at tragedy in the reference to Hippolytus is hardly taken up. If the mention of Achilles turns our thoughts to epic and to anger, the mention of Hippolytus should direct us to the most famous ancient treatment of this familiar myth.[29]

At this point let me briefly anticipate two possible objections, both of which can be shown to have little substance. The first is that, in the scene of his assault on Callirhoe, Chaereas takes the role not of Hippolytus but of Theseus. I am arguing here, however, for an evocation of Euripides' play in general; and even on a narrower view there is no cause to claim inconsistency. In relation to the Homeric intertexts of the novel Chaereas is plainly cast in a variety of roles, including those of both Achilles and Hector;[30] and there is no reason in the identification of an intertext to demand that correspondences between "source" and "target" texts be exact (indeed, it could be said that exact correspondence is impossible without complete repetition, in the target text, of the source text, and perhaps not even then). Chaereas-as-Theseus may not be what the alert reader expects the prompt at 1.1.3 to deliver, but s/he should not be surprised to be surprised in this way. Nor is it a matter for concern that Chaereas' attack is on the

---

"famous for their inability to exist on a plane equal with their fellow men." The comparison with Alcibiades is explored at great length by Smith in his final chapter (199–248), with further valuable comment on this passage at 214.

[26] Billault 1996: 126–127; cf., however, Billault 1998: 191, where the comparison with Hippolytus is seen as indicating that Chaereas will experience tragic events, whose severity, when they occur, is underlined by the implicit reference to tragedy.

[27] Hunter 1994: 1079; for Chaereas and Aphrodite see below, 299–300.

[28] See esp. 1083–84; history and epic are "the two poles between which his work swings." Alcibiades and Nireus are again mentioned in this connection (1084).

[29] I see no merit in attempting to engage with the idea that Chariton may have known either or both of the other treatments known to have been produced in the fifth-century Athenian theatre, Sophocles' *Phaedra* and Euripides' *Hippolytos Kalyptomenos*; endless games can be played with highly fragmentary texts, and from the point of view of the reader what matters is not what text/s Chariton may or may not have had in mind but what text/s are actually evoked in reading *C&C*. The surviving *Hippolytus*—a popular text throughout antiquity, well attested in papyri (see T. Morgan 1998: 115–116, with Table 22 [p. 321])—is, I argue, strongly present in the work.

[30] See, for example, 1.5.2, 4.1.5, 7.4.6 (Achilles); 3.5.6, 7.2.4 (Hector); 7.3.5, 7.4.6 (Diomedes). Callirhoe similarly evokes both Helen and Penelope, most obviously at 5.5.9; see also, e.g., 5.2.8 (Helen, with Chaereas implicitly—and ironically—cast as Paris), 8.1.17 (Penelope, with Chaereas equally marked as Odysseus). Such switching of roles is easily paralleled elsewhere in ancient literature: W. S. Anderson (1957) brilliantly demonstrated how the figure of Turnus in Virgil's *Aeneid* embodies both Paris and Hector (with the added complication that Turnus sees himself as a combination of Achilles and Menelaus), while Aeneas is mapped on to three Homeric models, Agamemnon, Menelaus, and Achilles (his enemies meanwhile viewing him as Paris); within the genre of the novel, further examples are afforded by Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* (see J. R. Morgan 1993: 222–223).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

woman in the triangle rather than the other man: this is essential for Chariton's plot, and it should in any case be observed that Chaereas' first intention is to kill the supposed lover, not Callirhoe (1.4.10). I shall return to the connection with Theseus in a moment; before that I want to draw attention to specific features of the assault scene and the trial scene in the next chapter which serve to bind together the parallel actions in the two texts. First, when Chaereas rushes into the bedroom and Callirhoe runs towards him, we are told, φωνὴν . . . οὐκ ἔσχεν ὥστε λοιδορήσασθαι, "he could find no voice to revile her with" (1.4.12). This repeats part of an earlier episode, where, in a first attempt to damage the marriage of the lovers, the jealous suitors fabricate evidence of a revel at Chaereas' house during his absence in the country; this has the desired effect of putting Chaereas into a rage with Callirhoe, and in the confrontation scene which follows (where Callirhoe fiercely rebuts her husband's unjust reproaches, and at the end of which the pair are easily reconciled), Chaereas is described as ἄφωνος . . . οὔτε ἀπιστεῖν οἷς εἶδεν οὔτε πιστεύειν οἷς οὐκ ἤθελε δυνάμενος, "speechless . . . able neither to disbelieve his eyes nor to give credence to what he did not want to believe" (1.3.4). In the present context Chaereas' speechlessness[31] evokes both the silence of the wax tablet on which Phaedra's accusation against Hippolytus was written[32] and Theseus' inability to keep silent, which destroys his son—he speaks rashly, Chaereas, unable to speak, acts rashly, with like results.[33] Still more arresting is Chariton's description of Chaereas' speech in the murder trial which follows, where instead of putting up a defence the young man accuses himself and votes for his own conviction,

οὐδὲν εἰπὼν τῶν πρὸς τὴν ἀπολογίαν δικαίων, οὐ τὴν διαβολήν, οὐ τὴν ζηλοτυπίαν, οὐ τὸ ἀκούσιον.

putting forward none of the arguments that could justly have been used in his defence—the slander, his jealousy, and the fact that his action was *akousion*. (1.5.4)

[31] For speechlessness as the consequence of emotion in *C&C* see also 1.1.14 (Callirhoe); 2.5.4, 2.7.4 (Dionysius); 3.9.2 (priestess of Aphrodite); 4.1.9, 5.5.9 (Mithridates); 6.3.3 (the king); 6.5.10 (the eunuch Artaxates); 8.1.9 (Polycharmus). It is attributed to Chaereas elsewhere only, I think, at 1.4.7, in describing his initial reaction to the report of Callirhoe's infidelity.

[32] In both cases, silence bars the way to the truth. An inanimate object, the tablet has no voice, and cannot be questioned; Theseus simply accepts its false message as true. Equally, Chaereas' inability to speak prevents him from getting at the truth by questioning Callirhoe. The silence of the tablet in the *Hippolytus* is emphasized, especially in retrospect, by Theseus' description of it as "crying out" (βοᾷ, βοᾷ, 877), and of its misleading message as "a song giving voice in writing" (γραφαῖς μέλος φθεγγόμενον, 879–880)—a powerfully ironic representation of the interplay between speech and silence which is such a dominant theme in the tragedy (on which see esp. Knox 1952).

[33] One might note too the use of the verb κατέχειν in conjunction with οὐκέτι in both texts: Chaereas, on seeing the alleged lover enter his house, οὐκέτι κατέσχεν, "could no longer restrain himself" (1.4.10); Theseus, having read the writing on the wax tablet, says "no longer shall I hold [οὐκέτι . . . καθέξω] within the gates of my mouth this ruinous evil, whose utterance brings me pain" (*Hipp.* 882–884), proceeding immediately to cry to the city, declare Hippolytus' supposed act of rape, and curse his son.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The key word here is ἀκούσιον, which is repeated shortly afterwards by Chaereas' father-in-law Hermocrates in urging his acquittal ("I know that what happened was *akousion*," 1.5.6), and again in Hermocrates' summarizing of the action of the first part of the novel at 8.7.7, when the whole story is retold from the points of view of Hermocrates and Chaereas ("But the people acquitted you, recognizing that what had happened was *akousion*"). At the end of Euripides' play Artemis, effecting reconciliation between Theseus and the dying Hippolytus, tells Theseus to embrace his son, "for ἄκων you destroyed him" (*Hipp.* 1433). The meaning of the word ἄκων in this passage has been much discussed; "innocently" is Barrett's approximation,[34] "in ignorance," that is, of the full situation, an attractive alternative.[35] The latter meaning would be particularly apposite for ἀκούσιον here:[36] Chaereas' kick was delivered in utter ignorance of the true circumstances.[37] But whether Chariton understood it in this way is not germane to the issue; what counts is what I take, given the accumulation of factors, to be a clear pointer to the *Hippolytus*.

