



1995

Literary Allusion and Myth in the Five Canonical Ancient Greek Novels

Edmund P. Cueva
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss



Part of the [Classics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Cueva, Edmund P., "Literary Allusion and Myth in the Five Canonical Ancient Greek Novels" (1995).
Dissertations. 3511.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/3511

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1995 Edmund P. Cueva

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

LITERARY ALLUSION AND MYTH IN THE FIVE
CANONICAL ANCIENT GREEK NOVELS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

BY

EDMUND P. CUEVA

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

JANUARY 1995

Copyright by Edmund P. Cueva, 1995
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Brian M. Lavelle, Dr. Edwin P. Menes, Dr. John F. Makowski, and Dr. Gareth L. Schmeling for all the help they have given me in writing the dissertation. I could not have finished this analysis of the ancient Greek novel without their scholarly input and expertise. Gratitude is also due to Fr. John P. Murphy, S. J., who helped me in the start of my research. I am greatly indebted and grateful to my wife Shannon, who has not only shown extraordinary patience and understanding, but has also made the writing of this dissertation possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COPYRIGHT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
FOREWORD.....	1
Chapter	
I. THE ANCIENT GREEK NOVEL.....	6
Origins.....	6
Audience.....	10
Influences.....	12
Myth.....	16
Dates of Composition of the Extant Novels.....	26
II. CHARITON, HISTORY, AND MYTH.....	31
Books 1-4.....	34
Characterization through myth: Callirhoe.....	35
Characterization through myth: Chaereas.....	48
Narrative design and Homer.....	50
Books 5 -8.....	55
III. XENOPHON, HISTORY, AND MYTHOLOGICAL ALLUSION.....	65
Habrocomes and Hippolytus.....	67
Antheia and Artemis.....	72
The Oracle and Possible History.....	74
Habrocomes and Antheia.....	76
IV. LONGUS, MYTH, AND AETIOLOGY.....	86
Prooemium to <i>Daphnis and Chloe</i> , Thucydides.....	88
Location of the <i>Aitia</i> and Structure.....	94
<i>Aition</i> # 1: the wood-dove.....	97
<i>Aition</i> # 2: Syrinx.....	99
<i>Aition</i> # 3: Echo.....	100
<i>Aition</i> # 4: Chloe?.....	104
The <i>Aitia</i>	104
V. THEMATIC MYTHS, PAN, AND ACHILLES TATIUS.....	114
VI. INNOVATIVE HELIODORUS.....	142
CONCLUSION.....	162
REFERENCES.....	170
VITA.....	181

FOREWORD

This dissertation explores the function and frequency of myth in the five canonical ancient Greek novels and will attempt to demonstrate that the utilization of myth increased as the nature of the novel evolved.¹ My evaluation will not touch upon all the facets of myth, but rather only on the novelists' literary application of myth. Consequently, literary antecedents of the myth will be taken into account only when the novelist incorporates a myth into his own text. Extended religious meanings of a particular myth, in particular whether the inclusion of a myth denotes the author's belief in the myth, are outside the scope of this dissertation because the levels of religious beliefs of any of the ancient novelists are not ascertainable.²

The novelists seem to use or to borrow their myths in this fashion: myths found in other literary works are incorporated into the novels. This methodology is similar both to that of the ancients who borrowed myths, lines, or passages from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as a source for their own stories and to that of modern authors who see the Old Testament as fertile source for stories and quotations. These later authors do not necessarily incorporate any religious feeling to their works even though the religious quality of their source is apparent.

Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, written perhaps as early as the first century A.D., represents the earliest complete extant Greek novel. In *Chaereas and Callirhoe*,

¹ The five extant canonical Greek novels are Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaca*, Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*, Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, and Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*.

² On such a question see e.g., Paul Veyne, *Did the Greeks Believe in Their Myths?* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988).

unlike the later novels, there is an abundance of historical detail which superficially classes this novel with historical works. Since this new form is written in prose and since the major literary genre which employed prose is history, Chariton, with his numerous historical minutiae, could not but have relied substantially on historiographical structures and features. After Chariton, however, the historical setting began to change to a romantic or mythological setting.

The question of the importance of myth for the novel appears to some scholars to be implicated with that of the origins of the genre. They argue that the roots of the ancient novel are found in religious texts associated with the worship of such deities as Isis and that the texts, which were used for purposes of instructing and edifying initiates and worshippers, contained myths which pertained to cult and ritual.³ From them, they contend, sprang the secular genre of novel, which nevertheless retained the components of its religious progenitor (as Attic Tragedy retained significant elements of Dionysus-worship). Many scholars have aligned themselves on one side or the other of this controversy; some have simply avoided the issue.

Steiner is among the first to set aside the debate on novels as *Mysterientexte* in favor of determining how myth actually functions in the novels.⁴ He suggests that specific myths were used as exemplars for all types of plot situations in which the characters found themselves, and he supplies some uses of myth: (1) moral patterns to be imitated; (2) evidence for what may happen under similar circumstances; (3) illustration; (4) and graphic analogues. Steiner concludes that the authors of ancient

³ R. Merkelbach, *Roman und Mysterium* (München/Berlin: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962); K. Kerényi, *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1927).

⁴ G. Steiner, "The graphic analogue from myth in Greek Romance," in *Classical Studies Presented to B. E. Perry* (Urbana, Illinois, 1969): 123-37.

Greek novels used myth selectively as analogues in certain places in the plots to support, explain, or enhance their meaning. He stops short, however, of a thorough analysis of myth's function in the Greek novel and leaves many questions unasked or unanswered.

Scobie analyzes the structure of Greek novels through the use of similes and is forced thereby to construe the use of myth.⁵ He supposes that similes were used to create a vividness which helped readers to suspend disbelief and become more absorbed in the novel's plot.⁶ His research, like Steiner's, advances our knowledge in that myth frequently appears in the novel in a literary-structural manner, but the advance is limited inasmuch as he does not specifically intend fully to comprehend the use of myth in the novel.

Although there has in fact been no comprehensive study on myth and the ancient

⁵ Alexander Scobie, *More Essays on the Ancient Romance and its Heritage* (Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1973).

⁶ Scobie focuses on the ἐνάργεια or vivid description used to help suspend disbelief (1). Previous to Scobie's research E. C. Harlan had examined the use *ekphraseis* in Achilles Tatius ("The Description of Paintings as a Literary Device and Its Application in Achilles Tatius," diss., Columbia University, 1965). Harlan divided the *ekphraseis* into oratorical and literary groups. The former is defined as narrative passages "characterized by visual vividness and useful for speech composition and historiography;" the latter "as a digressional description of secluded places in nature" (2). Furthermore, the description of paintings is a "device . . . shown to be symbolic and illustrative of the entire story or discourse in which it is used, rather than digressional" (2). Harlan concluded by noting that by the fourth century A.D. *ekphrasis* and painting description had merged (6). Shadi Bartsch, *Decoding the Ancient Novel* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1989), has also done some work on *ekphraseis* which she defines as "illuminators of the text" which "promise insight into it" and "call for acts of interpretation" (7).

Greek novel, no shortage of opinions exists. Deligiorgis,⁷ Hägg,⁸ MacQueen,⁹ and other scholars allude to myth in their studies of the ancient Greek novel, but none treat myth comprehensively. Deligiorgis downplays the role of myth suggesting it may get the plot moving or flesh out the story, but serves no essential purpose. Hägg contends that myth was possibly employed by the author to illustrate an idea or a moral or religious principle, but in resurrecting the issue of novels as *Mysterientexte*, omits to consider the possible literary function of myth. Finally, in his analysis of Longus' novel, MacQueen notes that myth is essential for the completion of ring-composition and thus is structurally vital. The debate has not resulted in consensus, and a fresh look and evaluation is certainly justified.

My study will focus on the transition in the ancient Greek novel of historical to romantic or mythological setting, and upon the increasing role of myth in enabling the change, but especially upon the nature of the various literary functions of myth introduced into the novel in later antiquity. I shall attempt to establish that myth served as a central part of the later novel, which relied on earlier literary myths for structure, and as a source of stories familiar to author and audience. The results should provide a clearer understanding of the use of myth in the ancient novel and insights into the mentalité of the authors and the audience for whom they were written.

The first chapter consists of an examination of the data on the five ancient extant Greek novels. The examination is subdivided into theories on possible origins of the

⁷ Stavros Deligiorgis, "Longus' Art in Brief Lives," *Philological Quarterly* 53 (1974): 1-9.

⁸ Tomas Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983).

⁹ Bruce D. MacQueen, "Longus and the Myth of Chloe," *Illinois Classical Studies* 10 (1985): 119-34.

novel, the audience of the genre, the influences on the development of the novel, myth, and dates of composition. Chapters two through six specifically examine the individual novels, and, in them, I shall demonstrate how myth is used. Each of these chapters is an isolated analysis, the results of which are summarized in the conclusion. This dissertation in no way attempts to supply a new theory on the origins of the ancient Greek novel, but, rather, demonstrates how one element of the novel, the historical setting, gave way to new elements, the mythological and romantic.

CHAPTER I
THE ANCIENT GREEK NOVEL

Origins

Several theories have come into being to explain the genesis of the novel. While it is obvious that the Greek novel is unique to itself, it is equally obvious that it could not have come about without relying on other preexisting genres, such as epic, New Comedy, Alexandrian erotic poetry, *periegesis*, and historiography. Although the theories which have been produced thus far acknowledge those sources, they fail to take into account their combination with myth in the novel. For certainly the novel transformed preexisting literary genres and myth into something unprecedented.

Rohde suggests that the authors of the ancient Greek novels deliberately blended or synthesized Alexandrian erotic poetry and the travel story (*Reisefabulistik*).¹⁰ Pervo, among others, however, roundly criticizes Rohde's analysis as disdainful of the genre and therefore biased. Eros is not to be found in all Greek novels nor does Rohde take into account other sources in the generation of the genre. In any case a list of preexisting literary materials does not explain how the genre came about.¹¹ Rather one should consider these preexisting materials as building blocks for the genre.

¹⁰ *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1960).

¹¹ Richard I. Pervo, *Profit With Delight* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987) 102.

Writing twenty years after Rohde, Schwartz suggests that the novel was a by-product, or perhaps an unwanted result, of the decomposition of historiography which occurred in the Hellenistic period.¹² This by-product, he urges, used the same elements, such as myth, legend, saga as debased historiography. Schwartz places the birth of the novel in the Second Sophistic, a period of literary activity which became the catalyst for the creation of this new literary genre.¹³ He replaces Rohde's hypothesis with one comprising Hellenistic historiography, in the manner of Duris, and erotic poetry as the main genres. The contribution of history to the development of the novel, however, was not a new idea: U. Wilcken in 1893 had cited the possibility that the novel was an outgrowth of Hellenistic historiography.¹⁴

Numerous theories on the origins of the genre followed:¹⁵ Lavagnini follows Schwartz; but emphasizes legend and saga as ingredients.¹⁶ Ludivosky accords primacy to the adventure component of the novels.¹⁷ Kerényi thinks that the religious element is

¹² E. Schwartz, *Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman* (1896; Berlin: DeGruyter, 1943).

¹³ *Ibid.*, 154.

¹⁴ U. Wilcken, "Ein neuer griechischer Roman," *Hermes* 28 (1893): 161-93. For a more recent analysis of the erotic plot and its union with historiography see C. W. Müller, "Chariton von Aphrodisias und die Theorie des Romans in der Antike," *Antike und Abendland* 22 (1976): 115-36.

¹⁵ G. Thiele, "Zum griechischen Roman," *Aus der Anomia*, ed. C. Robert (Berlin, 1890) 124-33, suggests that rhetorical handbooks may have molded the new genre.

¹⁶ B. Lavagnini, *Studi sul romanzo greco* (1921; Messina/Firenza, 1950).

¹⁷ J. Ludivosky, *Recky Roman Dobrodruzny, Le roman grec d'aventures: étude sur sa nature et son origine* (Prague: Publ. Fac. Philos. Prague, 1925).

primary, especially in its propaganda of eastern cults.¹⁸ Kerényi's work greatly influences Merkelbach, who views the ancient novels as *romans à clef*.¹⁹ Merkelbach suggests that the novels were indoctrination manuals for cults, but he does not consider Chariton's novel a *Mysterientext* because, as Merkelbach argues, Chariton was not aware that he was supposed to have composed a religious manual.²⁰ Merkelbach's thesis, and any which hold that novels are *Mysterientexte*, seems vitiated by his, or any, admission that it does not apply to Chariton, the first novelist, who must have had appreciable influence on those who followed.

Giangrande suggests that the origins of the genre may be found in erotic poetry.²¹ Hadas had already attached much importance to the erotic element of the novel, and, although, he did not date its introduction, he did note that by Chariton's time the erotic had gained primacy and had displaced the importance of the historical and patriotic elements.²² He also stressed that time and place became less important as the genre developed and consequently a genre which had originally preserved "national memories" came to be "a story . . . for the story's sake."²³

¹⁸ K. Kerényi, *Die griechische-orientalische; Der Antike Roman* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971).

¹⁹ Before Merkelbach wrote his influential work on the religious and the novel, F. Altheim, *Literatur und Gesellschaft im ausgehenden Altertum* Vol. I (Halle 1948), had noted the importance between religious elements, such as spirituality, mystery cults, and the novel.

²⁰ Merkelbach, *Roman und Mysterium* 339-40 (see above, n. 3).

²¹ G. Giangrande, "On the Origins of Greek Romance," *Eranos* 60 (1962) 155.

²² Moses Hadas, "Cultural Survival and the Origins of Fiction," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 51 (1952): 253-60.

²³ *Ibid.*, 257.

Perry focuses on the reasons behind rather than the process by which novels arose and accordingly centers his study on the *Zeitgeist*, thereby discarding speculation on a biological development of the novel.²⁴ In fact, he writes: "The first romance was deliberately planned and written by an individual author, its inventor. He conceived it on a Tuesday afternoon in July."²⁵ Perry suggests that historiography and New Comedy had a great influence on the novel, but emphasizes that the novel was entertainment and that these novels were written for their own sake.²⁶ Reardon follows Perry's lead in attempting to answer why the ancient novel was written and shows that not only the literary predecessors of the ancient novel must be examined, but also the environment in which they were written.²⁷

Though interesting, none of these theories can be said to have solved the problem of the origins of the genre. What is certain about the origin of the novel is best summarized in the conclusion of Bonnard:

. . . epic, lyric and drama, had run their course. Oratory had degenerated into rhetoric, history into romanced biography or suspect erudition. The last of the poets were versifying geography, medicine and natural history, or polishing up epigrams. . . . And then, as if ancient Greece could not settle herself to rest before

²⁴ B. E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances: A Literary Historical Account of Their Origins* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967).

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 175.

²⁶ For the influence of New Comedy, especially Menander, see G. Paduano, "Uno dei tanti: l'eroe comico di Menandro," in *Introduzione à Menandro, Commedie, a cura di G.P.* (Milan, 1980).

²⁷ B. P. Reardon, *Courants Littéraires Grecs des Iles et Iles Siècles Après J.-C.* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1971). For his analysis and summary of work done on the ancient novel see pages 312-33. For other reviews on the theories on the origins of the ancient novel see: Bruce D. MacQueen, *Myth, Rhetoric, and Fiction* (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1990) 204-24 and Pervo 86-114 (see above, n. 12).

bequeathing to the modern world the most modern genre in literature, she invented the novel.²⁸

Audience

The novel is a lengthy prose piece, possessing rather a complex plot involving human beings, their feelings, thoughts, and emotions. Components shared by most of the ancient Greek novels are: both aristocratic and bourgeois characters, an ethical moral code which determines the actions of the characters, invocations of the past or remote periods, well-known stories (myths), love and adventure, and everyday incidents. Pirates, kidnappings, deaths, burials, treasures, human sacrifice, recognition scenes, lively description, battles, and sex all conjoin to effect a suspension of disbelief.

Even though the majority of these elements show up in most of the ancient novels, one should, nevertheless, consider the idea that the ancient novel is the “least defined, the least concentrated, the least organic, and the most formless of all the so-called literary forms. It is the open form for the open society,” and a “latter-day epic for Everyman” which “has something for everybody.”²⁹ Who, however, was this ‘Everyman’? Why would he be interested in reading a narrative which had a *πάθος ἐρωτικόν* as its main ingredient?

Various audiences for the ancient novel have been suggested. Scobie claims that the audience was composed of “middle-class readers who enjoy reading fiction which mirrors their own ideals and unfulfilled longings.”³⁰ Other candidates are the educated

²⁸ Andre Bonnard, *Greek Civilization: From Euripides to Alexandria* (New York: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1961) 251-2.

²⁹ Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity* 89 (see above, n. 8).

³⁰ Scobie, *More Essays* 96.

class of the Hellenistic cities of Asia Minor,³¹ scribes, women, youths,³² and those poor in spirit.³³ Wessering suggests that the audience of the novel was “probably the intellectuals in the first place but not exclusively,” and, like Perry, also stresses that the primary function of the novel is entertainment and that “this entertainment provided by the novels consisted in satisfaction of emotional needs, wish fulfillment, escape, and, in addition, intellectual or aesthetic pleasure.”³⁴

There is no historical, literary, or archaeological evidence which can help to identify the audience of the ancient Greek novel (see below, Dates of Composition of the Extant Novels). Analyses of papyrological data cannot tell us who read the ancient novels, but do reveal, by a comparison of the number of novel fragments with fragments of other genres, that ancient readers possessed fewer novels than other literary forms.³⁵ The audience of the ancient novel may, therefore, be identified in terms of the authors of the genre. Since Chariton alone supplies autobiographical information, he may help in the identification of his readers.

The enormous amount of borrowing from preexisting literary works (cf. Chapter II) shows that Chariton was not only literate but extremely educated. He identifies

³¹ Douglas E. Edwards, “Surviving the Web of Roman Power: Religion and Politics in the Acts of the Apostles, Josephus, and Chariton’s *Chaereas and Callirhoe*,” in *Images of Empire*, ed. Loveday Alexander (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991) 200.

³² Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity* 90-1.

³³ Perry 89f (see above, n. 25).

³⁴ Berber Wessering, “The Audience of the Ancient Novels,” in *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* (Groningen, 1987) 67-79.

³⁵ Cf. Susan A. Stephens, “Who Read Ancient Novels?,” in *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, ed. James Tatum (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1994) 405-18.

himself as being the ὑπογραφεύς of Athenagoras, an orator in Aphrodisias, who probably depended upon Chariton to maintain his written records; an orator would not employ someone who was not capable of writing down or composing a literary product. The author also mentions that his homeland is Aphrodisias in Asia Minor. Since this Carian part of the Mediterranean has a tradition of epic, historiography, and travel-stories it would not be too great a leap to suggest that Chariton wrote for an audience which valued its literary inheritance and was itself widely literate. If Chariton did not write for an audience which would be able to enjoy, and more importantly understand the intertextual quality of his novel, why would he produce such a literary work? The answer has to be that Chariton wrote for an audience which was at least educated enough to understand and appreciate his work.³⁶

Influences

Two main influences on the genesis of the novel were history and epic. The authors chose to place their novels either in a time in which Rome had not yet become the ruler of the Greek world or in an idyllic, unreal setting, e.g. Longus.³⁷ The author was not just appealing to a sense of nostalgia; he could only with preexisting materials. By using a historical background the authors of the earlier novels showed that the narrative

³⁶ Cf. Ewen Bowie, "The Readership of Greek Novels in the Ancient World," in *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, ed. James Tatum (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1994) 435-60.

³⁷ Hägg, "The Beginnings of the Historical Novel," in *The Greek Novel AD 1-1985*, ed. Roderick Beaton (London: Croom Helm, 1988) 179. Scobie, *More Essays* (see above, n. 5), remarks that it was "not altogether surprising that at a time of comparative peace and political stability Greek romance-writers were tempted if not by literary fashion, then by nostalgia to project much of the action of their romances back into the turbulent but free past before the emergence of Rome as the dominant political force in the Mediterranean where Greeks were still at war partly with themselves and partly with the Persians" (19).

plot was at least plausible and realistic, and thereby helped the reader suspend disbelief.³⁸

Asia Minor, in particular Caria, was a fertile ground for literary production. Ionia claimed Homer, the earliest author to be associated with epic. The island of Chios, home of the Homeridae, and the city of Smyrna both have been cited as the possible birthplace of Homer, and it is in this general area in which we first find epic. With its long narrative and its hero engaged in a quest, epic might employ myth, legend, history, and folk-tale. It recalls a past time and by doing so it also recalls the culture of that period. Supernatural elements, such as gods, magic, oracles, and prophets, may also comprise a considerable portion of an epic. The novel shares some characteristics with epic such as a long narrative involving a quest: in Homer the quest is for honor or home, while in the novels it usually is erotic in nature. As I will show, the novels, at least the earlier novels, employ more history than myth, but as the genre develops the historical in the novel give way to the mythological. The supernatural plays a very important part in the novel; it directs the plot by means of the gods and myth shows up in dreams, omens, oracles, and prophecies. Certainly a major difference is epic's use of dactylic hexameter verse while the novel employs prose.

Chariton, in fact, relies heavily upon epic. In *Chaereas and Callirhoe* he not only borrows lines from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, but also uses the moment of the story in which these lines are found to lend plot structure to his own story. I shall return to this in the next chapter. In the first book of the novel we find suitors planning to get back at Chaereas for marrying Callirhoe, who they thought should have married one of them. The disaffected suitors and their plotting is reminiscent of the Helen-myth, as well as

³⁸ J. R. Morgan, "History, Romance, and Realism in the *Aithiopika*," *CLAnt* 1 (1982) 222.

the first two books the *Odyssey*. This competition for Callirhoe also suggests the “Wooing of Agariste” in Herodotus (6.129-30), another writer from Asia Minor. Perhaps Chariton, too, incorporated this local motif because he predicted its favourable reception by an indigenous audience.

The genres of novel and history are similar in certain aspects: lengthy narratives in prose, third-person narration in the past tense, rhetoric, and exciting and moving plots.³⁹ Morgan, however, has noted that the quasi-historical elements in the novels are decorative and do not dictate the plot.⁴⁰ (Morgan’s idea, however, may not be applicable to Chariton who seems to include more historiographical elements in his novel than the other novelists.)

Hadas adds that the novels were “histories written to promote cultural survival” and to glorify “national heroes.” He bases his argument on a comparison of similarities between III Maccabees and the romance: 1) In both works well-known characters “from a familiar period of history” were introduced, 2) the denouement of the plot takes place in a courtroom atmosphere, 3) in the courtroom there are “pathetic scenes and rhetorical forensic speeches involving extravagant exaggeration,” 4) both works are liberally sprinkled with literary allusions, 5) there is “religious interest” in both works - with a heavier religious emphasis placed on the biblical work, 6) and both works use quoted letters. The differences between the works are limited to two: there is no personal hero and no love story in III Maccabees.⁴¹ Hadas does not mean to imply that

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 223f.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 248.

⁴¹ Moses Hadas, *Hellenistic Culture* (New York: Columbia UP, 1972) 127-8.

the novelists borrowed from the Bible, but rather that both the nascent novel and parts of the Bible, i.e. III Maccabees, were heavily influenced by historiography.

The novelists employed what Schwartz would describe as degenerate Hellenistic historiography in order to give their erotic writings a semblance of respectability. Although travel stories were written before the Hellenistic period, one of the most prolific genres of that period and of Classical was the *periegesis*. Reardon speculates that the travel dimension of *Chaereas and Callirhoe* might have its roots in travel stories such as those of Ctesias synthesized with such historical legends as those found in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.⁴² As I shall show, notwithstanding the sources for the historical elements of the novel, it is undeniable that the earlier novels, *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and the *Ephesiaca*, were more historical in nature than the later novels.⁴³

Chariton used more historiographical than mythological elements in his novel (see chapter II). The historical parameters of his work, however, did not constrain his inventiveness, but rather supplied him with a framework within which he could develop his plot. In other words, Chariton uses history but is not bound to follow it: he conflates all his historical information. Schmeling has put forth possible reasons why Chariton employed a historical framework:⁴⁴ Chariton was a literary conservative who could draw from Xenophon, Ctesias, and even Cicero for authority to give prose fiction the appearance of history. Hence prose fiction resembling history would be more palatable to ancient readers than fiction written in prose rather than in verse. Precedents for Chariton's use of a historical background can be found in the *Ninus Romance* (c. 100

⁴² B. P. Reardon, *The Form of Greek Romance* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991) 141ff.

⁴³ Cf. Reardon, *Courants Littéraires* 315 (see above, n. 28).

⁴⁴ Gareth Schmeling, *Chariton* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1974) 55f.

B.C.) and in the *Parthenope Romance* (c. 2nd cent A.D.).⁴⁵ There were, however, restrictions placed on the writing of prose fiction in the disguise of history. Verse was the “correct literary vehicle for expressing τὸ μυθωδές, τὸ τερατώδες, τὸ ψευδές,” and literary critics did not particularly like “genres that lacked *utilitas*.”⁴⁶

Myth

In Classical times there were many attempts to find the basic substances of the universe, but in the Hellenistic period the foci of many enquires were humans, the pursuit of personal satisfaction, and purpose in life.⁴⁷ During this time astrology and mystery religions filtered into the Hellenistic world from the East. More importantly for the study of the ancient novel, mystery cults and religions played greater roles in the lives of Hellenistic people.

Merkelbach suggests, arguing on the basis of the importance which mystery cults and religions had in the Hellenistic and post-Hellenistic world, that the novel has its origins in mystery religions. He thinks that the novels, except Chariton, could be read by anyone, but could only be properly understood by the initiates of the mystery religions.⁴⁸ He sees, in particular, the plots of the novels reflecting the adventures

⁴⁵ Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity* 17. Marios Philippides, “Longus: Antiquity’s Innovative Novelist,” diss., State University of New York at Buffalo, 1978, writes that the habit “of placing the plot within a specific period is only exhibited in the earliest romances that are extant, the *Ninus* romance, and Chariton’s *Chaereas and Callirhoe*” (18). In the novels of Longus and Achilles Tatius there is, nevertheless, historical intent (79ff.).

⁴⁶ Alexander Scobie, *Aspects of the Ancient Romance and its Heritage* (Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1969) 16.

⁴⁷ Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity* 86-87 (see above, n. 8).

⁴⁸ This view is similar to the exoteric and esoteric readings of Plato.

which Isis and Osiris, her brother-husband, had undergone: separation, death, wandering, and reunion or rebirth. This is an interesting theory, but the interpretation of every incident in the novels as having some sort of religious or mysterious significance leads to according religious significance to all incidents.⁴⁹ But what clearcut religious interpretation can one give to the description of the suitor in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, to the homoerotic story of Hippothous in the *Ephesiaca*, or to the cicada hidden in Chloe's bosom in *Daphnis and Chloe*? This is not to say that the novels did not reflect the religious atmosphere of the Hellenistic and Roman world: due respect is given to Aphrodite in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*; Apollo, Isis, Apis, Helius, and Eros are properly revered in the *Ephesiaca* and the other ancient novels.

As previously mentioned, Kerényi influenced Merkelbach in developing his theory of the origins of the novel. Kerényi examines some of the components of the novels, such as premature burial, the scourging of the hero, executions from which the victim is rescued, and considers the novels to be aretalogies of the Isis-Osiris cult. Hadas agrees with Kerényi's theory and sees cult as the "earliest motivation" but modifies it by emphasizing that the glorification of "national heroes" gives a greater impetus to the development of the novel; the historical then receded as the erotic came "to the fore."⁵⁰

There can be no mistaking the fact that any literary work must, in one way or another, reflect the times in which it was written. Elements, such as religious sense,

⁴⁹ B. P. Reardon, "Novels and Novelties, or Mysteriuser and Mysteriuser," in *The Mediterranean World: Papers Presented to Gilbert Bagnani* (Peterborough, Ontario: Trent University, 1975) 87: "Once one begins to interpret things in a symbolizing, allegorical way, one very soon finds it impossible to turn around without stumbling on a symbol. Anything seems to be grist to the mill."

⁵⁰ Moses Hadas, *Three Greek Romances* (Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing, 1953) ix.

feeling, spirituality, and cult, were components of the times in which the novels were written and therefore some form of religion must find its place into the novel. The problem, although maybe not conscious, for the author is how to integrate religion, specifically divinities, into the work.⁵¹ As I shall show in the coming chapters, the easiest way to integrate religion, whether or not the author was religious, into the novels was through the use of myth. The inclusion of myths, however, should not be taken to mean that the authors were intentionally trying to create religious documents.

At this point a definition of myth is necessary. In this dissertation myth is defined and will be studied only as a traditional story, dealing with the supernatural or the marvelous, which has made its way into written form or whose literary origin can be identified. The literary component of myth allows me to approach my analysis of myth and the novel in an intertextual manner: I shall examine how the ancient novelists incorporate myths into their writings through literary allusion.

Steiner has examined the use of myth and the ancient Greek novel in terms of graphic analogue, which means that each author “found in myth a vivid analogue to something he saw before him.”⁵² These myths, in other words, were a source within which the novelist could find mythological examples to parallel or correspond to the narrative of the novel. For example, the novelist might want to find a mythological story which had moral patterns which could be imitated by his characters, or the novelist might have borrowed from myth a story to show what might happen under given circumstances. In a lesser narrative capacity the mythological stories could be used as illustration or decoration. In Chariton the motif of physical beauty, i.e. a character

⁵¹ Graham Anderson, *Ancient Fiction: The Novel in the Graeco-Roman World* (London/Sydney: Croom Helm, 1984) 75-6.

⁵² Steiner 123 (see above, n. 4).

mistaken for a god on account of his or her beauty, is based on the mythical or legendary characters found in the Homeric epics.

The source of these myths is of special importance. Chariton took the majority of his myths from the Homeric epics, and Xenophon seems to have imitated Chariton. Longus, Achilles Tatius, and Heliodorus, while showing Homeric influence on their selection of myths, employ myths which had been heavily reworked in the Hellenistic period by authors like Callimachus and Theocritus.⁵³

Authors from Homer to the time of the Greek novels utilized myth in many different ways, perhaps as each found it best for his own purposes. In my study of myth and the ancient Greek novel I shall not enter into the controversies surrounding sociological or religious interpretations of myth, rather I shall treat myth as a literary construct: the change in context and literary effect caused by the inclusion of myth. Consequently, literary myth, and its relation to history, from the time of Homer to that of προγυμνάσματα of the Second Sophistic will be briefly examined.

The myths and legends in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are the earliest recorded by the Greeks. Homer did not differentiate between the two and it was Hesiod who first commented on the difference between fiction and truth. In *Theogony* 26-8 Hesiod wrote that the Muses are able to tell both the truth and lies as if they were the truth.⁵⁴ The Presocratics were next in line to offer some criticism of myths found. Among the many Presocratics who criticized myth were Xenophanes of Colophon and Heraclitus of

⁵³ Reardon, *Courants Littéraires* (see above, n. 28), identifies the Hellenistic period as having been an important source for the myths used in the novels: “. . .mythe hellénistique dans lequel nous avons cru voir le noyau du roman” (352).

⁵⁴ ποιμένες ἀγραυλοὶ, κάκ' ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶον, / ἴδμεν ψεῖδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα, / ἴδμεν δ' εὖτ' ἐθέλωμεν ἀληθέα γηρῦσασθαι. The text of Hesiod is from *Carmina*, ed. A. Rzach (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1958).

Ephesus. Hecataeus of Miletus, one of the earliest Ionian geographers, also criticized mythography.

Xenophanes of Colophon (*fl.* 530 B.C.) spurned Homeric and Hesiodic mythology and the religious tradition which grew out of the epics.⁵⁵ Heraclitus of Ephesus (*fl.* 500 B.C.) continued the attack on the mythology found in his predecessors, Homer and Archilochus, and noted that: τόν τε "Ομηρον ἔφασκεν ἄξιον ἐκ τῶν ἀγῶνων ἐκβάλλεσθαι καὶ ῥαπίζεσθαι καὶ Ἀρχίλοχον ὁμοίως (*fr.* 42). Hecataeus of Miletus (*fl.* 500 B.C.), in the introduction to his *Γενεηλογίαι*, also called *Ἱστορίαι* or *Ἡρωολογία*, wrote: Ἐκαταῖος Μιλήσιος ὧδε μυθεῖται· τάδε γράφω, ὡς μοι δοκεῖ ἀληθέα εἶναι· οἱ γὰρ Ἑλλήνων λόγοι πολλοὶ τε καὶ γελοῖοι, ὡς ἐμοὶ φαίνονται, εἰσὶν (*fr.* 1). Hecataeus, from the very start of his work, attempted to show that the ἀληθέα must not be confused with the λόγοι γελοῖοι and hence differentiated the fictional from the historical.

Herodotus followed Hecataeus in separating the fictional from the historical. Although Herodotus' work at times might seem to be purely fictional, he did write in the first lines of his *History* that he would record what had actually happened:

Ἡροδότου Ἀλικαρνησσεὸς ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξις ἦδε, ὡς μήτε τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τῷ χρόνῳ ἐξίτηλα γένηται, μήτε ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωमाστά, τὰ μὲν Ἕλλησι, τὰ δὲ βαρβάροισι ἀποδεχθέντα, ἀκλεῖα γένηται, τὰ τε ἄλλα καὶ δι' ἣν αἰτίην ἐπολέμησαν ἀλλήλοισι (1.1-5).⁵⁶

He also related that he would arrive at the truth from his own observations, research, and by writing down what he himself saw (2.99).

⁵⁵ πάντα θεοῖσ' ἀνέθηκαν "Ομηρός θ' Ἡσίοδος τε, / ὅσσα παρ' ἀνθρώποισιν ὄνειδα καὶ φόγος ἐστίν, / κλέπτειν μοιχεύειν τε καὶ ἀλλήλους ἀπατεύειν (*fr.* 11). The texts of Xenophanes, Heraclitus, and Hecataeus are from Hermann Diels, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (1910; Berlin: Weidman, 1975).

⁵⁶ The text of Herodotus is from *Historiae*, ed. Carol Hude (Oxford: Oxford Classical Texts, 1954).

Shortly after Herodotus, Thucydides wrote that, in regard to the speeches in his work, he would attempt to narrate what he thought the speaker would have said and would have been fitting for the occasion of the speech. In regard to facts about the war, however, Thucydides had a different plan:

τὰ δ' ἔργα τῶν πραχθέντων ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ παρατυχόντος
πυνθανόμενος ἤξιωσα γράφειν οὐδ' ὡς ἐμοὶ ἐδόκει, ἀλλ' οἷς τε αὐτὸς παρῆν καὶ
παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσον δυνατὸν ἀκριβεῖα περὶ ἐκάστον ἐπέξελθῶν (1.22.2).⁵⁷

He also made it quite clear that he would not include τὸ μυθῶδες (1.22.4) even though the finished product might not be as pleasing. Thucydides **did not** want to write a prize-essay for the moment but rather a κτῆμά ἐς αἰεὶ (1.22.4), and **this** would necessarily eliminate any myth.

In the second book of the *Republic* Plato stressed that μύθοι, fictional stories, are the things first taught to children (377a); therefore these myths should not hold opinions contrary to those expected from the children when **they** have become adults (377b).⁵⁸ Accordingly, Plato suggested that there should be some sort of censorship of the myth-makers (377c), and that lists of acceptable myths should be created. These lists would include stories about respected heroes but not the myths and stories which harmed the image of the gods: Οὓς Ἡσίοδος τε, εἶπον, καὶ Ὀμηρος ἡμῖν ἐλεγέτην καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ποιηταί. οὗτοι γάρ που μύθους τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ψευδεῖς συντιθέντες ἔλεγόν τε καὶ

⁵⁷ The text of Thucydides is from *Historiae*, ed. Henry Stuart Jones (Oxford: Oxford Classical Texts, 1953).

⁵⁸ Cf. Reardon, *The Form of Greek Romance* 46-76, and Christopher Gill, "Plato on Falsehood - not Fiction," in *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*, eds. Christopher Gill and T. P. Wiseman (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1993) 38-87. See also Jean-Pierre Vernant, *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece* (New York: Zone Books, 1988) 203-60; Carlo Brillante, "History and the Historical Interpretation of Myth," in *Approaches to Greek Myth*, ed. Lowell Edmunds (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins UP, 1990) 91-140; Ken Dowden, *The Uses of Greek Mythology* (London: Routledge, 1992) 39-53.

λέγουσιν (377d).⁵⁹ Plato, in other words, harked back to the ideas of the Presocratics who had denigrated the traditional myths; Plato recommended that the myths told to children ought to espouse the fairest lessons of virtue (378e).

Aristotle, the student of Plato, also dealt with the subject of poetry as fiction and history as truth. In his *Poetics*, though not specifically examining myth in the modern sense of the word, he dictated that it is the poet's object not to tell τὰ γενόμενα but rather οἷα ἂν γένοιτο καὶ τὰ δυνατὰ κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ἢ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον (1451b1).⁶⁰ The difference between a historian and a poet, Aristotle continued, was not that a historian wrote in prose and a poet in verse, but that the historian tells τὰ γενόμενα while the poet writes οἷα ἂν γένοιτο. He also advised that the myths (stories) which the poet wrote had become hackneyed and therefore:

οὐ πάντως εἶναι ζητητέον τῶν παραδεδομένων μύθων περὶ οὓς αἱ τραγωδία εἰσὶν ἀντέχεσθαι. καὶ γὰρ γελοῖον τοῦτο ζητεῖν. ἐπεὶ καὶ τὰ γνώριμα ὀλίγοις γνώριμά ἐστιν ἀλλ' ὅμως εὐφραίνει πάντας (1451b8).

Vergil in *Georgics* 3.1-8 echoed Aristotle's notion that the myths had become worn-out.⁶¹ Vergil's comments on the state of literature dealing with mythology would be echoed by many other writers, for example, Martial in an epigram which might have

⁵⁹ The text of the *Republic* is from *Platonis Opera* vol. 4, ed. John Burnet (1902. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992).

⁶⁰ The text of Aristotle is from *Poetics*, ed. D.W. Lucas (Oxford: Oxford Classical Texts, 1968).

⁶¹ *Te quoque, magna Pales, et te memorande canemus / pastor ab Amphryso, vos, silvae amnesque Lycaei. / cetera, quae vacuas tenuissent cammine mentes, / omnia iam vulgata: quis aut Eurysthea durum / aut inlaudati nescit Busiridis aras? / cui non dictus Hylas puer te Latonia Delos / Hippodameque umeroque Pelops insignis eburno, / acer equis?* (III.1-8). The text of Vergil is from R. A. B. Mynors' Oxford Classical Text.

been aimed at Statius (4.49).⁶² Juvenal, in *Satire* 1.1-14, wrote that he did not want to remain a listener all his days, he also wanted to have his say. He was tired of listening to epics and tragedies such as the *Theseid* of Codrus, the *Telephus*, and the *Orestes*. He knew his mythology, which by his time had been worked to death.⁶³ The Romans also speculated about the historical and the fictional, as the author of the *Rhetorica Ad Herennium* (written c. 86-82 B.C.) shows. He differentiated between the factual and the fictional and said that the fictional and the factual can be mixed, but noted that the two are not the same.⁶⁴

In the beginning of the fourth book of his *World History*, Diodorus Siculus made plain the difficulties with which the mythographer had to struggle. Firstly, the antiquity of the events which the mythographer would write down in his work were hindering to research. Secondly, the numbers and types of heroes, demi-gods, and men

⁶² *Nescit, crede mihi, quid sint epigrammata, Flacce, / qui tantum lusus ista iocosque vocat. / ille magis ludit qui scribit prandia saevi / Tereos aut cenam, crude Thyesta, tuam, / aut puero liquidas aptantem Daedalon alas, / pascentem Siculas aut Polyphemon ovis. / a nostris procul est omnis vesica libellis, / Musa nec insano syrmate nostra tumet. / Illa tamen laudant omnes, mirantur, adorant. / confiteor: laudant illa sed ista legunt.* The text of Martial is from *Epigrammata*, ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1990).

⁶³ *nota magis nulli domus est sua quam mihi lucus / Martis et Aeoliis vicinum rupibus antrum / Vulcani. Quid agant venti, quas torqueant umbras / Aeacus, unde alius furtivae devehat aurum / pelliculae, quantas iaculetur Monychus ornos, / Frontonis platani convulsaque marmora clamant / semper et adsiduo ruptae lectore columnae: / expectes eadem a summo minimoque poeta (1.7-14).* The text of Juvenal is from *Satires*, trans. and eds. Pierre de Labriolle and François Villeneuve (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1983).

⁶⁴ *Id quod in negotiarum expositione positum est tres habet partes: fabulam, historiam, argumentum. Fabula est quae neque veras neque veri similes continet res, ut eae sunt quae tragoediis traditae sunt. Historia est gesta res, sed ab aetatis nostrae memoria remota. Argumentum est ficta res quae tamen fieri potui, velut argumenta comoediarum (1.8.13).* The text is from *Rhetorique à Herennius*, trans. and ed. Guy Achard (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1989).

were too vast to allow a coherent exposition of deeds and genealogies. Lastly, Diodorus complained that the ancient mythographers themselves had been in disagreement and so have handed down compilations which were faulty and confusing. On account of these three factors the greatest historians, Isocrates, Callisthenes, and Theopompus, according to Diodorus, have not included myth in their histories. Diodorus, in contrast to the greatest historians which he cited, endeavored to include the ancient legends. It is true that a pronouncement like Diodorus' may be subjective and superficial since some historians included the fantastic consciously, e.g. Duris, and others unconsciously, e.g. Thucydides. Diodorus is saying that those who impress him as historians are historians, those who do not are not. Though his comment may say nothing about popular tradition it does hint at what the educated writer and reader expected.

Lucian, a contemporary of the earlier novelists, also ventured into the realm of fact and fiction. In his satiric *How to Write History*, Lucian recalls the faults of shoddier historians: they neglected to record events, they included excessive praise of individuals, and, more importantly, they did not separate history and poetry (7-8). These historians did not see that history must be useful and that this usefulness could only be arrived at through truth (9). In contrast to these historians, the best historians had to have two prerequisites before undertaking the writing of history: political acumen and the power of expression. Lucian did understand that myth would have to turn up in any historical work, but when it did he cautioned that

καὶ μὴν καὶ μῦθος εἴ τις παρεμπέσοι, λεκτέος μὲν, οὐ μὴν πιστωτέος πάντως, ἀλλ' ἐν μέσῳ θετέος τοῖς ὅπως ἂν ἐθέλωσιν εἰκάσουσι περὶ αὐτοῦ· σὺ δ' ἀκίνδυνος καὶ πρὸς οὐδέτερον ἐπιρρεπέστερος (60).⁶⁵

⁶⁵ The text of Lucian is from *Lucian*, ed. Carol Jacobitz (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1966).

In the second and third centuries A.D. many rhetoricians wrote on what history should be and what myth was. Rufus of Perinthus, a student of Herodes Atticus, noted in his *ΤΕΧΝΗ ΡΗΤΟΡΙΚΗ* that ἱστορικὸν δὲ ἐν ᾧ διηγούμεθα πράξεις τινὰς μετὰ κόσμου ὡς γεγενημένας (β').⁶⁶ Hermogenes of Tarsus (2nd century A.D.), in his *προγυμνάσματα* or rhetorical handbook, echoed Plato when he wrote that myth was the first type of story to which children were exposed. He, however, after recalling the fact that myths were found in Hesiod and Archilochus (1.4-5), specified that myth had to be fictitious, ψευδῆ (1.10), practical, χρήσιμον (1.11), plausible, πιθανόν (1.12), expandable, ἐκτείνειν, or concise, συστέλλειν (1.17-18). Theon of Alexandria (2nd century A.D.), who also wrote a *προγυμνάσματα*, defined myth as being a false story, but having some semblance of truth (3.1).

In sum: according to ancient Greek and Roman sources myth preceded history and history employed myth. History was to be written in prose since it was factual and myth was mostly to be written in verse since it was fictional. Parallel to this literary restriction of genre and content it can be said that the factual had to be written in prose while the fictional in verse. There are exceptions, however, to this history-prose and myth-verse practice, e.g. Apollodorus, and the ancient Greek novel which is purely fictional in content, though the earlier novels might have some quasi-historical form, especially disregard the content-form maxim. This genre-specific attribute was probably the cause for the contempt and disregard that the ancient literary critics had for the novel. Lucian in *How to Write History*, in my opinion, best sums up approach of the ancient novelists to myth.

⁶⁶ The texts of Rufus, Hermogenes, and Theon are from *Rhetores Graeci*, ed. Leonard Spengel (Leipzig: Teubner, 1883-6).

Dates of Composition of the Extant Novels

A chronology for the novels is necessary in order to have a timetable in which can be charted the change in content from historical to mythological. The five extant canonical novels were written between the first century A.D. and the fourth century A. D. Chariton's novel is the earliest extant Greek novel and could be dated as early as the first century A.D. and as late as the second century A.D. Perry dates Chariton to the first century A.D. on the inclusion of historiographical elements in the novel and on the novelist's language and style.⁶⁷ Reardon, likewise, assigns this novel to the first century A.D. based on examination of the papyrological evidence.⁶⁸ Hägg lists and discusses the bibliography on the dating of Chariton and himself dates the composition as early as the first century B.C.⁶⁹ Papanikolaou places Chariton's novel in the first century B.C. on account of the novel's lack of Atticism.⁷⁰

Rohde originally dated *Chaereas and Callirhoe* to the fourth or fifth century A.D., but papyri since discovered demonstrate that the *terminus ante quem* of this novel must be the second century A.D.⁷¹ Ruiz-Montero has suggested that Chariton composed in the

⁶⁷ Perry 343-5 (see above. n. 25).

⁶⁸ Reardon, *Courants Littéraires* 334, n. 55 (see above. n. 28).

⁶⁹ Hägg, *Narrative Technique* 15, n. 1.

⁷⁰ *Chariton-Studien: Untersuchungen zur Sprache und Chronologie der griechischen Romane* (Göttingen 1973).

⁷¹ *Der griechische Roman*. The papyri are Pap. Fayûm I, in *Fayûm Town and Their Papyri* (London 1900) 74-82; Pap. Oxyrhynchus no. 1019, in *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* vol. VIII (London 1910); Papyrus Michaelides I, in *Papyri Michaelidae* (Aberdeen 1955).

first decades of the second century A.D.⁷² She bases her suggestion on inscriptions found in Aphrodisias, *C.I.G.* 2782, 2783, 2846, and on references in the *Palatine Anthology*, 11.180, 181 and 150, to a certain Athenagoras, very possibly the employer of Chariton, found in the poetry of Ammianus (A.D. 88-145).

The date of the Xenophon's *Ephesiaca* seems more firmly fixed than Chariton's in the earlier second century A.D. Xenophon mentions an *eirenarch* of Cilicia in 2.13 and 3.11, a political and military office not known to have existed before the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 117-38).⁷³ Reardon points out, however, that the word *eirenarch* is found in inscriptions dated to A.D. 116 or 117.⁷⁴ Xenophon also seems to have imitated Chariton, thereby making it probable that his novel dates later than *Chaereas and Callirhoe*.⁷⁵

Although Rohde had dated Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* to the fifth century A.D., papyri⁷⁶ assure a middle to late second century A.D. date. The first papyrus fragment to be published was Oxyrynchus papyrus no. 1250 which is dated to the early fourth century. The date of the novel, after more scholarly analysis, was then

⁷² Consuelo Ruiz-Montero, "Una Observacion Para La Cronologia De Caritón De Afrodiasias," *Estudios Clásicos* 24 (1980): 63-69 and "Caritón de Afrodiasias y el mundo real," in *Piccolo Mondo Antico: Le donne, gli amori, i costumi, il mondo reale nel romanzo antico* (Perugia: Università degli Studi di Perugia, 1989) 107-50.

⁷³ David Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1950) 647-8; 1514-15. Cf. Perry 345.

⁷⁴ Reardon, *Courants Littéraires* 336.

⁷⁵ See A. D. Papanikolaou, ed. *Xenophon Ephesius: Ephesiacorum Libri V* (Leipzig: BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1973). Papanikolaou supplies a list of possible imitations of Chariton by Xenophon.

⁷⁶ Perry 348, n. 12.

dated to the third, and afterwards to the late second century.⁷⁷ A papyrus at Milan published by A. Vogliano dates the novel to the second century A.D.⁷⁸

On the basis of internal criteria, Longus may be said to have written *Daphnis and Chloe* in the second century A.D.⁷⁹ Perry points out two factors which may further aid in the dating of Longus: his name and the wall-painting mentioned in the prologue of the novel. Longus' cognomen could be identified with that of the Mytilenean family which "had taken its gentile name, Pompeius, from its patron Pompey the Great" and which had had in its members a consul by the name of Pompeius Longus (*cos. suff.* A.D. 49). Longus, the writer, according to Perry, might have been a member of this Mytilenean family. The second point is the particular use of wall-painting employed by Longus, a picturesque technique which can be dated to Roman imperial times. The rural landscape of the wall-painting found in the prologue was customarily used in the second century and literary treatments of such wall-paintings can also be found among writers of the Second Sophistic such as Dio Chrysostom, Lucian, Alciphron, Aelian, and Philostratus.⁸⁰

Heliodorus' novel has been dated to the third or fourth century A.D.⁸¹ It is very difficult, if not impossible, to date accurately this novel. Emperor Julian in his eulogy

⁷⁷ Cf. T. Sinko, "De ordine quo erotici scriptores Graeci sibi successisse videantur," *Eos* 41 (1940-1946) 40 f.

⁷⁸ *Stud. Ital. di Fil. Class.* 15 (1938).

⁷⁹ Perry 350, n. 17.

⁸⁰ Cf. Jean-René Vieillefond, ed. *Pastorales (Daphnis et Chloé)* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1987) cix.

⁸¹ Gerald N. Sandy, *Heliodorus* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1982) 1-5. Perry, 349, dates the novel to the mid-third century; Reardon, *Courants Littéraires* 334, states that the probable date of composition is somewhere in the third or fourth centuries A.D.; Hägg, *Narrative Technique* 15, n. 1, agrees with Reardon.

of the Emperor Constantius (written in A.D. 357), however, seems to parallel Heliodorus' account of the siege of Syene (Bk. 9) with his account of the third siege of Nisibis "by the Persian King Sapor II in A.D. 350."⁸² Two hypotheses are possible: Heliodorus imitated Julian and therefore he must have written after A.D. 357 or Julian imitated Heliodorus and therefore Heliodorus wrote before A.D. 357. Although this quandary has not been settled, most scholars are inclined to believe that Julian borrowed from Heliodorus.⁸³

It must be emphasized however that there is very little archaeological or historical evidence with which to date firmly any of the ancient novels. None of the authors, except, perhaps, Chariton, can be historically or archaeologically verified; there are in fact only two very thin historical threads which can be tied to Chariton. Firstly, Philostratus addressed a letter (66) to Chariton in which he wrote Μεμνήσασθαι τῶν σῶν λόγων οἷσι τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐπειδὴν τελευτήσης· οἱ δὲ μηδὲν ὄντες ὁπότε εἰσίν, τίνες ἂν εἶεν ὁπότε οὐκ εἰσίν;⁸⁴ Secondly, inscriptions C.I.G. 2782, 2783, and 2846 may identify Chariton's employer, Athenagoras, as being an official in Aphrodisias, Chariton's homeland, and Chariton as a physician. Neither of these two pieces of data supplies any conclusive information capable of accurately dating Chariton the novelist. Philostratus tells his reader that Chariton was a writer and nothing more; the

⁸² Sandy 4.

⁸³ Cf. C. S. Lightfoot, "Fact and Fiction - the third seige of Nisbis (A.D. 350)," *Historia* 38 (1988): 107-25; M. Maróth, "Le siège de Nisibe en 350 ap. J.-C. d'après des sources syriennes," *Acta Antiqua Hungarica* 17 (1979): 239-43; T. Szepessy, "Le siège de Nisibe et la chronologie d'Héliodore," *Acta Antiqua Hungarica* 24 (1976): 247-76.

⁸⁴ The letter is #66 and is found in *Letters of Alciphron, Aelian, and Philostratus*, trans. Allen Rogers Benner and Francis H. Fobes (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1948).

inscriptions reveal that a certain Athenagoras was an official at Aphrodisias and that the physician Chariton had erected a funeral mound. The inscriptions do not mention that Chariton was a writer.

We may establish a rough chronology of composition: Chariton composed *Chaereas and Callirhoe* between the end of the first century A.D. and the early to middle decades of the second century A.D.; Xenophon of Ephesus possibly wrote his *Ephesiaca* after Chariton wrote his novel and most likely in the middle part of the second century A.D. Papyrological discoveries place Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* in the middle to late second century; Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* is roughly contemporary with *Leucippe and Clitophon*. Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* may be dated last of all to the third or fourth century A.D., although the later date is most plausible.

CHAPTER I I
CHARITON, HISTORY, AND MYTH

Chariton's novel is probably the earliest extant Greek novel and the only novel that has definite historiographical features. The history in the novel, however, is not factual because it has been "romanticized."⁸⁵ The other novelists do include historiographical details or allusions, but as I shall try to demonstrate, they do not rely on history for a background as much as Chariton does. Later novelists seem to be more interested in romance, and, as a result, displace the historical elements with mythological allusions or erotic elements. However, the reader expected some truth in historical or geographical elements⁸⁶ and perhaps supposed that the dates were correct, the historical events correctly related, and the historical places and figures realistically depicted.⁸⁷

⁸⁵ Ruiz-Montero, "The Structural Pattern of the Ancient Greek Romance and the Morphology of the Folk tale of V. Propp," *Fabula* 22 (1981) 237.

⁸⁶ Hägg, *Narrative Technique*, writes: "The action in the romance of Chariton is set against a historical background. The heroine, Callirhoe, is the daughter of Hermocrates, the Syracusan general who defeated -or, at least, participated in the struggle against - the Athenians in 413 B.C. . . . Artaxerxes, the king of Persia, takes an active part in the romance . . . and an Egyptian rebellion against the Persians dominates the last part of the romance. . . . But obviously these historical ingredients come from different sources and are combined by the author without any claim to historical accuracy" (26). Schmeling, *Chariton*, 79, suggests that, according to Manetho, the Egyptian rebellion could have been the revolt by Amnytaeus II of Egypt.

⁸⁷ Hägg, "Callirhoe and Parthenope: The Beginnings of the Historical Novel," *CIAnt* 6 (1987) 189. Ruiz-Montero, "Caritón de Afrodísias y el mundo real" (see above, n. 73), agrees with Hägg but stresses that Chariton also includes contemporary

In Chariton, the story takes place in the past, famous historical figures are included, and history has a tremendous effect on the behavior of the characters. For example, the defeat of the Athenian fleet by Hermocrates, the father of the heroine of the novel, had made him and his family important people in Syracuse.⁸⁸ And although, Chariton imitates the classical historians in technique,⁸⁹ he does not do so for the purpose of masquerading as a “true” historian but rather to create the “effect of openly mixing fictitious characters and events with historical ones.”⁹⁰

While various scholars have examined the use of historical background, the use of myth by Chariton has not been adequately explained.⁹¹ The novel has been examined as

historical and social references: “. . . existe en la novela una combinación de elementos heredados de la tradición literaria junto con otros propios de la época del autor. Dionisio de Mileto y su ciudad proporcionan los datos más interesantes al respecto. Por tanto, la obra de Caritón no puede ser calificada de realista ni de documento histórico, pero sí contiene referencias que reflejan su época y que son útiles para completar el conocimiento que poseemos de sus instituciones, sociedad o creencia religiosas. Entre ellas hay que mencionar las concomitancias que existen entre la novela y aspectos locales, sobre todo en la exaltación del culto a Afrodita, pero también con aspectos léxicos y con algunos nombres propios” (145).

⁸⁸ Hägg, “Callirhoe and Parthenope” 191.

⁸⁹ F. Zimmerman, “Chariton und die Geschichte,” *Sozialökonomische Verhältnisse in alten Orient und klassischen Altertum, Tagung der Sektion Alte Geschichte der Deutscher Historiker Gesellschaft 12-7 Okt. 1959 (Berlin 1961)* 329-330: “Chariton war ein außerordentlich belesener Schriftsteller. Er kennt seinen Thukydides und von Xenophon besonders die *Kyrupaideia* sowie die *Anabasis*. Daß er jedoch auch historische Werke von Autoren, die heute für uns verloren sind, ausgiebig herangezogen hat, steht außer allem Zweifel.”

⁹⁰ Hägg, “Callirhoe and Parthenope” 197.

⁹¹ G. Hetteger, “Über des Mythologie bei Chariton” (I^o Teil 42. Jahresberichte des Staatsgymnasium Krumau, 1914/1915), discusses only the roles that the gods and goddesses have in the novel. M. Laplace, “Les légendes troyennes dans le ‘roman’ de Chariton *Chairéas et Callirhoe*” *REG* 93 (1980), attempts to prove that “légendes définissent le schéma dramatique de la fiction de Chariton” (83). Neither author,

religious text, ritual handbook, and indoctrination manual.⁹² Other studies have analyzed the function of myth in terms of analogue, *aitia*,⁹³ simile, and literary frame.⁹⁴ These studies, however, focus on one function of myth and do not elucidate the overall use of myth in Chariton. Most of these analyses also take up the *Mysterientext* debate which, in this chapter, I do not intend to join; rather I shall endeavor to study the literary utilization of and allusion to myth in Chariton.

The approach to myth in this chapter is an analysis based on Julia Kristeva's theory of "intertextuality."⁹⁵ Kristeva suggests that in order to study the structure of a novel, or perhaps any literary work, one must understand that there is a literary dialogue occurring between many texts, a textual dialogue,⁹⁶ and that consequently the lines or passages borrowed from one text and placed in another demand new interpretation in light of their new literary surroundings. On this textual dialogue Chariton constructed his work. My approach, therefore, comprises a study of the

however, shows how myth functions in the novel.

⁹² Cf. Reardon, *The Form of Greek Romance* 171-75; MacQueen, *Myth, Rhetoric, and Fiction* 215-9; Anderson, *Ancient Fiction* 75-87; Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity* 101-4; Schmeling, *Chariton* 35. For a detailed critique of the Merkelbach's text see R. Turcan, "Le roman «initiatique»,» *RHR* 163 (1963): 149-99.

⁹³ Marios Philippides, "The 'Digressive' *Aitia* in Longus," *Classical World* 74 (1981): 193-99.

⁹⁴ MacQueen, "Longus and the Myth of Chloe," and Joseph Kestner, "Ekphrasis as Frame in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*," *Classical World* 67 (1974): 166-71.

⁹⁵ Julia Kristeva, *Le Texte Du Roman* (Paris: Mouton, 1970); Margaret Waller, trans., *Revolution in Poetic Language*, by Julia Kristeva (New York: Columbia UP, 1984).

⁹⁶ Kristeva, *Le texte* 66-8.

“sources” of the literary borrowings and, if possible, a “new articulation” or understanding of the transposed lines and passages.⁹⁷

This chapter’s first section comprises an analysis of books one through four, and it itself is divided into smaller sections which examine the two uses of myth in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*: characterization through analogues with myth and plot structuring through Homeric quotation. The second major section, an examination of books five through eight, analyzes the mythical and the Homeric elements in the novel, but emphasizes that these books are more historical in nature than the first four.

Books 1-4

The story begins with an introduction of the author by the author, Χαρίτων Ἀφροδισιεύς, Ἀθηναγόρου τοῦ ῥήτορος ὑπογραφεύς, πάθος ἐρωτικὸν ἐν Συρακούσαις γενόμενον διηγέσσομαι (1.1.1),⁹⁸ who then proceeds to the introduction of the two main characters of the story, Callirhoe and Chaereas. Before introducing the hero and heroine of the romance, however, Chariton points out that he hails from Aphrodisias; indeed, what better place to set a love story and to narrate a πάθος ἐρωτικὸν than in a city which

⁹⁷ Kristeva, *Revolution* 60.

⁹⁸ For the text of Chariton I have used Chariton, *Le Roman de Chairéas et Callirhoé*, trans. Georges Molinié (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1979).

is devoted to the goddess of love herself?⁹⁹ Straight away Chariton has set a romantic tone for a novel in which Aphrodite and her son will take very active roles.

Characterization through myth: Callirhoe. The introduction of the two youths exemplifies the first use of myth in Chariton: he wants to make analogous the leading characters with mythological beings.¹⁰⁰ In the case of Callirhoe, Chariton primarily compares her to Aphrodite and Ariadne, less emphasis is placed on analogues to Artemis, Helen of Troy, the nymphs, and Medea. Chaereas is compared to Achilles, Nireus, Hippolytus, and Alcibiades.

Callirhoe is a young girl whose beauty is considered divine and even surpasses the beauty of the Nereids and the mountain nymphs; in fact her loveliness is very often compared with Aphrodite's: ἦν γὰρ . . . αὐτῆς Ἀφροδίτης Παρθέου (1.1.2). Chariton

⁹⁹ For a brief historical and archaeological study of Aphrodisias see Kenan T. Erim *Aphrodisias: City of Venus Aphrodite* (New York: Facts on File Publications, 1986). Aphrodisias, modern name Geyre, was identified in 1961. Aphrodisias in the Roman period, on account of its steadfast loyalty to Augustus, had gained immunity from imperial taxation. It was also a center of religious, cultural and intellectual activity. In addition, the city had one of the best schools of sculpture in the ancient world. All these factors caused Aphrodisias to prosper. The history of Aphrodisias, like many other histories of cities in Asia Minor, is based not on texts, which are few in number, but on a reliance on the archaeological record. Stephanus of Byzantium called Aphrodisias Ninaë, a name which attached some religious significance to it. In pre-Hellenic, Hellenic, and post-Hellenic times there was always a "sacred or temple site" (27) in the city. The "sacred or temple site" might have been associated with an earth goddess.

A series of letters ranging from Trajan to Gordian III and Decius testify to the continuing "privileged status of Aphrodisias and the maintenance of a close relationship with the central authority in Rome" (31). The city reached its apex in the second century A.D. as evidenced by its sculpture, philosophy (Alexander), oratory, and literature (Chariton). In the third century there was a cessation of autonomy. The cessation might have been due to the new province created by the merging of Caria and Phrygia; Aphrodisias was the center of administration. Under Diocletian (284-305) the city became the metropolis of the smaller province of Caria (32). In the fourth century the city was home to a Christian archbishopric.

¹⁰⁰ For analyses of character development and delineation see Johannes Helms, *Character Portrayal in the Romance of Chariton* (The Hague: Mouton, 1966).

compares the heroine with the goddess, from the very outset of the story, because he wants to connect the desirability of the goddess with Callirhoe's and to demonstrate that the fate of Callirhoe in the novel is based upon the actions involving the goddess.

Chariton also likens Callirhoe to a sleeping Ariadne: πάντες εἶκαζον αὐτὴν Ἀριάδνην καθευδούσῃ (1.6.2). The author introduces this description of the heroine after Callirhoe has been shocked into a coma by her husband; it is fitting that Chariton introduces the myth of Ariadne at this point in time. Ariadne, like Callirhoe, suffered an injustice at the hands of someone she loved. She had helped Theseus defeat her half-brother the Minotaur and escape the labyrinth, only to be repayed with abandonment by Theseus on the island of Naxos. Callirhoe might not have saved her husband from any monsters or helped him escape from a maze, but she did not deserve, as Chaereas later found out, to be treated as she was. The myth of Ariadne also has numerous references to sailing and traveling: Theseus sailed to Crete, Minos had a thalassocracy, Ariadne sailed to Naxos with Theseus, and Theseus sailed back to Athens. Chariton is foreshadowing the sailing adventures which Callirhoe must undergo (see below the discussion on the use of Homeric lines to structure the novel's plot).¹⁰¹

In Bk. 3 Chaereas attributes the disappearance of his wife to some divinity, and likens her disappearance to Dionysus' theft of Ariadne from Theseus. This version of the Ariadne myth (cf. Apollodorus) is different from the one that Chariton supplied in 1.6.2. Homer, *Od.* 11.321-25, tells us that Theseus took Ariadne from Crete to Athens but that on the way there he left her on the Isle of Dia (Naxos), where she was killed by Artemis at the bidding of Dionysus. Hesiod, *Theog.* 947-49, relates that Dionysus took Ariadne as

¹⁰¹ Schmeling, *Chariton*, writes: "It is obvious from the frequency of comparison between Ariadne and Callirhoe that the reader was intended to see Callirhoe as a type of Ariadne, and that while Callirhoe was a somewhat unfamiliar character she was brought into focus, universalized, and delineated nicely by the simile" (p. 89).

his wife and that Kronos made her immortal. Chariton's version in 1.6.2, therefore, seems to have been loosely based on the myths of Homer and Hesiod.

Plutarch in the *Theseus*, however, associates Aphrodite with Ariadne, and supplies various accounts of the adventures of Ariadne and Theseus, and it is mainly upon Plutarch's stories, based on the works of other writers, which Chariton models his version of the Ariadne myth found in 3.3.5 and in the rest of the novel.¹⁰² In the *Theseus*, Plutarch writes that, as many historians and poets tell, Ariadne fell in love with Theseus when he arrived on the island of Crete. She gave him the clue which enabled Theseus, after killing the Minotaur, to exit the Labyrinth. Plutarch uses the accounts of Pherecydes (*fl. c. 550 B.C.*), Demon (*fl. c. 300 B.C.*), Philochorus (b. 340 B.C.), and Cleidemus (*fl. c. 350 B.C.*), who give differing versions of the escape of Theseus, the death of the Minotaur, and of the love of Ariadne for Theseus. Plutarch allots a great deal of space to Cleidemus, who includes the escape of Daedalus from Crete in his account and who specifically points attention to the ship sent by Minos to pursue Daedalus, noting that only five men manned the ship because: ὅτι δόγμα κοινὸν ἦν Ἑλλήνων μηδεμίαν ἐκπλεῖν τριήρη μηδαμόθεν ἀνδρῶν πέντε πλείονας δεχομένην (19.8).¹⁰³

Plutarch then proceeds to relate several variants of the love story of Ariadne and Theseus. He writes that Πολλοὶ δὲ λόγοι καὶ περὶ τούτων ἐτι λέγονται καὶ περὶ τῆς

¹⁰² The use of Plutarch by Chariton may point to the date of the composition of the novel as being in the first quarter of the second century A.D. and not the first century A.D.

¹⁰³ The five men may be the 1) pilot, "2) officer in charge at the bow (*proreus*); 3) the purser or supply officer (*pentecontarque*); . . . 4) the boatswain (*keleustes*), who commanded the oarsmen and regulated their movements in rowing" and 5) the trierarch. Cf. Arthur MacCartney Shepard, *Sea Power in Ancient History: The Story of the Navies of Classic Greece and Rome* (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1925) 16.

Ἄριάδης, οὐδὲν ὁμολογούμενον ἔχοντες (20.1).¹⁰⁴ Our historian supplies six versions: 1) Theseus deserted Ariadne on Naxos and she then hanged herself. 2) Ariadne was taken prisoner by sailors to Naxos and there she lived with Oenarus, a priest of Dionysus. 3) Theseus abandoned Ariadne because he was in love with Aigle, Panopeus' daughter (Hereas of Megara). 4) Ariadne bore to Theseus, Oenopion and Staphylus (Ion of Chios, *et al.*). 5) The most pleasing of these tales is the one told by Paeon, about whom we know only what Plutarch tells us, which is not very much; he is a Cypriot from Amathus.

Paeon's story is as follows:

Ἄ δ' ἐστὶν εὐφημώτατα <τῶν> μυθολογούμενων πάντες, ὡς ἔπος εἶπεῖν, διὰ στόματος ἔχουσιν. Ἴδιον δέ τινα περὶ τούτων λόγον ἐκδέδωκε Παίων ὁ Ἄμαθούσιος. Τὸν γὰρ Θησέα φησὶν ὑπὸ χειμῶνος εἰς Κύπρον ἐξενεχθέντα, καὶ τὴν Ἄριάδην ἔγκυον ἔχοντα, φαύλως δὲ διακειμένην ὑπὸ τοῦ σάλου καὶ δυσφοροῦσαν, ἐκβιάσαι μόνην, αὐτὸν δὲ τῷ πλοίῳ βοηθοῦντα πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέλαγος ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς φέρεσθαι. Τὰς οὖν ἐγχωρίους γυναῖκας τὴν Ἄριάδην ἀναλαβεῖν καὶ περιέπειν ἀθυμοῦσαν ἐπὶ τῇ μονώσει, καὶ γράμματα πλαστὰ προσφέρειν ὡς τοῦ Θησέως γράφοντος αὐτῇ, καὶ περὶ τὴν ὥδινα συμπονεῖν καὶ βοηθεῖν, ἀποθανοῦσαν δὲ θάψαι μὴ τεκνοῦσαν. Ἐπελθόντα δὲ τὸν Θησέα καὶ περίλυπον γενόμενον τοῖς μὲν ἐγχωρίοις ἀπολιπεῖν χρήματα, συντάξαντα θύειν τῇ Ἄριάδῃ, δύο δὲ μικροῦς ἀνδριαντίσκους ἰδρῦσασθαι, τὸν μὲν ἀργυροῦν, τὸν δὲ χαλκοῦν. Ἐν δὲ τῇ θυσίᾳ, τοῦ Γορπιαίου μηνὸς ἰσταμένου δευτέρᾳ κατακλινόμενόν τινα τῶν νεανίσκων φθέγγεσθαι καὶ ποιεῖν ἄπερ ὥδίνουσαι γυναῖκες· καλεῖν δὲ τὸ ἄλλος Ἄμαθούσιος, ἐν ᾧ τὸν τάφον δεικνύουσιν, Ἄριάδης Ἀφροδίτης (20.3-7).

The sixth and last version is supplied by Naxian writers, who record that there were two Minoses and two Ariadnes. One Ariadne bore Staphylus and Oenopion to Dionysus, the other, accompanied by her nurse Corcyne, was abducted and then deserted by Theseus.

On his way back to Athens, Plutarch continues, Theseus stopped at Delos, where he dedicated in the temple of Apollo a statue of Aphrodite which had been given to him by Ariadne, a statue not mentioned previously by Plutarch. Theseus then causes the death of

¹⁰⁴ The text of *Theseus* is from Plutarch, *Vies* trans. and eds. Robert Flacelière, Émile Chambry, and Marcel Jumeaux (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1964).

his father by forgetting to hoist the right sails on his approach to Attica. Hesiod, *Theog.* 917, Diodorus Siculus, 4.60.4, Ovid, *Fasti* 3.460ff., and Nonnos, 47.270ff., relate that Ariadne was deserted by Theseus but immortalized in the heavens as a celestial crown. Homer, *Od.* 11.322, however, writes that she was killed by Artemis at a word from Dionysus. Hyginus in his *Fabulae* is the only one to mention that the reason for Theseus' and Ariadne's layover in Dia (Naxos) was a storm. It is Plutarch, and only Plutarch, who gives an extensive listing of variations of the Ariadne myth, and among these variations is found Paeon's account which may provide the greater part of the foundation for the plot of *Chaereas and Callirhoe*.