The view I have argued is buttressed by a number of other features in the novel. Most obviously there is the controlling role played by Aphrodite in both texts.[38] In Euripides the action derives from Aphrodite's determination to punish Hippolytus for rejecting her; Theseus' curse as the instrument of his son's death is already mentioned in the prologue delivered by the goddess herself (*Hipp.* 44–45). Though Chaereas' kick is not similarly predetermined, it is made clear late in the novel that the goddess is offended by it—here the parallel is with Hippolytus again—and that the sufferings which Chaereas has experienced to this point, which include enslavement, near-crucifixion, and the dangers of war, are her punishment for his assault on Callirhoe, interpreted by Aphrodite as ingratitude and insult. At this point in the text Chaereas, having travelled to the east from Syracuse in pursuit of the kidnapped Callirhoe, has become embroiled in a rebellion in Egypt against the King of Persia, and risen to command of the rebel

[34] Barrett 1964: 413.

[35] See Rickert 1989: 115, who is followed by Halleran (1995: 141, with n. at 266); Rickert's interpretation is grounded in a discussion of Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 3.1, on which see below, n. 37. MacDowell (1968) prefers "under compulsion."

[36] Reardon (1989: 17–124) and Goold (1995) offer for τὸ ἀκούσιον at 1.5.4 "[the fact] that his action was involuntary" (Reardon) and "the lack of premeditation" (Goold); and for ἀκούσιον at 1.5.6 and 8.7.7, respectively "unintended" and "involuntary" (Reardon), and "unintended" and "not deliberate" (Goold).

[37] In Aristotle's analysis at *Eth. Nic.* 3.1, one of the categories of acts that are *akousion* is that of those done through ignorance (δι' ἄγνοιαν). Cf., on Theseus, Stinton 1975: 248 (= 1990: 177): "Theseus acts wholly δι' ἄγνοιαν, though his ignorance is culpable to this extent, that his πάθος (his grief and anger) prevent him from giving due weight to his son's protestations of innocence. So too the curse, which is a natural outcome of his mistake, is culpable because it is hastily uttered and irrevocable." One might say that Chaereas demonstrates a kind of *hamartia* very like that of Theseus.

[38] Recognition of the intertext in the assault scene may (conversely) suggest less "cosiness" in Chariton's Aphrodite than Reardon 1982: 24 (who observes [23] the parallelism in Aphrodite's role in the two works) would have it.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

fleet; without either of them knowing it, Callirhoe—along with the Persian queen and others left by the king on the Phoenician island of Aradus—is now actually in his possession. Fortune, *Tyche*, however—one of the external forces at work in the narrative[39]—intends that Chaereas should remain ignorant of this fact and leave Callirhoe behind, alone.

ἀλλ' ἔδοξε τόδε δεινὸν Ἀφροδίτῃ· ἤδη γὰρ αὐτῷ διηλλάττετο, πρότερον ὀργισθεῖσα χαλεπῶς διὰ τὴν ἄκαιρον ζηλοτυπίαν, ὅτι δῶρον παρ' αὐτῆς λαβὼν τὸ κάλλιστον, οἷον οὐδὲ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Πάρις, ὕβρισεν εἰς τὴν χάριν. ἐπεὶ δὲ καλῶς ἀπελογήσατο τῷ Ἔρωτι Χαιρέας ἀπὸ δύσεως εἰς ἀνατολὰς διὰ μυρίων παθῶν πλανηθείς, ἠλέησεν αὐτὸν Ἀφροδίτη καὶ ὅπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς δύο τῶν καλλίστων ἥρμοσε ζεῦγος, γυμνάσασα διὰ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης, πάλιν ἠθέλησεν <ἀλλήλοις> ἀποδοῦναι.

But this seemed too cruel to Aphrodite; by this time she was becoming reconciled to Chaereas, though earlier she had been made intensely angry by his inappropriate jealousy, because after receiving from her the fairest of gifts, superior even to the gift Alexander Paris had received, he had repaid her kindness with insult. But since Chaereas had now made honourable amends to Love by wandering the world from west to east amid innumerable sufferings, Aphrodite took pity on him, and, having harassed by land and sea the beautiful couple she had originally brought together, she now decided to reunite them. (8.1.3)

Aphrodite's anger against Chaereas is generated by what she regards as the ὕβρις (cf. ὕβρισεν) involved in his abusing Callirhoe, Aphrodite's gift to him, the most beautiful of women, frequently mistaken for the goddess herself;[40] Hippolytus' behaviour towards Aphrodite in the Euripidean play is not far removed from this, and we might well see here a reflex of Aphrodite's words at *Hippolytus* 6, σφάλλω δ' ὅσοι φρονοῦσιν εἰς ἡμᾶς μέγα, "I bring down all those whose thoughts towards me are proud."[41] Her anger against Chaereas (she is ὀργισθεῖσα), similarly, echoes the language of the tragedy: the action of the drama is described by Artemis as the work of Aphrodite, πληροῦσα θυμόν, "sating her anger" (1328); ὀργαί is used of her feelings at 1418.[42]

[39] For *Tyche* in *C&C*, see esp. Robiano 1984; Van Steen 1998.

[40] See *C&C* 1.14.1, 2.3.5–6, 5.9.1.

[41] Cf. 445–446. For the close relation between μέγα φρονεῖν and ὕβρις see esp. Cairns 1996: 10–17, with consideration of *Hipp.* 6 at 16. The word ὕβρις and its cognates are not themselves used of Hippolytus' attitude to Aphrodite in Euripides' play, but the nurse's assertion to Phaedra that it is ὕβρις to want to be superior to the gods (474–475, quoted below, 303) could, *mutatis mutandis*, readily be applied to Hippolytus too (the point is made independently by Cairns [1997: 73]).

[42] Harris (2001: 300, n. 66) takes ὀργαί here to refer to *Theseus'* anger. The passage which immediately precedes offers support for this interpretation, but it is hard to read the sentence itself without understanding the anger to be Aphrodite's. In any event Harris's assertion (174, n. 68) that ὀργή is not used of Aphrodite's anger in this play is erroneous; see *Hipp.* 438, where the nurse—without knowing of Aphrodite's design to punish Hippolytus, in which Phaedra is merely an instrument, and therefore with irony—tells her mistress, ill and striving to suppress her love for Hippolytus, that the goddess's ὀργαί has struck her (Nauck's proposal to delete this line is universally ignored by modern editors). The ὀργαί assumed by the nurse in this passage is generally understood to refer to Aphrodite's punishment—expressed in the form of the illness—for Phaedra's resistance to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

More specific substantiation of the connections between the assault scene and its Euripidean model is afforded by the recurrence at several points of a mythological parallel to the situation of Chaereas and Callirhoe after the assault.[43] Almost immediately after Chaereas' acquittal in the murder trial preparations are made for Callirhoe's funeral. Lying on a golden bier, wearing her wedding garments, Callirhoe appears so beautiful "that everyone compared her to the sleeping Ariadne" (*C&C* 1.6.2). The allusion is to the abandonment on the shore at Naxos of Ariadne by Theseus; and if the (apparently) dead Callirhoe is like Ariadne, the "murderer" Chaereas must be the counterpart of the hero who abandoned her. A further, more straightforward, comparison between Callirhoe and Ariadne occurs at 4.1.8;[44] but more significant is a passage which appears immediately before the depiction of Aphrodite's anger—with its reference to Chaereas' act of jealousy—in the final book. Fortune was planning that, without realizing it, Chaereas would

τὴν ἰδίαν [*sc.* γυναῖκα] ἐκεῖ καταλίπῃ οὐχ ὡς Ἀριάδνην καθεύδουσαν, οὐδὲ Διονύσῳ νυμφίῳ, λάφυρον δὲ τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ πολεμίοις.

leave his own wife there [on Aradus], not, like Ariadne, asleep, nor for a Dionysus to marry, but as spoils for his enemies. (8.1.2)

Again there is an implicit comparison between Chaereas and Theseus, strengthened this time by a play on the names Dionysus and Dionysius, the god who married Ariadne after her abandonment[45] and the Greek nobleman who married Callirhoe after her "death," kidnap, and sale in Ionia. Earlier Chaereas himself has, all unwitting, drawn the same parallels; after the discovery of the tomb robbery, he turns to heaven and says:

τίς ἄρα θεῶν ἀντεραστής μου γενόμενος Καλλιρόην ἀπενήνοχε καὶ νῦν ἔχει μεθ' αὑτοῦ . . . : . . . οὕτω καὶ Θησέως Ἀριάδνην ἀφείλετο Διόνυσος καὶ Σεμέλην ὁ Ζεύς.

---

her feelings (so Barrett 1964: 239, Halleran 1995: 188, looking forward to *Hipp.* 444–446); at another level one wonders whether in the context the word does not carry the overtones of sexual desire to which attention has been drawn particularly by Allen (2000: 54; though see also Harris 2001: 52, n. 11).

[43] The Ariadne/Theseus parallels are also discussed by Smith (2007: 99–104), in the context of an essentially political argument. My identification of the curse scene in the *Hippolytus* as a model for the assault scene in *C&C*, with its implicit casting of Chaereas as Theseus, incidentally supports Smith's reading of Chaereas as a politically problematic figure for democratic Syracuse.

[44] "The woman's great fame had spread throughout all Asia, and the name of Callirhoe was now making its way to the Great King, outstripping that of Ariadne or of Leda."

[45] This is the canonical version, as found in, for example, Catull. 64.50–264 (251–253 for Bacchus/Dionysus), Ov. *Met.* 8.172–179, Nonnus, *Dion.* 47.268–469, and traceable as far back as Pherecydes of Athens in the fifth century B.C. (see *FGH* 3 F 148). It is of no consequence for my general argument that Eur. *Hipp.* 339 apparently alludes to the (rather murky) alternative tradition in which Ariadne left Dionysus for Theseus, as a result of which she was killed by Artemis (see Hom. *Od.* 11.321–325) (on this see Barrett 1964: 222–223); the intertextual links between the play and *C&C* do not depend on exact correspondences in other common elements.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Which of the gods has become my rival in love and carried off Callirhoe and now has her with him . . . ? . . . In just this way Dionysus stole Ariadne from Theseus[46] and Zeus Semele. (3.3.4–5)

For Reardon,[47] the point of the comparison is that Ariadne and Semele were transformed into divinities (Chaereas' next remark is that he must have had a goddess for a wife without knowing it); this is entirely reasonable, but we should not ignore the male side of the comparison either, which confirms Chaereas' identity as a Theseus-figure. The wordplay on Dionysus/Dionysius in this passage also holds an irony.[48] Chaereas does not yet know of Dionysius and his marriage to Callirhoe, which has taken place a page before; the reader does.

Finally, and perhaps most tellingly, a second scene in the novel is reminiscent of action in the *Hippolytus*. Like all the other men of high station in the work, the King of Persia, Artaxerxes, falls in love with Callirhoe and asks his minister, the eunuch Artaxates, to find a remedy (φάρμακον) for his love. The eunuch replies that "there is no other *pharmakon* for love except the loved one"[49] (6.3.7). This exchange recalls the scene in Euripides' play where Phaedra's nurse, to save her mistress from death, urges her to surrender to her passion for Hippolytus. At the end of her speech of persuasion (*Hipp.* 433–481) the nurse speaks ambiguously of a φάρμακον to cure Phaedra's love-sickness (479), which, for all the vagueness and ambiguity of her language, we should in the context[50] understand (as Phaedra clearly does, 486–489) to refer to a means of achieving Hippolytus' love in return, even indeed to Hippolytus himself (cf. 699, where the reference is unmistakable); at 516 Phaedra herself uses the word, in response to further ambiguous utterances by the nurse about love-charms.[51] Artaxates' reply to the king could not be more unambiguous, but his intention is the same as the nurse's: to procure the object of desire for the person he serves. He also stands in the same kind of relation to the king as the nurse to Phaedra: the role is that of an inferior who is also

[46] The text here reflects a different version of the Ariadne story from that evident at 8.1.2; cf. Diod. Sic. 4.61.5, Paus. 10.29.4, Apollod. *Epit.* 1.9, and perhaps Ath. 7.47 (296a), referring to an episode in the *Bacchica* of Theolytus of Methymna. The attempt of Cueva 1996 (essentially identical to Cueva 2004: 16–24) to establish Plut. *Thes.* 19–20 as a specific source for the Ariadne elements (and various other details) in *C&C* is unconvincing; among other reasons, the detail of the theft in the present passage has no counterpart in the *Theseus*.

[47] Reardon 1989: 53, n. 51.

[48] Διόνυσος here is Reiske's emendation for MS Διονύσιος (see Reardon 2004: 47 [app. crit. *ad loc.*]); the wordplay seems certain.

[49] φάρμακον γὰρ ἕτερον ἔρωτος οὐδέν ἐστι πλὴν αὐτὸς ὁ ἐρώμενος.

[50] And particularly in the light of the nurse's explicit assertion at 490–491 about Phaedra needing "the man."

[51] Given that the nurse is not *actually* planning to use any kind of love-magic, but to make a direct approach to Hippolytus (hence her ludicrous reply—οὐκ οἶδ'—to Phaedra's question about the nature of the supposed magic drug [516–517]; she has been blathering, and is caught by surprise by the specific inquiry), the φίλτρα . . . θελκτήρια ἔρωτος of 509–510 might also be taken as a reference to her coming attempt to win Hippolytus over (the λόγοι θελκτήριοι of 478, which this phrase echoes, similarly gain a retrospective gloss from the action that follows). Cf. Goff 1990: 48–54.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a confidant. His implicit suggestion horrifies the king, who rejects absolutely the idea of seducing another man's wife, and adds: μηδεμίαν μου καταγνῷς ἀκρασίαν. οὐχ οὕτως ἑαλώκαμεν ("Don't accuse me of a lack of self-control. I am not overcome to that extent," 6.3.8). ἀκρασία here should remind us of that central concept of the *Hippolytus*, σωφροσύνη,[52] and particularly of Phaedra's efforts to subdue her passion (cf. esp. *Hipp.* 398–99: τὴν ἄνοιαν εὖ φέρειν / τῷ σωφρονεῖν νικῶσα προυνοησάμην, "I took care to bear the folly well, subduing it with *sophrosune*"). Shifting his ground, Artaxates encourages the king not to apply the usual remedy for his love but to fight against himself, distracting his thoughts with pleasure. In commenting δύνασαι γάρ, ὦ δέσποτα, σὺ μόνος κρατεῖν καὶ θεοῦ ("for you alone, master, can overcome even a god," 6.3.8), Artaxates inverts the tactic of Phaedra's nurse, who tells the queen that Κύπρις ... οὐ φορητὸν ἢν πολλὴ ῥυῇ ("Cypris cannot be withstood if she rushes upon us in spate," 443), and that οὐ[κ] ... ἄλλο πλὴν ὕβρις / τάδ' ἐστί, κρείσσω δαιμόνων εἶναι θέλειν ("it is nothing but *hubris*, to wish to be superior to the gods," 474–475).[53] His specific suggestion is that the king go hunting:

μάλιστα δὲ κυνηγεσίοις ἐξαιρέτως χαίρεις· οἶδα γάρ σε ὑφ' ἡδονῆς διημερεύοντα ἄβρωτον, ἄποτον ἐν θήρᾳ. <θήρᾳ> δὲ ἐνδιατρίβειν <βέλτιον> ἢ τοῖς βασιλείοις καὶ ἐγγὺς εἶναι τοῦ πυρός.

You take very great pleasure in hunting in particular; indeed, I know that you spend the entire day without food or drink when you go hunting, you enjoy it so much. It is better to spend your time hunting than in the palace and close to the fire. (6.3.9)

Now while hunting is the kind of thing which Persian kings in Greek literature regularly do,[54] and its use as a means of counteracting love became something of a topos in Roman poetry in particular,[55] it is also the activity of the chaste Hippolytus *par excellence*; and of course it is one of the activities in which Phaedra expresses a wish to engage in the episode of her wild fantasies early in the play

[52] Cf. Pl. *Symp.* 196c: εἶναι ... ὁμολογεῖται σωφροσύνη τὸ κρατεῖν ἡδονῶν καὶ ἐπιθυμιῶν; and esp. Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 7.1–10 (for the correlation of the pairs of opposites ἀκρασία/ἐγκράτεια and ἀκολασία/σωφροσύνη). For Phaedra's falling in love with Hippolytus, and her failure to keep her secret from the nurse, as ἀκρασία, see Stinton 1975: 247 (= 1990: 176); cf. also Cairns 1993: 338. σωφροσύνη in the *Hippolytus* has recently been discussed by Rademaker (2005: 163–173).

[53] My thanks to Simon Goldhill for pointing me towards this connection. With Artaxates' words at 6.3.8 cf. also *Hipp.* 400–401, where Phaedra, reviewing how she has attempted to deal with her passion, says that she was unable to "overcome Cypris" (Κύπριν κρατῆσαι) by silence or *sophrosune*. The notion of *sophrosune* as *hubris* (normally the terms are antithetical), implicit in *Hipp.* 474–475, finds a sharp parallel at *C&C* 2.4.5, where Eros' reaction to Dionysius' attempts to suppress his desire for Callirhoe is to consider this *hubris* (ὕβριν ἐδόκει τὴν σωφροσύνην τὴν ἐκείνου) and inflame him all the more; on this cf. Balot 1998: 147.

[54] See esp. Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* (e.g., 1.2.9–10, 1.4.5–15, 2.4.16–21), but also, for example, Hdt. 3.129.1; Heraclides of Cyme *apud* Ath. 12.8 (514e) (= *FGH* 689 F 1); Plut. *Artax.* 5.3; with J. K. Anderson 1985: 58–63; Lane Fox 1996: 123, 140–141.

[55] See, for example, Virg. *Ecl.* 10.56–60; Hor. *Epod.* 2.29–38; Ov. *Rem. am.* 199–206; and cf. Xen. *Cyn.* 5.33.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(*Hipp.* 215–222), and in the scene in Chariton, as we have observed, Phaedra's is the role taken by the king.[56] The reference in the above passage to going without food may also draw on the words of the chorus at *Hippolytus* 135–138, where they sing how it is now the third day since Phaedra has eaten:

τρίταταν δέ νιν κλύω
τάνδ' ἑκὰς ἀβρώτου στόματος ἁμέραν
Δάματρος ἀκτᾶς δέμας ἁγνὸν ἴσχειν.

I hear that for three days now, her mouth taking no food, she has kept far off the holy substance of Demeter's grain.

τάνδ' ἑκὰς ἀβρώτου is Willink's text,[57] a combination of conjectures by Reiske (τάνδ' ἑκάς) and Verrall (ἀβρώτου), for the impossible τάνδε κατ' ἀμβροσίου of the manuscripts;[58] Barrett and Diggle[59] follow Hartung's τάνδ' ἀβρωσίᾳ, the first emendation along these lines.[60] Chariton's phrase διημερεύοντα ἄβρωτον, ἄποτον echoes first and foremost Xenophon *Cyropaedia* 7.5.53: περίβλεπτος ἦν, ὅτι μετὰ σοῦ ἄσιτος καὶ ἄποτος διημέρευον ("I was envied all around because I was spending a whole day with you—without anything to eat or drink");[61] but ἄβρωτος does not occur in that work, and it seems highly likely that the novelist's ἄβρωτον—a word less frequently and widely found than ἄσιτος, and exceptionally rare in an active sense[62]—was prompted by the passage in the *Hippolytus*.[63]

Some comment on the reading process involved in disclosing the presence of the *Hippolytus* in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* may be useful at this juncture. At 296 above, I wrote of the reference to Hippolytus at *Chaereas and Callirhoe* 1.1.3 as the "trigger" for recognition of the Euripidean intertext in the scene of Chaereas'

[56] Plepelits (1976: 183, n. 48) and Goold (1995: 297, n. b) offer *Hipp.* 215 ff. as a parallel to the Chariton passage on the ground that—like the passages cited above, 303, n. 55—it presents hunting as an antidote to love. The more usual view is that Phaedra is expressing a desire to be in the places frequented by Hippolytus and taking part in his pursuits (for a summary of critical opinion, see Goff 1990: 32–34); on this interpretation, recognition of the intertext will suggest that the eunuch's scheme will fail, as indeed it does—far from distracting the king, the hunt causes his passion to flare up violently, through the intervention of the god Eros (*C&C* 6.4.4–7).

[57] Willink 1968: 37; he is followed by Kovacs (1995), whose colometry and translation I also give.

[58] On the manuscript reading, see Barrett 1964: 187.

[59] Barrett 1964; Diggle 1984; so too Stockert 1994.

[60] Hartung 1848.

[61] For the frequent echoes of the *Cyropaedia* in Chariton, see Papanikolaou (1973: 19–20), who observes the present borrowing.

[62] A search of the *Thesaurus linguae Graecae* online undertaken on 17 July 2007 generated (as raw data) 113 instances of ἄβρωτος in Greek up to and including the second century A.D., against 154 for ἄσιτος; much more significant is the fact that of those 113 instances only two evidently bear an active sense ("not eating," rather than "inedible" or "not eaten"): the Chariton passage discussed here and Soph. fr. 967 Radt, which depends on very sketchy evidence in the *Onomasticon* of Pollux (6.39; for Euripides, the *TLG* presents Diggle's text).