As previously mentioned, Chariton employs divinities or heroes upon which to model his characters. Chaereas, the hero of the novel, is modeled or compared to Achilles, Nireus, and Alcibiades among others. Callirhoe is likened to Aphrodite, and in physical description she is shown to be Aphrodite-like in many respects. But Chariton uses the myth of Ariadne to direct many of the major portions of the plot of the novel.

Callirhoe is the daughter of the general Hermocrates, who, like Minos, had made a name for himself at seafaring and like Minos had gone to war with Athens. She marries Chaereas, who unintentionally causes her apparent death (*Scheintod*) by kicking her in the stomach. Chariton then tells us that the dead Callirhoe resembled Ariadne sleeping on the shore of Naxos (1.6) which parallels Plutarch's first version of the myth: Theseus deserted Ariadne on Naxos. The death-kick of Chaereas causes many things to occur, but one in particular: the identity of Callirhoe is altered. She who once had been alive and free is now dead and entombed; even though she recovers from her *Scheintod* she does not recover her former freedom. She is first sold as a slave by a pirate named Theron, and then forced to commit bigamy by marrying a second time, and interestingly enough Callirhoe (Ariadne) marries Dionysius (Dionysus).

When Chaereas visits his dead wife's tomb he discovers that it has been broken into and that corpse has been stolen. He immediately stretches his hands up to the heavens and cries out:

Τίς ἄρα θεῶν ἀντεραστής μου γενόμενος Καλλιρρόην ἀπενήνοχε καὶ νῦν ἔχει μεθ' αὐτοῦ μὴ θέλουσαν, ἀλλὰ βιαζομένην ὑπὸ κρείττονος μοίρας; Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ αἰφνιδίως ἀπέθανεν, ἵνα μὴ νοσήσῃ. Οὕτω καὶ Θησέως Ἀριάδνην ἀφείλετο Διόνυσος καὶ Σεμέλην ὁ Ζεὺς. μὴ γὰρ οὐκ ἦδειν ὅτι θεὰν εἶχον γυναῖκα καὶ κρείττων ἦν ἢ καθ' ἡμᾶς. Ἄλλ' οὐκ ἔδει ταχέως αὐτὴν οὐδὲ μετὰ τοιαύτης προφάσεως ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀπελθεῖν. Ἡ Θέτις θεὰ μὲν ἦν, ἀλλὰ Πηλεΐ παρέμεινε καὶ υἱὸν ἔσχεν ἐκεῖνος ἐξ αὐτῆς, ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν ἀκμῇ τοῦ ἔρωτος ἀπελείφθην. Τί πάθω; Τί γένωμαι, δυστυχῆς; Ἐμαυτὸν ἀνέλω; Καὶ μετὰ τίνος ταφῶ; Ταύτην γὰρ εἶχον ἐλπίδα τῆς συμφορᾶς· εἰ θάλαμον μετὰ Καλλιρρόης κοινὸν οὐκ ἐπήρησα, τάφον αὐτῇ κοινὸν εὐρήσω. Ἀπολογοῦμαι σοι, δέσποινα τῆς ἐμῆς ψυχῆς. Σὺ με ζῆν ἀναγκάζεις· ζητήσω γὰρ σε διὰ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης, κἂν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναβῆναι τὸν ἀέρα δύνωμαι. Τοῦτο δέομαί σου, γυνή, σὺ με μὴ φύγῃς (3.3.4-7).

Chaereas relates some very interesting things: 1) He compares Callirhoe to Ariadne; 2) says that Dionysus took Ariadne (and interestingly enough Dionysius has taken Callirhoe); 3) that he will search for Callirhoe even in the heavens which may mean that Chariton is referring to the celestial metamorphosis of Ariadne.

After this speech Theron, the pirate kidnapper of Callirhoe (version #2: Ariadne taken by sailors to Naxos) is found and brought to trial, where he identifies himself as a Cretan and attempts to exculpate himself. He is eventually sentenced to crucifixion but not before relating the details of the kidnapping and sale of Callirhoe, but he does not name Dionysius as the buyer. Chariton makes Hermocrates, the man in charge, in keeping with Plutarch's rendition of Cleidemus' version of the myth, declare that only five men, two from the assembly, two from the council, and Chaereas should be sent to look for Callirhoe.

Chaereas and his crew arrive in Miletus, Callirhoe's new home, where he and his best friend, Polycharmus, come upon a statue of Callirhoe in a temple of Aphrodite (3.6) [version #5: Paeon's story]. Nowhere has it been mentioned that anyone has dedicated a

statue, in the semblance of Callirhoe, to Aphrodite. This small detail, I suggest, has to have been taken from Paeon's version of the myth; in fact Chariton is recalling the Ariadne Aphrodite grove of Paeon's version. A little later, but not much later in the narrative, Chariton further emphasizes the Ariadne-Callirhoe association by saying that Callirhoe's name is more famous than Ariadne's (4.1).

The letter component of Paeon's story is also included in Chariton's novel: a certain Mithridates, who has fallen in love with Callirhoe, suggests to Chaereas, who has learned that Callirhoe has remarried, that he may be able to get his wife back by writing a letter to her (4.5). This letter, however, is intercepted by Dionysius who thinks that is a forgery by Mithridates, who is attempting to seduce his wife. Dionysius appeals to the satrap Pharnaces, another love victim of Callirhoe, who in turn writes to Artaxerxes, a future love victim of Callirhoe.

The letter motif is heavily accentuated in this novel: at the end of the novel, once Callirhoe has been recovered by Chaereas, she writes to Dionysius and bids him to take care of their son. The child, however, belongs not to Dionysius but to Chaereas. Before Chaereas caused the pseudo-death of Callirhoe he had made love to her and she had conceived. Callirhoe, therefore, was pregnant when she was sold as a slave and then married to Dionysius. She did not want her child to be brought up as a slave and so tricked Dionysius into thinking that it was his son (a pseudo-premature birth is involved). Once again Plutarch's versions of the myth are recalled: Ariadne is pregnant and she gives birth to two sons.

At the end of the novel, after the hero and heroine have undergone many an adventure, such as an Egyptian rebellion, the siege of Tyre, and the capture of Aradus, and after Chaereas finds Callirhoe on the island of Aradus, the main characters set sail back for Syracuse. Before Chaereas heads home, however, he sends back to Artaxerxes at

Chios the people he had captured in his seizure of Aradus, among whom was Statira, the King's wife. In the account of the ship heading back to Artaxerxes, Chariton includes the next-to-last allusion to the Ariadne-Theseus myth: as the ship approaches Chios, the King and his forces do not recognize the vessel and think that it is an enemy ship. This erroneous notion is corrected when the ship hoists a friendly standard.

The last reference to the Ariadne myth is found in the fifth chapter of the last book of the novel (8.5), where, in keeping with Paeon's account, Dionysius, after having read Callirhoe's letter, returns to Miletus and sets up numerous statues in her likeness.

There are many parallels between the versions of the Ariadne myth supplied by Plutarch, Paeon's in particular, and the adventures of the Callirhoe-Ariadne character:

- 1) Callirhoe is likened to Ariadne, who, like Callirhoe, is likened to Aphrodite. 2) Paeon of Amathousa unites Ariadne and Aphrodite in a "peculiar" account. 3) Some of the plot involving Callirhoe seems to follow the outline of Paeon's "peculiar" treatment as found in Plutarch. 4) There are verbal echoes in Chariton from Paeon's account: a) Chariton 8.1.2, τὰς ἀλλοτρίας γυναῖκας ἀναλαβὼν ταῖς τριήρεσιν ἀπαγάγη, μόνην δὲ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐκεῖ καταλίπη οὐχ ὡς Ἀριάδνην, may be based on Plutarch 20.5, Τὰς οὖν ἐγχωρίους γυναῖκας τὴν Ἀριάδνην ἀναλαβεῖν καὶ περιέπειν ἀθυμοῦσαν ἐπὶ τῇ μονώσει; b) Chariton 4.1.4, ἐν ᾧ ποιήσει τὸν τάφον. Ἦρσε δὲ αὐτῇ πλησίον τοῦ νεῶ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης, and 5.10.1, τάφον ἔχω; Δέσποινα Ἀφροδίτη, may be based Plutarch 20.7, ἐν ᾧ τὸν τάφον δεικνύουσιν, Ἀριάδνης Ἀφροδίτης; c) Chariton 3.5.5, ἀποθάνω· θάψον δὲ με καὶ ἄπιθι. Ἡ δὲ μήτηρ, may be based on Plutarch 20.5, ἀποθανοῦσαν δὲ θάψαι μὴ τεκνοῦσαν. 5) There exist other elements, such as the letters, the destinations of both characters as Cyprus, and the statuettes which may possibly be from Paeon. 6) Ariadne is separated from her lover Theseus by the sea, as is Callirhoe. 7) Callirhoe and Ariadne are both pregnant when separated from their

lovers. 8) Callirhoe gives birth to one offspring, as does Aphrodite. 9) Lastly, the account of Paeon is romantic in nature and can be easily seen as a prototypical love story.

Although the use of myth to depict the character of Callirhoe is found throughout the novel, it is emphasized in the second book. When Leonas calls Callirhoe a slave, he is rebuked by Dionysius who says that it is not possible for anyone who is not freeborn to be beautiful and attributes Leonas' estimation of Callirhoe's beauty to the fact that not only had the loneliness of the estate warped his judgment, but that he had compared Callirhoe to peasant women who Dionysius thought were ugly:

ὦ Λεωνᾶ, καλὸν εἶναι σῶμα μὴ πεφυκὸς ἐλεύθερον. Οὐκ ἀκούεις τῶν ποιητῶν ὅτι θεῶν παῖδες εἰσιν οἱ καλοί, πολὺ δὲ προτέρον ἀνθρώπων εὐγενῶν; Σοὶ δὲ ἤρρεσεν ἐπ' ἐρημίας· συνέκρινας γὰρ αὐτὴν τοῖς ἀγροίκοις (2.1.5).

By reminding Leonas of the divinity of a beautiful person the author is reminding the reader of the divine connection between Callirhoe and Aphrodite which was established in Book 1.

Callirhoe's connection with the divine is further strengthened when Plangon and her fellow slaves, who are about to bathe Callirhoe, notice how divinely beautiful her face is, τὸ πρόσωπον ὡς θεῖον ἔδοξαν ἰδοῦσαι (2.2.2). This bond between Callirhoe and Aphrodite becomes concrete when Callirhoe is taken to the temple of Aphrodite, where the goddess was known to appear (2.2.6). There a slave says to Callirhoe Δόξεις, ὦ γύναι, θεασαμένη τὴν Ἀφροδιτην εἰκόνα βλέπειν σεαυτῆς (2.2.6).

Slaves are not the only ones captivated by the divine beauty of Callirhoe for Dionysius thinks Callirhoe is probably a divinity in disguise:

Καί τε θεοὶ ξείνοισιν εἰκότες ἀλλοδαποῖσιν

ἄνθρώπων ὕβριν τε καὶ εὐνομίην ἐφορῶσι (*Od* 17.485-87).¹⁰⁵

This quotation inspired by Homer (*Od*. 17.485-7) refers to Antinoös' cruel and inhospitable treatment of Odysseus at the banquet hall. This shabby treatment and mean insolence of Antinoös caused someone in the banquet hall to warn him that the gods are wont to go about in disguise keeping an eye on the unrighteous behavior of humans. Dionysius' use of Homer is quite appropriate in the context of Leonas' shabby treatment of Callirhoe.

Even after it is explained to Dionysius that Callirhoe is not a divinity, he refuses to believe that she is a mortal, but rather proceeds to compare repeatedly her pulchritude with that of the nymphs and Nereids. The repeated comparison may show that Chariton was not only familiar with Homer but also with the *Homeric Hymns* or Hesiod's *Theogony*, for in both works a nymph called Kallirhoe appears. In the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* Kallirhoe is one of the maidens who accompanied Persephone on the day that she was abducted by Hades (419). In lines 288, 351, and 979 of the *Theogony* Kallirhoe is identified as the daughter of Okeanos, wife of Chrysaor, and mother of Geryoneus. According to the author of the *Homeric Hymn* and Hesiod, therefore, it would be more proper to compare Callirhoe's beauty with that of an Okeanid than that of a Nereid. The confusion may have arisen in that Okeanids and Nereids are both water divinities, and in that the name Καλλιρρόη means beautiful-flowing spring, or water.¹⁰⁶

Dionysius also compares Callirhoe to Helen of Troy when he states that with

¹⁰⁵ The Homeric text reads: καὶ τε θεοὶ ξείνοισιν ἑοικότες ἀλλοδαποῖσι, παντοῖοι τελέθοντες, ἐπιστρωφῶσι πόληας, ἀνθρώπων ὕβριν τε καὶ εὐνομίην ἐφορῶντες. All citations from Homer, unless otherwise noticed, are from *Opera*, ed. Thomas W. Allen (Oxford: Oxford Classical Texts, 1952).

¹⁰⁶ There was a famous spring in Athens called Kallirhoe.

Callirhoe he would be as happy, if not happier, than Menelaus was with Helen.¹⁰⁷

Chariton then follows up this analogue with a sailing motif based on the prior reference to Helen, who, of course, is known for her sea-faring adventures. Chariton uses nautical imagery four times in framing Callirhoe's situation. First, Callirhoe says that the Sicilians admire Alcinous for having sent Odysseus home. Second, Chariton mentions Helen and her mythical maritime voyage to Troy; Paris' actions caused a thousand ships to be launched and a war to be started. Third, the author recalls the name of Hermocrates, a verified historical war hero,¹⁰⁸ and his naval victory over the Athenians. Fourth, the literary frame is closed when Dionysius brings Theron, the pirate, into the picture. There is a chiasmic arrangement in this frame: (A) Alcinous, a good man associated with the sea, (B) the Trojan War, a legendary-mythical conflict,

¹⁰⁷ Laplace, "Les légendes troyennes," writes: "Pour Chariton, la légende de la guerre de Troie se résout en un ensemble de thèmes rhétoriques symbolisés par des mots - δῶρον, εἶδωλον, ὄνομα, Ἰλίου ἄλωσις -, des images - celles du concurs et du feu -, des proverbes - le jugement de Pâris, la pomme de discorde, la palinodie, la guerre pour un fantôme. Leur interprétation romanesque s'appuie sur l'*Illiade*, et surtout sur l'*Hélène* d'Euripide. L'imitation d'Homère n'apparaît que dans les scènes de dénouement - le procès à Babylone, et la guerre des Égyptiens contre le grand Roi -, où elle s'avoue par des citations. Au contraire, les situations romanesque empruntées à Euripide - le transport du fantôme, les fausses funérailles, la fuite de l'épouse aux côtés de son premier mari - sont mentionnées plusieurs fois au cours de l'intrigue, mais seulement par allusions, ou jeu de mots.

La combinaison des deux modèles, épique et dramatique, permet la construction de l'intrigue: parce qu'elles se transforment en de fausses funérailles, les entreprises guerrières que prétendants évincés et régisseur de Dionysios mènent contre Chairéas servent de « stratagèmes » pour nourrir la séparation des héros, sans compromettre leur salut. Elle suggère, d'autre part, un dédoublement de Callirhoé. Car à tout récit d'une épreuve telle que guerre ou jugement, correspond, dans la fiction, l'une des images de l'absence d'Hélène - parfois les deux confondues -: le fantôme et la fuite réelle. Chariton signifie ainsi que les malheurs racontés ne concernent que l'apparence de Callirhoé, son nom. La véritable Callirhoé n'est affectée ni par la mort ni par la souffrance. Sa nature est autre" (100).

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Schmeling, *Chariton* 76-80.

(B) the defeat of the Athenians forces by Hermocrates, an historical battle, and (A) Theron, an evil man associated with the sea.

As if the analogues to Aphrodite, the nymphs, and Helen are not enough, Chariton also compares Callirhoe to other mythical females. In a moving soliloquy in which the fate of her child is to be decided, the heroine asks herself the following questions: Should she bear the grandchild of the illustrious Hermocrates only to be a slave? Should she bear a child supposedly whose father no one knows? If she did bear a child out of wedlock, perhaps someone would say that the father was one of the pirates who kidnapped her? Should she give birth to a child who would hear only disparaging things about its mother?

Callirhoe, after deciding to kill the child, in her speech likens herself to Medea and numbers Zethus, Amphion, and Cyrus among those born in slavery. After making this speech, Callirhoe decides not to kill her child because she did not want to sully her reputation by being compared to Medea. Medea and Callirhoe, however, have things in common. They both are connected in one way to the Okeanids because Medea is the daughter of an Okeanid and Callirhoe shares her name with the nymph Kallirhoe. Both women undergo sailing adventures: Medea joins Jason and the Argonauts and Callirhoe is kidnapped by pirates. In both stories children are involved: Medea kills her children in order to get back at her husband and Callirhoe decides at first to kill her unborn child, but then elects to have her son in order to bring glory upon herself, husband, and father. The inclusion of Medea serves to clarify who Callirhoe is.

In her soliloquy Callirhoe mentions three other names: Zethus, Amphion, and Cyrus. Amphion and Zethus were the children of Antiope and Zeus. Nycteus, Antiope's father, and Lycus, her brother, did not want Antiope to give birth, and when she did, Lycus ordered her to expose the children on Mt. Cithaeron, which she did. A shepherd

found and raised the children. In the meanwhile Dirce, Lycus' wife, tormented and threatened Antiope with murder. When the children grew up they lay siege to Cadmeia, Lycus' kingdom, and rescued Antiope. In the end, once Lycus and Dirce had been done away with, the brothers ruled the city jointly.

Cyrus is the third example mentioned and he serves as an excellent example of a child of noble lineage, who on account of mitigating circumstances loses or is deprived of its ancestry and afterwards regains what has been lost. Chariton includes Cyrus for the same reason he included Alcibiades in Bk. 1: he wants to round off his examples by including an historical model.

In Bk. 3 Chariton once again compares Callirhoe to the nymphs when he writes that while she is sailing to the port of Docimus¹⁰⁹ some boatmen see her and think that she is a nymph: ὅτι Νηρηΐς ἐκ θαλάσσης . . . ἢ ὅτι θεὰ πάρεστιν ἐκ τῶν Διονυσίου κτημάτων (3.2.15). When she arrives at Docimus the people there think that she is Aphrodite.

In book 5 a diminution of characterization through myth and Homeric lines begins. Section 1 of Book Five partially recalls the adventures of the adventures of Callirhoe up to the point of her departure for Babylon. Rumor then announces that Dionysius is approaching with Callirhoe whose beauty is not human but τι θεῖον (4.2.6). Dionysius was perturbed by the spread of the rumor about Callirhoe's beauty and chides himself for having brought Callirhoe into a place full of men who would lust after his wife. He even goes as far as to compare himself to Menelaus. In 2.6.1 Dionysius had hoped that his marriage would be similar to the marriage of Menelaus and Helen: he got his wish, since his marriage was to have a bitter ending and it, like Menelaus' marital

¹⁰⁹ There was a harbor in Miletus named after Docimos who was a commander of the army under Antigonos Monophthalmos, the liberator of Miletus. Cf. C. P. Jones "Hellenistic History in Chariton of Aphrodisias," *Chiron* 22 (1992): 91-102.

problems, would only be solved by military action in Bks. 6, 7, and 8. Chariton continues his allusion to the Helen myth by mentioning that it was a barbarian shepherd, and hence a low-class person, who took Menelaus' place in Helen's bed (cf. Apollodorus 3.149). Chaereas, a slave, would take Dionysius' place in Callirhoe's bed.

The trial about the legal husband of Callirhoe should have started immediately after the arrival of Dionysius and Callirhoe, but it did not because the King was busy conducting a religious festival. The trial was postponed for thirty days during which time the populace took sides and became eager for the trial to begin: Ποῖος ἄγων Ὀλυμπικός ἢ νύκτες Ἐλευσίνια προσδοκίαν τοσαύτην σπουδῆς;¹¹⁰ When the appointed day came for the trial the King and his nobles were situated in the court room in such a way that they resembled οἱ δὲ θεοὶ παρ Ζηνὶ καθήμενοι ἡγορόωντο (// 4.1). All of the litigants were brought into the courtroom except for Callirhoe because she had not been physically compromised and therefore need not be examined. The King, however, ordered her to be shown in, not for legal reasons, but because he wanted to see her. The trial was postponed for one more day. On the day of the trial the courtroom was packed by those wishing to see Callirhoe, and Chariton states that when Callirhoe entered the court she was like Helen when Homer, ὁ θεῖος ποιητής, described her as appearing ἀμφὶ Πρίαμον καὶ Πάνθοον ἠδὲ Θυμοίτην. (// 3.146) Chariton then uses the Homeric line, Πάντες δ' ἠρήσαντο παρὰ λεχέσσι κλιθῆναι (Od. 1.366 and 18.213), to describe Callirhoe's beauty, albeit more basely.

Characterization through myth: Chaereas. The hero of the novel resembles mythological, legendary, and historical heroes: Achilles, Nireus, Hippolytus and Alcibiades (Bk. 1). These four men serve to illustrate the multi-faceted persona of Chaereas. Achilles is said to be the handsomest man in the Greek host, with Nireus as

¹¹⁰ 4.4.4 is the only reference made in this novel to mystery religions.

second in handsomeness. It is strange that Chariton would describe his main character in terms of a hero, Achilles, who himself is never actually physically described. By such a comparison Chariton is not attempting to depict Chaereas physically, but rather he is trying to manufacture an image similar to that of Achilles. This idea is supported by the fact that the author also compares Chaereas to Nireus, a man who might have been quite attractive but who could muster the following of only a few people:

Νιρεὺς αὖ Σύμηθεν ἄγε τρεῖς νῆας εἶσας,
 Νιρεὺς Ἀγλαΐης υἱὸς Χαρόποιό τ' ἄνακτος,
 Νιρεὺς, ὃς κάλλιστος ἀνὴρ ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθε
 τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν μετ' ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα.
 ἀλλ' ἀλαπαδνὸς ἔην, παῦρος δέ οἱ εἶπετο λαός (II. 2. 671-5).

Chariton perhaps is pointing to a dichotomy in Chaereas' character: on the outside Chaereas may be physically strong and handsome like Achilles, but in the inside he is less than perfect. This dichotomy in character is observable in the many scenes in which the handsome Chaereas either cries or opts for suicide rather than facing his problems.

Hippolytus is the third character to whom Chaereas is likened. In Euripides' *Hippolytus* and in Seneca's *Phaedra* the general idea of Hippolytus' beauty is made clear, but not through actual description. Hippolytus' beauty is shown through the actions of Phaedra: she would not fall in love with anyone who was not attractive. In addition to the beauty of Hippolytus, Chariton evokes the conceit of Hippolytus: the son of Theseus rejected the worship of Aphrodite and had to be punished. Likewise, Chaereas commits an outrage against Aphrodite, and, accordingly, must suffer the consequences.¹¹¹

¹¹¹ Schmeling, *Chariton*, notes that Aphrodite is the moving force in the novel's plot: "The whole novel is a tribute to her power and an aretalogy of her mystic power" (21).

Lastly, Chariton compares Chaereas to Alcibiades, who was known for his handsomeness in the ancient world. His beauty is made clear when his good-looks are compared with the ugliness of Socrates (cf. Plato *Symp.* 216D). The inclusion of Alcibiades in Chariton's list is perplexing since Alcibiades is not a mythological being. The solution to this quandary may be that, although, Achilles, Nireus, and Hippolytus are much better models than Alcibiades, Chariton, in keeping with the historical veneer of his work, includes Alcibiades, an historical figure, because the background of his novel is historical rather than mythical.

The comparison to Achilles is positive, but the other three comparisons have negative qualities: Nireus was handsome, but had trouble attracting loyalty, Hippolytus incurred the wrath of Aphrodite, and Alcibiades was a handsome rakish youth who put his own interests ahead of those of Athens. Chariton, it must be noted, does not supply the reader with an actual physical description of his hero but rather delineates his character's qualities by likening him to legendary or mythological heroes who adumbrate a likeable but faulty character.

Narrative design and Homer. When Chariton compares Chaereas to Achilles, he sets the precedent for the use of numerous Homeric quotations.¹¹² It seems that Chariton wants to let the reader know right away that he will be relying on Homer and the myths included in his epics as the source for most of his mythological allusions. Schmeling states that the "frequent quotations from Homer and various literary allusions and

¹¹² For example: *Il.* 21.114 in 1.1.14; *Il.* 18.22-24 in 1.4.6; *Od.* 17.485-87 in 2.4.7; *Il.* 23.66-67 in 2.9.6; *Il.* 10.540 and *Od.* 16.11 and 359 in 3.4.4; *Il.* 22.82-83 in 3.5.6; *Il.* 23.71 in 4.1.3; *Od.* 24.83 in 4.1.5; *Od.* 15.21 in 4.4.5; *Od.* 17.37 and 19.54 in 4.7.5; *Il.* 4.1 in 5.4.6; *Il.* 3.146 in 5.5.9; *Od.* 1.366 and 18.213 in 5.5.9; *Il.* 22.389-90 in 5.10.9; *Il.* 24.10-11 in 6.1.8; *Il.* 1.317 in 6.2.4; *Od.* 6.102-4 in 6.4.6; *Il.* 22.304-5 in 7.2.4; *Il.* 9.48-49 in 7.3.5; *Il.* 13.131 and 16.215 in 7.4.3; *Od.* 22.308 and 24.184 and *Il.* 10.483ff. in 7.4.6; *Od.* 23.296 in 8.1.17; *Il.* 19.302 in 8.5.2.

devices demand an audience acquainted with a respectably wide range of literature.”¹¹³

Hägg notes that the literal Homeric quotations

are a distinct and often-noticed feature of Chariton’s narrative . . . only a few serve as similes . . . most of them are organic parts of the narration of this action. . . . The author simply substitutes for part of his own narration a well-known phrase from the epic - or, occasionally, from some classical prose author - and so gets a stylistic ornament, which, at the same time, has an associative value.¹¹⁴

The last part of Hägg’s comment, the associative value of the Homeric phrase, is the second use of myth by Chariton: he employs the Homeric lines in order to lend structure to the plot.

When Callirhoe in Bk. 1 thought that she was being forced to marry someone she did not know, she fainted in Homeric style:

τῆς δ’ αὐτοῦ λῦτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ.¹¹⁵

The Homeric line refers to the death of pitiable Lycaon, the son of Priam (cf. *Il.* 21.34-135). Achilles had captured Lycaon and sailed with his hostage to Lemnos where he sold Lycaon to Euneüs, the king of Lemnos. From there the ransomed Lycaon traveled to Imbros, an island, and then to Arisbe a coastal town. From Arisbe he made his way back to his father’s home in Troy where he lived for twelve days before dying in combat with Achilles, who was slaughtering Trojans and doing battle with the river Xanthos.

Before he died, Lycaon grabbed the son of Peleus by his knees and begged him not to kill him, rather to take pity upon him as a master takes pity on a suppliant. He

¹¹³ Schmeling, *Chariton* 132.

¹¹⁴ Hägg, *Narrative Technique* 95. Cf. M. Packinska, “Motywy Homerowe w romansie Charitona,” *Meander* 21 (1966): 149-57.

¹¹⁵ 1.1.14. *Il.* 21.114 reads τοῦ instead τῆς.

implored Achilles not to kill him because, although he was the brother of Hector, he was not born from the same womb. Achilles countered by stating that he lost all sense of pity the day Patroclus died and that since that day not one Trojan who would escape death. At the end of his rejection of Lycaon's plea he tells him that better men than he have died, namely Patroclus, at which time Lycaon's *λύτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ*.

One may attribute the inclusion of this line to a show of erudition,¹¹⁶ but there seems to be more behind it. After all this line refers to the murder of Lycaon by Achilles, which ranks second in vileness only to the shameful treatment of Hector's body. This line, easily recognized by any Greek schoolboy, foreshadows Chaereas' atrocious treatment of Callirhoe: she will be kicked to death (really a *Scheintod*). A closer examination of this line, in view of its new literary surroundings, may also hint at the adventures of Callirhoe: she will be captured, sold as a slave, and sail to islands and coastal cities. Even if Chariton does not intend the background of this line to prefigure the adventures of Callirhoe, the line itself, with its undertones of death, relentless vengeance and cruelty, should alert the reader to its special qualities in that it was associated with a time which should have been filled with immense joy for Callirhoe.

Another example of this Homeric structuring through myth occurs when the cabal led by the tyrant of Acragas convinces Chaereas that Callirhoe had been unfaithful. Chaereas, in keeping with the Nireus component of his persona since he could not muster the support of his fellow suitors, faints in Homeric flair:

ὣς φάτο· τὸν δ' ἄχεος νεφέλη ἐκάλυψε μέλαινα
Ἄμφοτέρησι δὲ χερσὶν ἐλὼν κόνιν αἰθαλόεσσαν

¹¹⁶ Wessering, "The Audience of the Ancient Novel," writes: "Chariton displays familiarity on a large scale with classical authors such as Homer, Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon . . . It is more likely that he has in mind a category of people who will recognize his references. His careful use of language and technical skill supports this idea" (76).

Χεύατο κάκ κεφαλῆς, χαρίεν δ' ἤσχυνε πρόσωπον (*Il.* 18.22-24).

The Homeric line refers to Achilles' fainting upon hearing that Patroclus had fallen in battle. In Chariton, the hero of the novel imitates the action of the Homeric hero: both lament in the dust for a considerable period of time. There are, however, some differences between these passages. Firstly, in the Homeric passage it was a trusted companion of Achilles who delivered the account of Patroclus' death and despoilment at the hands of Hector. In the novel Chaereas heard about Callirhoe's alleged adultery from the tyrant of Acragas, who wanted Callirhoe for himself. There is good reason why Chariton's tyrant is from Acragas: the legendary tyrant of Acragas was known for his cruelty, particularly his unusual manner of executing his prisoners in a bronze bull (cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1305a17, 1316a36; Polyæn. 5.47, 5.1.1-2). In no way can Chariton's tyrant be considered a trusted companion. Secondly, the news reported to Chaereas was not that someone he loved was dead, but rather the news forces the hero to seek her out and to kick Callirhoe to death (once again, a *Scheintod*).¹¹⁷

Chaereas wants to kill himself when he realizes what he has done, but Polycharmus, his best friend, prevents this. Chariton writes that Polycharmus was: φίλος ἐξάριετος, τοιοῦτος οἷον Ὅμηρος ἐποίησε Πάτροκλον Ἀχιλλέως (I.5.2), and with this reference to Homer, Patroclus, and Achilles Chariton is closing the ring-composition which he started when he quoted lines 18.22-24 of the *Iliad*. Patroclus had to appear in this passage because the cause of Achilles' swooning and lament was the death of his beloved Patroclus. In other words, Chariton is telling his reader that, although, it may seem odd that he is borrowing from Homer and even odder that he is

¹¹⁷ On the kick of death in ancient literature see: Diod. 3.112, 62.27; Diog. Laert. 1.94; Hdt. 3.32, 3.50; Nepos *Dion* 3; Suet. *Ner.* 35; Tac. *Ann.* 16. Cf. Ed. Frankel *RE Suppl.* VI 625,27-39.

sticking the lines into what seem to be incongruous places, nevertheless, there is an explanation for this usage of Homer: the lines he borrowed dealt with Patroclus and supply a closure to the Homeric structure by comparing Polycharmus with Patroclus.

Structuring of the plot after Homer is also found in Bk. 2 in the dream of Callirhoe, who had gone to bed having decided to abort the child. Chaereas appears to her in a vivid dream: Μέγεθός τε καὶ ὄμματα κάλ' ἔικυῖα, Καὶ φωνήν, καὶ τοῖα περὶ χροῦτ' εἶματα ἔστο (Il. 23.66-67 in 2.9.6). In this dream Chaereas asks Callirhoe that she take care of the child. The Homeric line refers to the time Achilles had killed Hector and dragged him under the bier of Patroclus. After some mourning and weeping on the part of Achilles he fell asleep and dreamt that Patroclus came and spoke to him. Patroclus then disappears after telling Achilles that Achilles' ashes will lie in the same urn as his own ashes. Achilles reached out to embrace Patroclus, but like Callirhoe, awoke only to find out that it was all a dream. Callirhoe, after Chaereas told her to save the child and not destroy it, decided to rear the child.

The beginning of Book 4 finds Callirhoe weeping over the death of her husband, which causes Dionysius to suggest to her that perhaps Chaereas, although dead, might be saying:

Θάπτε με ὅττι τάχιστα, πύλας Ἀΐδαο περήσω (Il. 23.71).

Chariton is referring to Patroclus' appearance to a sleeping Achilles whom Patroclus accused of being neglectful. Chariton places this appropriate line in an appropriate place. Callirhoe, however, was not forgetful; she did not want Dionysius to know the cause of her grief.

The young widow/bride took her new husband's advice and looked for a place to set up a memorial tomb for Chaereas and chose a spot near the temple of Aphrodite.

Dionysius, however, wanted this real-estate for himself and suggested to Callirhoe that the tomb of Chaereas should rather be built at a lofty place:

”Ὡς κεν τηλεφανῆς ἐκ ποντόφιν ἀνδράσιν εἶη (*Od.* 24.83).

This Homeric quotation closes off the Homeric frame begun when Dionysius told Callirhoe what Chaereas might be saying. In the previous Homeric passage Patroclus accused Achilles of being neglectful and Patroclus had also mentioned in the same passage that his remains and Achilles’ were to lie together in the same urn. The second Homeric reference recalls the fact that Achilles’ remains came to be in the same urn with Patroclus’.

Books 5-8

In Bk. 5 a lessening of structuring through Homeric quotations parallels the diminution of characterization through myth. One rare example is when Chaereas learns that his wife is married to another man and contemplates suicide:

Εἰ δὲ θανόντων περ καταλήθοντ’ εἰν’ Αἴδαο
Αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ κείθι φίλης μεμνήσομ’ ἐταίρου (*Il.* 22.390).

He sees no other escape from the loss of his wife; it was not so bad if his wife had died, it was terrible that she was married to another man, but he could not endure the fact that Callirhoe had not embraced him when they had first seen each other after their long separation.

Εἰ δὲ θανόντων περ καταλήθοντ’ εἰν’ Αἴδαο
Αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ κείθι φίλης μεμνήσομ’ ἐταίρου

are the words spoken by Achilles to the assembled Achaeans after he had finished mutilating Hector’s body. The hero of the *Iliad* then went on to tell his men that they should take the dead Hector back to their ships. Before he finished speaking to the

warriors, Achilles also told them that Patroclus would not go unremembered. Chaereas, on the other hand, spoke those words to Callirhoe, who was not present, and then proceeded to attempt to hang himself. Luckily, and in keeping with the context of the Homeric paraphrase, Polycharmus, Chaereas' Patroclus, was present to stop the suicide.