[63] Where note too ἁμέραν. The Chariton passage and its context offer excellent substantiation for Verrall's conjecture; I shall discuss the whole matter more fully in a further article.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

assault. Located at the beginning of the novel, and in a context disposed to activate the reader's generic consciousness, the reference offers a clear pointer towards coming engagement with Euripides' play; and this engagement appears a few pages later, to be reinforced by the subsequent connections I have identified. But in fact identification of the intertext does not depend on a unidirectional reading. The awakening of an intertextual awareness is a complex process in which the reader may follow any number of paths; to put this differently, there is not one trigger, but many. The uncovering of the Euripidean intertext may begin with any of the details to which I have drawn attention (or some other which I have not observed), so that (for example) the recognition of the scene of Theseus' curse beneath the assault scene in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* may either stimulate or follow the recognition of significant details associating the two texts elsewhere in the novel; even my initial trigger at 1.1.3 might be the final intertextual element to be identified. The fundamental point is that the individual threads in the intertextual web are mutually supportive; it is the accumulation of links that gives strength to each and to all.[64]

Two scenes in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, then, can claim to be modelled on scenes in the *Hippolytus* of Euripides.[65] In the second, the model is made subject to gender inversion (two men take the roles of two women) and, as the scene proceeds, to reversal in the role of the character of lower status: the nurse blusters and conceals her true intentions, but never seriously adopts a different policy towards Phaedra, while the eunuch at this point (later he encourages the king's desire for Callirhoe[66]) seeks to assist the king to overcome his feelings. Recognition of the intertext points to potential tragic consequences, for the desiring subject (the king/Phaedra), the object of desire (Callirhoe/Hippolytus), or both; in the event—in the way of the Greek romantic novel—such consequences do not ensue, though the king's desire for Callirhoe remains unfulfilled and he experiences defeat in war at the hands of a rebel army led by Chaereas. This tragic potential, however, should not be ignored; I shall return to this in a moment.

[64] For further helpful observations on the kind of reading process I outline here, see Gale 2000: 15–17.

[65] Kaimio (1996: 56–57) also points to similarities in Chariton's presentation of the response of Dionysius to falling in love with Callirhoe early in the novel (concealment [2.4.1], attempted suppression through self-discipline [2.4.4], resolve to commit suicide [2.6.2, 3.1.1]) and Euripides' depiction of Phaedra in the *Hippolytus* (see esp. 391–402); she also draws attention to the role played by servants in both cases. In Kaimio's view, these similarities "may be conscious reflections." We can at all events see here a double use of the Euripidean model—which, given that the characters of the king and Dionysius have much in common, especially in their reactions to the assaults of Eros, should not surprise us—but in my judgement the model is much more evident in the case of the king: the density of influence in the scene just discussed (*C&C* 6.3.7–9) is far greater than in the sequence with Dionysius, where the echoes are diluted owing to their being distributed through a much longer portion of text (the better part of Book 2, and into Book 3).

[66] See esp. *C&C* 6.4.7–8. In making approaches to Callirhoe on the king's behalf (6.5, 6.7) the eunuch again acts in a parallel way to the nurse in the *Hippolytus*, with the difference, of course, that this is done with the approval (indeed at the command) of his master.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

But the more striking and more important intertextual connection between *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and the *Hippolytus* is that involving the scenes of Chaereas' assault and Theseus' curse. As I have said, the assault scene is absolutely central in the development of the plot of the novel. The parallel with the *Hippolytus* is also closer than that with its comic counterpart in Menander's *Perikeiromene* in two important respects. First, the false information which triggers the act of anger is in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and Euripides' play deliberately conveyed to the perpetrator for malicious purposes: the suitors stage the apparent love affair and set up Chaereas, Phaedra leaves her lying message for Theseus. In Menander, by contrast, there is only misunderstanding. Secondly, Polemon's act of cutting his mistress' hair is clearly of an altogether different order from Chaereas' kick to the stomach and Theseus' curse, and carries far less risk of catastrophic consequences.[67]

As I made clear earlier, this is not, of course, to deny a comic as well as a tragic model for the scene in Chariton. In his stimulating discussion of the relationship of *Chaereas and Callirhoe* to classical and post-classical historiography Hunter draws attention to this episode from the *Perikeiromene*,[68] and later seeks to demonstrate how "this sequence of action is crucially integrated into Chariton's concern with history and historicity."[69] In his analysis he alerts us, *inter alia*, to a range of texts which preserve stories of historical figures striking their pregnant wives in anger (Callirhoe is, as it later turns out, pregnant), the legal situation regarding adulterers caught in the act in fifth-century Athens, and the position assumed in respect of such cases in Greek and Roman declamation; and concludes with the view that Chariton has deliberately problematized what "code" should be used when we read the scene—historical? comic? rhetorical/declamatory? "Rather," says Hunter, "we must recognise in this scene an interplay of various codes which, and this is crucial, we are *supposed* to recognise" (his italics).[70] Though I would state this in a less intentionalist way, I am in absolute agreement with the fundamental point being made; and to Hunter's categories I would add "tragic."

The evocation of the *Hippolytus* in the assault scene in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, so important in the narrative, invites us to read this episode as serious tragedy[71]—

[67] It is worth noting at this point a possible direct link between the *Hippolytus* and the *Perikeiromene*. In both there is a divine (or quasi-divine) level of causation, Aphrodite controlling the action of Euripides' play, Agnoia (Misconception or Ignorance)—who similarly delivers a prologue—promoting Polemon's act of rage (but with good intent) in Menander's (see *Pk.* 162–170). (One might also compare the malicious *daimon* which lies behind the suitors' plot in *C&C* [see 1.1.16], though this figure is far less prominent.) And the presence of the "goddess" Agnoia herself may echo the action of the *Hippolytus* as well as supporting the suggestion of Menandrean influence on Chariton.

[68] See above, 294, n. 16.

[69] Hunter 1994: 1079.

[70] Hunter 1994: 1082.

[71] Tragic qualities in the episode as a whole are also noted by Cicu (1982: 125–129), examining it through the lens of Aristotle's *Poetics*; he does not, however, make connections with specific plays.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

which is not at all to exclude our reading it in other ways.[72] Generically (and because the author has provided hints that there is going to be more[73]) we may know that the tragedy will be temporary, but familiarity with normal closural patterns in genre does not suck out all emotional life from a text. Until we reach the end we can never be completely certain that the expected conclusion will result, and if Chariton's work represents an early stage in the history of the ancient novel[74] expectations may in any case have been less clear; besides, tension can be experienced even in the course of reading a text we have read before, when we are absolutely certain of the outcome—we may know that Oedipus will find out the truth about himself in *Oedipus Tyrannus*, but we are still capable of engaging emotionally in resistance to his drive to do so as the action proceeds. Again—and this is something of which we should not lose sight—among the perspectives offered by a text is the perspective of the characters, and from the point of view of Chaereas and all the people of Syracuse the consequences of the assault on Callirhoe are utterly tragic. Some sense of the emotional complexity to be found here may be acquired by looking at a much later play, the Shakespearean comedy

[72] Paulsen (1992: 85–102) takes a slightly different approach in considering the generic (or modal) complexity of Cnemon's story in the *Aethiopica* of the much later novelist Heliodorus (*Aeth.* 1.9–17), but comparison may be illuminating. In Paulsen's analysis this episode, an instantiation of the common "Potiphar's Wife" story-type most familiar in Greek literature in the form of the Phaedra/Hippolytus legend (which Heliodorus explicitly evokes, and with specific reference to tragedy [see *Aeth.* 1.8.7, 1.10.2]; an unmistakable verbal echo of Eur. *Hipp.* 802 is also evident at *Aeth.* 8.15.2, in the context of a second reworking of the legend), can be seen to possess a tragic character, which is, however, *undercut* by the presence of comic elements. In this article I offer a different sort of solution to the generic problem raised by the assault scene in *C&C*, but the two approaches are in accord in underlining the point that generically these are slippery texts which refuse the reader easy purchase. It may be added here that Cnemon's story in Heliodorus' novel displays interesting and complex links with the episode of the suitors' plot and Chaereas' assault on Callirhoe in *C&C*: note, for example, the accusation made by the Phaedra-figure, Demainete, who claims to be pregnant, that she has been kicked by the Hippolytus-figure, Cnemon (*Aeth.* 1.10.4); the evocation of Theseus' anger (*Aeth.* 1.11.1–2); and the plot with deliberate misinformation which results in Cnemon, in anger, bursting in upon Demainete and her alleged lover in the bedroom, with the intent of killing them (*Aeth.* 1.11.3–12.4).

[73] In the first sentence of the novel (*C&C* 1.1.1) Chariton states that he is going to tell a love story (πάθος ἐρωτικόν), which (whatever the novel's true title [see above, 291, n. 1]) no reader of the opening chapters is likely to take to be anything other than that of Chaereas and Callirhoe—which can hardly end so soon. More specifically, the careful wording at 1.5.1, where Callirhoe "present[s] to all the *appearance* of a corpse" (see above, 294, n. 15), provides the attentive reader with a firm clue that she is not actually dead.

[74] Dating is uncertain; the broad consensus now is that it belongs to the second half of the first century A.D. or possibly the first decades of the second, though it could be earlier. In any event, with rare exceptions (most notably O'Sullivan 1995: 145–170, who argues for the priority of Xenophon's *Ephesiaca*), it is accepted that *C&C* is the earliest of the five extant Greek novels. For a recent summary of scholarly positions and arguments concerning Chariton's date, see Cueva 2000; and for a fresh discussion of the dating of *C&C*, the fragmentary novel texts *Ninus* and *Metiochus and Parthenope*, and Xenophon's *Ephesiaca*, Bowie (2002: 47–58), who argues that all were probably written within the space of a few decades in the mid- and late first century A.D., and tentatively proposes *termini* of 41 and 61 or 62 for Chariton.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Much Ado About Nothing, where the Claudio–Hero plot offers striking similarities to the assault episode in Chariton, with undoubted tragic colour.[75]

None of this, of course, is intended to suggest that Chariton's novel *as a whole* is to be regarded as having a tragic character; but neither is it true to say, with Reardon, "there is not even a glimpse of tragedy."[76] Indeed, the existence of an expressly tragic dimension to the work may be thought to be implied by the apparent allusion to Aristotle's doctrine of *catharsis* (*Poet.* 6 [1449b]) early in the last book, where the narrator, addressing his readers in the first person in a kind of internal prologue, expresses his belief that they will find the final book very enjoyable, καθάρσιον γάρ ἐστι τῶν ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις σκυθρωπῶν ("for it washes away the gloomy events in the earlier books," 8.1.4).[77] Whether this reflects a misunderstanding or "trivialization" of the Aristotelian passage, or testifies to a less accepted interpretation of it,[78] it directs us towards reading the novel in partly tragic terms[79]—even if the tragedy it invokes is (necessarily) of the "catastrophe survived" type. As far as more "tragic" tragedy is concerned, I suggested earlier (292) that the critical emphasis on the influence of comedy on the Greek novel may have led to the failure to perceive intertextual connections between the novel and such works, a kind of critical blind spot. But the greater responsibility lies with the history of scholarship on the novel since Rohde,[80] the

[75] The key points of contact are the duping of the male lover (Claudio) into believing that the beloved (Hero), whom he is to marry, is unfaithful; the means used in effecting the ruse (the apparent affair is "staged" for Claudio—who has been primed with the false information—to see with his own eyes, and a female servant of the heroine is involved in both cases); and the accusation hurled at Hero by Claudio at their wedding, which results in her swooning and apparent death. Claudio's remorse on learning that he has been tricked can similarly be compared with Chaereas' wish to die when the truth about Callirhoe's innocence has been revealed (*C&C* 1.5.2, 1.5.4–5, 1.6.1); both still believe their beloved to be dead. In the case of *Much Ado*, the audience is assured moments after the assault that Hero is *not* in fact dead; but this does not, in my judgement, diminish the sense of tragedy inherent in the assault scene and in Claudio's subsequent regret and mourning, with which we can still fully empathize. The Shakespearean story finds close analogues in a number of earlier Renaissance texts, and while the lines of influence are impossible to establish with precision, the hypothesis that *C&C* lies at the back of the tradition is plausible and attractive; see the discussions of Weichberger 1898; Gesner 1970: 64–70; Mason 1998.

[76] Reardon 1982: 24 (= Swain 1999a: 185).

[77] The association with pleasure of course reinforces the Aristotelian connection; see esp. *Poet.* 14 (1453b), with Müller 1976: 134–135, who also rightly draws attention to the further implication of the Chariton passage that readers will have derived pleasure from the earlier parts of the narrative—the "gloomy events"—as well (νομίζω δὲ καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον τοῦτο σύγγραμμα τοῖς ἀναγινώσκουσιν ἥδιστον γενήσεσθαι, "I think this final book *too* will prove very enjoyable to my readers"). The relation of the Greek novel to Aristotle's analysis of tragedy in the *Poetics* generally is considered in some detail by Cicu (1982, esp. 115–135), with considerable emphasis on Chariton; Reardon 1988: 205–211; Reardon 1991: 77–83, 100–106.

[78] See Müller 1976: 134–135; Rijksbaron 1984.

[79] A conclusion which scholarship has been reluctant to draw; the possible wider implications of the allusion have routinely been ignored.

[80] Rohde 1876.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

attitude of disdain towards these texts—particularly the so-called "presophistic" or "non-sophistic"[81] examples (Chariton, Xenophon of Ephesus)—from which we have begun to emerge but have still not entirely escaped,[82] and which resists the serious association of the novel with "high" genres. Recognition of the scenes in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* which echo Euripides' *Hippolytus* reveals the tragic potential in the work, and this should both complicate and enrich our response to it[83] and give us further encouragement towards a more generous estimation of this novel and its genre. Such recognition also marks the passage at 1.1.3, where the initial comparison between Chaereas and Hippolytus is made,[84] as more strongly programmatic than has hitherto been observed; and this should alert us to the possibility that other tragic intertexts lurk beneath the surface of Chariton's romance.

Department of Ancient Classics
National University of Ireland, Maynooth
Maynooth
Co. Kildare
Ireland

david.scourfield@nuim.ie

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, D. S. 2000. *The World of Prometheus: The Politics of Punishing in Democratic Athens.* Princeton.

Anderson, J. K. 1985. *Hunting in the Ancient World.* Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.

Anderson, W. S. 1957. "Vergil's Second *Iliad*," *TAPA* 88: 17–30 (repr. in Harrison 1990: 239–252).

[81] The distinction between "sophistic" and "pre-" or "non-sophistic" is pervasive in scholarship on the novel: see, for example, Perry 1967: 108–109; Hägg 1983: 34; Ruiz-Montero 1996: 30. In the case of "presophistic," the distinction is collapsed by Swain (1999b: 27–28). See further below, n. 82.