The decrease of the use of myth begun in the previous book continues in Book 6. The trial had also affected the king Artaxerxes, who on the night before he was to give his verdict, did not sleep at all. Chariton says that the king ἄλλοτ' ἐπὶ πλευρᾶς κατακείμενος, <ἄλλοτε δ' αὐτε Ὕππιος> ἄλλοτε δὲ πρηνῆς (*Il.* 24.10-11). In the *Iliad* Homer goes on to tell how Apollo had kept the face of Hector from suffering disfigurement at the hands of Achilles. Chariton, in the novel, does not build on this Homeric line, but rather makes the King say that Callirhoe had been chosen by the Sun as a gift for him and that only Eros can advise a lover.

Artaxerxes plans to take his mind off the matter at hand by going hunting, however, he can not escape Love: the King cannot concentrate on the hunt, rather he thinks only about Callirhoe. He sees Callirhoe as Artemis:

Ὅτ' ἴη δ' Ἄρτεμις εἶσι κατ' οὖρεος ἰοχέαιρα,
 Ἦ κατὰ Τηθύγετον περιμήκετον ἢ Ἐρύμανθον,
 Τερπομένη κάπροισι καὶ ὠκείης ἐλάφοισι (*Od.* 6.102-4).

The plans of the king for the seduction of Callirhoe, however, are interrupted when Egypt, one of the King's subject nations, rebels. Book 6 ends with the King and his royal entourage, which included Callirhoe, setting off to crush the rebellion.

Book 6 ends with the stage set for a war, and hints at the predominantly military and historical aspect of Book 7. Chaereas had remained behind in Babylon since he was a free man and therefore not subject to the King. He had hoped that Callirhoe would have also remained in Babylon, but when he found out that she had left, he fell into despair and

even madness. Dionysius, who had left with the King, had left word for Chaereas that the King had adjudged Callirhoe to Dionysius because he was an ally of the king. Chaereas swore to get even with Artaxerxes and judged that the best way of doing so was to join the rebellious Egyptian forces.

Chaereas went to Egypt, where he met the Egyptian king and offered himself and Polycharmus as volunteers for the Egyptian cause. He, however, would fight only to make his personal enemy suffer and would not die before he revenged himself on Artaxerxes:

Μῆ μὲν ἄσπουδί γε καὶ ἀκλειῶς ἀπολοίμην
Ἄλλὰ μέγα ῥέξας τι καὶ ἔσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι (Il. 22.304-5).

A bad Homeric choice of words, since it was Hector who spoke these words before he engaged in combat with Achilles. Chaereas is no Hector: he cries at the drop of a hat, and only attempts suicide when there is someone near-by.

The Egyptian king agreed to Chaereas' request and put him in charge of a group of three-hundred Greek mercenaries, but only after the hero had said:

Νῶϊ δ' ἐγὼ Πολύχαρμος τε μαχησόμεθα
Σὺν γὰρ θεῶν εἰλήλουθμεν.¹¹⁸

Once again Chariton has selected a strange choice of Homeric words. These lines are spoken by Diomedes when Agamemnon suggests that the Greek expedition against Troy should be discontinued because Zeus had turned against them. Diomedes rejected this suggestion and, at the advice of Nestor, an embassy was sent to Achilles in order to correct the mistake. It seems that Chariton is no longer attempting to fit the Homeric lines and the plot behind them with the plot and characters of the novel. In other words,

¹¹⁸ The Homeric text reads: Νῶϊ δ', ἐγὼ Σθένης τε, μαχησόμεθ' εἰς ὃ κε τέκμων / Ἰλίου εὐρωμεν· σὺν γὰρ θεῶν εἰλήλουθμεν.

the use of Homeric lines and the myth alluded to in those lines has become purely decorative.

Although the Egyptian king had placed Chaereas in charge of the mercenary force, nevertheless Chaereas elaborately refused the command and would only accept it if the soldiers thought it best. The soldiers made it quite clear that they wanted him as commander and Chaereas, in turn, replied that they would not regret doing so, that they would become famous, rich, and celebrated for their courage, just as the men Othyrades and those of Leonidas are celebrated. It is at this point in the narrative, when Chaereas mentions Othyrades and Leonidas, that the few instances of mythological allusions and the use of the Homeric epics give way to an almost complete historical background. This is not to say that at any point in the narrative the mythological and Homeric elements overwhelmed the historical, rather the historical was always present and actually predominant.

Leonidas and his deeds are well known.¹¹⁹ Othyrades¹²⁰ is mentioned in Herodotus 1.82 as having been the only Spartan survivor of an arranged battle, the "Battle of the Champions," between the Argives and Spartans over a place called Thyrea. All of the Argive and Spartan forces did not fight in this battle but rather three hundred men, the same number as Chaereas' forces, were chosen from each side to fight. There were two Argive survivors, Alcanor and Chromius, and one Spartan, Othyrades. Since there were two Argive survivors, the Argives thought that they had won and therefore returned to Argos. Othyrades, on the other hand, stripped the bodies of the fallen Argives and carried their armour back to his camp. The two armies could not decide who

¹¹⁹ Cf. Hdt. 7.204-39, Diod. 11.3-11, and Plut. *Leonidas*.

¹²⁰ Manuscript *L.* supplies Mithridates instead of Othyrades.

had won and consequently both armies entered again into battle. The Spartans won but Othyrades, on account of shame, did not return to Sparta and committed suicide.

Chaereas led his three hundred mercenaries against the city of Tyre which the Egyptians had not been able to capture. Chariton tells the reader that Chaereas led his men ἀσπίς ἄρ' ἀσπίδ' ἔρειδε, κόρυς κόρυιν, ἀνέρα δ' ἀνήρ. The two places in the Homeric texts in which this military formation is mentioned are *Il.* 13.131 and 16.215. In *Il.* 13.131 the description of the battle formation is in reference to Hector's assault against the Achaean ships, and *Il.* 16.215 refers to Achilles' encouragement of his troops as they entered battle with Patroclus as leader. These Homeric lines are decorative in function.¹²¹

Chaereas enters the fortress of Tyre, having convinced the Tyrians that they were Greeks who did not want to serve the Egyptian king, but rather did want to join the Tyrians in their struggle against the Egyptians. The Tyrians let the Greek mercenaries in, and once in, Chaereas went on a slaughter and τύπτε δὲ ἐπιστροφάδην τῶν δὲ στόνος ὄρνυτ' ἀεικής. Three places in which this line occurs are *Od.* 22.308 and 24.184 and *Il.* 10.483ff. *Od.* 22.308 and 24.184 deal with the suitors of Penelope. The first reference recalls the actual slaughter of the suitors by Odysseus, while the second occurs when the dead suitors recount their death to Agamemnon. The use of *Il.* 10.483ff. is especially suitable in the novel because, like the *Iliad* passage, the novel passage continues with a simile in which Chaereas is likened to a lion falling upon a herd of unguarded cattle.

¹²¹ It can be argued that there was some sort of ring-composition in the use of these two lines. One instance refers to the Trojans going towards the Greek ships and the second use of the line shows the Trojans being repelled from the Greek ships. The ring-composition, if it does exist, exists in the Homeric text and not in the novel. The action in the novel has not progressed and, in fact, the Homeric lines do not hint at anything but the battle formation.

After Tyre falls, Chaereas refuses to partake of the victory celebration because he does not have Callirhoe. Artaxerxes had left her, Statira, and other noble Persian women, unbeknownst to Chaereas, on the island of Aradus which is sacred to Aphrodite. At the end of the book Chaereas takes the island and holds the Persian retinue as prisoners. Chaereas is unaware, however, that the Egyptian rebellion had been quashed on land. With his mercenaries, nevertheless, he retains naval supremacy.

Book 7 is a military book, and in it there are battles and war strategies which are of two types: actual land or sea battles and erotic struggles. The use of myth drops drastically in this book; there are only vague references to myths and, in fact, historical detail gives way to mythological allusion. Chaereas is no longer compared to Paris or any other mythical lover, but rather, as befits his new warrior role, he is likened to military men. He can be a potential Leonidas or Othyrades.

Book Eight begins with Τύχη about to accomplish a παράδοξον which was σκυθρωπὸν in nature. Chaereas is going to evacuate the island and take all the noble Persian wives with him, but he is going to leave Callirhoe on Aradus, just as Theseus left the sleeping Ariadne on Naxos. Aphrodite, however, thought that this would be too harsh and did not approve. Aphrodite, it seems, had forgiven Chaereas for having badly treated Callirhoe, her gift to him. This gift was more precious and beautiful than Helen, the gift she had given Paris Alexander. Since Chaereas, through his suffering, had made amends to Eros, all was forgiven.

Chariton himself states that the last book will focus on the truth which will come to light and on the reunification of the couple. After the couple was reunited and Φήμη had reported to all the people on Aradus that the general had recovered his wife, both

lovers tell each other their adventures.¹²² Immediately afterwards they embrace each other and ἀσπάσιοι λέκτροιο παλαιοῦ θεσμὸν ἴκοντο. (*Od.* 23.296) This line is of course very suitable since Odysseus and Penelope, like Chaereas and Callirhoe, had been separated by the sea and by adventures.

From Aradus Chaereas and his troops sail to Cyprus,¹²³ Paphos, and there they go to the temple of Aphrodite and pay honor to the goddess. On Cyprus Statira, the Persian queen, sees that the odds had turned against her, and lays all misfortune at the feet of Τύχη. Callirhoe, seeing the depressed state of the queen, quickly disabuses her of the idea that she is a prisoner of war. Chaereas then arranges for the queen to be safely returned to her husband.

Before the queen is returned to her husband, Callirhoe entrusts her with a letter for Dionysius, in which she instructs Dionysius to raise their son, tells him that he should not remarry in order that the child may never know a step-mother, and that he should send their son to Syracuse to visit his grandfather. In the meanwhile, the king mourns the loss of his wife, Στάτειραν πρόφασιν, σφῶν δὲ αὐτῶν κήδε' ἕκαστος, echoing the line 19.302 of the *Iliad*, Πάτροκλον πρόφασιν, σφῶν δ' αὐτῶν κήδε' ἕκάστη, referring to the mourning of the Greek women for Patroclus.

At the same time that Statira is restored to Artaxerxes, Dionysius is deprived of Callirhoe. This loss of and seeming betrayal of Callirhoe forces Dionysius to say: Οὔτω κοῦφον ἔστιν ὁ Ἔρως καὶ ἀναπείθει ῥαδίως ἀντερᾶσθαι (8.5.14). Poor Dionysius can only find solace in his child θεασάμενος δὲ τὸ παιδίον καὶ πῆλας ταῖς χερσίν, an

¹²² Callirhoe did tell Chaereas that she had a son but that the father of the child was Dionysius.

¹²³ Cyprus was a suitable island to arrive at since it is *the* island of Aphrodite. In Paeon's version of the Ariadne myth, Ariadne is left at Cyprus.

adaptation of *Il.* 6.474, αὐτὰρ ὃ γ' ὄν φίλον υἷον ἐπεὶ κύσε πῆλέ τε χερσίν. The line recalls the moment when Hector played with Astyanax before he joined Achilles in mortal combat. The use of this Homeric line clearly shows that Chariton is no longer using Homer as mythological background but rather as literary decoration.

Dionysius leaves Babylon and returns to Miletus as quickly as possible where he will take solace in the likenesses of Callirhoe. These 'likenesses' were the statues that Dionysius had offered to Aphrodite in her temple at Miletus. As previously stated, this mention of the statues parallels the Ariadne myth of Paeon in that in both Paeon and Chariton Ariadne dies near or leaves the sanctuary of Aphrodite; in her stead a child, in both instances a male, and life-like statues are left.

While Statira and Dionysius are undergoing their trials and tribulations, Callirhoe and Chaereas make their way back to Syracuse. When they reach their homeland all the Syracusans gather around her and compare her, for the last time, to Aphrodite, a suitable comparison in that Callirhoe reappears, or is reborn, from the sea just as Aphrodite had been. The novel ends with Callirhoe thanking Aphrodite and asking her that she let her and Chaereas live together and that they not be separated from each other.

Book 8 reverses the trend of books 5, 6, 7 by incorporating into the narrative numerous mythological allusions and Homeric lines. The action of the book is non-stop and Eros quickly brings an end to this love-story. It appears that Chariton wants to mention every myth one more time before he finishes his story; he mentions Ariadne, Paris Alexander, and alludes to Helen, Penelope, Odysseus, Hector, Astyanax, Patroclus, Achilles, Eros, and, of course, Aphrodite. Chariton includes Homer in this last book; he supplies a line from the *Iliad* adapted in such a manner that Chariton seems to be telling his reader, "I just wanted to let you know, one more time, that I know my Homer."

Analysis of *Chaereas and Callirhoe* shows that Chariton wrote a work with a predominantly historical background. The mythical element, however, is sizable and cannot be disregarded. It takes many forms, such as allusion, quotation, and simile. One might even say that the social and historical conditions have a mythical quality about them. For example, women are included in the assemblies, a woman conquers a barbarian king, and altogether too much importance is awarded to the *demos*.¹²⁴

The use of myth in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* is primarily limited to the depiction of character through mythological comparison. Chariton compares Callirhoe to Aphrodite in order to show that the heroine of the novel is a beautiful young woman who, at least in the beginning of the novel, is a virgin and cherishes her virginity. The novelist also likens Callirhoe to Helen, the nymphs, Medea, and Ariadne. The last of the mythological analogues is very important because Chariton uses the adventures of Ariadne to direct parts of the action of the plot.

Chariton uses Achilles, Nireus, Hippolytus, and Alcibiades as models upon which to base his depiction of Chaereas. The persona of the hero, however, is not, at least in the first half of the novel, developed as extensively as is the character of Callirhoe. In the first four books Chariton attempts to show that a dichotomy exists in the person of Chaereas, but this superficial characterization gives way to a more detailed one in the last four books. In the second half of the novel Chaereas' character is depicted more through his acts than through mythological reference. In fact, historical characters displace the mythological as models for Chaereas.

In books five through seven the mythological elements, such as references to myths found in the Homeric corpus, and the use of lines transposed from the *Iliad* or the

¹²⁴ Cf. Margaret Williamson, "The Greek romance," *The Progress of Romance* (London and New York 1986) 38.

Odyssey, lessen in frequency. It seems that Chariton can only deviate so far from the historical nature of his work, through his use of myth, before having to reintroduce historical elements into the novel. Book eight, however, makes up for the lack of the mythological in the preceding three books by including numerous mythological allusions, some based on the myth of Ariadne, and by having Aphrodite, the moving force behind the start of the novel, appear as the catalyst for the end of the novel.

CHAPTER III

XENOPHON, HISTORY, AND MYTHOLOGICAL ALLUSIONS

Examinations of mythological allusions in Xenophon's *Ephesiaca* have resulted in the conclusion that such references are both subtle and scarce in this novel. Steiner speculates that Xenophon may have wanted to use myth, as he did in the opening of the novel, but did not consistently do so throughout the entire novel.¹²⁵ Heiserman suggests that Xenophon deprives the novel of allusions to myth and endows the protagonist with godlike qualities, thereby "replacing mythic reputation with moral flawlessness."¹²⁶ Schmeling concurs with Heiserman on Xenophon's minimal use of myth:

Little use is made by Xenophon of myth to help him universalize his characters and stories. By comparison Xenophon's model, Chariton, uses graphic analogue from myth to compare Callirhoe to goddesses at least eight times.¹²⁷

¹²⁵ Steiner, "The graphic analogue" 134.

¹²⁶ Arthur Heiserman, *The Novel before the Novel: Essays and Discussions about the Beginnings of Prose Fiction in the West* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977) 55.

¹²⁷ Gareth Schmeling, *Xenophon of Ephesus* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1980) 25. Tomas Hägg, "The Naming of the Characters in the Romance of Xenophon Ephesius," *Eranos* 69 (1971) 39, writes that that most of the names of the characters in the *Ephesiaca* are found "in Greek literature as the names of mythical, historical or fictional characters." He further states that the "names of well-known mythological or historical figures, like Althaia, Apsyrtos and Kleisthenes, are given, as we have seen, to the characters of the romance without any discernible symbolic meaning, and this is true also when the names in question were uncommon in daily life, as seems to be the case especially with the first two" (58).

Xenophon does not set his novel in a specific historical time period as Chariton does, but rather sets it in a more recent time, thereby differing substantially from Chariton.¹²⁸ It is important to note, however, that although Xenophon may place his novel in a time period closer to his own time than Chariton did, he still gives his work historiographical qualities. Reardon theorizes that the earlier ancient novels, in general, were more historical in nature.¹²⁹ If Reardon is correct, it would be necessary to examine the historical elements of the *Ephesiaca*. Hägg, however, has done so, and writes that the novel's historical components do not place it within any specific time scheme:

The action in Xenophon's romance seems to have no connection with any known historical incident or person. The prefect of Egypt (ὁ ἄρχων τῆς Αἰγύπτου) - whose presence in the romance shows that it belongs to Roman imperial times - remains anonymous throughout the romance. All the action is of a private nature; no wars or other political events are mentioned, except the struggles of different officials against the pirates in Cilicia and Egypt respectively.¹³⁰

The inclusion of the eirenarch may imply that Xenophon wants to set his novel in a time contemporary to that of his readers, and this may be due to the possibility that no novelist can completely separate himself from the world in which he lives, and, as a result, there will be occasional references to the author's own time.

In this chapter I shall approach the use of myth and its interrelation with history in the *Ephesiaca* in several ways. The first approach will be to examine the development of character through myth. Xenophon seems to compare Habrocomes, the hero of the novel, with Hippolytus, Bellerophon, and Potiphar. Artemis serves as the paradigm for

¹²⁸ Cf. chapter II.

¹²⁹ Reardon, *The Form of Greek Romance* 61.

¹³⁰ Hägg, *Narrative Technique* 49.

Antheia, the heroine of the *Ephesiaca*, which is in keeping with the Hippolytus aspect of Habrocomes' character since Hippolytus was devoted to Artemis. The second approach is an analysis of the oracle which portends trials and tribulations for the young couple. The third approach is an overview of the separation, adventures, and reunion of the couple, which will demonstrate how Xenophon bases some of his narrative on the Hippolytus nature of Habrocomes.

Habrocomes and Hippolytus

The *Ephesiaca* begins with Xenophon supplying the parentage of Habrocomes, the hero of the novel. His father is Lycomedes and his mother is Themisto. Hägg writes that Lycomedes is found in the *Iliad*:

(Lycomedes is) a Homeric warrior who is characterized as κρατερός and ἀρηίφίλος, who slays an enemy but who is not individualized beyond this (*Il.* 9.84; 12.366; 17.345-6; 19.240). In the *Ephesiaca* the name is applied to Habrocomes' father, an important man in Ephesus, who is characterized only by his behavior: he is worried about his son (1.5.5) and irresolute (1.7.1), he feels sorrow (1.10.7) and regret (5.6.3) - in short, there are no resemblances.¹³¹

Hägg does not mention that *Il.* 17.345-6 notes that Lycomedes is dear to Ares, a god whose name appears three times in this novel (1.9; 2.13; 3.3), and that Lycomedes, the King of Scyrus, is responsible for the death of Theseus (Plut. *Thes.* 35). Apollodorus (3.13.8) and Pausanias (1.17.6; 10.26.4) also mention that Thetis at one time came to Lycomedes' kingdom to entrust to Lycomedes her son Achilles. There Achilles disguised himself as a girl in order that he might escape being drafted for the Trojan War. Another Lycomedes was a very important leader of the Arcadian League in the 370's B.C. (cf. Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.25 and Diod. 15.59.1).

¹³¹ Hägg, "The Naming of the Characters" 41.

Themisto's name, according to Hägg, is mythical in nature.¹³² This mythological Themisto was the daughter of Hypseus, an early Thessalian king, and the wife of Athamas, mother of Leucon,¹³³ Erythius, Schoeneus, and Ptoüs. She killed herself after inadvertently murdering Schoeneus and Ptoüs in an attempt to dispose of the sons of Ino, another wife of Athamas. This story is found in Hyginus *Fab.* 1, 4, and 157 and is based on the *Ino* of Euripides.

Athamas, according to Hyginus, had a brother named Cretheus, the king of Iolcus, who was married to Demodice. She fell in love with Phrixus, the son of Athamas by a previous marriage, and when he did not respond to Demodice's amorous advances she told Cretheus that Phrixus had attempted to violate her. This aspect of the story may foreshadow the Hippolytus-Potiphar-Bellerophon aspect of Habrocomes' relationship with Manto, the daughter of Apsyrtus, and the use of the *Ino* may hint at the stage based facet of Habrocomes.¹³⁴

In Greek mythology, Manto, the daughter of Teiresias, had been instructed by Apollo to found a colony in Asia Minor, which turned out to be Colophon. Manto had a son by the name of Mopsus, who left Colophon to settle other colonies, one of which happened to be Tyre, the home of Manto, the daughter of Apsyrtus. In the *Ephesiaca*, the character Manto falls in love with Habrocomes and confides to Rhode, the slave of Habrocomes and Antheia, that she loves her master Habrocomes and urges her to help win him over.

¹³² Hägg, "The Naming of the Characters" 44.

¹³³ Leucon is a character in the *Ephesiaca*.

¹³⁴ Although it may seem to be a very far stretch to connect Athamas' story with the plot of the *Ephesiaca*, I am attempting to show that Xenophon may have been familiar with myths other than those found in the Homeric epics.

“Rosey” agrees to help “Blossom” but not before seeking the advice of Leucon, her fellow slave and paramour.

Leucon reveals Manto’s intentions, but Habrocomes swears that Manto will never be able to persuade him. Manto retaliates by writing a letter in which she states that she loves him and begs him not to spurn or humiliate her, and if he refuses, all will suffer. Habrocomes also replies by letter that what Manto wants can never be. During this exchange of letters, Apsyrtus plans to marry his daughter to Moeris, but she tells him that Habrocomes had attempted to rape her. This deceit explicitly connects the story of Habrocomes with that of Hippolytus: both are falsely accused of attempting rape, are devoted to Artemis, have spurned Love, and have been implicated through letters. In addition, letters and slaves play important roles in the *Hippolytus* and the *Ephesiaca*: Phaedra makes her love known through a letter and her nurse, and Manto uses her slaves and a letter in her attempt to seduce Habrocomes.

This deceit of Manto also recalls the Homeric narrative involving Bellerophon, who had been sent to the court of King Proetus, where the King’s wife, Stheneboea, falls in love with him.¹³⁵ She had approached Bellerophon and made known her illicit love to him, but he refused to reciprocate, thereby forcing Stheneboea to tell Proetus that Bellerophon had attempted to rape her. Proetus, not wanting to invoke the wrath of Zeus, does not punish Bellerophon at his court, but rather sends him to his father-in-law, the King of Lycia, with a sealed letter in which he asks the King of Lycia to kill the bearer of the letter. This letter is mentioned by Homer in *Il.* 6.168-9 as being σήματα λυγρά ... ἐν πίνακι πτυκτῶ θυμοφθόρα πολλά. Although the content of the letter is

¹³⁵ For a discussion of the resemblance of Habrocomes’ plight to those of Bellerophon and Potiphar see Schmeling, *Xenophon* 42.

different, Xenophon uses a word with Homeric undertones, πινακίδα (2.5.4), to describe the letter.

Moeris and Manto marry and Apsyrtus gives them a great number of wedding gifts, among which are included Antheia, Rhode, and Leucon. Manto, her new husband, and the others then set off to Moeris' home in Antioch, where Manto gives Antheia to a goatherd to be deflowered. The goatherd, however, when he learns of Antheia's misfortunes, takes pity on her and promises that he will never harm her. In keeping with the Euripidean tone of the novel, Antheia's situation recalls that of Electra in the *Electra*. In the meanwhile Apsyrtus finds out the truth about Habrocomes, places him in charge of his household, and promises a free citizen's daughter for a wife; Habrocomes prefers to have Antheia.

Antheia, on the other hand, falls into the hands of the robber Hippothous,¹³⁶ who decides to offer her as sacrifice to Ares. The ritual of the sacrifice is unique: the victim is to be hung from a tree and struck with javelin. This sort of ritual would be more appropriate for Habrocomes, since he has been likened to Hippolytus, the son of an Amazon known to worship Ares.¹³⁷ Antheia manages to escape being sacrificed to Ares

¹³⁶ Hägg, "The Naming of the Characters" 40-1: "The name Ἴπποθόος is borne by two persons in the Iliad, by the leader of the Pelasgians who is killed by Ajax (2.840-3 and 17.288-318) and by one of Priam's sons who is mentioned only in an enumeration (24.251). In Xenophon, Hippothoos is the third character in importance, but his characteristics change from episode to episode: sometimes he is the ruthless robber who even tries to kill Antheia on two different occasions (2.13 and 4.6) and sometimes Habrocomes' best friend and helper (2.14 - 3.3; 3.9-10; 5.8-14); in his own story he is the ill-fated lover of a young boy (3.2). In none of these functions does he show any distinct similarities with his namesakes in the epos." Hippothous is also, according to Hyg. *Fab.* 187. and Paus. 1.5.1-2 and 1.39.3, the son of Poseidon and Alope, the daughter of Cercyon, the King of Eleusis. He was granted by Theseus the kingship of Eleusis.

¹³⁷ André-Jean Festugière, O.P., *Personal Religion Among the Greeks* (Berkeley, 1954) 11.

when Perilaus, the eirenarch of Cilicia, shows up at the nick of time, kills the robbers, and rescues her.

At the beginning of the first book of the novel, after the parents of Habrocomes have been identified, Xenophon proceeds to describe the youth:

μέγα δέ τι χρῆμα [ώραιότητι σώματος ὑπερβαλλούση] κάλλους οὔτε ἐν Ἴωνία οὔτε ἐν ἄλλῃ γῆ πρότερον γενομένου. οὗτος ὁ Ἀβροκόμης αἰεὶ μὲν καὶ καθ' ἡμέραν εἰς κάλλος ἤϋξετο, συνήνθει δὲ αὐτῷ τοῖς τοῦ σώματος καλοῖς καὶ τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγαθὰ· παιδείαν τε γὰρ πᾶσαν ἐμελέτα καὶ μουσικὴν ποικίλην ἤσκει, καὶ θήρα δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ἵππασία καὶ ὄπλομαχία συνήθη γυμνάσματα. ἦν δὲ περισπούδαστος ἅπασιν Ἐφεσίοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς τὴν ἄλλην Ἀσίαν οἰκοῦσι, καὶ μεγάλας εἶχον ἐν αὐτῷ τὰς ἐλπίδας ὅτι πολίτης ἔσοιτο διαφέρων. προσεῖχον δὲ ὡς θεῶ τῷ μεираκίῳ· καὶ εἰσιν ἤδη τινὲς οἱ καὶ προσεκύνησαν ἰδόντες καὶ προσηύξαντο. ἐφρόνει δὲ τὸ μεираκίον ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ μεγάλα καὶ ἠγάλλετο μὲν καὶ τοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς κατορθώμασι, πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον τῷ κάλλει τοῦ σώματος· πάντων δὲ τῶν ἄλλων, ὅσα δὴ ἐλέγετο καλά, ὡς ἐλαττόνων κατεφρόνει καὶ οὐδὲν αὐτῷ, οὐ θέαμα, οὐκ ἄκουσμα ἄξιον Ἀβροκόμου κατεφαίνετο· καὶ εἴ τινα ἢ παῖδα καλὸν ἀκούσαι ἢ παρθένον εὖμορφον, κατεγέλα τῶν λεγόντων ὡς οὐκ εἰδότες ὅτι εἰς καλὸς αὐτός. Ἔρωτά γε μὴν οὐδὲ ἐνόμιζεν εἶναι θεόν, ἀλλὰ πάντῃ ἐξέβαλεν ὡς οὐδὲν ἠγούμενος, λέγων ὡς οὐκ ἂν ποτε οὐκδὲ εἰς ἐρασθεῖη οὐδὲ ὑποταγεῖη τῷ θεῷ μὴ θέλων· εἰ δὲ που ἱερὸν ἢ ἀγαλμα Ἔρωτος εἶδε, κατεγέλα, ἀπέφαινε τε ἑαυτὸν Ἔρωτος παντὸς καλλίοντα καὶ κάλλει σώματος καὶ δυνάμει. καὶ εἶχεν οὕτως· ὅπου γὰρ Ἀβροκόμης ὄφθει, οὔτε ἀγαλμα <καλὸν> κατεφαίνετο οὔτε εἰκὼν ἐπηνεῖτο (1.1.1-6).¹³⁸

Even though the name of Artemis is never mentioned by Xenophon, it appears that Habrocomes has dedicated himself to Artemis. Therefore, if any myth is alluded to in this passage it is the myth of Hippolytus.¹³⁹ Habrocomes' conduct strongly resembles

¹³⁸ The Greek text of the *Ephesiaca* is from the Teubner text edited by A. D. Papanikolaou.

¹³⁹ Schmeling, *Xenophon 23*, suggests that the Narcissus myth may be a possibility: "The subsequent overweening pride of Habrocomes drives him to consider himself beautiful and then, unfortunately, to disconnect this beauty from any erotic consideration. Because Xenophon develops nothing special out of this situation by way of graphic analogue with the Narcissus myth, we should be able to conclude that he had very little concern for such learned references and allusions, or for universalizing his story through the use of myth."

that of Hippolytus in Euripides' tragedy, an obvious source for much of the initial plot. For example, Euripides in the opening speech of Aphrodite notes that Hippolytus

λέγει κακίστην δαιμόνων πεφυκέναι
ἀναίνεται δὲ λέκτρα κού ψαύει γάμων (13-14).¹⁴⁰

Habrocomes, like Hippolytus, denigrates the divinity of Love, and rejects the accoutrements of Love. Hippolytus rejects marriage and the marriage couch while Habrocomes rejects Eros and the love which it brings. Moreover the illicit love which Phaedra has for Hippolytus is paralleled by Manto's love of Habrocomes.¹⁴¹

Antheia and Artemis

Eros, like Euripides' Aphrodite, cannot stand being rejected by Habrocomes and accordingly seeks vengeance: she makes Habrocomes fall in love with Antheia the daughter of Megamedes¹⁴² and Euipe¹⁴³ at a festival in honor of Artemis. In the festival

¹⁴⁰ The text of the Euripidean play and all other Euripidean passages are from Euripides, *Fabulae*, ed. J. Diggle (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981).

¹⁴¹ On the historical Habrocomes see Hägg, "The Naming of the Characters," 41: "In Herodotus Ἀβροκόμης is a son of Darius, killed at Thermopylae (Hdt. 7.224; also mentioned in Isocrates 4.140). In Xenophon's *Anabasis* (1.3.20; 4.3-5; 7.12) another Ἀβροκόμας is the satrap of the Great King in Phoenicia at the time of Cyrus' expedition. Thus, both are Persians who fight against the Greeks; they do not play heroic parts in these sources, and there are no comments on their outward appearances or inner qualities. In the romance, Ἀβροκόμης is a Greek (from Ephesus), and he is described as beautiful, proud and persevering: it seems to be out of the question that Xenophon should have intended the name of his hero to allude directly to the colourless Persians, as they are depicted in Herodotus and Xenophon the historian." It is interesting to note that in Hdt. 7.224 it is mentioned that the brother of Habrocomes was Hyperanthes, another character in the *Ephesiaca*.

¹⁴² Hägg, "The Naming of the Characters" 43-44: "The name Μεγαμήδης . . . recorded only for Xenophon, is now also to be found in a fragment, the so-called Chione romance, in which a man called Megamedes seems to be one of the principal characters.

the youths, separated according to sex, proceed to the temple of Artemis, located about a mile away from the city, in this order: πρῶτα μὲν τὰ ἱερά καὶ δᾶδες καὶ θυμιάματα· ἐπὶ τούτοις ἵπποι καὶ κύνες καὶ σκεύη κυνηγετικά, ἔτι καὶ πολεμικά, τὰ δὲ πλεῖστα εἰρηνικά (1.2.4). At the head of the maidens is Antheia who is fourteen, very beautiful, and exquisitely dressed:

κόμη ξάνθη, ἢ πολλή καθειμένη, ὀλίγη πεπλεγμένη, πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀνέμων φορὰν κινουμένη. ὀφθαλμοὶ γοργοί, φαιδροὶ μὲν ὡς κόρης, φοβεροὶ δὲ ὡς σώφρονος· ἐσθῆς χιτῶν ἀλουργῆς, ζωστὸς εἰς γόνυ, μέχρι βραχιόνων καθειμένος, νεβρὶς περικειμένη, γωρυτὸς ἀνημμένος, τόξα ὄπλα, ἄκοντες φερόμενοι, κύνες ἐπόμενοι (1.2.6).

Since Antheia is wearing a tunic, girdle, fawnskin, arrows and is accompanied by the dogs, Xenophon has created a graphic analogue of the girl to Artemis. In addition to her appearance, the position she holds in the procession further strengthens her association with Artemis.¹⁴⁴ The divine nature of Antheia is further emphasized when the spectators of the procession think that she is Artemis in person or that she has been made by the goddess to appear in her own image (1.2.7).

This has led to the interesting theory that Xenophon intentionally connected his romance with an earlier popular one by making his heroine, Antheia, the daughter of one of its characters with this unusual name.” Μεγαμηδείδαο is also found in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* 100.

¹⁴³ Euipe, according to Pausanias 9.34.5-9, was the daughter of Leucon and the granddaughter of Athamas, the husband of Themisto. Xenophon has definitely linked the mythological backgrounds of Themisto, the wife of Lycomedes, and Euipe, the wife of Megamedes.

¹⁴⁴ See the introduction to Georges Dalymeda's *Xénophon D'Éphèse. Les Éphésiaques ou Le roman D'Habrocomès et D'Antheia* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1926); cf. C. Picard, *Éphèse et Claros* (Paris, 1922) 185-9, 329-32. For an account of an actual procession of Artemis see Guy MacLean Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesus: Foundation Myths of a Roman City* (London, 1991) 54, 68, 185, which is based on the A. D. 104 foundation inscription of the roman equestrian C. Vibius Salutaris found in Ephesus.

The love of the couple cannot be quickly sated, since the genre demands that the couple suffer.¹⁴⁵ Habrocomes and Antheia fall ill, and, consequently, Antheia's parents, alarmed at the state of their child, summon diviners and priests to find out what ails their daughter:

εἰς τέλος εἰσάγουσι παρὰ τὴν Ἀνθίαν μάντις καὶ ἱερέας, ὡς εὐρήσοντας λύσιν τοῦ δεινοῦ. οἱ δὲ ἐλθόντες ἔθουόν τε ἱερεῖα καὶ ποικίλα ἐπέσπενδον καὶ ἐπέλεγον φωνὰς βαρβαρικός, ἐξιλάσκεσθαι τινὰς λέγοντες δαίμονας, καὶ προσεποιοῦν ὡς εἶη τὸ δεινὸν ἐκ τῶν ὑποχθονίων (1.5.6-7).

All this divination and glossolalia are of no avail¹⁴⁶ and the mention of chthonic deities by the diviners is characterized by Xenophon as being pretense. A closer reading of the description of the procession which Antheia led (πρῶτα μὲν τὰ ἱερά καὶ δᾶδες καὶ θυμιάματα· ἐπὶ τούτοις ἵπποι καὶ κύνες καὶ σκεύη κυνηγετικά, ἔτι καὶ πολεμικά, τὰ δὲ πλεῖστα εἰρηνικά [1.2.4]) makes clear that torches and incense were used. Rogers suggests that the inclusion of this paraphernalia may hint at the possibility that the Artemisian procession may have had chthonic symbols;¹⁴⁷ Picard also notices this possible symbolism.¹⁴⁸

The Oracle and Possible History

Since the diviners are of no use, the parents of both youths send embassies to the temple of Apollo in Colophon for an oracle. The response is:

¹⁴⁵ For narrative and verbal similarities between Chariton and Xenophon see the Teubner text by Papanikolaou who supplies a catalogue of such incidents.