[82] In recent years the residue of Rohde's disdain has perhaps been most evident in the association of the writings of Chariton and Xenophon in particular with terms normally applied to modern cultural productions such as *letteratura di consumo*, *paralittérature*, and *Trivialliteratur*; the English phrase "popular literature" strikes me as less damning, though an implicit hierarchy of texts is evident here too. My point is not that adhesion to, or the construction of, such hierarchies is in itself (as it were) morally reprehensible (it may indeed be unavoidable, to some degree), but that it can be critically deleterious to texts placed in lower positions on the ladder, predisposing us to think that they contain little of interpretative interest. In the case of the Greek novel, the distinction mentioned above between "sophistic" and "pre-" or "non-sophistic" similarly imposes a judgement which, if by certain criteria reasonable, nevertheless tends to a sheep-and-goats classification. For the application (and consideration of the applicability) of the term *letteratura di consumo* and its equivalents to Greek novel texts, see esp. Fusillo 1994, 1996; Brioso Sánchez 2000, 2001.

[83] Cf. Kaimio 1996: 57, on the *Medea* echo (see above, 292, n. 10) and the reflections of the *Hippolytus* in Dionysius' reaction to falling in love with Callirhoe (see above, 305, n. 65): "Such cases of tragic intertextuality should not be regarded as mere embellishments, but as a means of emphasizing the serious nature of the conflict."

[84] Above, 296.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Arnott, W. G. ed. 1996. *Menander* 2. Cambridge, MA and London.

Balot, R. K. 1998. "Foucault, Chariton, and the Masculine Self," *Helios* 25: 139–162.

Barrett, W. S. ed. 1964. *Euripides:* Hippolytos. Oxford.

Bartsch, W. 1934. *Der Charitonroman und die Historiographie*. Diss., Leipzig.

Billault, A. 1996. "Characterization in the Ancient Novel," in Schmeling 1996: 115–129.

—— 1998. "Les romanciers grecs et la tragédie," in *Le théâtre grec antique: La tragédie. Actes du 8ème colloque de la Villa Kérylos à Beaulieu-sur-Mer les 3 et 4 octobre 1997, sous la présidence et la direction de Jean Leclant et la direction de Jacques Jouanna.* Cahiers de la Villa Kérylos 8. Paris. 179–194.

Borgogno, A. 1971. "Menandro in Caritone," *RFIC* 99: 257–263.

Bowie, E. L. 2002. "The Chronology of the Earlier Greek Novels since B. E. Perry: Revisions and Precisions," *Ancient Narrative* 2: 47–63.

Brioso Sánchez, M. 2000. "¿Oralidad y *literatura de consumo* en la novela griega antigua?: Caritón y Jenofonte de Éfeso (I)," *Habis* 31: 177–217.

—— 2001. "¿Oralidad y *literatura de consumo* en la novela griega antigua?: Caritón y Jenofonte de Éfeso (II)," *Habis* 32: 425–461.

Cairns, D. L. 1993. Aidōs*: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*. Oxford.

—— 1996. "*Hybris*, Dishonour, and Thinking Big," *JHS* 116: 1–32.

—— 1997. "The Meadow of Artemis and the Character of the Euripidean Hippolytus," *QUCC* N.S. 57: 51–75.

Cicu, L. 1982. "La poetica di Aristotele e le strutture dell'antico romanzo d'amore e d'avventure," *Sandalion* 5: 107–141.

Corbato, C. 1968. "Da Menandro a Caritone: studi sulla genesi del romanzo greco e i suoi rapporti con la commedia nuova (I)," *Quaderni triestini sul teatro antico* 1: 5–44.

Cueva, E. P. 1996. "Plutarch's Ariadne in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*," *AJP* 117: 473–484.

—— 2000. "The Date of Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* Revisited," *ClMed* 51: 197–208.

—— 2004. *The Myths of Fiction: Studies in the Canonical Greek Novels*. Ann Arbor.

Diggle, J. ed. 1984. *Euripidis Fabulae* 1. Oxford.

D'Orville, J. P. ed. 1750. Χαρίτωνος Ἀφροδισιέως Τῶν περὶ Χαιρέαν καὶ Καλλιρρόην ἐρωτικῶν διηγημάτων λόγοι η´. Amsterdam.

Fowler, D. P. 1997. "On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies," *MD* 39: 13–34 (repr. in Fowler 2000: 115–137).

—— 2000. *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin*. Oxford.

Fusillo, M. 1989. *Il romanzo greco: polifonia ed eros*. Venice.

—— 1994. "Letteratura di consumo e romanzesca," in G. Cambiano, L. Canfora, and D. Lanza (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica* 1: *La produzione e la circolazione del testo* 3: *I greci e Roma*. Rome. 233–273.

—— 1996. "Il romanzo antico come paraletteratura? Il *topos* del racconto di ricapitolazione," in O. Pecere and A. Stramaglia (eds.), *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino: Atti del convegno internazionale, Cassino, 14–17 settembre 1994*. Cassino. 47–67.

—— 1997. "How Novels End: Some Patterns of Closure in Ancient Narrative," in D. H. Roberts, F. M. Dunn, and D. Fowler (eds.), *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. Princeton. 209–227.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Gale, M. R. 2000. *Virgil on the Nature of Things: The* Georgics, *Lucretius and the Didactic Tradition*. Cambridge.

Gerschmann, K.-H. 1974. *Chariton-Interpretationen*. Diss., Münster.

Gesner, C. 1970. *Shakespeare and the Greek Romance: A Study of Origins*. Lexington.

Goff, B. E. 1990. *The Noose of Words: Readings of Desire, Violence and Language in Euripides'* Hippolytos. Cambridge.

Goold, G. P. ed. 1995. *Chariton:* Callirhoe. Cambridge, MA and London.

Hägg, T. 1971. *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances: Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius, and Achilles Tatius*. Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae, Series in 8°, 8. Stockholm.

—— 1983. *The Novel in Antiquity*. Engl. tr. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Halleran, M. R. ed. 1995. *Euripides:* Hippolytus. Warminster.

Hammer, S. 1922. "De amatoriis Graecorum fabulis observationes," in *Charisteria Casimiro de Morawski septuagenario oblata ab amicis, collegis, discipulis*. Cracow. 88–123.

Harris, W. V. 2001. *Restraining Rage: The Ideology of Anger Control in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA and London.

Harrison, S. J. ed. 1990. *Oxford Readings in Vergil's* Aeneid. Oxford and New York.

Hartung, J. A. 1848. *Euripides' Werke* 3. Leipzig.

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

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

Holzberg, N. 2001. *Der antike Roman: Eine Einführung*[2]. Düsseldorf.

Hunter, R. 1994. "History and Historicity in the Romance of Chariton," *ANRW* II.34.2: 1055–86.

Kaimio, M. 1996. "How to Enjoy a Greek Novel: Chariton Guiding his Audience," *Arctos* 30: 49–73.

Kapparis, K. 2000. "Has Chariton Read Lysias 1 'On the Murder of Eratosthenes'?," *Hermes* 128: 380–383.

Knox, B. M. W. 1952. "The *Hippolytus* of Euripides," *YCS* 13: 3–31.

Kovacs, D. ed. 1995. *Euripides* 2. Cambridge, MA and London.

Lane Fox, R. 1996. "Ancient Hunting: From Homer to Polybios," in G. Shipley and J. Salmon (eds.), *Human Landscapes in Classical Antiquity: Environment and Culture*. Leicester–Nottingham Studies in Ancient Society 6. London and New York. 119–153.

Laplace, M. 1980. "Les légendes troyennes dans le 'roman' de Chariton, *Chairéas et Callirhoé*," *REG* 93: 83–125.