¹⁴⁶ For the superstitious climate of Ephesus see Ch. Picard, *Éphèse et Claros* (Paris: Anciennes Maisons Thorin et Fontemoing, 1922) 131-2.

¹⁴⁷ Rogers, *The Sacred Identity* 110.

¹⁴⁸ Picard, *Éphèse et Claros* 297.

Τίπτε ποθεῖτε μαθεῖν νοῦσου τέλος ἤδὲ καὶ ἀρχήν;
 ἀμφοτέρους μία νοῦσος ἔχει, λύσις ἔνθεν ἀνυστή.
 δεινὰ δ' ὁρῶ τοῖσδεσσι πάθη καὶ ἀνήνυτα ἔργα·
 ἀμφότεροι φεύξονται ὑπεῖρ ἄλα λυσοδιώκτοι,
 δεσμὰ δὲ μοχθήσουσι παρ' ἀνδράσι μιξοθαλάσσοις
 καὶ τάφος ἀμφοτέροις θάλαμος καὶ πῦρ ἀίδηλον,
 καὶ ποταμοῦ † Νείλου † παρὰ ρεύμασιν Ἴσιδι σεμνῇ
 σωτείρῃ μετόπισθε παραστῆς ὄλβια δῶρα.
 ἀλλ' ἔτι που μετὰ πῆματ' ἀρείονα πότμον ἔχουσι (1.6.2).

It was not uncommon for Ephesians to ask questions of the oracle of Apollo at Colophon, or more precisely at Claros.¹⁴⁹ Unlike the female priestess at Delphi, the Clarian oracle had a male priest, who would issue Apollo's answer in hexameter verse and who would "not merely give a 'yes' or 'no' answer" to a question like the Delphic priestess.¹⁵⁰

The Roman historian Tacitus supplies one of the few references to the Clarian oracle. Germanicus, while in Asia, had attempted to visit Samothrace but could not do so because of unfavorable weather. He went instead to Colophon:

adpellitque Colophona ut Clarii Apollonis oraculo uteretur. Non femina illic, ut apud Delphos, sed certis e familiis et ferme Mileto accitus sacerdos numerum modo consulantium et nomina audit; tum in specum degressus, hausta fontis arcani aqua, ignarus plerumque litterarum et carminum, edit responsa versibus compositis super rebus quas quis mente concepit. Et ferebatur Germanico per ambages, ut mos oraculis, maturum exitum cecinisse (Ann. 2.54).

It is strange that the Xenophon's oracle is so clear-cut and understandable while the response mentioned by Tacitus seems to have been equivocal and ambiguous. Aelius Aristides records in his *Sacred Tales* (3.12) an oracle given to him by the Clarian oracle

¹⁴⁹ Picard, *Éphèse et Claros* 123.

¹⁵⁰ H. W. Parke, *Greek Oracles* (London: Hutchinson University Library, 1967) 122; see also pages 30ff. and 137ff.

regarding Aristides' health, which states that Asclepius will cure and heal him in the famous city of Telephus, which is located near the streams of the Caicus.¹⁵¹

Aristides' and Xenophon's oracle have some elements in common: illness, cures, divinities, and bodies of water. All of the Clarian responses, however, were not so clear (cf. Germanicus'). For example, when Oenomaus, a Cynic philosopher, went to Claros to ask commerce-related questions he was given this response:

In the land of Trachis lies the fair garden of Herakles (sic) containing all things in bloom for all to pick on every day, and yet they are not diminished, but with rains continually their weight is replenished.¹⁵²

It seems that this response was so vague that Oenomaus became so angry and depressed that he proceeded to write his *Exposure*, a tell-all book about the oracle. It appears that he got even angrier when he found out that the same response had been given numerous times to numerous people.

Habrocomes and Antheia

When the response of the oracle is made known to both Habrocomes' and Antheia's parents, a wedding is planned for the couple. The parents, however, are fearful of the oracle since it predicts misfortune for the youths. Nevertheless the parents interpret (παραμυθήσασθαι) the oracle and then allow the couple to marry. What exactly does παραμυθήσασθαι mean? According to Liddell and Scott, it can mean "to explain". The oracle the parents had requested had to be explained just as every oracle must be. In

¹⁵¹ The text of Aelius Aristides can be found in C. A. Behr's *Aelius Aristides and The Sacred Tales* (Chicago: Argonaut, Inc., 1968) 243.

¹⁵² The oracular response is found in H. W. Parke's *The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor* (London: Croom Helm, 1985) 142.

addition, Xenophon is telling his audience that he will explain the contents of the oracle via the story of Antheia and Habrocomes which comprises their separation, adventures, and reunion. Xenophon already has shown that Antheia's and Habrocomes' parents have some sort of mythological backgrounds, now he must construct a story full of mythological allusions.

On their wedding night Antheia and Habrocomes are taken to the bridal suite, where there is a canopy embroidered with mythical figures:

παίζοντες Ἔρωτες, οἱ μὲν Ἀφροδίτην θεραπεύοντες (ἦν δὲ καὶ Ἀφροδίτης εἰκὼν), οἱ δὲ ἰππεύοντες Νάβαταίαις στρουθοῖς, οἱ δὲ στεφάνους πλέκοντες, οἱ δὲ ἄνθη φέροντες. ταῦτα ἐν τῷ ἐτέρῳ μέρει τῆς σκηνῆς. ἐν τῷ ἐτέρῳ Ἄρης ἦν οὐχ ὠπλισμένος, ἀλλ' ὡς πρὸς ἐρωμένην τὴν Ἀφροδίτην κεκοσμημένος, ἐστεφανωμένος, χλαμύδα ἔχων. Ἔρωσ αὐτὸν ὠδήγει, λαμπάδα ἔχων ἡμμένην (1.8.2-3).

By describing this canopy Xenophon momentarily relates the story on the embroidery to the story taking place in the narrative. The Erotes are bringing in ἄνθη, Antheia as a *figura etymologica*, and Eros himself is bringing in an Ares, Habrocomes, who is prepared for love and not war. Xenophon is emphasizing this literary plot by alluding to a myth which comprises an unfaithful marriage and the adulterous affair of Ares and Aphrodite.¹⁵³ The author puts the finishing touch on the transformation of the two characters into mythical personae when he has Habrocomes tell Antheia that she is τῶν πώποτε λαλουμένων εὐτυχεστέρα (1.9.3), or in other words, she can be included among those women who are recalled in stories.

After the wedding the parents decide to send away the couple. On the journey Antheia swears by Artemis of the Ephesians that she will not live or look upon the sun if separated even for a short time from Habrocomes. One of their first stops is Rhodes, where the couple is mistaken for gods and consequently the Rhodians offer sacrifice and

¹⁵³ Xenophon may also be foreshadowing the appearance of Ares in the *Ephesiaca*.

celebrate their arrival as a festival. In Rhodes, at the temple of Helius, the couple offer a gold panoply inscribed with their names, and as it happens, pirates are made aware of the wealthy cargo of the newlyweds' ship and decide to take it.

Corymbus, the chief of these pirates, leads the assault on the ship and orders the slaughter of everyone except Antheia and Habrocomes, who had begged him to spare their lives, and hands them over to Apsyrtus, his commander.¹⁵⁴ Corymbus in the meanwhile develops a violent passion for Habrocomes, and a fellow pirate by the name of Euxinus has the same feelings for Antheia. Corymbus and Euxinus confide to each other their loves and decide to help each other: Euxinus will reveal to Habrocomes Corymbus' feeling and Corymbus will reveal Euxinus' feelings to Antheia. Both Habrocomes and Antheia, when they had been made aware of the pirates plans, tell the pirates to give them time to think over their proposals.

While Habrocomes and Antheia are pondering the pirates' offers, Apsyrtus takes them away from Corymbus and Euxinus and sets sail to Tyre, where the people think that Habrocomes and Antheia are gods. As mentioned above, however, Manto, the daughter of Apsyrtus, falls in love with Habrocomes.

Later on in the novel, Habrocomes meets up with Hippothous, who tells his traveling companion the sad story of his life, διηγήματα καὶ πολλήν ἔχοντα τραγωδίαν (3.1.4), which not only seems to reinforce the tragic sub-text of this novel, but also parallels the adventures of the hero and heroine. It seems that Hippothous is from

¹⁵⁴ Hägg, "The Naming of the Characters" 43: "Ἄψυρτος, Medea's brother . . . was murdered during her and Jason's flight from Colchis. With this child or youth (according to different versions of the myth) the chief pirate in the romance has obviously no point of contact (1.14-2.12)."

Perinthus, where he had fallen in love with a young man named Hyperanthes.¹⁵⁵ The two Perinthians loved each other, unbeknownst to everyone else, but a man by the name of Aristomachus interfered in that love. Aristomachus took Hyperanthes away to Byzantium, on the pretext of wanting to be his tutor; Habrocomes followed them there and killed Aristomachus. Afterwards Habrocomes and Hyperanthes fled by ship to Asia, but as luck would have it the ship sank off the coast of Lesbos and Hyperanthes drowned. To assuage his grief Habrocomes set up an inscription which read:

Ἴππόθοος κλεινῷ τεύξεν τόδε κῆμ' Ὑπεράνθει,
 οὐ τάφον ἐκ θανάτου ἀγαθὸν ἱεροῖο πολίτου
 ἐς βάθος ἐκ γαίης, ἄνθος κλυτόν, ὃν ποτε δαίμων
 ἤρπασεν ἐν πελάγει μεγάλου πνεύσαντος ἀήτου (3.2.13).¹⁵⁶

After setting up the inscription he went to Asia Minor where he became a robber.

Habrocomes, in turn, tells Hippothous all of his adventures, but does not mention Antheia's name. Hippothous, in an attempt to console Habrocomes, reveals to him that he and his fellow robbers were about to sacrifice a girl to Ares, but had not been able to because they had been interrupted by Perilaus. Habrocomes surmises that it had been Antheia and consequently the two men set out to find her.

In the meantime at Tarsus Antheia had become friends with a certain fellow Ephesian named Eudoxos, who happened to be a doctor. He knew of the trials and tribulations that Antheia had undergone and swore by Artemis that he would not reveal

¹⁵⁵ Hägg, "The Naming of the Characters" 41-2: "Ὑπεράνθης . . . is another son of Darius who is killed at Thermopylae (Hdt. 7.224)." Xenophon must have been using Hdt. 7.224 since Habrocomes is also mentioned in the same passage as being a son of Darius. Hyperanthes may also be the character foil of Antheia: Habrocomes loves Antheia, Blossom, while Hippothous loved Hyperanthes, one who blossoms exceedingly.

¹⁵⁶ The narrative of the drowning of Hyperanthes parallels the almost fatal voyage which Antheia had on the Cilician ship. Xenophon is drawing attention to the similar experiences which have made Habrocomes and Hippothous so compatible.

any of Antheia's story. When Antheia sees that she will be forced to marry Perilaus she asks Eudoxos for help, and he gives her a potion which, when taken, simulates death (*Scheintod*). Antheia, thinking that she has a lethal concoction, takes it in the bridal chamber and falls into a deep sleep. Perilaus then assumes that Antheia is dead and buries her. In the tomb, however, Antheia regains consciousness (cf. Callirhoe) and cries out that she has been made a sacrifice to Love and Death. Antheia, however, suffers even more misfortune: pirates find out that a girl had been richly buried and, consequently, they plunder the tomb.

When Habrocomes finds out what has happened, he sets sail to catch up with the pirates, but is shipwrecked off the Phoenician coast. There he is taken prisoner and sold to a retired soldier named Araxus. The old soldier has a wife by the name of Kyno,¹⁵⁷ who so lusts after Habrocomes that she tells him that she would even kill Araxus to sleep with him. Kyno forces Habrocomes, after much pressure, to agree to have sex with her and on the night that they are to consummate her illicit love Kyno kills Araxus. When Habrocomes finds this out he will have nothing to do with her and she in turn, angered by his refusal of sex, accuses him in of having murdered her husband. Habrocomes is arrested and sent for trial to the prefect of Egypt. This part of the story once again emphasizes the Hippolytean nature of Habrocomes.

Habrocomes is then sent to Egypt, where he is ordered by the prefect¹⁵⁸ to be crucified. When Habrocomes hears this he consoles himself by thinking that it is for the best since Antheia is dead. The crucifixion is attempted on the banks of the Nile, but it is

¹⁵⁷ Hägg, "The Naming of the Characters" 42: "Κυνώ, who is evil personified in Xenophon (3.12), has nothing more than the name in common with the Persian woman in Herodotus (1.110 and 122) who saves the little boy Cyrus from death and brings him up as her own son."

¹⁵⁸ A reflection of Xenophon's time?

futile since the Nile sends a gust of wind which knocks the cross into the river.

Habrocomes is then ordered to be burnt on a pyre, which proves as ineffective as the cross: the Nile surges onto the pyre and quenches the fire.¹⁵⁹ When this occurs the prefect orders Habrocomes to be kept under watch in order that he may find out the identity of this divinely protected man.

Psammis, en route to Ethiopia with Antheia, stops in Memphis, is attacked by Hippothous and his band. At the same time the prefect of Egypt finds out the truth about Habrocomes and gives him his freedom, gifts, money, and promises to send him back to Ephesus. Habrocomes, for some unknown reason, chooses instead to take the money and gifts and to sail to Italy.

Antheia does not fare as well as Habrocomes: she is almost raped by a guard named Anchilaus,¹⁶⁰ who is killed by her before he can commit the act. In retribution Antheia is condemned to a gruesome death by being placed in a ditch with two fierce and ravenous dogs. Another guard, by the name of Amphinomus,¹⁶¹ however, rescues her.

To parallel the adventures of Antheia, Xenophon writes that when Habrocomes makes his way to Syracuse he meets there an old fisherman by the name of Aegialeus who

¹⁵⁹ For other instances of fires being miraculously quenched see Schmeling, *Xenophon* 166, n. 38.

¹⁶⁰ Hägg, "The Naming of the Characters," 40: "Ἀγχίαλος occurs in Homer as the name of three different persons, all with very peripheral roles: a Greek warrior who is killed by Hector (*Il.* 5.609), the ruler of the Taphians with the epithet δαίφρων (*Od.* 1.180 and 418) and a Phaeacian (*Od.* 8.112). There is no agreement with Xenophon's picture of the Syrian robber who tries to outrage Antheia but is stabbed to death by her (4.5)."

¹⁶¹ Hägg, "The Naming of the Characters" 40: "In the *Odyssey* . . . Ἀμφίνομος is the foremost but also the noblest among the suitors; he has the righteous mind, but hardly anything more definite, in common with the compassionate robber who saves Antheia from the hungry dogs in 4.6 and 5.2."

tells him a very interesting story. It seems that he and his future wife, Thelxinoe, had met at a festival in Sparta, promised each other undying love, and eloped even though Thelxinoe had originally been betrothed to a Spartan named Androcles. They both loved each other, but this love became threatened by some god who was envious of them. Aegialeus and Thelxinoe had consequently eloped on the night before Thelxinoe was to marry Androcles.¹⁶² They had lived happily ever after in Syracuse, until the death of Thelxinoe. Aegialeus, however, after embalming her, talked with her, ate with her, and slept with her. She even consoled him (παραμυθεῖται 5.1.11; her body is called a παραμυθία for Aegialeus 5.1.12;).¹⁶³ Habrocomes, however, did “not bolt out of the house immediately to avoid . . . a senile lunatic,”¹⁶⁴ but having been consoled by Aegialeus’ story he lived with him and helped him in his fishing.

Antheia undergoes one more attempted rape at the hands of a certain Polyidus, but she escapes by taking asylum in the temple of Isis in Memphis. She asks the goddess to protect her and when Polyidus hears this he pities her and promises not to do violence to her. On account of his promise Antheia leaves the temple and goes to the temple of Apis where she asks the god to give her a sign. The prophecy is that soon all will be well. All does not go well soon enough because Antheia is sold to a brothel-keeper in Tarentum. Now that all three main characters are in roughly the same part of the world, Antheia in Tarentum, Hippothous in Tauromenium, and Habrocomes in Syracuse, the story comes to

¹⁶² For the myth of Androkles and the founding of Ephesus see Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesus*, 2, 103, 144 .

¹⁶³ On the subject of necrophilia see Schmeling, *Xenophon* 166, n. 40. Euripides also uses this motif in his *Alcestis*.

¹⁶⁴ Schmeling, *Xenophon* 67.

an end. Hippothous finds Antheia, rescues her from the brothel, and takes her to Rhodes where she and Habrocomes are reunited.

The few and subtle mythological elements in the *Ephesiaca* appear mostly in the early part of the novel. There are even fewer historical elements. Eros is the chief divinity in the novel since the plot depends for momentum upon his dislike of Habrocomes, but in Xenophon, in fact, the divinities that are mentioned are those gods which played important roles in Xenophon's time, whereas in Chariton the gods "smack of literary personification."¹⁶⁵ The gods in Xenophon have greater religious importance than they do in Chariton and this hypothesis causes Reardon to state that Xenophon is of a more "religious cast of mind than his predecessor, and seems to want to make of his story a patently religious document."¹⁶⁶

Before Reardon, Witt,¹⁶⁷ borrowing heavily from Merkelbach's *Mysterientext* hypothesis, argued that Xenophon was a deeply religious writer. Witt saw in the *Ephesiaca*, in particular in the wanderings of Antheia, the story of Io and speculated that the Io myth served as a sub-text for the plot of the novel:

At the very beginning we meet Antheia performing the duties of a priestess so admirably that she is honored by her associates as being herself godlike. Io is treated in the same manner as priestess of Hera. The father of Antheia consults the oracle of Apollo at Colophon concerning his daughter's future. Inachus goes to the Pythian Apollo at Delphi about Io. Io craves to be freed from her sufferings instead of lingering for death. So does Antheia. Io is promised the Nile with his hallowed sweet-tasting waters. Apollo's oracle makes clear to Antheia that she

¹⁶⁵ Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity* 26.

¹⁶⁶ Reardon, *The Form of Greek Romance* 35.

¹⁶⁷ R. E. Witt, *Isis in the Graeco-Roman World* (New York: Cornell UP, 1971); especially chapter XVIII, "Xenophon's Isiac Romance."

will have to make sacrifice to hallowed Isis on the banks of the Nile, when she has reached Egypt.¹⁶⁸

Witt even made the bold statement that without the Io myth Xenophon would have been “lost for his plot.”¹⁶⁹ It is true that if one searches long enough for allusions to particular myth in the novel one will find them, just as I have done with the Euripidean influence on the *Ephesiaca* in the form of the myths of Hippolytus, Electra, Alcestis, and Ino. Schmeling, in dealing with the myth of Io, notes that Xenophon uses the Io myth, but borrows “much of what he has from Chariton, and does not really care much whether it has a natural origin or basis.”¹⁷⁰ Witt, once again echoing Merkelbach, also sees Isis as playing a great role in the *Ephesiaca*. He partially based this idea on the use of the adjectives which are shared by Antheia and Isis, e.g. *lysikomōs*, which in the novel described Antheia’s hair and which is used by Philostratus (*Ep.* 16) to describe Isis’ hair.¹⁷¹

Altogether, mythological allusions play a minimal role in Xenophon; and history even less. A possible explanation for the scarcity of mythological elements may be that the *Ephesiaca*, as we have it, has come to down to us in an abridged form.¹⁷² The *Suda*

¹⁶⁸ Witt, *Isis* 247ff.

¹⁶⁹ Witt, *Isis* 249.

¹⁷⁰ Schmeling, *Xenophon* 128.

¹⁷¹ Witt, *Isis* 348-9.

¹⁷² For studies on the possibility of abridgement see: Hägg, “Die *Ephesiaca* des Xenophon Ephesios - Original oder Epitome?” *Classica et Mediaevalia* 27 (1966) 118-161; Reardon, *Courants Littéraires Grecs des IIe et IIIe Siècles Après J.-C.* 353; E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* 429; K. Bürger, “Zu Xenophon of Ephesos,” *Hermes* 27 (1892) 36ff.

tells us: Χενοφῶν, Εφέσιος, ιστορικός. Εφεσιακά· ἔστι δὲ ἐρωτικά βιβλία ἰ' περὶ Ἀβροκόμου καὶ Ἀνθίας· καὶ Περὶ τῆς πόλεως Ἐφεσίων· καὶ ἄλλα (ed. A. Adler, III,495). Of the ten books mentioned books we have only five. There is the possibility therefore that we do have an abridged version of the original novel. This would explain why the novel appears to be so choppy in places, why people who never were mentioned show up in the plot, why the parents decide to send the newly wedded couple on a sailing trip, why Habrocomes ends up going to Sicily, and a host of other oddities. The extant novel, therefore, may be abridged and what we have is only a skeletal framework of the original, which may have had more mythological stories and allusions and possibly historical references. In the first part of the novel he seems to be doing that with the mention of Eros, Hippolytus, the canopy with Ares and Aphrodite, but then the mythological aspect of the novel disappears. Even if the novel is not in an abridged form the ratio between the historical and the mythological does support my thesis that the historical gave way to a the mythological. Much more mention is made of divinities and there are many more mythological allusions or mythological pedigrees than there are historical data.

CHAPTER IV
LONGUS, MYTH, AND AETIOLOGY

Goethe in a conversation with Johann Peter Eckermann said that *Daphnis and Chloe* is “so schön daß man den Eindruck davon, bei den schlechten Zuständen, in denen man lebt, nicht in sich behalten kann und daß man immer von neuem erstaunt, wenn man es wieder liest.” He ended his conversation with Eckermann stressing that

Man müßte ein ganzes Buch schreiben, um alle großen Verdienste dieses Gedichts nach Würden zu schätzen. Man tut wohl, es alle Jahr einmal zu lesen, um immer wieder daran zu lernen und den Eindruck seiner großen Schönheit aufs neue zu empfinden.¹⁷³

From the enormous amount of translations, scholarly books and articles it seems that scholars have taken Goethe’s suggestion to heart. There are thirteen editions of the Greek text of *Daphnis and Chloe*, ten in Greek and Latin, three in Greek and English, two in Greek and German, and one in Greek and French.¹⁷⁴ There are thirty-five translations of *Daphnis and Chloe* in eleven languages (Latin, French, Italian, English, German, Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, Russian, Polish and Hebrew). Research on Longus overshadows the individual research on each of the other four ancient Greek novels.

The majority of studies on *Daphnis and Chloe* involve the origins of the ancient

¹⁷³ “Sonntag, den 20. März 1831,” in *Eckermanns Gespräche mit Goethe in den letzten Jahren seines Lebens*, ed. Johann Peter Eckermann (Basel: Verlag Birkhäuser, 1945) 455-6.

¹⁷⁴ MacQueen, *Myth, Rhetoric, and Fiction* 261-7.

novel¹⁷⁵ and possible religious meaning in it.¹⁷⁶ One theme, however, that runs throughout most of the scholarly work is the importance of the *aitia* of the wood-dove, the syrinx, and of the echo in the novel,¹⁷⁷ in conjunction with the importance of painting to the work.¹⁷⁸ This chapter examines the *aitia*, but, unlike previous research, it does not stress the symmetrical structural frames created by the *aitia*.¹⁷⁹ This chapter determines the components which form the *aitia* and whether the *aitia* exist on their own and should be solely interpreted as the building blocks upon which Longus constructs his novel or the *aitia* exist because mythological context allows them to do so.

¹⁷⁵ Among others see especially: Gunnar Valley, *Über den Sprachgebrauch des Longus* (Uppsala: Berling, 1926); Georg Rohde, "Longus und die Bukolik," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 86 (1937): 23-49; Bruno Lavagnini, *Studi sul Romanzo Greco* (Messina/Florence: G. d'Anna, 1950); Otto Schönberger, *Hirtengeschichten von Daphnis und Chloe* (Berlin, 1960); R. L. Hunter, *A Study of Daphnis & Chloe* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983).

¹⁷⁶ See H. H. O. Chalk, "Eros and the Lesbian Pastorals of Longus," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 80 (1960): 32-51; Reinhold Merkelbach, "Daphnis und Chloe: Roman und Mysterium," *Antaios* 1 (1960): 47-60; Merkelbach's more recent work: *Die Hirten des Dionysos. Die Dionysos-Mysterien der römischen Kaiserzeit und der bukolische Roman des Longus* (Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1988). Michael C. Mittelstadt, "Longus: *Daphnis and Chloe* and the Pastoral Tradition," *Classica et Mediaevalia* 27 (1966): 162-77, searches for artistic features in the novel, rather than mystical or religious ones.

¹⁷⁷ Paul Turner, "*Daphnis and Chloe: An Interpretation*," *Greece and Rome* 7 (1960): 117-23.

¹⁷⁸ Michael C. Mittelstadt, "Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe*, and Roman Narrative Painting," *Latomus* 26 (1967): 752-61.

¹⁷⁹ MacQueen, "Longus and the Myth of Chloe," notes that "Longus repeats certain groups of themes and images in essentially chiasmic order, so that a kind of frame is created around each μῦθος: that is, ring composition" (122). He also suggests that "Longus uses paired motifs and images to convert a linear, diachronic narrative into a synchronic frame" (129). This ring-structure of Longus results in the transformation of Chloe from a παρθένος to a γυνή (131).

Myth, however, figures incidentally rather than centrally in the construction of the plot. Longus seems to use myth as a kind of literary thesaurus from which he can construct the *aitia*, which in turn are themselves the building blocks for the novel. The analysis of the *aitia* supports the thesis of this dissertation because the results of the analysis will show that Longus, unlike Chariton and Xenophon, uses mythological allusion in the *aitia* and not history as the force behind both the literary-structural background and the plot of the novel.

The Prooemium to *Daphnis and Chloe* and Thucydides

The form of *Daphnis and Chloe* presents problems. The novel is unique in its telling of the love story of the hero and heroine because it does not include what are considered regular plot ingredients in the other four ancient novels, such as the *Scheintod* of the heroine¹⁸⁰ or voyages to distant places. Consequently, the uniqueness of Longus has caused some scholars to exclude him in their surveys of this ancient genre.¹⁸¹ *Daphnis and Chloe*, however, is included in this study because it shows that

¹⁸⁰ MacQueen, *Myth, Rhetoric, and Fiction*, suggests that Chloe does undergo a false death because the main characters do suffer some sort of death when they were exposed as children. He also notes that Longus did not abandon this conventional theme but instead “transformed” it (136). The *Scheintod* motif comprises two elements: the false death of one of the two leading characters and the recognition of this false death by the surviving leading character. In *Daphnis and Chloe* this does not occur; in fact, the exposure of a child, in ancient literature, does not suggest death but rather foreshadows the survival of the child (cf. *Oedipus Rex*, the plays of Plautus and Terence).

¹⁸¹ F. A. Todd, *Some Ancient Novels* (Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1940), excludes *Daphnis and Chloe* from his examination of the ancient novels on the basis that Longus’ work “stands alone in ancient literature as a union of the Romance with the pastoral” (2). Moses Hadas, “Cultural Survival and the Origins of Fiction,” excludes Longus on the same grounds as Todd because he thinks *Daphnis and Chloe* is excessively contaminated by “the bucolic tradition” (258). Massimo Fusillo, “Textual Patterns and Narrative Situations in the Greek Novel,” in *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* vol. 1 (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1988), isolates, in rather harsh terms, this

after Chariton and Xenophon of Ephesus, whether or not through the influence of the Second Sophistic, the novel genre changed drastically from an historically detailed form to one that is more mythological in nature. In this novel, in fact, no internal references pinpoint any external historical incidents or events.¹⁸² This study is in three parts: 1) an examination of the possibly historical characteristics of the novel, 2) an analysis of the included mythological allusions, and 3) a discussion on the importance and functions of the three or possibly four *aitia*.

Longus gives an historical quality to his work by recalling in the preface to *Daphnis and Chloe* the ending of Thucydides' introduction, the *archaeologia*, to his history:

Ἐν Λέσβῳ θηρῶν ἐν ἄλσει Νυμφῶν θέαμα εἶδον κάλλιστον ὧν εἶδον, εἰκόνας γραφήν, ἱστορίαν ἔρωτος. καλὸν μὲν καὶ τὸ ἄλσος, πολὺδένδρου, ἀνθηρόν, κατάρρυτον· μία πηγή πάντα ἔτρεφε, καὶ τὰ ἄνθη καὶ τὰ δένδρα· ἀλλ' ἡ γραφή τερπνοτέρα, καὶ τέχνην ἔχουσα περιττήν καὶ τύχην ἐρωτικὴν, ὥστε πολλοὶ καὶ τῶν ξένων κατὰ φήμην ἤεσαν, τῶν μὲν Νυμφῶν ἰκέται, τῆς δὲ εἰκόνας θεαταί. γυναῖκες ἐπ' αὐτῆς τίκτουσαι καὶ ἄλλαι σπαργάνοις κοσμοῦσαι, παιδία ἐκκείμενα, ποιμνία τρέφοντα, ποιμένες ἀναιρούμενοι, νέοι συντιθέμενοι, ληστῶν καταδρομή, πολεμίων ἐμβολή, πολλὰ ἄλλα καὶ πάντα ἐρωτικά. ἰδόντα με καὶ θαυμάσαντα πόθος ἔσχεν ἀντιγράψαι τῇ γραφῇ, καὶ ἀναζητησάμενος ἐξηγητὴν τῆς εἰκόνας τέτταρας βιβλους ἐξεπονησάμην, ἀνάθημα μὲν Ἑρωτι καὶ Νύμφαις καὶ Πανί, κτῆμα δὲ τερπνὸν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, ὃ καὶ νοσοῦντα ἰάσεται καὶ λυπούμενον παραμυθήσεται, τὸν ἐρασθέντα ἀναμνήσει, τὸν οὐκ ἐρασθέντα προπαιδεύσει.

novel because supposedly "it is a perfumed pastoral written by a sophisticated aristocrat for sophisticated aristocrats" (17). It seems that these three scholars by isolating Longus have made the novelist even more intriguing.

¹⁸² Longus supplies some information on topography; for research done on this data see H. J. Mason, "Longus and the Topography of Lesbos," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 109 (1979): 149-63; P. Green, "Longus, Antiphon, and the Topography of Lesbos," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 102 (1982): 210-14; and E. L. Bowie, "Theocritus' Seventh Idyll, Philetas and Longus," *Classical Quarterly* 35 (1985): 67-91. Although these scholars postulate that Longus knew the topography of Lesbos, this inclusion of topographical data, in addition to the pirates and drachmas, tell us nothing about the historical setting of the novel.

πάντως γὰρ οὐδείς Ἔρωτα ἔφυγεν ἢ φεύξεται μέχρις ἅ κάλλος ἦ καὶ ὀφθαλμοὶ βλέπωσιν. ἡμῖν δὲ ὁ θεὸς παράσχοι σωφρονούσι τὰ τῶν ἄλλων γράφειν.¹⁸³

Longus tells his audience that he will be writing an history of love in response to a picture he saw while hunting in Lesbos. The document Longus supplies his reader is a pleasing possession for all men which has curative powers and contains many stories:

γυναῖκες ἐπ' αὐτῆς τίκτουσαι καὶ ἄλλαι σπαργάνοις κοσμοῦσαι, παιδία ἐκκείμενα, ποίμνια τρέφοντα, ποιμένες ἀναιρούμενοι, νέοι συντιθέμενοι, ληστῶν καταδρομή, πολεμίων ἐμβολή, πολλὰ ἄλλα καὶ πάντα ἐρωτικά.

These stories, however, must not be confused with the myths involving Eros, and the popular gods of countryside such as Dionysus, Pan, and the Nymphs, which are later found in the novel.¹⁸⁴

Longus' juxtaposition of the phrase κτῆμα τερπνὸν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις with the

¹⁸³ The Greek text of *Daphnis and Chloe* is from *Longus: Daphnis et Chloe*, ed. Michael D. Reeve, (Leipzig: Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Latinorum Teubneriana, 1982).

¹⁸⁴ Todd, *Some Ancient Novels*, writes that gods and goddesses were a "regular constituent of the Greek novels" (46), but Mittelstadt, "Longus: *Daphnis and Chloe* and the Pastoral Tradition," narrows this constituency to those divinities of the "popular religion of the countryside" which was "the most persistent form of Greek religion in antiquity" (176). Before Mittelstadt, Andre Bonnard, *Greek Civilization*, had noted that in Longus the oldest divinities are celebrated: nymphs, Pan, Dionysus, satyrs, maenads and those of the "pool and tree" who were village "gods, country gods - *di pagan*" (257). Bonnard eloquently pictures the state of the literary Graeco-Roman pantheon in Longus: "Now even the gods remember to be merciful and practice kindness! Already their faces have lost that radiance unbearable to mortal eyes, that seemed to reflect the blazing thunderbolts. The shades are climbing up the steep slopes of Olympus; already the foremost of the immortals, who have no mention in these pages of Longus, dip towards the horizon like fallen stars. The old world has turned on its axis, and its outworn face is presented to some new dawn elsewhere" (256-7).

verb παραμυθήσεται¹⁸⁵ *may* cause the reader who is familiar with Thucydides to question if Longus intentionally alludes to the historian. If he did, why did he do it?¹⁸⁶ In 1.22.4 of his history Thucydides writes that in his work there will be an absence of τὸ μυθῶδες and that perhaps the exclusion of the fabulous will result in the work being less pleasing to its audience. He prefers to write a κτῆμα ἐς αἰεὶ rather than something that will be momentarily pleasing. Thucydides then immediately proceeds to the historical causes for the outbreak of the war between the Greek city states. In linear progression, therefore, Thucydides goes from the fabulous, τὸ μυθῶδες, to a work of true historical worth, κτῆμα ἐς αἰεὶ, and ends up with the historical causes of the Peloponnesian War. The outline could then be formulated as myth - history - history.

Longus' preface is written inversely to Thucydides' introduction. The novelist begins his preface by writing that he has seen, εἶδον, a picture which told a story. Longus does not use the usual terms of μῦθος or λόγος, instead he uses ἱστορία. This indeed is an odd usage of ἱστορία, but he immediately clarifies it by writing that, after some research, he will tell his readers the stories found in the painting and will dedicate

¹⁸⁵ MacQueen, *Myth, Rhetoric, and Fiction*, writes: "The story that Longus tells will heal the sick and comfort the afflicted. Here the verb for 'comfort,' παραμυθήσεται, is especially interesting. Literally, it means to "speak" (-μυθ-) 'beside' (παρα-). The use of the {myth-} morpheme invokes (in a typically allusive-elusive way) the whole concept of myth, with which, as we shall see, so much of *Daphnis and Chloe* is concerned. Underlying the literal meaning of παραμυθέω, then, is the image of one sitting beside the bed, telling stories intended to cheer the one who is ill. Though nothing exactly like this happens in *Daphnis and Chloe*, one may still note that stories (μῦθοι) are told throughout the novel to distract or entertain the hearer - though we shall eventually learn that there is teaching going on as well, sub rosa" (27).

¹⁸⁶ William E. McCulloh, *Longus* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1970), and Turner, "Daphnis and Chloe: An Interpretation," 117, speculate on the use of Thucydides by Longus, but decide to discuss this usage as just one of the many examples of allusions to literary sources in *Daphnis and Chloe*. See also Jean-René Vieillefond, ed. *Longus: Pastorales* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1987) cxvii-cxx.

these stories to mythological entities, such as Eros, Pan, and the Nymphs.¹⁸⁷ In contrast to Thucydides' myth - history - history, Longus' outline, therefore, could be formulated as history - myth - myth.

Longus, however, makes it quite clear that his narrative will be different from Thucydides': *Daphnis and Chloe* will be a pleasing work for all men, κτῆμα τερπνὸν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, unlike Thucydides' history which excludes elements which could make his work pleasing to his audience. The novel, on the one hand, will also cure the sick and lessen the grief of those in sorrow. The history of Thucydides, on the other hand, will help men in the future avoid the mistakes of the past: ὅσοι δὲ βουλήσονται τῶν τε γενομένων τὸ σαφὲς σκοπεῖν καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ποτὲ αὔθις κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τοιούτων καὶ παραπλησίων ἔσεσθαι, ὠφέλιμα κρίνειν αὐτὰ ἀρκούντως ἔξει (1.22.4).

Longus not only reflects the possible historical ancestry of the novel by recalling Thucydides but also by including words that denote historical enquiry: εἶδον, γραφήν, ἱστορίαν, φήμην, ἰδόντα, ἀντιγράψαι, ἀναζητησάμενος, ἐξηγητήν, βιβλους, βλέπωσι, and γράφειν. The novelist, in fact, is telling his audience what must be done in order to write history or to at least go about researching the material necessary to write history. The methodology consists of seeing or having first hand experience of the data and then producing a written response to the data. If first-hand experience of the subject matter cannot be attained, second-hand knowledge must be sought, such as eye-witnesses or interpreters or reports; the best information, however, is that gotten through a hands-on approach. The finished product should be written down in some sort of form. Longus even supplies the caveat that historical research is not easy work.

¹⁸⁷ In the first chapter of his dissertation Philippides suggests that Longus was familiar with the elements that composed an historical enquiry in ancient times. Longus, Philippides argues, knew that ὄψις and ἀκοή were necessary for any historical enquiry; he quite properly therefore includes these two elements in his preface in many different ways: εἶδον, εἶδον, ἰδόντα, ὀφθαλμοὶ βλέπωσιν.

The preface also recalls the epic genre. In the last line of the preface Longus asks that ἡμῖν δὲ ὁ θεὸς παράσχοι σωφρονοῦσι τὰ τῶν ἄλλων γράφειν thereby making an educated audience remember the famous opening lines of the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and the *Aeneid*.¹⁸⁸ In the *Iliad* Homer asks Μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος (1.1), and in the *Odyssey* he asks Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολὺτροπον (1.1). Vergil in the eighth line of his work asks *Musa, mihi causas memora* (1.8). Longus is truly keeping within the established traditions of his literary ancestors.¹⁸⁹

Longus knows that even though he is working within a new genre,¹⁹⁰ he has to keep within or reflect literary tradition. Just as Chariton resoundingly echoes the opening lines of historical works,¹⁹¹ in particular Herodotus, Longus wants to pay homage to his literary predecessors. He does not begin his work with the customary “I am X, hail from Y, and will write about Z.” But he prefers to show that he is familiar with one of the correct or accepted ways of opening a narrative in prose, but opts not to follow the established practice. Longus elects to demonstrate his proficiency in historiographical theory rather than actually writing history.

¹⁸⁸ Steiner, “The graphic analogue,” suggests that Longus seems “to be writing for an audience familiar with old motifs and the well-worn episodes” (134).

¹⁸⁹ πάντως γὰρ οὐδεὶς Ἔρωτα ἔφυγεν ἢ φεύξεται μέχρις ἂν κάλλος ἢ καὶ ὀφθαλμοὶ βλέπωσιν may show that Longus is familiar with tragedy. One possible source is the *Antigone* (781-90). Sophocles describes Love as: Ἔρωσ ἀνίκατε μάχαν. / Ἔρωσ, ὃς ἐν κτήνεσι πίπτεις, / ὃς ἐν μαλακαῖς παρειαῖς / νεάνιδος ἐννυχεύεις, / φοιτᾶς δ' ὑπερπόντιος ἐν τ' / ἀγρονόμιος αὐλαῖς / καὶ σ' οὔτ' ἀθανάτων φύξιμος οὐδεὶς / οὔθ' ἀμερίων σέ γ' ἀνθρώπων, / ὁ δ' ἔχων μέμνηεν. The text of Sophocles is from *Fabulae*, ed. A.C. Pearson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955).

¹⁹⁰ McCulloh, *Longus*, writes that “*Daphnis and Chloe* is the last Greek attempt at a formulation of existence in mythical terms - a worthy Indian summer reminiscence of the great phases of Greek creation through myth: epic, choral ode, and drama” (20).

¹⁹¹ See chapter I.

The Location of the *Aitia* and Structure

Preceding the presentation of the analysis of the *aitia*, I would like to summarize briefly the plot in order to illustrate the connections, if any, between the characters of the novel and mythological characters. I do not suggest that every name in Longus is connected with myth or literature involved with myth, since some of the characters' names, e.g., Gnathon, may be derived from New Comedy, a possible influence on Longus.

The novel concerns the love of Daphnis and Chloe, and the action takes place in Lesbos. Daphnis,¹⁹² the son of Myrtale¹⁹³ and Lamon,¹⁹⁴ was found as an infant being

¹⁹² Δάφνις appears in many ancient sources but appears most frequently in the works of Theocritus. In *Id.* 1 his death is recalled. Thyrsis asks an unnamed goatherd to play on his syrinx (one of the *aitia* of *Daphnis and Chloe* is about the syrinx), but the goatherd refuses because he does not want to anger Pan (an important god in *Daphnis and Chloe*), since custom forbids him to play the syrinx at noontime. The goatherd persuades Thyrsis to sing by offering him a goat and an expertly crafted drinking cup. The goatherd describes the cup as having a woman standing between two men, who are trying to win over her love; this depiction parallels a scene in *Daphnis and Chloe* 1.16. Not far from these three people is an old fisherman (Philetas?), who is about to cast his net not far from a small boy (Eros?), who is standing near a vineyard (Philetas' garden?). It appears that the old fisherman may be trying to catch the small boy. If this is true, this scene parallels *Daphnis and Chloe* 2.3-7, where Philetas attempts to catch the Eros, an interloper in his garden. According to the goatherd the small boy is weaving a cage for grasshoppers (cf. *Daphnis and Chloe* 1.26). There are many other parallels in this idyll. One, for example, is Daphnis' resentment at the he-goats whom he saw mounting the nannies (cf. *Daphnis and Chloe* 3.14). Daphnis eventually dies from unrequited love. In *Id.* 6 Daphnis sings about Galatea and Polyphemus, while in *Id.* 7 Xenea is the maiden for whom Daphnis yearned and wasted away like snow: χιών ὡς τις κατετάκετο μακρὸν ὑφ' Αἴμον / ἢ Ἄθω ἢ Ῥοδόπαν ἢ Καύκασον ἐσχατόωντα (76-77). In *Daphnis and Chloe* 3.10 Daphnis says that he will melt away before the snow of the winter which is keeping them separated melts away: καὶ δέδοικα μὴ ἐγὼ πρὸ ταύτης τακῶ. In *Id.* 8 Daphnis, described as being red-headed and skilled in playing the syrinx, is the victor of a contest and mention is also made that Daphnis married a Nymph by the name of Naïs. In *Id.* 9 Daphnis is once again in a contest in which he wins a staff for his eloquence. In *Id.* 27 Daphnis identifies his parents as Lycidas and Nomaië.

Other authors who include Daphnis in their works are Callimachus, Zonas, Parthenius, and Aelian. Callimachus (*A. P.* 7.518) identifies Daphnis as the shepherd *par excellence* about whom the poets sang before Astacides took his place. Zonas (*AP*

suckled by a goat.¹⁹⁵ Chloe,¹⁹⁶ the daughter of Nape¹⁹⁷ and Dryas,¹⁹⁸ was discovered in

9.556) describes the beauty of Daphnis using Pan as his interlocutor: Νύμφαι ἐποχθίδιαι, Νηρηΐδες, εἶδετε Δάφνιν / χθιζόν, ἐπαχνιδίαν ὡς ἀπέλουσε κόνιν, / ὑμετέραις λιβάδεσσιν ὅτ' ἔνθορε σειριόκαυτος, / ἡρέμα φοινηχθεὶς μᾶλα παρηΐδεια. / εἶπατέ μοι, καλὸς ἦν; ἢ ἐγὼ τράγος οὐκ ἄρα κνάμαν / μοῦνον ἐγυιόωθην, ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ κραδίαν; Parthenius, in his ΠΕΡΙ ΔΑΦΝΙΔΟΣ, writes that Daphnis was the son of Hermes, skilled in the syrinx, and very beautiful. Parthenius says that the nymph Echenais fell in love with Daphnis and told him never to associate with mortal women or else he would lose his sight. A Sicilian princess, however, got Daphnis drunk and he, with his resolve weakened, slept with the princess. Consequently, Daphnis became blind. Aelian (*VH* 10.18) tells the same story as Parthenius.

¹⁹³ Μυρτάλη appears in ancient literature as a courtesan. Herondas, in *Mimiamb* 1, groups her with Sime who is a courtesan, and Horace (*Ode* 1.33) writes that he was in love with a slave-born Myrtale.

¹⁹⁴ Λάμων is the dedicator of rustic paraphernalia to Priapus in the *Anthologia Palatina* 6.102: 'Ροῖν ξανθοχίτωνα, γεραιόφλοιά τε σῦκα, / καὶ ῥοδέας σταφυλῆς ὠμὸν ἀποσπάδιον, / μῆλόν θ' ἠδύπνουον λεπτή πεποκωμένον ἄχνη, / καὶ κάρουον χλωρῶν ἐκφανὲς ἐκ λεπίδων, / καὶ σίκουον χνοάοντα, τὸν ἐν φύλλοις πεδοκοίτην, / καὶ πέρκην ἦδη χρυσοχίτων' ἐλάην, / σοὶ, φιλοδίτα Πρίηπε, φυτοσκάφος ἄνθετο Λάμων, / δένδρεσι καὶ γυίοις εὐξάμενος θαλέθειν. The Greek text of this epigram, and all other passages from the *Anthologia Palatina*, are from *The Greek Anthology*, trans. W. R. Paton (1917; London: William Heinemann, 1919). Lamon does not appear as a mythological character in any extant ancient text.

¹⁹⁵ Zeus, Poseidon, Hephaestus, Dionysus, and Romulus and Remus were also nursed by animals.

¹⁹⁶ Chloe (Green) as a mythological character is not found in any extant ancient source, but the name Χλόη is found as being an epithet of Demeter. For the most extensive collection of ancient sources and of research done on this epithet see Merkelbach, *Die Hirten des Dionysos*, 32, n. 8. Philippides, "Longus: Antiquity's Innovative Novelist," 102-4, has an excellent and brief discussion on the name "Chloe."

¹⁹⁷ Νάπη, wooded glen or vale, appears in Ovid's *Amores* 1.11 as Corinna's handmaiden who is adept in gathering and placing in order the scattered locks of her mistress. She is also known for being useful in carrying out such lovers' requests as delivering love letters. In *Amores* 1.12 Nape is seen as portending doom when she tripped exiting Naso's abode. Strabo (9.4.5) writes ταύτην μὲν οὖν τὴν Βῆσσαν ἐν τοῖς δυοῖς γραπτέον σῖγμα (ἀπὸ γὰρ τοῦ δρυμῶδους ὠνόμασται ὁμωνύμως, ὥσπερ καὶ Νάπη ἐν

a shrine dedicated to the Nymphs.¹⁹⁹ The true identities of both children, however, are not actually known, but will be revealed later on through trinkets found with each of them.

When the children reach their teen-age years, Eros, in a dream, commands them to tend his flocks. The two youths obey and spend their days tending their flocks, weaving garlands for the Nymphs, culling flowers, playing on pan-pipes, and making cages for grasshoppers.²⁰⁰ Eros, all the meanwhile, kindles in them a fire of mutual love. One day Chloe manages to see Daphnis naked, and, as a result, falls in love with Daphnis.²⁰¹ The boy then falls in love with the maiden, but only after winning a contest

τῷ Μηθύμνης πεδίῳ, ἦν Ἑλλάτικος ἀγνοῶν Λάπην ὀνομάζει). This passage caused Hunter to write that “Longus wishes us to remember . . . that Νάπη was, as Strabo 9.426 informs us, the name of a place in the plain of Methymna, and this deepens the sense that we are reading a local μῦθος or aetiological tale” (17).

¹⁹⁸ Homer (*Il.* 1.263) calls Dryas (Dry Oak) a “ποιμένα λαῶν” which agrees, somewhat, with the profession Longus gives to Chloe’s foster-father. He is also the father of Lycurgus and according to the *Homeric Hymn to Pan* he is also identified as the grandfather of Pan (cf. Hunter, 17).

¹⁹⁹ Longus borrows the description of the grotto from Theocritus 7.136-37.

²⁰⁰ See Theocritus 1 for similar activities, in particular line 52.

²⁰¹ Longus writes in 1.13: ἐδόκει δὲ τῇ Χλόῃ θεωμένη καλὸς ὁ Δάφνις, ὅτι <δὲ οὐ> πρότερον αὐτῇ καλὸς ἐδόκει, τὸ λουτρὸν ἐνόμιζε τοῦ κάλλους αἴτιον. This line recalls the famous poem of Sappho (fr. 31) in which she describes the effects she suffers upon seeing a man who seems to be as fortunate as the gods. More importantly Longus may be pointing out the importance that the *aitia* have in his work when he mentions the transformation which Daphnis has undergone in Chloe’s eyes, the cause of which was τὸ λουτρὸν or the αἴτιον of the transformation in beauty.

for which he receives as his prize a kiss from Chloe.²⁰² The loser of this contest, Dorcon, does not take this loss lightly and unsuccessfully plans to get even by raping Chloe.

Aition #1: the wood-dove. One day Daphnis tells Chloe a story about how a maiden became a wood-dove; the first *aition* in the novel. The story is one that deals with metamorphosis, sets the theme for the two explicitly metamorphic stories of Syrinx and Echo, and alludes to the possible metamorphic change of Chloe from maiden to woman in Book 4.

After the *aition* of the wood-dove Phoenician pirates kidnap Daphnis, kill Dorcon, and steal his cattle. Longus, of course, is bowing to the literary restrictions of the novel genre, but, by having the pirates kidnap the hero and not the heroine, he gives the norm a twist. Chloe rescues Daphnis by playing on Dorcon's pan-pipes a tune known to the cattle. The cattle recognize the tune, jump overboard in their attempt to get back to shore, and thereby cause the ship to sink and the pirates to drown. Daphnis makes it

²⁰² In this contest, a debate, Daphnis states that he, like Zeus, was raised by a goat. He also stresses the fact that although he does associate with animals he does not smell badly but, like Pan, he is sweet smelling company. As to his physical appearance Daphnis states that he is as beardless as Dionysus and that if he is black (tanned) in color so is the hyacinth. By mentioning the hyacinth Longus is associating Daphnis with Hyacinthus, the son of Amyclas and the lover of Apollo. After all the story of Hyacinthus is another tale of love and metamorphosis. In sum: Daphnis' rhetorical speech solidifies the notion that he and Chloe are analogues of mythical and not historical characters. In other words, Daphnis could have chosen historical persons with which to compare himself but he did not. The word *aition* and its different forms are used in 1.8, 1.13, 2.26, 3.24, 3.26, 3.30, and 4.13.

back to the shore riding between two oxen.²⁰³ So ends the first book, in which the only myth that is mentioned is a generic metamorphosis myth: the myth of the wood-dove.

Book 2 begins with the celebration of the vintage and with a feast in honor of Dionysus, in which men are compared to satyrs, Daphnis to a young Dionysus, and Chloe to a Bacchant. Longus writes that the young couple wants to sate their passions, but they do not possess the technical skill. Luckily, an old man called Philetas²⁰⁴ visits them and tells them that Eros appeared in his garden and told him the myth of Eros.²⁰⁵ Philetas also instructs them, to no avail, in the ways of love, but not before telling them the story of the love of his life, Amaryllis.²⁰⁶

²⁰³ This episode of Daphnis riding back to shore on oxen gives a new twist to the myth of Europa and the bull. Daphnis, while seeking escape from a kidnapping, rode on two oxen towards the shore while Europa, while being kidnapped, rode on one bull away from shore.

²⁰⁴ Philetas is the innovator of the scholar-poet tradition and possible teacher of Theocritus. Hunter has included a very comprehensive and meticulous appendix on Philetas in his book *Daphnis and Chloe*.

²⁰⁵ The myth of Eros (2.5) by Eros recalls in the first part Hesiodic theogony and in the latter Plato's *Symposium*, particularly the flowery speech on love by Agathon : οὔτοι παῖς ἐγὼ καὶ εἰ δοκῶ παῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ Κρόνου πρεσβύτερος καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ παντός. . . . εἰς τὸν σὸν ἔρχομαι κῆπον καὶ τέρπομαι τοῖς ἄνθεσι καὶ τοῖς φυτοῖς κὰν ταῖς πηγαῖς ταύταις καὶ λούομαι. διὰ τοῦτο καλὰ καὶ τὰ ἄνθη καὶ τὰ φυτὰ τοῖς ἐμοῖς λουτροῖς ἀρδόμενα.

²⁰⁶ The story of Amaryllis and Philetas is one of a love that never comes to fruition. Philetas wanted Amaryllis, but Amaryllis did not want Philetas or at least would not come to him. Ἀμαρυλλίς is mentioned by Theocritus in *Idylls* 3 and 4. In *Idyll* 3 she is the cave nymph whom an unnamed goatherd serenades. The goatherd with many a loving word attempts to rekindle the love that Amaryllis previously had for him. In *Idyll* 4 she is a mortal maiden who had died but when alive was loved by Aigon and Battos.

Vergil includes an Amaryllis in his first and eighth *Ecloques*. In *Eclogue* 1 Meliboeus tells Tityrus (cf. Theocritus' *Idyll* 3) that he is teaching the woods to echo *formosam Amaryllida* who one may presume to have been loved by and in been love with Tityrus. Ovid also makes mention of Amaryllis in the *Ars Amatoria* and in the *Tristia*. In *Ars* 2.267 she is no longer a country shepherdess but rather a city lady who will not take chestnuts as a gift. In *Tristia* 2.537 Ovid notes that Vergil had once written,

The tutelage of Philetas is of particular importance because he gives them explicit instructions: Ἐρωτος γὰρ οὐδὲν φάρμακον, οὐ πινόμενον, οὐκ ἐσθιόμενον, οὐκ ἐν ᾧδαϊς λεγόμενον, ὅτι μὴ φίλημα καὶ περιβολή καὶ συγκατακλιθῆναι γυμνοῖς σώμασι (2.7). The young couple, however, πάνυ ἐτέρφθησαν ὥσπερ μῦθον οὐ λόγον ἀκούοντες (2.7), and, as a result, are mistaken in thinking that what Philetas told them was a tale, μῦθον, and not instruction, λόγον, which was to be carried out. They believe it is a myth they are hearing because that is what they are accustomed to hearing. In this passage Longus himself is making quite clear the difference between what will be narrating (μῦθον - *aitia*) and what Philetas is relating (λόγον).

In an attack by a band of Methymaeans Chloe is taken, and Daphnis, learning of her capture, seeks the help of the Nymphs who, in a dream, reveal to Daphnis that Pan will aid him. The aid from Pan comes in the form of a dream, in which Pan forces the captain of the military force to return Chloe because Pan wished παρθένον ἐξ ἧς Ἐρωσ μῦθον ποιῆσαι (2.27).²⁰⁷ Pan's revelation of his plans is the unifying theme that dictates the plot of the novel: Pan, through Longus, will create a new myth, the metamorphosis of Chloe.

Aition #2: Syrinx. In honor of Pan and the Nymphs, and in thanksgiving for Chloe's rescue, there is a celebration in which Philetas and his son Tityrus²⁰⁸ are

presumably in the *Eclogues*, on the love of Amaryllis. It is more probable that Longus, if he was relying on literary sources, used Theocritus' Amaryllis rather than Vergil's or Ovid's.

²⁰⁷ Cf. Hdt. 6.105.

²⁰⁸ Τίτυρος has already appeared in the discussion on Amaryllis. In Theocritus *Idyll* 3 he is the shepherd to whom the anonymous goatherd entrusts his flock. Vergil also mentions him in connection with Amaryllis in *Eclogue* 1. Tityrus is also connected with sileni (cf. *Schol. Theoc.* 3.2) and may also be identified with he-goats (cf. *Schol. Theoc.* 1.c.). A τίτυρος may also be a musical instrument such as a pipe; if this is

present. In this celebration Lamon tells the story of the metamorphosis of Syrinx, the *aition* of the pan-pipes, and in response Chloe and Daphnis mimic the story of Pan and Syrinx. Thus ends the second book in which, for the first time, actual myths are told.

Aition #3: Echo. Book 3 begins with the Mytileneans marching out, under the command of Hippasus,²⁰⁹ against the Methymnaeans, but this state of hostility is quickly settled. At this time, Daphnis, who, on account of winter, has been separated from Chloe, visits her home on the pretext of bird-catching in the vicinity of Dryas' cottage. His plan is so successful that he is invited by Dryas into his home, and partakes in a feast of Dionysus in which tales are told (μυθολογήσαντες, 3.9). The next day Daphnis and Chloe argue as to why Daphnis had come to see Chloe, a debate in which Longus describes Chloe as being καθάπερ Ἠχώ (3.11), and by so doing Longus hints at the next *aition*. This allusion to Echo is further strengthened by Daphnis himself who says δέδοικα μὴ ἐγὼ πρὸ ταύτης τὰκῶ (3.10): he fears that he will disappear just as Echo disappears in most of the myths dealing with this nymph of Mount Helicon.

In the spring the young couple returns to the fields and to the Nymphs and take-up where they had left off in their passions.²¹⁰ Daphnis' erotic fever burns greater than ever especially when he sees the animals mating. He even imitates, to no avail, the

correct then name would be very suitable for the son of Philetas, who in Longus' novel gives the pan-pipe to Philetas.

²⁰⁹ In Greek mythology, Apd. 2.7.7, Ἴπασσος was the son of Ceÿx an ally of Heracles in his battle against the Eurytus, the king of Oechalia. In this battle Hippasus was killed. There seems to be no correlation between Longus' Hippasus and the Hippasus in Greek myth except for the fact that both men were warriors.

²¹⁰ During this tranquil time the myth of Tereus and Itys is mentioned. Once again this myth deals with metamorphosis. Eugene O'Connor, "A Note on the Nightingale's Itys Song in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*," *Classical Bulletin* 63 (1987): 82-84, suggests that Longus may have been using the literary version of this myth as found in Antoninus Liberalis' *Metamorphoseon Synagoge*.

actions of the mating animals on Chloe. Luckily a woman by the name of Lycaenium,²¹¹ the wife of a landed-man called Chromis,²¹² takes it upon herself to teach Daphnis the art of love. He learns quite eagerly and willingly. Lycaenium, however, warns him that what he has done to her will cause Chloe some pain and perhaps some shedding of blood, Daphnis, therefore, does not try out his newly acquired erotic skills on Chloe, but instead relates to her the myth of Echo, the third *aition*.

In the summer suitors come to Chloe's parents to ask for her hand in marriage. Daphnis, therefore, decides to ask Chloe's parents' for their daughter's hand in marriage, but his poverty and lack of dowry stand in the way. The Nymphs help by revealing to him, in a dream, that a dolphin, which had swallowed 3,000 drachmas of the booty of the sunken pirate ship, was putrifying on a nearby shore. Daphnis takes the money to Dryas who promises to give him Chloe in marriage. Lamon, however, thinking

²¹¹ On the name of Lycaenium see J. Lindsay, *Daphnis & Chloe* (London: The Daimon Press, 1948) 103; A. M. Scarcella, "La donna nel romanzo di Longo Sofista," *GIF* n.s. 3 (1972): 63-94; Hunter, *Daphnis and Chloe* 28, 60-1, and 68-9.

²¹² There is no mythological character by this name, that is, except if Longus was thinking of the mythical Χρόμιος or Χρόμις found in the epics of Homer. In *Il.* 5.160 he is identified as one of the sons of Priam; in *Il.* 4.295 and in *Od.* 11.286 as the son of Neleus; in *Il.* 5.677 as a Lycian; in *Il.* 8.275 as a Trojan; in *Il.* 17.218, 494, and 534 as a chief of the Mysians. Χρόμις is found in *Il.* 2.858 as a chief of the Mysians. A χρόμις is also a sea-fish; Longus may have been pairing two different types of animals, a she-wolf with a fish, to show that the marriage between Chromis and Lycaenium was not normal since it did not partake of the loyalty found in the other marriages of this novel. The name Χρόμις may be a joke on the part of Longus who describes him, the man-with-the-fish-name, as being a γεωργὸς γῆς ἰδίας (3.15). The name Χρόμις also appears in Theocritus l.14 where he is said to be a Lycian singer.

that his son deserves better, does not agree to the marriage and asks that this business be set aside until his master, Dionysophanes,²¹³ pays them a visit in the fall.²¹⁴

In the fall all await and prepare for the arrival of Dionysophanes. Lampis,²¹⁵ one of the rejected suitors of Chloe, however, disrupts the arrival by destroying the garden under the care of Lamon.²¹⁶ In this garden there is a fane and altar dedicated to Dionysus. In the inner recesses of the fane are paintings which tell the story of

²¹³ Διονυσοφάνης is an appropriate name for the father for Daphnis for two reasons. First of all, the novel seems to center around Dionysus as the main divinity in the novel, and secondly, the name Διονυσοφάνης can be interpreted in terms of a stage direction or foreshadowing device: Dionysus (Διονυσο-) will soon appear (-φάνης). This interpretation is possible since two of the parenting genres may be tragedy and comedy.

²¹⁴ At the end of this book, Daphnis and Chloe see an apple tree which has had all of its fruits picked off except for one apple at the very top. Against the protests of Chloe, Daphnis climbs the tree and picks the lonely apple. He gives the apple to Chloe, but she, still angry with him, rejects the gift. He then reminds Chloe that Aphrodite took an apple as a prize for her beauty, and that Paris, a shepherd like Daphnis, gave the apple. It seems odd that Aphrodite is first mentioned at the end of Book 3 since Book 3 seems to finish the amorous and erotic quality of *Daphnis and Chloe*. Book 4 is a somewhat tepid denouement to an otherwise steamy novel. In fact, the inclusion of Sappho by Longus gives an even greater erotic quality to the ending of Book 3. The lonely apple episode recalls Sappho, who writes οἶον τὸ γλυκύμαλον ἐρεύθεται ἄκρω ἐπ' ὕδα, / ἄκρον ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῳ, λελάθοντο δὲ μαλοδρόπης· / οὐ μὲν ἐκλελάθοντ', ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐδύναντ' ἐπίκεισθαι (fr. 105).

²¹⁵ Λάμπις does not appear in any extant ancient literature as a mythological character. This name points to a trend in the last book in which there is no actual metamorphosis, unless one considers Chloe's transformation from virgin to non-virgin, or *aition*, except the spring of Daphnis. The names have no connection to myth. This also applies to the names of Astylus, Dionysophanes' son, Gnathon, the parasite, Eudromus, a trusted slave, Sophrone, a slave of Dionysophanes, and Megacles, Chloe's biological father. Book 4, unlike the mythological/pastoral quality of the first three books, takes on New Comedy aspects: kidnappings, anagnoriseis, a happy ending.

²¹⁶ Upon discovering the ruined garden Lamon laments to Dionysus, the one to whom the garden is dedicated, that he will be treated like Marsyas. Marsyas, of course, was the satyr who challenged Apollo to a music contest and who was flayed because he had done so. The allusion to this myth fits in perfectly with the musical (pan-pipes) quality of the novel.

Dionysus and of the people and events in his life: Semele, Ariadne, Lycurgus, Pentheus, Etruscan pirates, Satyrs, and Bacchae. This painting is in exact parallel to the painting described in the preface: in the former, Dionysus's life story is told while in the latter, the life stories of the two main protagonists are told. Longus has given us a nice ring-composition embedded within the narrative framework. Pan is also worshipped in the garden because a statue is set up in his honor. There is also included, in Longus' description of the garden, the *aition* of the spring Daphnis: πηγή τις ἦν, ἣν εὔρεν ἐς τὰ ἄνθη Δάφνις. ἐσχόλαζε μὲν τοῖς ἄνθεσιν ἡ πηγή, Δάφνιδος δὲ ὁμῶς ἐκαλεῖτο πηγή. Longus, therefore, includes a minor *aition* in the painting; an *aition* which does not need exegesis.

The destruction of the garden by Lampis is the worst possible crime which any one could commit in this idyllic setting. Since most of the characters in this novel are in one way or another connected with vegetation or pastoralia, such as Chloë, Daphnis, Dryas, Nape, and Lamon, a destruction of vegetation would be a destruction of the same force which gives life to the characters. Anderson, in fact, considers this novel a restatement of the "original fertility myth."²¹⁷

The destruction of the gardens does not cause grief for Lamon and his fellow peasants because Astylus, the son of Dionysophanes, arrives a few days before his father and placates his father. Astylus, however, has brought with him a parasite named Gnathon,²¹⁸ who falls in love with Daphnis. Gnathon eventually asks his master to give him Daphnis by citing erotic mythological examples, ἐρωτικὴν μυθολογίαν (4.17), to prove that neither his love for a shepherd's son nor homosexual love are abominable. He

²¹⁷ Anderson, *Ancient Fiction* 8.

²¹⁸ In keeping with the New Comedy atmosphere of Book 4 Γνάθων is a suitable name for this character. Gnathon has the same name of that of the parasite in Terence's *Eunuchus*.

says that Aphrodite, a goddess, loved Anchises, a shepherd; Apollo, a god, loved Branchus, a goatherd; Zeus, the king of the gods, loved Ganymede, a shepherd. The hero and Lamón, however, hear what Gnathon has planned and take preventative measures.

In the meanwhile the arrival of Dionysophanes and the plot of Gnathon force the parents of Daphnis to reveal his true identity. Daphnis, of course, turns out to be the child of Dionysophanes. Lampis, thinking that the class difference between Daphnis and Chloe would prevent their marriage, carries off Chloe, but Gnathon, hoping to get on the good side of his new master Daphnis, rescues the maiden. The end of the fourth book includes the revelation of the true identity of Chloe's parents, the wedding of the couple, a description of altars built to Eros the Shepherd and Pan the Soldier, and Daphnis testing his erotic skills on Chloe.

Aition #4: the myth of Chloe? The major *aitia* are four in number.²¹⁹ In Book 1 Longus supplies his reader with the generic myth of the maiden to wood-dove metamorphosis. Book 2 contains the *aition* of the pan-pipes and Book 3 that of Echo. In Book 4, however, Longus does not supply a specific *aition*, that it is unless we take MacQueen's suggestion that this novel relates the *aition* behind Chloe's womanhood or that the novel tells a myth concerning Chloe. Pertinent to the thesis of this dissertation is the fact that there is a preponderance of mythological elements in the novel, and that they outnumber the historical elements.

The *Aitia*

The myth of the maiden and the wood-dove, as mentioned above, is a generic *aition* which sets the theme of transformation for the other three *aitia*. After a half-day of

²¹⁹ There are minor *aitia* in the novel, e.g. the *aition* of the naming of the spring of Daphnis.

rustic activities the hero and heroine decide to take a break at which time Chloe hears a wood-dove and asks Daphnis μαθεῖν ὅ τι λέγει to which Daphnis answers (μυθολογῶν):

Ἦν οὕτω, παρθένε, παρθένος καλή, καὶ ἔνεμε βοῦς πολλὰς οὕτως ἐν ὕλῃ. ἦν δὲ ἄρα καὶ ῥοδική, καὶ ἐτέρποντο αἱ βόες ἐπ’ αὐτῆς τῇ μουσικῇ, καὶ ἔνεμεν οὔτε καλαύροπος πληγῇ οὔτε κέντρον προσβολῇ, ἀλλὰ καθίσασα ὑπὸ πίτυν καὶ στεφανωσαμένη πίτυϊ ἦδε Πᾶνα καὶ τὴν Πίτυν, καὶ αἱ Βόες τῇ φωνῇ παρέμενον. παῖς οὐ μακρὰν νέμων βοῦς καὶ αὐτὸς καλὸς καὶ ῥοδικὸς φιλονεικῆσας πρὸς τὴν μελωδίαν, μείζονα ὡς ἀνὴρ, ἠδείαν ὡς παῖς, φωνὴν ἀντεπεδείξατο, καὶ τῶν βοῶν ὀκτῶ τὰς ἀρίστας ἐς τὴν ἰδίαν ἀγέλην θέλξας ἀπεβουκόλησεν. ἄχθεται ἡ παρθένος τῇ βλάβῃ τῆς ἀγέλης, τῇ ἥττη τῆς ῥοδῆς, καὶ εὐχεται τοῖς θεοῖς ὄρνις γενέσθαι πρὶν οἴκαδε ἀφικέσθαι. πείθονται οἱ θεοὶ ποιοῦσι τήνδε τὴν ὄρνιν ὄρειον καὶ μουσικὴν ὡς ἐκείνην. καὶ ἔτι νῦν ᾄδουσα μὴνύει τὴν συμφορὰν, ὅτι βοῦς ζητεῖ πεπλανημένας (1.27).

This myth lays out ten elements which comprise the structural frame employed by the next two myths: 1) questioning or supplication by a character in the novel: μαθεῖν ὅ τι λέγει; 2) the identification, sex and beauty, of the main character of the novel: παρθένος καλή; 3) the profession of the main character: ἔνεμε βοῦς πολλὰς; 4) the skill possessed by the main character: ἦν δὲ ἄρα καὶ ῥοδική, καὶ ἐτέρποντο αἱ βόες ἐπ’ αὐτῆς τῇ μουσικῇ, καὶ ἔνεμεν οὔτε καλαύροπος πληγῇ οὔτε κέντρον προσβολῇ; 5) reference or allusion to a divinity (Pan): καθίσασα ὑπὸ πίτυν καὶ στεφανωσαμένη πίτυϊ ἦδε Πᾶνα καὶ τὴν Πίτυν; 6) the introduction of the main character’s rival or lover: παῖς οὐ μακρὰν νέμων βοῦς καὶ αὐτὸς καλὸς καὶ ῥοδικός; 7) the main character’s rejection of her rival or lover: ἄχθεται ἡ παρθένος; 8) a prayer to gods for help: εὐχεται τοῖς θεοῖς; 9) the acquiescence of the gods: πείθονται οἱ θεοὶ; 10) the metamorphosis of the main character: οἱ θεοὶ ποιοῦσι τήνδε τὴν ὄρνιν. The majority of these elements are found to be found in the *aitia* of the pan-pipes and of the echo.