Liapis, V. J. 2006. "Achilles Tatius as a Reader of Sophocles," *CQ* N.S. 56: 220–238.

Lowe, N. J. 2000. *The Classical Plot and the Invention of Western Narrative*. Cambridge.

MacDowell, D. 1968. "Unintentional Homicide in the *Hippolytos*," *RhM* N.F. 111: 156–158.

Marini, N. 1993. "Il personaggio di Calliroe come 'nuova Elena' e la mediazione comica di un passo euripideo (Charito III 10–IV 1 = *Hel*. 1165–1300)," *SIFC* 11: 205–215.

Mason, H. J. 1998. "Genealogy of a Frame-Up," *Canadian Journal of Italian Studies* 21: 1–15.

—— 2002. "Chaireas in Chariton and New Comedy," *Classical Bulletin* 78: 21–27.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Morgan, J. R. 1993. "Make-Believe and Make Believe: The Fictionality of the Greek Novels," in C. Gill and T. P. Wiseman (eds.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*. Exeter. 175–229.

Morgan, T. 1998. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge.

Müller, C. W. 1976. "Chariton von Aphrodisias und die Theorie des Romans in der Antike," *A&A* 22: 115–136.

O'Sullivan, J. N. 1995. *Xenophon of Ephesus: His Compositional Technique and the Birth of the Novel*. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 44. Berlin and New York.

Papanikolaou, A. D. 1973. *Chariton-Studien: Untersuchungen zur Sprache und Chronologie der griechischen Romane*. Hypomnemata 37. Göttingen.

Paulsen, T. 1992. *Inszenierung des Schicksals: Tragödie und Komödie im Roman des Heliodor*. Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium 10. Trier.

Perry, B. E. 1967. *The Ancient Romances: A Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins*. Sather Classical Lectures 37. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Plepelits, K. tr. 1976. *Chariton von Aphrodisias: Kallirhoe*. Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 6. Stuttgart.

Porter, J. R. 2003. "Chariton and Lysias 1: Further Considerations," *Hermes* 131: 433–440.

Rademaker, A. 2005. Sophrosyne *and the Rhetoric of Self-Restraint: Polysemy and Persuasive Use of an Ancient Greek Value Term*. *Mnemosyne* Supp. 259. Leiden and Boston.

Reardon, B. P. 1982. "Theme, Structure and Narrative in Chariton," *YCS* 27: 1–27 (repr. in Swain 1999a: 163–188).

—— 1988. "The Form of Ancient Greek Romance," in R. Beaton (ed.), *The Greek Novel A.D. 1–1985*. London. 205–216.

—— ed. 1989. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.

—— 1991. *The Form of Greek Romance*. Princeton.

—— 1996. "Chariton," in Schmeling 1996: 309–335.

—— ed. 2004. *Chariton Aphrodisiensis: De Callirhoe narrationes amatoriae*. Munich and Leipzig.

Reitzenstein, R. 1906. *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen*. Leipzig.

Rickert, G. 1989. *Ἑκών and ἄκων in Early Greek Thought*. American Classical Studies 20. Atlanta.

Rijksbaron, A. 1984. "Chariton 8, 1, 4 und Aristot. Poet. 1449 b 28," *Philologus* 128: 306–307.

Robiano, P. 1984. "La notion de *Tychè* chez Chariton et chez Héliodore," *REG* 97: 543–549.

Rohde, E. 1876. *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*. Leipzig.

Ruiz-Montero, C. 1996. "The Rise of the Greek Novel," in Schmeling 1996: 29–85.

Schmeling, G. L. 1974. *Chariton*. New York.

—— ed. 1996. *The Novel in the Ancient World*. *Mnemosyne* Supp. 159. Leiden, New York, and Cologne.

Scourfield, J. H. D. 2003. "Anger and Gender in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*," in S. M. Braund and G. Most (eds.), *Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen*. Yale Classical Studies 32. Cambridge. 163–184.

Smith, S. D. 2007. *Greek Identity and the Athenian Past in Chariton: The Romance of Empire*. *Ancient Narrative* Supp. 9. Groningen.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Stinton, T. C. W. 1975. "*Hamartia* in Aristotle and Greek Tragedy," *CQ* n.s. 25: 221–254 (repr. in Stinton 1990: 143–185).
—— 1990. *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy*. Oxford.
Stockert, W. ed. 1994. *Euripides:* Hippolytus. Stuttgart.
Swain, S. ed. 1999a. *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*. Oxford.
—— 1999b. "A Century and More of the Greek Novel," in Swain 1999a: 3–35.
Tilg, S. 2010. *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the Invention of the Greek Love Novel*. Oxford.
Trenkner, S. 1958. *The Greek Novella in the Classical Period*. Cambridge.
Van Steen, G. 1998. "Destined to Be? *Tyche* in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and in the Byzantine Romance of *Kallimachos and Chrysorroi*," *AntCl* 67: 203–211.
Weichberger, K. 1898. "Die Urquelle von Shakespeare's 'Much Ado About Nothing'," *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* 34: 339–345.
Whitmarsh, T. 2005. "The Greek Novel: Titles and Genre," *AJP* 126: 587–611.
Willink, C. W. 1968. "Some Problems of Text and Interpretation in the *Hippolytus*," *CQ* n.s. 18: 11–43.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAEREAS, HIPPOLYTUS, THESEUS: TRAGIC ECHOES, TRAGIC POTENTIAL IN CHARITON

J. H. D. SCOURFIELD

This article argues for the presence of previously unrecognized intertextual connections between Euripides' *Hippolytus* and two scenes in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, one of them of central importance to the action of the novel; and then considers the consequences of this identification for our reading of Chariton's work.

Cet article démontre la présence de rapports intertextuels qu'on n'avait pas ce jour identifiés entre l'*Hippolyte* d'Euripide et deux scènes du roman de Chariton, *Chéréas et Callirhoé* ; l'une de ces scènes est d'importance capitale pour l'action du roman. L'article s'intéresse ensuite aux conséquences de ces liens sur notre lecture de l'œuvre de Chariton.

IPSA DIXERAT: WOMEN'S WORDS IN ROMAN LOVE ELEGY

SHARON L. JAMES

The speech of women in Roman love elegy, represented in *oratio recta*, *oratio obliqua*, and summarized or inferable speech, does not characterize any *puella*. Outside of Propertius Book 4, all female elegiac speech is generic, designed to reflect what the male lovers want and to manipulate them.

La parole des femmes dans l'élégie amoureuse romaine, mise en sene en discours direct, discours indirect, résumée ou insinuée, ne représente aucune *puella*. À l'exception du livre IV de Properce, tous les discours élégiaques féminins sont génériques, destinés à refléter ce que l'amant recherche et à les manipuler.

PASSÉISME ET MODERNISME AU DÉBUT DU SECOND SIÈCLE: LE CAS DE PLINE LE JEUNE

NICOLE MÉTHY

Attachment to the past and modernism are equally present in Pliny the Younger's thought. The former is based on traditional moral criteria, the latter on newer, intellectual and spiritual criteria. This integration in a system of values allows the author to reconcile both attitudes and to transcend them.

Passéisme et modernisme sont également présents dans la pensée de Pline le Jeune. Le premier se fonde sur des critères moraux, traditionnels, le second sur des critères intellectuels et spirituels, plus nouveaux. Cette intégration dans un système de valeurs permet de concilier les deux attitudes et de les dépasser.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.