In the *aition* of the wood-dove there is an allusion to the myth of Pitys. The line καθίσασα ὑπὸ πίτυν καὶ στεφανωσαμένη πίτυϊ ἦδε Πᾶνα καὶ τὴν Πίτυν has two references

to the myth of Pitys who was “killed by Pan’s rival Boreas.”²²⁰ The story of Pitys is found in Nonnus 42.259 and may be alluded to in Theocritus 1.1-3.²²¹ This *aition*, therefore, does not exist in a vacuum because it depends on the questioning of Daphnis by Chloe which precedes it, and on the allusions to the myth of Pitys which are incorporated into it. The latter is a very important aspect of the *aition* for it makes Pan *the* divinity of the *aitia*.²²²

In Book 2 Philetas had promised Chloe, who had asked to hear Philetas’ musical skill, that he would play the pan-pipe for her. He could not do what Chloe asked, however, since he did not have his own instrument with him. In order to remedy this he sent his son, Tityrus, home to fetch his own pipe. In the meanwhile Lamon would tell them a story, ἐπηγγείλατο . . . ἀφηγήσασθαι μῦθον, 2.33, to keep them entertained; Lamon’s story is the second major *aition* of the novel:

Αὕτη ἡ σύριγξ τὸ ἀρχαῖον οὐκ ἦν ὄργανον, ἀλλὰ παρθένος καλὴ καὶ τὴν φωνὴν μουσικὴ. αἶγας ἔνεμεν, Νύφαις συνέπαιζεν, ἦδεν οἶον νῦν. Πάν, ταύτης νεμούσης, παιζούσης, ἀδούσης, προσελθὼν ἐπειθεν ἐς ὃ τι ἔχρηξε καὶ ἐπηγγέλλετο τὰς αἶγας πάσας θήσειν διδυματόκους. ἡ δὲ ἐγέλα τὸν ἔρωτα αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ ἐραστὴν ἔφη δέξασθαι μήτε τράγον μήτε ἄνθρωπον ὀλόκληρον. ὄρμᾳ διώκειν ὁ Πάν ἐς βίαν. ἡ Σύριγξ ἔφευγε καὶ τὸν Πᾶνα καὶ τὴν Βίαν. φεύγουσα, κάμουσα ἐς δόνακας κρύπτεται, εἰς ἔλος ἀφανίζεται. Πάν τοὺς δόνακας ὄργῃ τεμῶν, τὴν κόρην οὐχ εὐρών, τὸ πάθος μαθὼν καὶ τοὺς καλάμους κηρῶ συνδήσας ἀνίσους, καθ’ ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἔρωσ ἀνισὸς αὐτοῖς, τὸ ὄργανον νοεῖ, καὶ ἡ τότε παρθένος καλὴ νῦν ἐστὶ σύριγξ μουσικὴ (2.34).

This story shares eight of the ten elements of structure found in the first *aition*.

The first, as we have seen, is the request by Chloe that Philetas play her a tune on the

²²⁰ Hunter, *Daphnis and Chloe* 53.

²²¹ Cf. Hunter, *Daphnis and Chloe* 115, n. 114. For further information on Pitys see Merkelbach, *Die Hirten des Dionysos* 34-35.

²²² For an excellent discussion of Pan and *Daphnis and Chloe* see Philippides, “Longus: Antiquity’s Innovative Novelist” 241-72; for Eros, 177-40.

pan-pipes. παρθένος καλή is the second element, the identification of the main character of the aition. αἴγας ἔνεμεν satisfies the the identification of her profession, the third element, and ἦδεν οἶον νῦν describes her musical skill, the fourth element. There can be no clearer examples of the fifth element, the introduction of the divine, and of the sixth, the introduction of the lover, than Πάν . . . προσελθών. ἡ δὲ ἐγέλα τὸν ἔρωτα αὐτοῦ. οὐδὲ ἔραστην ἔφη δεῖσθαι μήτε τράγον μήτε ἄνθρωπον ὀλόκληρον. ὄρμα διώκειν ὁ Πάν ἐς βίαν. ἡ Σύριγξ ἔφευγε is the refusal of the lover, the seventh element. ἡ τότε παρθένος καλή νῦν ἐστι σύριγξ μουσική, the metamorphosis, is the eighth element shared by this aition with the aition of the wood-dove.

There is no imprecation to the gods by the main character of the aition or the granting of wishes by the gods in this version of the story. In most of the other myths concerning the metamorphosis of Syrinx,²²³ however, there is a prayer to divinities for succor. For example, Ovid writes:

*Tum deus, "Arcadiae gelidis sub montibus" inquit
 "inter hamadryadas celeberrima Nonacrinas
 naias una fuit: nymphae Syringa vocabant,
 non semel et satyros eluserat illa sequentes
 et quoscumque deos umbrosaue silva feraxque
 rus habet. Ortygiam studiis ipsaque colebat
 virginitate deam; ritu quoque cincta Dianae
 falleret et posset credi Latonia, si non
 corneus huius arcus, si non foret aureus illi;
 sic quoque fallebat.*

*Redeuntem colle Lycaeo
 Pan videt hanc pinuque caput praecinctus acuta
 talia verba refert" - restabat verba referre
 et precibus spretis fugisse per avia nympham,
 donec harenosi placidum Ladonis ad amnem
 venerit; hic illam cursum impredientibus undis
 ut se mutarent liquidas orasse sorores,
 Panaque cum prensam sibi iam Syringa putaret,
 corpore pro nymphae calamos tenuisse palustres,*

²²³ Ovid, *Met.* 1.689ff.; Achilles Tatius 8.6.7ff. The text of Ovid is from *Metamorphoses*, ed. Rudolph Merkel (Leipzig: Teubner, 1875).

*dumque ibi suspirat, motos in harudine ventos
effecisse sonum tenuem similemque querenti.
arte nova vocisque deum dulcedine captum
"hos mihi colloquim tecum" dixisse "manebit,
atque ita disparibus calamis conpagine cerae
inter se iunctis nomen tenuisse puellae (Met. 1.689-712).*

Ovid differs from Longus in several ways. Ovid characterizes Syrinx as a nymph, while Longus makes her mortal, though raised and educated by Nymphs. The second difference is that Ovid has Syrinx praying to her nymph-sisters to help her in her flight from Pan, while Longus makes no mention of prayers for divine aid.

The third *aition* is of that of the echo. In Book 3 Longus writes that Chloe had heard the echo of some sailors rebounding from the land. Since she had never experienced this phenomenon before, ἡ δὲ Χλόη τότε πρῶτον πειρωμένη τῆς καλουμένης ἠχοῦς, 3.22, she did not know who or what was echoing back the voice of the mariners, and so she asked, ἐπυνθάνετο τοῦ Δάφνιδος, 3.22, Daphnis what the cause of the echo was. To which he responded, ἤρξατο αὐτῇ μυθολογεῖν τὸν μῦθον, 3.22, that:

Νυμφῶν, ὧ κόρη, πολὺ <τὸ> γένος, Μελίαι καὶ Δρυάδες καὶ Ἑλειοί, πᾶσαι καλαί, πᾶσαι μουσικαί. καὶ μιᾶς τούτων θυγάτηρ Ἥχῳ γίνεται, θηγῆ μὲν ἐκ πατρὸς θηγῆτος, καλὴ δὲ ἐκ μητρὸς καλῆς. τρέφεται μὲν ὑπὸ Νυμφῶν, παιδεύεται δὲ ὑπὸ Μουσῶν συρίττειν, αὐλεῖν, τὰ πρὸς λύραν, τὰ πρὸς κιθάραν, πᾶσαν ᾠδὴν. ὥστε καὶ παρθενίας εἰς ἄνθος ἀκμάσασα ταῖς Νύμφαις συνεχόρουε, ταῖς Μούσαις συνῆδεν ἄρρενας δὲ ἔφευγε πάντας καὶ ἀνθρώπους καὶ θεοὺς, φιλοῦσα τὴν παρθενίαν. ὁ Πᾶν ὀργίζεται τῇ κόρῃ, τῆς μουσικῆς φθονῶν, τοῦ κάλλους μὴ τυχεῶν, καὶ μανίαν ἐμβάλλει τοῖς ποιμέσι καὶ τοῖς αἰπόλοις. οἱ δὲ ὥσπερ κύνες ἢ λύκοι διασπῶσιν αὐτὴν καὶ ρίπτουσιν εἰς πᾶσαν γῆν ἔτι ἄδοντα τὰ μέλη. καὶ τὰ μέλη <ή> Γῆ χαριζομένη Νύμφαις ἔκρυψε πάντα καὶ ἐτήρησε τὴν μουσικὴν καὶ <ἀ> γνώμη Μουσῶν ἀφήσι φωνὴν καὶ μιμεῖται πάντα, καθάπερ τότε ἡ κόρη, θεοὺς, ἀνθρώπους, ὄργανα, θηρία. μιμεῖται καὶ αὐτὸν συρίττοντα τὸν Πᾶνα. ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας ἀναπηδᾷ καὶ διώκει κατὰ τῶν ὄρων, οὐκ ἔρων τυχεῖν ἀλλ' ἢ τοῦ μαθεῖν, τίς ἐστὶν ὁ λανθάνων μιμητής (3.23).

The structural components found in the first two *aitia* are also present in the myth of Echo. The first, the questioning of Daphnis by Chloe, has already been mentioned. Daphnis replies, probably keeping Ovid's genealogical identification of

Syrinx in mind, with Νυμφῶν, ὧ κόρη, πολὺ <τὸ> γένος, Μελίαι καὶ Δρυάδες καὶ ἼΕλειοι, πᾶσαι καλάι, πᾶσαι μουσικαί. καὶ μιᾶς τούτων θυγάτηρ ἼΗχώ γίνεται, θηνητὴ μὲν ἐκ πατρὸς θνητοῦ, καλὴ δὲ ἐκ μητρὸς καλῆς. Immediately after this the profession and musical ability of the maiden are given: τρέφεται μὲν ὑπὸ Νυμφῶν, παιδεύεται δὲ ὑπὸ Μουσῶν συρίπτειν, αὐλεῖν, τὰ πρὸς λύραν, τὰ πρὸς κιθάραν, πᾶσαν ᾠδὴν; the profession of Echo is different from that of the first two maidens, she is a musician and not a shepherdess. The introduction of the divine and of the lover and the rejection of the lover are included in the line ὁ Πᾶν ὀργίζεται τῇ κόρῃ, τῆς μουσικῆς φθονῶν, τοῦ κάλλους μὴ τυχῶν. Although there is no distinct prayer for help there is divine aid: καὶ τὰ μέλη <ῆ> Γῆ χαριζομένη Νύμφαις ἔκρυσε πάντα καὶ ἐτήρησε τὴν μουσικὴν. The last element, the metamorphosis, is described as

καὶ <ᾗ> γνώμη Μουσῶν ἀφήσει φωνὴν καὶ μιμεῖται πάντα, καθάπερ τότε ἡ κόρη, θεοὺς, ἀνθρώπους, ὄργανα, θηρία. μιμεῖται καὶ αὐτὸν συρίπτοντα τὸν Πᾶνα. ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας ἀναπηδᾷ καὶ διώκει κατὰ τῶν ὄρων, οὐκ ἔρων τυχεῖν ἀλλ' ἡ τοῦ μαθεῖν, τίς ἐστὶν ὁ λανθάνων μιμητής.

Longus calls special attention to the metamorphosis of Echo because the version that he gives does not appear in any other extant source.²²⁴ This may mean that the story must have some sort of deeper significance than the obvious attempt of Daphnis to explain the origins of the echo. Longus includes among the genealogical identification of Echo three types of nymphs: Μελίαι καὶ Δρυάδες καὶ ἼΕλειοι. The Μελίαι are, according to Hesiod, nymphs born from the blood of the castrated Uranus:

ὄσσαι γὰρ ῥαθάμιγες ἀπέσσυθεν αἱματοέσσαι,

²²⁴ Hunter, *Daphnis and Chloe* 53. The usual story is that Echo had incurred the wrath of Hera, who had cursed her with a speech impediment, which caused Echo to be able to repeat only the words of others; she was not able to start a conversation. She eventually fell in love with Narcissus who was to be busy being in love with himself, and consequently, out of grief over an unfulfilled love, she faded away. The only thing that remained of Echo was her voice. Cf. *Met.* 3.356-410.

πάσας δέξατο Γαῖα· περιπλομένων δ' ἑνιαυτῶν
 γείνατ' Ἐρινῦς τε κρατερὰς μεγάλους τε Γίγαντας,
 τεύχεσι λαμπομένους, δολίχ' ἔγχεα χερσὶν ἔχοντας,
 Νύμφας θ' ἅς Μελίης καλέουσ' ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν
 (*Theog.* 182-85).

The Δρυάδες are tree-nymphs, who at least in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, are included in stories which tell the story of Echo or describe the dismemberment of mythological characters. For example, in the third book of the *Metamorphoses* the Dryades and other assorted nymphs lament the death of Narcissus:

*planxere sorores
 naides et sectos fratri posuere capillos,
 planxerunt dryades; plangentibus adsorat Echo* (3.505-7).

In the sixth book Ovid compares Philomela to the Dryades:

*ecce venit magno dives Philomela paratu,
 divitior forma; quales audire solemus
 naidas et dryadas mediis incedere silvis,
 si modo des illis cultus similesque paratus* (6.451-4).

Philomela of course is a member of family which will suffer from the disfiguring of Philomela and the dismemberment of Itys.²²⁵ In the eleventh book Ovid writes that the wild beasts of the forest, the flinty rocks, the trees, the rivers, and the *naides et dryades* (11.49) mourned the dismembered Orpheus.

The Ἑλαιοὶ are also included in Daphnis' list. There is a problem, however, with the identification of these nymphs because they are not mentioned in any of the extant ancient literature which include references to nymphs.²²⁶ ἡ Ἑλεία, however, is a title

²²⁵ This myth also appears in Achilles Tatius 5.5.

²²⁶ Hesiod's works do not include them nor do the *Homeric Hymn to Pan* 19, the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* 5, or the *Orphic Hymn to the Nymphs* 51.

of Artemis in Cos and this epithet may help clarify the inclusion of the names of the nymphs at the outset of the myth of Echo.²²⁷ The first two sets of nymphs are associated with myths which are particularly bloody and gruesome. The Meliai were born from the blood of the castrated genitals of Uranus; the Meliai, therefore, are suitably included in Daphnis' account because he had just learned from Lycaenium erotic skills which would cause blood to flow from Chloe's genitals. More importantly the violence done to Uranus foreshadows the violence which will occur to Echo. The Dryades are also associated with myths which deal with blood and violence, in particular the rending of flesh. The *sparagmos* of Orpheus, therefore, foreshadows the rending of Echo; Orpheus' eternal musical contribution to the world hints at the musical or audial inheritance Echo will leave to the world: καὶ ἄλ' γνώμη Μουσῶν ἀφήσι φωνήν καὶ μιμείται πάντα, καθάπερ τότε ἡ κόρη, θεούς, ἀνθρώπους, ὄργανα, θηρία. μιμείται καὶ αὐτὸν συρίττοντα τὸν Πᾶνα. The epithet of Artemis, however, reinforces and reminds the reader of the fact that Chloe, just like all of the maidens in the *aitia*, is a virgin like Artemis, but will undergo some sort of violence.

The first three *aitia* of the novel deal with metamorphosis and foreshadow the *aition* or myth of Chloe's womanhood. They also imply an antithesis of innocence, virginity, and violence, sex, about which Hunter comments that it is "perhaps obvious that the increasing savagery of the three stories foreshadows the loss of Chloe's virginity."²²⁸ The story of Chloe also shares some of the ten structural components found in the three *aitia*: 1) The questioning which introduces the myth is Longus' searching out of an exegete of the painting he saw while hunting in Lesbos:

²²⁷ E. Schwyzer, *Dialectorum Graecarum Exempla epigraphica potiora* (Leipzig 1923) 251.

²²⁸ Hunter, *Daphnis and Chloe* 54.

ἀναζητησάμενος ἐξηγητὴν τῆς εἰκόνας (Preface). 2) The identification of the maiden occurs when Dryas follows a sheep into a cave where he finds it suckling a baby girl: θῆλυ ἦν τοῦτο τὸ παιδίον (1.5). 3) The profession of the maiden is given when her father dreams that Eros commands that Dryas' daughter should tend Eros' flock: κελεύσαι λοιπὸν ποιμαίνειν ... τὴν δὲ τὸ ποίμιον (1.7). 4) The musical ability of Chloe is mentioned many times, but the first time it is mentioned is when she attempts to imitate Daphnis' beauty, which she thought emanated from the beautiful music he produced with his syrinx: καὶ ἐδόκει καλὸς αὐτῇ συρίττων πάλιν, καὶ αὐθις αἰτίαν ἐνόμιζε τὴν μουσικὴν τοῦ κάλλους, ὥστε μετ' ἐκείνον καὶ αὐτὴ τὴν σύριγγα ἔλαβεν, εἴ πως γένοιτο καὶ αὐτὴ καλή (1.13). 5) The divine is not introduced into the novel at any one particular point for it appears many times in many forms and in many ways: Eros appears in a dream and in Philetas' story within a story; Nymphs in pictures, dreams, caves; Pan in dreams and myths. 6) The introduction of the lover occurs in the myth of Chloe before the introduction of Chloe herself: Ἐν τῷδε τῷ ἀγρῷ νέμων αἰπόλος Λάμων τοῦνομα, παιδίον εὗρεν ὑπὸ μιᾶς αἰγῶν τρεφόμενον (1.2). 7) The refusal of the lover comes at the end of Book 3 not as an actual fleeing, but rather as a symbolic metaphor. Daphnis has acquired his erotic arts from Lycaenium and had been promised Chloe's hand in marriage, but nevertheless, Chloe refuses to be deflowered:

μία μηλέα τετρύγητο καὶ οὔτε καρπὸν εἶχεν οὔτε φύλλον· γυμνοὶ πάντες ἦσαν οἱ κλάδοι. καὶ ἐν μῆλον ἐπέτετο, ἐν αὐτοῖς <τοῖς> ἄκροισ ἀκρότατον, μέγα καὶ καλὸν καὶ τῶν πολλῶν τὴν εὐωδίαν ἐνίκα μόνον. ἔδρυσεν ὁ τρυγῶν ἀνελθεῖν ἢ ἡμέλησε καθελεῖν· τάχα δὲ καὶ ἐφυλάττετο <τὸ> καλὸν μῆλον ἐρωτικῶς ποιμένι. Τοῦτο τὸ μῆλον ὡς εἶδεν ὁ Δάφνις, ὥρμα τρυγᾶν ἀνελθῶν, καὶ Χλόης κωλυούσης ἡμέλησεν. ἡ μὲν ἀμεληθεῖσα, ὀργισθεῖσα πρὸς τὰς ἀγέλας ἀπήει (3.33-34).

The elements of prayer for divine aid are found throughout the novel, for example the prayer of Daphnis that he may be rescued from the Methymnaeans (2.24). The prayer for help is answered by Pan, who warned the captain of the Methymnaeans to let

Chloe go because he wanted παρθένον ἐξ ἧς Ἔρωσ μῦθον ποιῆσαι. (2.27) The loss of Chloe's virginity or her metamorphosis from maiden into a sexual adult may appear to be the last structural element. It is not. The metamorphosis which with Chloe should be primarily associated is the overall metamorphosis which has occurred in the novel: Chloe has gone from being one of the παιδία ἐκκείμενα to being the subject of the overall myth of the novel. The παιδία ἐκκείμενα at the beginning of the novel, were one of the many incidents found in the painting, but by the end of the novel it had become the core of the novel's plot.

Longus observes and incorporates many of the elements of the Greek novel which are to be found in his predecessors. However, he discards the manner in which those were employed and instead forges a different path, which is almost wholly devoted to myth or to stories found in *aitia*. The mythological aspects of this novel are found in the *aitia*, which may supply the structure and form of the novel, and in the mythological background of the *aitia* without which the *aitia* could not exist.

CHAPTER V
THEMATIC MYTHS, PAN, AND ACHILLES TATIUS

Although Longus is somewhat anomalous in respect of his predecessors, in his novel nevertheless the change from an historical background to a mythological and romantic background is very apparent. The mythological and romantic elements in *Daphnis and Chloe* take precedence over any quasi-historical information, and if historical data is supplied, the inclusion of such information can be attributed to the actuality that no author can completely separate himself from contemporary social circumstances. Longus removes all realistic elements from the world in which he sets his novel, thereby creating a utopian world: an Arcadian Lesbos which traces its lineage to the idyllic and pastoral world of Theocritus.

The two novelists who write after Longus, Achilles Tatius (hereafter Tatius) and Heliodorus, do not duplicate the utopian and comprehensively mythological design of *Daphnis and Chloe*. Instead they place their characters and stories in a more realistic world. Hägg writes:

. . . the situation at the beginning of the romance, where the author relates that he met the hero of the romance in Sidon and heard the story from him, clearly gives the reader the impression that what is related is supposed to have happened in the author's own time, and there are actually details . . . which seem to reflect happenings in the second century A.D.,²²⁹

²²⁹ Hägg, *Narrative Technique* 63.

On the subject of myth Hägg comments: “Similes from mythology are rare . . . (one example is III, 15, 4), but in their speeches the acting characters sometimes use such material (see I, 8, 1-9 and VI, 13,2).”²³⁰ Steiner asserts that Tattius seems “to be writing for an audience familiar with old motifs and the well-worn episodes.”²³¹ The characters and plots, however seem to incorporate myth for their development.

Leucippe and Clitophon is the subject of four scholarly examinations which deal, in one way or another, with myth and its functions in Tattius' novel.²³² Harlan examines the use of mythologically inspired *ekphraseis* in Tattius and applies rhetorical and literary theories to them. Bartsch also explores the inclusion of myth and *ekphraseis* in *Leucippe and Clitophon*, but unlike Harlan, she interprets the *ekphraseis* in terms of foreshadowing and prolepsis.

Laplace argues that Tattius uses literary sources to model Leucippe and Clitophon on mythological characters:²³³ Observing close similarities she identifies Leucippe as Iphigeneia: the same birthplace for the two women; the prominent figure of Argos in both stories; the madness which afflicts both women. The *Prometheus Bound* is probably the major source, according to Laplace, for Tattius' delineation of Leucippe. Helen can also be the mythological figure on which Tattius bases his Leucippe, and this correlation is

²³⁰ Hägg, *Narrative Technique* 107, n. 2.

²³¹ Steiner, “The graphic analogue” 134.

²³² Cf. F. Wilhelm, “Zu Achilles Tattius,” *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 57 (1902): 55-75. Wilhelm's article is an excellent study of literary sources in *Leucippe and Clitophon*.

²³³ Marcelle Laplace, “Légende et fiction chez Achille Tattius: Les personnages de Leucippé et de Iô,” *BAGB* (1983): 311-18; “Achille Tattius, ‘Leucippé et Clitophon’: des fables au roman de formation,” *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* vol 4, ed. H. Hofmann (1991): 35-56.

partially supported by a comparison between Leucippe's counterpart Calligone and the Helen who went to Egypt and her counterpart the phantom Helen who went to Troy. Ovid, Aeschylus, Euripides and other writers are the sources from which Tattius gathered his information. Adonis and Odysseus are suggested as prototypes for Clitophon. In this chapter I shall not identify characters with mythological figures since Laplace has already done so, but shall attempt to demonstrate that myth or mythical allusion directs the action of the chapter and consequently the plot of the novel.

Although Tattius includes numerous references to mythological beings and animals in the first chapter,²³⁴ he nevertheless imparts both historical and literary qualities to the beginning of his novel.²³⁵ He writes Σιδῶν ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ πόλις· ἡ θάλασσα· μήτηρ

²³⁴ In Chapter 1, e.g., Cadmus, Astarte, Europa, Zeus (as a bull), Eroses, Eros, Apollo, Daphne, Selene, the Sirens, Eriphyle, Philomela, Stheneboea, Aerope, Procne, Agamemnon, Chryseis, Achilles, Briseis, Helen, Penelope, Phaedra, Hippolytus, Clytemnestra, Aurora, Tereus, the peacock of Hera, Alpheus, and Arethusa.

²³⁵ Direct quotations, modified excerpts, parallels, and literary allusions to other authors are found in the following passages: *Il.* 21.257-9: 1.1.5; Ovid *Met.* 6.101ff.: 1.1.13; *Phdr.*: 1.2.3; Artem. 1.2: 1.3.3; *Il.* 4.141-2: 1.4.3; Musaeus 92-98: 1.4.4; Dem. *De Cor.* 296: 1.6.1; Hes. *Op.* 57-58: 1.8.2; Ovid *Ars Am.* 2.373ff., Juv. 6.634ff., *Anth. Pal.* 9.166, Ath. 13.8ff., Stob. 67ff.: 1.8.4; *Il.* 2.478: 1.8.7; Pl. *Symp.* 203, Xen. *Cyr.* 6.1.14: 1.10.1; Soph. *El.* 723ff., Eur. *Hipp.* 1173ff.: 1.12-13; *Anth. Pal.* 8.815 and 8.712: 1.13; Ael. *NA* 4.21, Lucian *Dom.* 11, Philostr. *VS* 2.27 and *Imag.* 2.21: 1.16; Philostr. *Imag.* 2.6.1, Pliny *NH* 31.5: 1.18.1-2; Ael. *NH* 1.50 and 9.66, Oppian *Hal.* 1.554, Pliny *NH* 9.76 and 32.14: 1.18.3; *Il.* 16.823-6: 2.1.1; Hes. *Op.* 587, Theoc. 14.15, *Od.* 9.197, Ath. *Dipnosoph.* 11.484: 2.2.2; Hdt. 1.25: 2.3.1; Apollod. 2.6.3: 2.6.2-3; Lucian *D. deorum* 5.2: 2.9.2; Hdt. 2.45, Chariton 7.2: 2.14; *Il.* 10.435ff.: 2.15.3; Hdt. 4.195, Ktesias *Indika* 4: 2.14.9; *Il.* 10.435, *Aen.* 12.84: 2.15.4-5; Pliny *NH* 10.21: 2.21.2; *Od.* 9: 2.23.2; *Il.* 9.302: 2.34.7; Pl. *Symp.* 180D-182A: 2.36.2-3; *Il.* 20.234: 2.36.3; Xen. *Symp.* 8.29: 2.36.4; *Il.* 21.385: 3.2.3; Strab. 16.760: 3.6.1; Pliny *NH* 10.2, Hdt. 2.73: 3.25; Ovid *Met.* 2.235: 4.5.1; Eur. *Hec.* 570: 4.9.2; Hdt. 2.60: 4.18.3; Hyg. *Fab.* 2: 5.5.2; Theoc. 2.10, Hor. *Sat.* 1.8.21: 5.26.12; Thuc. 2.87.4: 7.10.4; Macrobius *Sat.* 5.19: 8.12.9. Although this is not an exhaustive list of such occurrences, there is nevertheless a noticeable decrease of them as the novel progresses. I am including references only to pagan classical authors; Tattius includes numerous references to Christian authors (cf. Vilborg).

Φοινίκων ἡ πόλις· Θηβαίων ὁ δῆμος πατήρ (1.1.1).²³⁶ Tattius proceeds to give a description of the harbor and the inlets of the bay and to supply a description of a painting located in the temple of Astarte in Sidon: Ευρώπης ἡ γραφή· Φοινίκων ἡ θάλασσα· Σιδῶνος ἡ γῆ· ἐν τῇ γῆ λειμῶν καὶ χορὸς παρθένων· ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ ταῦρος ἐπενήχετο, καὶ τοῖς νῶτοις καλὴ παρθένος ἐπεκάθητο, ἐπὶ Κρήτην τῷ ταύρῳ πλέουσα (1.1.2-3).²³⁷ The narrator then enters into a dialogue with a young man who is admiring the painting and tells the narrator that he suffered something similar to the story told in the painting. His story, the young man says, may seem to be mythological, but it is really true, εἰ καὶ μῦθοις ἔοικε (1.2.2-3). The young man then narrates his adventure: the love story of Leucippe and Clitophon.²³⁸

The historical qualities of the opening sections of the novel are based on Herodotus, much in the way Longus uses Thucydides. Tattius starts his novel with the abduction of a woman (Europa), which is the same motif (Io) used by Herodotus to begin his history. Herodotus writes that the Phoenicians were to blame for the troubles between the Greeks and the Persians because they stole Io, the daughter of Inachus, and in turn the Greeks, probably Cretans, carried off Europa, the daughter of the king of Tyre. Accordingly, similar elements in both narratives cause the plot to unfold. In both works Europa is stolen, Crete and Phoenicia are mentioned, and the action is centered in or around Sidon and Tyre.

²³⁶ The text of *Leucippe and Clitophon* is from *Achilles Tattius: Leucippe and Clitophon*, ed. Ebbe Vilborg (Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 1955).

²³⁷ The description of the meadow recalls the details of *Il.* 21.257-59. On the description of Europa being carried away see Ovid *Met.* 6.101ff.

²³⁸ For other works that have narratives based on paintings confer Cebes, *Pinax* 1-4, Petronius, 81-88, Lucian, *Toxaris* 5-8, Ps.-Lucian, *Erotes* 6-7, and Longus' preface.

That the theft and rape of Europa depicted in the painting foreshadow the elopement of Leucippe and Clitophon and more importantly the abduction of Clitophon's sister Calligone is no new idea. Harlan sees the description of Europa and the bull as only having "symbolic significance,"²³⁹ and Bartsch notes that the garden in the painting of Europa and the garden of Clitophon help to equate Europa with Leucippe;²⁴⁰ she goes as far as to make Europa synonymous with Calligone.²⁴¹ Harlan and Bartsch, however, do not observe the borrowing of Herodotus by Tattius. It seems that Tattius, in what appears to be a parallel to the quasi-historical proemia of his novelistic predecessors, must include some historical elements in his novel and so refers to Herodotus' history, which begins with mythological allusions, which the author nevertheless debases.

Eros plays a very important role in the novel, particularly in chapter 1.²⁴² Tattius relates in 1.1.13 that in the painting there are *erotes* leading the bull, which may hint at the possibility that since Eros is responsible for the abduction of Europa, he may also be responsible for the amorous adventures the characters of the novel will undergo. In fact, he is to blame, because he makes the leading characters fall in love. Thus

²³⁹ Harlan, "The Description of Paintings" 94-95.

²⁴⁰ Bartsch, *Decoding the Ancient Novel* 50.

²⁴¹ Bartsch, *Decoding the Ancient Novel* 63ff.

²⁴² For an interesting approach to the function of Eros and the unique construct of love in the ancient Greek novels, with the exception of Xenophon Ephesius, see David Konstan, *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994).

Eros²⁴³ and myths dealing with love, whether fortunate or unfortunate, dictate the action in the first chapter of the novel.

The erotic myths in this chapter can be divided into two groups: those having fortunate and unfortunate outcomes. For example, the myth of Apollo's one-sided, ill-fated love-affair with Daphne in 1.5.5 and 1.8.2 is followed by lines from Hesiod:

Τοῖς δ' ἐγὼ ἀντὶ πυρὸς δώσω κακόν, ᾧ κεν ἅπαντες
τέρπωνται κατὰ θυμόν, ἐόν κακὸν ἀμφαγαπῶντες; *Op.* 57-8.

They foreshadow the numerous ill-fated or treacherous love-stories and myths which Tattius will relate. First mentioned are the Sirens, the bird-headed females who cause men to fall in love with their voices but also bring about their doom.²⁴⁴ Tattius includes the husband-killer and filicide Eriphyle to foreshadow Clitophon's infidelity, which is also insinuated in the myth of Philomela, and later in the inclusion of Procne's name. The myth of Stheneboea seems to have been inserted in order to illustrate what Clitophon should do, i.e. he should imitate Bellerophon and not surrender to sexual temptation. The story of Aerope probably indicates that Leucippe, like the daughter of Catreus, will be sold in a foreign land. The rest of the alluded to myths, those of Agamemnon, Chryseis, Achilles, Briseis, Helen, Penelope, Phaedra, Hippolytus, and Clytemnestra, give witness to the certainty that Leucippe's and Clitophon's amorous adventures will not have smooth sailings.

²⁴³ Achilles Tattius echoes the *Phaedrus* 229f. and its discussion on love in 1.2.3 and in 2.35-38, where there is a debate on whether homosexuality or heterosexuality is better.

²⁴⁴ Cf., on Sirens and other winged females, John Pollard, *Birds in Greek Life and Myth* (Great Britain: Latimer Trend & Company Ltd., 1977) 188-91. See also Hyg. *Fab.* 125, Apollod. 1.7.10, and *Argon.* 4.893ff.

In his listing of *exempla*, Tattius is closely following literary tradition, such as that of Ovid, *Ars Am.* 2.373ff. and Juvenal 6.643ff. Ovid exonerates Helen and blames her husband, pities Medea and condemns Jason, and understands that Procne killed her own son because she had to avenge herself and her sister. Ovid also writes that so long as Agamemnon was faithful, Clytemnestra was chaste, but when she heard about his dalliances with Chryseis, Briseis, and Cassandra she invited Thyestes' son to her bed. Juvenal lists Medea, Procne, the Belidae, Eriphyle, and Clytemnestra as wicked women whom men should avoid. These examples of female *exempla* show that Tattius is following an established literary tradition of giving caveats about women through female archetypes and their myths. The novelist, however, aside from using the myths to lend structure to his plot, also includes in his list a semi-mythical character: Candaules. By incorporating this king of Lydia the novelist is not only giving a new slant to the exercise, but he may also be acknowledging his debt to Herodotus' work, where he found the impetus for his own narrative.

In the middle of the first chapter, 1.10-12, Tattius once again invokes the figure of Eros, as he had previously done (*Phaedrus* 229f. in 1.2.3), and places him in a philosophical setting.²⁴⁵ To demonstrate fully the faculties of Eros Tattius alludes to the myth of Aurora in the description of the garden, where Clitophon makes his first amorous advances towards Leucippe (1.15.8). In the garden, the narrator says, there are flowers, vegetation, and fauna of all different types; the creatures in the garden are of particular interest because the cicadas sing of Aurora and her marriage-bed, while the swallows sing of the banquet of Tereus.

²⁴⁵ On the influence of the *Phaedrus* on second-century A.C. literature cf. M. B. Trapp, "Plato's *Phaedrus* in Second-Century Greek Literature," *Antonine Literature* ed. D. A. Russell (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990) 141-74.

The power of Eros over humans, plants, animals, vegetation, and even bodies of water is also made clear at the end of chapter 1. After Clitophon has insinuated to Leucippe, by way of *exempla*, that he has some sort of erotic feelings for her, Satyrus,²⁴⁶ a slave of Clitophon whose name is appropriate for the bosky environment, adds his own *exempla* to those of his master. He discloses that Eros not only has dominion over birds, but also snakes, plants (palms), stones, and even bodies of water (1.18.1-2):

Γίνεται δὲ καὶ γάμος ἄλλος ὑδάτων διαπόντιος. καὶ ἔστιν ὁ μὲν ἐραστής ποταμὸς Ἡλείος, ἡ δὲ ἐρωμένη κρήνη Σικελική. διὰ γὰρ τῆς θαλάσσης ὁ ποταμὸς ὡς διὰ πεδίου τρέχει. ἡ δὲ οὐκ ἀφανίζει γλυκὴν ἐραστήν ἀλμυρῶ κύματι. σχίζεται δὲ αὐτῶ ῥέοντι, καὶ τὸ σχίσμα τῆς θαλάσσης χαράδρα τῶ ποταμῶ γίνεται· καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀρέθουσαν οὕτω τὸν Ἄλφειὸν νυμφοστολεῖ. ὅταν οὖν ἦ ἢ ἢ τῶν Ὀλυμπίων ἐορτή, πολλοὶ μὲν εἰς τὰς δίνας τοῦ ποταμοῦ καθιᾶσιν ἄλλος ἄλλα δῶρα. ὁ δὲ εὐθύς πρὸς τὴν ἐρωμένην κομίζει, καὶ ταῦτά ἐστιν ἔδνα ποταμοῦ.

The Arcadian myth of Alpheus and Arethusa, which involves travelling over bodies of water and the gift-giving of the sea to those in love, foreshadows one of the more gruesome episodes in the novel.

This gruesome episode is in chapter 5, where Chaereas and some ne'er-do-wells have kidnapped Leucippe and are trying to escape with their booty while Clitophon is in hot pursuit. In order to stop the pursuit, the kidnappers behead Leucippe (her second *Scheintod*) and dump only her body into the sea while presumably keeping the head on

²⁴⁶ Graham Anderson, "Achilles Tatius: a New Interpretation," *The Greek Novel AD1-1985* ed. Roderick Beaton (London/New York: Croom Helm, 1988) 190-3, suggests that Achilles Tatius' use of the character of Satyrus might be employed to interpret this novel as an attempt at writing satire. He also notes that Pan plays a very important role in the novel: "The plot is run by Satyrus, and taken over by Pan. The former is the confidant of two dubious love-affairs; he has his fair share of education; he has charge of the money-bag; he pulls off a pastoral trick with a sheep's stomach; and all begins in an erotic garden" (191-2).

board the ship. Clitophon begs that the ship be stopped and the body be picked up. Once the body is on board Clitophon cries out:

Νῦν μοι, Λευκίππη, τέθνηας ἀληθῶς θάνατον διπλοῦν, γῆ καὶ θαλάττη
 διαιρούμενον· τὸ μὲν γὰρ λείψανον ἔχω σου τοῦ σώματος, ἀπολώλεκα δὲ σέ. οὐκ
 ἴση τῆς θαλάσσης πρὸς τὴν γῆν ἢ νομή· μικρὸν μοί σου μέρος καταλέλειπται ἐν
 ὄψει τοῦ μείζονος· αὕτη δὲ ἐν ὀλίγῳ τὸ πᾶν σου κρατεῖ. ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ μοι τῶν ἐν τῷ
 προσώπῳ φιλημάτων ἐφθόνησεν ἡ Τύχη, φέρε σου καταφιλήσω τὴν σφαγὴν
 (5.7.8-9).

The sea presents as a final gift to Clitophon the partial remains of Leucippe.

Chapter 1 has Eros and the myths associated with him dictating the overall structure of the chapter and of the novel. He is the prime mover of the novel and causes the adventures and misadventures which the hero and heroine undergo. The other myths in the chapter are supplied in order to show what types of infidelities will occur and what the proper comportment of Clitophon should be. Some of the myths even point to what will occur in the forthcoming chapters. Eros is the prominent divinity in this chapter, but by the end of the chapter a new divinity, Pan, is starting to gain in significance. Although Pan is only alluded to twice, in the form of the slave Satyrus and in the myths which deal with Arcadia, he will eventually become the principal god with which most of the myths are associated.

Chapter 2 begins with Leucippe singing line 16.823 of the *Iliad*. Once she has finished her performance all retire to dinner where various *aitia* of wine are put forth:

ἦν γὰρ ἐορτὴ προτρυγαίου Διονύσου τότε. τὸν γὰρ Διόνυσον Τύριοι νομίζουσι
 ἑαυτῶν, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸν Κάδμου μῦθον ᾄδουσι. καὶ τῆς ἐορτῆς διηγοῦνται πατέρα
 μῦθον, οἶνον οὐκ εἶναι ποτε παρ' ἀνθρώποις ὅπου μήπω παρ' αὐτοῖς, οὐ τὸν
 μέλανα τὸν ἀνθοσμίαν, οὐ τὸν τῆς Βιβλίας ἀμπέλου, οὐ τὸν Μάρωνος τὸν Θράκιον,
 οὐ Χῖον ἐκ Λακαίνης, οὐ τὸν Ἰκάρου τὸν νησιώτην, ἀλλὰ τούτους μὲν ἅπαντας
 ἀποίκους εἶναι Τυρίων οἴνων, τὴν δὲ πρῶτην παρ' αὐτοῖς φῦναι τῶν μητέρα
 (2.2.1-2).

The mention of these four different types of wine is programmatic: the myths associated with each type of wine will dictate what will occur in this chapter: Eros and wine

(Dionysus) will kindle the love-affair of Leucippe and Clitophon; Conops, Panthea's slave and Leucippe's guardian, will be beguiled by Satyrus, who employs the same method with which Odysseus fooled Polyphemus; the *aition* of the discovery of purple dye will be associated, through Athenaeus, with Chian wine; the effects produced by Icarus' wine will parallel the aphrodisiac given to Leucippe in a later chapter.

In the passage above there are four *aitia* for wine. The author tells the reader that in the beginning there was no wine (οἶνον οὐκ εἶναι ποτε παρ' ἀνθρώποις) and then proceeds to mention different types: ὅπου οὐ τὸν μέλανα τὸν ἀνθοσμῖαν, οὐ τὸν τῆς Βιβλίας ἀμπέλου, οὐ τὸν Μάρωνος τὸν Θράκιον, οὐ Χῖον ἐκ Λακαίνης, οὐ τὸν Ἰκάρου τὸν νησιώτην. Tatius finally reveals that all wines are derived from Tyrian vines: ἀλλὰ τούτους μὲν ἅπαντας ἀποίκους εἶναι Τυρίων οἴνων, τὴν δὲ πρώτην παρ' αὐτοῖς φῦναι τῶν μητέρα.

References to Biblical wine are found in *Works and Days* 587 and in Theocritus 14.15. Hesiod remarks that βίβλιος οἶνος should be drunk when flowers are blooming, cicadas are singing, goats are their fattest, women are most wanton, and men are most feeble. He gives no *aition* for the origin of this wine, but makes it quite clear that this wine should be drunk when everything, especially women, is ripe for the picking. Theocritus has Aeschines, the protagonist of the idyll, declaring his love for a maiden while sharing Biblical wine with said maiden, who does not love him in return (cf. the drinking scene in chapter 2 of Tatius' novel).

Maron, the Ismarian priest of Apollo whom Odysseus spared when he destroyed Ismarus and slaughtered its inhabitants, presented wine as a gift to Odysseus, who in turn gave it to the Cyclops. As is well known the monster got drunk on this wine, thereby allowing Odysseus and his men to blind the creature and to escape. This myth is important because in the novel the guardian of Leucippe, Conops, is put to sleep by a

drink administered to him by Satyrus (2.23). More importantly this Conops is called Cyclops. Satyrus likewise drugs Conops (Cyclops, 2.23.3 and 2.23.27) in order for his master to have an ill-fated sexual escapade with Leucippe and in order for his master and mistress to escape the wrath of Panthea, Leucippe's mother.

Athenaeus relates that the third type of wine, οὐ Χῖον ἐκ Λακαίνης, is of the best kind,²⁴⁷ and that this line on wine comes from the Aristophanic saying "from a Laconian cup." But it may also be a subtle reference to the *ekphrasis* on the *aition* of purple dye in 2.11, that is if Tattius was using either Athenaeus as a source or Athenaeus' source.²⁴⁸ In 2.11 Tattius gives his reader a short account of the discovery of purple dye, which involves a shepherd (or herdsman), a dog, and a sea shell; he also specifies that this dye is used to color Aphrodite's robe (2.11.4). Athenaeus, however, does not limit his comments on Chios to the wine that it produces for he also notes about Alexander the Great

ἤθελεν γὰρ τοὺς ἐταίρους ἅπαντας ἀλουργὰς ἐνδύσαι στολάς. ἀναγνωσθείσης δὲ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς Χίοις παρῶν Θεόκριτος ὁ σοφιστῆς νῦν ἐγνωκέναι ἔφη τὸ παρ' Ὀμήρῳ εἰρημένον· ἔλλαβε πορφύρεος θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταιή (11.540a).

The Homeric passage refers to Diomedes, whom Athena had enthused with her power, but more importantly many polyptotic forms of πορφύρεος are found in the sections dealing with the *aition* of wine and with the description of the Calligone's wedding dress (2.11). The threads connecting Chian wine with the *aition* of purple dye in 2.11 are to be sure very tenuous, but the supposition that Tattius knew that Chios was known for more than its wine cannot be ignored.

²⁴⁷ *Deipnosophistae* 1.26b, 1.28e-f, 1.29a and e, 1.31a, 1.32f, 1.33c, 4.167e, 11.473a, 11.484f, *et al.*

²⁴⁸ Cf. *Achilles Tattius*, trans. S. Gaselee (1917; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1969) 59, n. 3.

The last type of wine included in Tattius' list recalls the unlucky myth of Icarus. He is the luckless soul to whom Dionysus first presented the gift of wine. He, however, gave it in an undiluted state to ignorant Athenian shepherds, who, when they felt the full effects of the wine, thought that Icarus had attempted to poison them.²⁴⁹ The shepherds sought vengeance on Icarus and beat him to death with clubs. Dionysus, not wanting to let this offense go unpunished, consequently made all the Athenian maidens go mad.

This madness visited upon the Athenian maidens portends the induced madness which Gorgias the Egyptian soldier inflicts upon Leucippe through an aphrodisiac (4.15). The undiluted aphrodisiac which the soldier gives Leucippe, however, is a mistake, just like the misunderstood effects of wine:

ἦρα δὲ τῆς σῆς γυναικός. ὦν δὲ φύσει φαρμακεὺς σκευάζει τι φάρμακον ἔρωτος καὶ πείθει τὸν διακονούμενον ὑμῖν Αἰγύπτιον λαβεῖν τὸ φάρμακον καὶ ἐγκαταμεῖξαι τῷ τῆς Λευκίππης ποτῶ. λανθάνει δὲ ἀκράτῳ χρησάμενος τῷ φαρμάκῳ, καὶ τὸ φίλτρον εἰς μανίαν αἴρεται (4.15.3-4).

Thus the intended madness in the Athenian maidens has a parallel in the madness caused by the love-philtre.

After listing the types of wine Tattius proceeds to give an Attic account (2.2.3) of the origin of this beverage: Dionysus once visited a herdsman who was very hospitable to him and in turn the god gave his host a cup of wine. After drinking the wine the herdsman describes the effects caused by the wine, and in response Dionysus showed him what the source of the wine was. The Tyrians use this myth as the justification for celebrating the gift of wine and for thanking Dionysus.

Clitophon's father, in keeping with the mood of the party, brought out a cup, which resembled the famous goblet of Glaucus of Chios, in which to serve the gift of the god (2.3.1). On the goblet were Eros and Dionysus, who symbolize the effects which

²⁴⁹ Cf. Hyg. *Fab.* 130 and *Poetica Astronomica* 2.4.

wine can produce: not only inebriation but also an increase in libido brought on by the alcohol. Clitophon and Leucippe eventually succumb to the power of both Eros and Dionysus.

Tatius includes a few other myths in chapter 2. He has Clitophon say to Leucippe that he feels as if he has become her slave just as Heracles became the slave of Omphale (2.6.2-3), which is an ironic statement because Leucippe (as Lacaena) will become his slave. This allusion to Heracles sets the groundwork for the mistaken abduction of Calligone by Callisthenes (2.14-18).

Sostratus, Leucippe's father, in order to win the gods' favor in war and to fulfill an oracle, sends a delegation to make sacrifice in Tyre at the altar of Heracles. The oracle reads as follows:

Νῆσός τις πόλις ἐστὶ φυτῶνυμον αἶμα λαχοῦσα,
 ἰσθμὸν ὀμοῦ καὶ πορθμὸν ἐπ' ἠπείροιο φέρουσα,
 ἔνθ' Ἥφαιστος ἔχων χαίρει γλαυκῶπιν Ἀθήνην·
 κεῖθι θυηπολίην σε φέρειν κέλομαι Ἡρακλεῖ (2.14.2).

The oracle is almost certainly based on the verses preserved in *AP* 14.34:

Νῆσός τις πόλις ἐστὶ φυτῶνυμον αἶμα λαχοῦσα,
 ἰσθμὸν ὀμοῦ καὶ πορθμὸν ἐπ' ἠπείροιο φέρουσα·
 ἔνθ' ἀπ' ἐμῆς ἔσθ' αἶμα ὀμοῦ καὶ Κέκροπος αἶμα·
 ἔνθ' Ἥφαιστος ἔχων χαίρει γλαυκῶπιν Ἀθήνην·
 κεῖθι θυηπολίην σε φέρειν κέλομαι Ἡρακλεῖ.

The line from the anthology, ἔνθ' ἀπ' ἐμῆς ἔσθ' αἶμα ὀμοῦ καὶ Κέκροπος αἶμα, which is not included in Tatius' oracle, discusses the types of people who were at Tyre: Athenians (Κέκροπος αἶμα) and Tyrians (ἀπ' ἐμῆς ἔσθ' αἶμα).²⁵⁰ It is very suitable that sacrifice should be made to Heracles at Tyre since he is the patron deity of the Tyrians.

²⁵⁰ Cf. Gaselee 82, n. 1. For the accuracy of the description of Tyre see Pliny *NH* 5.19.

Both oracles, however, are a bit strange in that they have Hephaestus embracing or holding sweet Athena. Hephaestus did try to force violence on Athena in the Acropolis at Athens but he was not successful; he instead prematurely ejaculated and from his semen Erichthonius was born.²⁵¹

The strange parts of this myth need to be decoded. Tatius does go on to interpret the oddness of the oracle in 2.14.5-10: the expression of Hephaestus embracing Athena is meant to be interpreted, according to Tatius, as an allusion to the connection between the olive and fire and the connection between an olive grove and the mild volcanic eruptions which supply the necessary soil ingredients. A non-agricultural decoding, however, must take into account that in the original oracle the snaky Kekrops is mentioned and that there is an allusion to the attempted rape of Athena by Hephaestus.

These two mythological references must be accounted for and fit into the narrative flow of the novel: In 2.23 Satyrus has arranged for Leucippe and Clitophon to bring their love to fruition. Clitophon is to slip into Leucippe's room after Satyrus (Odysseus) has drugged Conops (Cyclops), but all does not go well, for when Clitophon is about to make love to Leucippe, her mother, Panthea, has a dream in which she sees her daughter being murdered by a robber: ἐδόκει τινὰ ληστήν μάχαιραν ἔχοντα γυμνὴν ἄγειν ἄρπασάμενον αὐτῆς τὴν θυγατέρα καὶ καταθέμενον ὑπτίαν, μέσην ἀνατεμεῖν τῇ μαχαίρᾳ τὴν γαστέρα, κάτωθεν ἀρξάμενον ἀπὸ τῆς αἰδοῦς (2.23.5). This scene brings to mind the dream (1.3.4) in which Clitophon sees himself grown, from the waist down, into one body with Calligone. A woman, however, appears who cuts the two bodies apart:

ἐφίσταται δὴ μοι γυνὴ φοβερὰ καὶ μεγάλη, τὸ πρόσωπον ἀγρία· ὄφθαλμὸς ἐν αἵματι, βλοσυραὶ παρειαί, ὄφεις αἱ κόμαι. ἄρπην ἐκράτει τῇ δεξιᾷ, δάδα τῇ λαιᾷ. ἐπιπεσοῦσα οὖν μοι θυμῷ καὶ ἀνατείνασα τὴν ἄρπην καταφέρει τῆς ἰξύος, ἔνθα τῶν δύο σωμάτων ἦσαν αἱ συμβολαί, καὶ ἀποκόπτει μου τὴν παρθένον.

²⁵¹ Cf. Apollod. 3.14.6.

The description of the woman in Clitophon's dream would be a fitting portrait of Leucippe's mother and of her intended action when she bursts into her daughter's room. It is interesting that the woman in Clitophon's dream has snaky hair while in the oracle the snaky Kekrops is mentioned. In the dream Panthea sees a robber splitting her daughter in two, metaphorical rape, while the oracle makes mention of the myth of Hephaestus and Athena, which in some versions includes an attempted rape. Thus the decoded oracle fits perfectly into the plot: Clitophon will attempt to consummate illegally his love for Leucippe just as Hephaestus had tried to have illicit sex with Athena.

Once Panthea discovers that a man has been in Leucippe's room, she is determined to find out who the culprit and his accomplices are, thereby forcing everyone associated with the amorous plans of Clitophon and Leucippe to flee: Clitophon, Leucippe, Satyrus, Clio (Leucippe's maid), and some assorted friends take the next possible boat out of Tyre. Before the great escape, however, Leucippe asks Satyrus that he help her avoid her mother's wrath. She implores him in the name of the country gods, thereby linking him even closer with Pan: "Δέομαι," says Leucippe, "πρὸς θεῶν ξένων καὶ ἑγχωρίων, ἔξαρπάσατέ με τῶν τῆς μητρὸς ὀφθαλμῶν, ὅποιοι βούλεσθε" (2.30.1).

On the fleeing ship the fugitives encounter a certain Menelaus, who relates his own tragic love-story (2.34).²⁵² It seems that he accidentally killed his lover, who is compared to Patroclus, in a hunting accident. In 2.35.4 Clitophon tells Menelaus, who is arguing in behalf of homosexual love, that the beauty of males disappears no sooner than it has blossomed. It is a beauty which resembles the draught of Tantalus which at the

²⁵² Towards the end of the second chapter Tatius tacks on references to the myths of Patroclus, Tantalus, Ganymede, Alcmena, Danae, Semele, Hebe, Europa, Antiope, and Perseus.

very act of drinking disappears. Menelaus rebuts by noting in Homeric terms that it was Ganymede, a beautiful male youth, whom Zeus took up to Olympus and not a woman (2.36.3). He continues his argument by listing women (Alcmene, Danae, and Semele) whom Zeus loved but never shared his abode in Olympus, but Zeus loved Ganymede so much that he even replaced Hebe.

Clitophon rejoins that although Zeus never took any of these women up to Olympus, it was their beauty which not only brought Zeus down from Olympus but even made him undergo metamorphosis: Europa caused him to become a bull, Antiope forced Zeus to become a satyr, Semele saw Zeus as a golden beam. If this is not enough proof of the king of the gods' love and preference for women Clitophon also hints at the noble offspring generated from these liaisons, in particular Perseus. What is more important here is that Menelaus, like his mythological namesake, is going to Egypt since it is Egypt where the mythological Menelaus finds his wife.

This chapter continues the trend of counting on myth for structure. The arrangement of the myths divides the chapter into two sections; the first myths deal with wine, the second set of myths deal with love, both heterosexual and homosexual. The first myths encountered deal with the origin of wine, and the different *aitia* program the action of the first half of the chapter. Biblian, with its sensual connotation, denotes the ever-increasing love of Leucippe and Clitophon. The wine of Maron foreshadows the battle of wits between Conops, Panthea's slave and Leucippe's guardian, and Satyrus and Conops' eventual sedation. Chian wine links itself to the *aition* of the discovery of purple dye. Icarius' wine not only parallels the aphrodisiac given to Leucippe in a later chapter, but also completes the circle started by the inclusion of the Biblian: Biblian is an aphrodisiac and so is the drug given to Leucippe. In between the wine *aitia* and the myths dealing with love, an oracle is also used to arrange the structure of the chapter.

This oracle uses the myth Hephaestus and his attempted rape of Athena to anticipate the sexual encounter of Leucippe and Clitophon, foiled by Panthea.

The second set of myths appears in a philosophical debate. Clitophon and Menelaus argue the merits of heterosexual versus homosexual love by recalling the loves of Zeus. Since Tatius heavily emphasizes the king of the gods and the myths associated with him in the second half of the chapter, it is no surprise that the first myth he employs in the third chapter deals with Zeus; in other words, the erotic debate not only employs these myths as *exempla*, but also serves to bridge the action between the end of chapter two and that of beginning of the following chapter. In 2.30 we see, once again, the divinity of Pan making an appearance through the person of Satyrus. As in the first chapter a binary structure is found: Eros and his accoutrements show up in the earlier parts of both chapters, while in the latter parts of the both chapters Pan, the madness he invokes, and the power of unrestrained sexuality with which he is associated materialize.

Is there an historical allusion in chapter 2 in keeping with Tatius' custom of including an historical element in his *exempla*? Yes. Callisthenes, the kidnapper of Calligone, wants to marry Leucippe, but Sostratus, Leucippe's father, refuses to allow this marriage because he does not approve of Callisthenes' loose living. ὁ δὲ βδελυπτόμενος τοῦ βίου τὴν ἀκολασίαν ἠρνήσατο (2.13.2). In chapter 1 there was a single historical allusion, Candaules, and in this chapter there seems to be a parallel between Callisthenes and Herodotus' Hippocleides (6.128-9); both do not have the respect of their prospective father-in-laws and lose their fiancées because of their styles of living.

Chapter three begins with a ship-wreck and among the survivors are Leucippe and Clitophon, who manage to come ashore at Pelusium, where there is located a statue of

Zeus of Mount Casius. In the statue's hand there is sculpted a pomegranate, which Harlan points out has generative qualities,²⁵³ and which Bartsch maintains is an omen of the first *Scheintod*, the disembowling of Leucippe.²⁵⁴ Anderson writes that Artemidorus associates the pomegranate, in dreams, with "slavery and subjection." It also symbolizes the first *Scheintod*, and in particular the clothing and the pouch full of sheep guts. He concludes his article noting that the pomegranate (beautiful on the outside, not so in the inside) may have been used in sophistic argumentation, which further strengthens the contention that Tattius was well-versed in literature.²⁵⁵

Near the statue there are two paintings by Evanthes.²⁵⁶ One painting shows Andromeda chained and ready to be sacrificed to the sea monster, the other depicts a chained Prometheus with an eagle tearing at his liver. Andromeda is otherwise beautifully painted except for her wrists: τὰς δὲ χεῖρας εἰς τὴν πέτραν ἐξεπέτασεν, ἄγχει δὲ ἄνω δεσμὸς ἐκατέραν συνάπτων τῇ πέτρᾳ· οἱ καρποὶ δὲ ὥσπερ ἀμπέλου βότρυες κρέμανται (3.7.4). This description of the wrists and hands may seem to be overobserved, but what can one expect from a painter whose son may owe his reputation to the vine? This painting of Andromeda has been decoded as foreshadowing the trials and

²⁵³ Harlan, "The Description of Paintings" 107ff.

²⁵⁴ Bartsch, *Decoding the Ancient Novel* 55ff.

²⁵⁵ Graham Anderson, "The Mystic Pomegranate and the Vine of Sodom: Achilles Tattius 3.6" *American Journal of Philology* 100 (1979): 516-8.

²⁵⁶ There is no known painter in the ancient world called Evanthes. In myth Evanthes is the son of Oenopion and the father of Maron the Ismarian priest. Cf. Diod. 5.79.2, Paus. 7.4.8, Hes. *Catalogues of Women* 86, and *Od* 9.197.

tribulations which Leucippe will undergo.²⁵⁷ Prometheus and his lacerated liver also point to this fact.

Included in the painting are the rescuers of both mythological prisoners, who have already been encountered in the previous chapter: Heracles and Perseus. Heracles was tied in with the sacrifice at Tyre and he now will rescue Prometheus from eternal suffering. Perseus was the only offspring mentioned by name in the listing of women who had born children to Zeus. The slayer of the Gorgon, depicted with a strange rapier, will now prevent Andromeda from becoming the sacrificial victim offered to the sea monster.

Chapter 3 derives its plot from Evanthes' paintings. In fact the narrative of this chapter faithfully follows the scenes depicted on the paintings. Leucippe is kidnapped by robbers (cf. Panthea's dream) and is pegged to the ground with all her limbs stretched in the same manner as Andromeda.²⁵⁸ The heroine is then disembowled before the very eyes of Clitophon:²⁵⁹ εἶτα λαβῶν ξίφος βάπτει κατὰ τῆς καρδίας καὶ διελκύσας τὸ ξίφος εἰς τὴν κάτω γαστέρα ῥήγνυσι (3.15.4); in a manner recalling the death of Leucippe in Panthea's dream: ἐδόκει τινὰ ληστὴν μάχαιραν ἔχοντα γυμνὴν ἄγειν ἀρπασάμενον αὐτῆς τὴν θυγατέρα καὶ καταθέμενον ὑπτίαν, μέσῃν ἀνατεμῖν τῇ μαχαίρᾳ τὴν γαστέρα, κάτωθεν ἀρξάμενον ἀπὸ τῆς αἰδοῦς (2.23.5).²⁶⁰ The location of Leucippe's wound is in

²⁵⁷ Bartsch, *Decoding the Ancient Novel* 57.

²⁵⁸ Her stance is compared to that of Marsyas when he was flayed.

²⁵⁹ Clitophon says that when he saw Leucippe disembowled he felt like Niobe when she saw her children slaughtered by Apollo and Artemis.

²⁶⁰ Cf. Helen E. Elsom, "Callirhoe: Displaying the Phallic Woman," *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*, ed. Amy Richlin (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992) 216-7, on the reversal of genders through myth in this scene.

the same general area as the wound inflicted upon Prometheus by the eagle and the exotic quality of Perseus' sword finds its counterpart in the stage-knife used by Menelaus to fake the death of Leucippe.²⁶¹

In keeping with the Herodotean tenor of the first two chapters Tattius introduces the myth of the Phoenix bird (2.25), which is an episode right out of Herodotus (2.73).²⁶² The Phoenix is said by Tattius to carry the corpse of its father from Ethiopia to Egypt in a sepulchre. The bird is described as being about the same size as a peacock but superior in plumage. It lives in Ethiopia but upon its death the male offspring of the Phoenix constructs a sepulchre, places his dead father in it, and carries the casket to Heliopolis in Egypt for burial. In Heliopolis one of the priests of the Sun examines the bird to make sure that it is an authentic Phoenix. The bird helps in its identification by allowing himself to be thoroughly examined, even to the extent that the bird allows his private parts to be scrutinized.

Herodotus' account agrees with but varies from Tattius' narrative in a number of ways. He states that the bird comes with the corpse of his father from Arabia and not from Ethiopia. Egypt as the place of burial is the same in both accounts, but in Herodotus there is no physical examination by the priests of the Sun to validate the Phoenix's lineage and identity. It seems that it is not enough for Tattius that a bird has constructed a movable coffin for its parent and brought it all the way from Ethiopia to Heliopolis for burial.²⁶³

²⁶¹ When revived, Leucippe is thought by Clitophon to be Hecate.

²⁶² Cf. Gaselee 187, n. 1.

²⁶³ On the humorous aspects of the Phoenix story cf. Graham Anderson, *Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelist at Play* (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1982) 28. See also Donald Blythe Durham, "Parody in Achilles Tattius," *Classical Philology* 33 (1938): 1-19.

Before the account of the Phoenix, Tattius construes a military overtone.

Charmides, the general who rescued Clitophon and his group from the robbers, plans to attack the camp of the robbers. There is more, however, since Charmides has fallen in love with Leucippe and schemes to have his way with the heroine. This military ambience dove-tails with the myths which begin the fourth chapter. In this chapter the myth of Aphrodite and Ares sets the agenda for the chapter. Charmides loves (Aphrodite) Leucippe but has to make war (Ares) on the robbers. The general himself detects the dilemma he is in:

ἐν πολέμῳ δὲ τίς ἐπιθυμίαν ἀναβάλλεται; στρατιώτης δὲ ἐν χερσὶν ἔχων μάχην οἶδεν εἰ ζήσεται; τοσαῦται τῶν θανάτων εἰσὶν ὁδοί. αἴτησαί μοι παρὰ τῆς Τύχης τὴν ἀσφάλειαν, καὶ μενῶ. ἐπὶ πόλεμον νῦν ἐξελεύσομαι βουκόλων· ἔνδον μου τῆς ψυχῆς ἄλλος πόλεμος κάθηται. στρατιώτης με πορθεῖ τόξον ἔχων, βέλος ἔχων. νενίκημαι, πεπλήρωμαι βελῶν· κάλεσον, ἄνθρωπε, ταχὺ τὸν ἰώμενον²⁶⁴ ἐπείγει τὸ τραῦμα. ἄψω πῦρ ἐπὶ τοὺς πολεμίους· ἄλλας δᾶδας ὁ Ἔρως ἀνῆψε κατ' ἐμοῦ (4.7.3-4).

The only cure Charmides can find is to pray that he has sex with Leucippe before he engages in battle with the enemy: Ἄφροδίτη με πρὸς Ἄρεα ἀποστείλάτω (4.7.5). The general's lust, however, is not sated since Leucippe suffers an epileptic-like fit, like Anthea's induced by an aphrodisiac, which prevents the general from having sex with the maiden.²⁶⁵

The rest of this chapter comprises a battle between Charmides' forces and those of the enemy, the routing of the general's forces, the death of the general, and the destruction of the enemy's forces by a larger contingent of men sent by the Satrap of

²⁶⁴ Can this be the god Asclepius, who is invoked in 4.17 in order that Leucippe may recover from an epileptic sort of madness?

²⁶⁵ The epileptic fit is analyzed by A. M. G. MacLeod, "Physiology and medicine in a Greek novel: Achilles Tattius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 89 (1969): 97-105, in view of Erasistratus' treatment and diagnosis of this disease.

Egypt.²⁶⁶ In this chapter Eros plays no role, but is supplanted by his mother Aphrodite. Pan does not appear and need not since this book is solely dedicated to sexual and military strategies.

After the episode involving love and war we find the hero and heroine in Alexandria. They enter the city by the Sun Gate and notice that at the opposite end of the town is the Moon Gate and that in-between the two portals there is a labyrinth of columns, streets, peoples, and temples. Coinciding with their arrival to the city is a festival to Zeus (Serapis) in which the ritual torches are so many in number and so bright that they remove the darkness caused by the oncoming night. Straightaway then the scene has been set for a transformation from light (the Sun Gate) to darkness (Moon Gate). This polarity sets the theme for chapter 5.

Chaereas, the man who had cured Leucippe of her madness, falls in love with her and contrives to kidnap her. He invites Leucippe, Clitophon, and Menelaus to dinner on the pretext of celebrating his birthday. On the way to his home, located near the lighthouse at Pharos, a hawk strikes Leucippe's head, an ill omen. As the characters are searching for an explanation for this incident they come upon a painting depicting the rape of Philomela.²⁶⁷ The painting tells the complete myth of Philomela, Procne, and Tereus, except for the metamorphoses of these people into birds.

The painting is interpreted by Clitophon, who gives a nearly identical version of the myth. His rendering starts with the metamorphoses, provides the reasons for Tereus'

²⁶⁶ The use of the word Satrap is not an attempt by Tatius to place the action of the story in historic times, but rather, he either prefers to use pre-Roman terminology for the different offices, or, it is another piece of Herodotean romanticism. Cf. H. J. Mason, "The Roman Government in Greek Sources," *Phoenix* 24 (1970): 150-9.

²⁶⁷ For an analysis of the rape motif in Greek myths see Froma Zeitlin, "Configurations of Rape in Greek Myth," *Rape*, eds. Sylvana Tomaselli and Roy Porter (Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1986) 122-51.

lust and the means he employs to rape and mutilate Philomela, supplies a description of the weaving of Philomela, relates the gruesome banquet, and ends with the transformation of humans into birds. The avian ring-structure of Clitophon's version ends with the party-guests postponing their visit to Chaereas for one day.

The one-day delay does not prevent Chaereas from carrying out his designs. He kidnaps Leucippe and stops the pursuing Clitophon by staging the second simulated death of Leucippe. Chaereas escapes with Leucippe, and Clitophon, through the machinations of Satyrus, is engaged to marry Melite, a widow from Ephesus. The pre-nuptial discussions are held in the temple of Isis in order that the goddess may witness their engagement. The wedding, however, will not be held in Egypt, but rather in Melite's hometown of Ephesus, where Artemis is the patron deity. Since Isis is associated with the Underworld, and Artemis is associated with Selene, the moon, and with Hecate, with whom Leucippe was compared,²⁶⁸ the transformation from light to darkness is accomplished by degrees. At the beginning of chapter 5 the Sun and his powers were emphasized, but now towards the end the Moon and the divinities associated with it come to fore.

On the sea-voyage to Ephesus Melite attempts to seduce Clitophon, who refuses because he wants to remain faithful to Leucippe. In a rhetorical outburst Melite tries to win over Clitophon by citing her own *exempla* of mythological figures such as Aphrodite, Eros, Poseidon, the Nereids, and Amphitrite, which are connected with the seas and its creative powers. The learned disquisition of Melite is of no avail.

The divinities are not the only ones who undergo transformation in this chapter. Leucippe, who up until now had been a noble-born and free person, loses her freedom

²⁶⁸ Most manuscripts of 1.4.3 read Σελήνην (β reads Εὐρώπην) and since this is so, Tatiüs has correlated Leucippe with Selene from the very start of his novel.

and becomes a slave and a follower of the moon goddesses. The transformation from normal person to witch has been planned from the first chapter of the novel. In 1.4.3 Leucippe is said to resemble Selene, in 2.7 Leucippe casts a spell on the bee-stung hand of Clio and on the healthy lips of Clitophon, in 3.18.3 Leucippe is mistaken for Hecate, and in 5.17 she is identified as Lacaena a woman from Thessaly, the genetrix of Greek witches.²⁶⁹ The transformation is complete when Melite asks Lacaena to supply her with herbs with which she can make Clitophon have sex with her (5.22-26.12). The description of Leucippe picking herbs is especially meaningful because she does this in the moonlight; witchery and the moon-goddesses are united: διανυκτερεύσειν γὰρ ἔλεγεν εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν βοτανῶν ἔνεκεν χάριν, ὡς ἐν ὄψει τῆς σελήνης αὐτὰς ἀναλάβοι. (5.26.12)

The aphrodisiac of Lacaena is never used because Thersander, Melite's husband, reappears after having been missing for several years. Thus ends chapter 5. In this chapter transformations program the action. At the beginning of the chapter the polarity between the Sun and Moon gates reveals the changes which will take place: divine attributes go from those identified with the sun to those related to the moon; Leucippe the nobly-born becomes a slave; Leucippe is depicted as a witch and as a servant of the moon-goddess.

Transformation as a motif is not limited to chapter 5. From the very outset of chapter 6 Tattius recalls this motif by having Clitophon dress up in women's clothing in order to escape from jail, but not before Melite and Clitophon have sex. Thersander, the husband of Melite, has sent him there on the charge of adultery. Melite supplies the clothes for Clitophon's transvestism, and when he is in drag Melite compliments him, saying that he reminds her of a picture of Achilles she once saw. The painting, of course,

²⁶⁹ Cf. Lucan *Pharsalia* 6.58 and Seneca *Heracles on Mount Oeta* 449-72.

must have depicted the time Achilles spent at the court of King Lycomedes of Scyros while dressed as a woman.

The theme is intensified by the myth of Iphigenia in 6.2.3. The prison guard, who was to have kept a close eye on his prisoner, is flabbergasted when he looks inside the jail and realizes that Clitophon has escaped and in his stead is Melite. Tatius writes that this change is *θέαμα . . . παραδοξότατον, τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἔλαφον ἀντὶ παρθένου παροιμίας* (6.2.3-4). Metamorphosis also shows up in the scene (6.7.4) in which Thersander attempts to seduce Leucippe, whom he has also imprisoned. Leucippe, when she perceives Thersander's intentions, bursts into tears. If these tears solidified, then the earth *καινὸν ἂν εἶχεν ἤλεκτρον* (6.2.3). The old *ἤλεκτρον* obviously refers to the amber produced by the tears of Phaethon's sister while they were mourning the death of their brother also underwent metamorphosis.²⁷⁰

The metamorphosis motif undergoes a reversal in 6.19.6 where Leucippe tells Thersander, after many an attempt at seduction, that she would love him only if he became Clitophon. No transformation actually takes place; rather the underlying motif is revealed: only metamorphosis can allow Thersander to achieve what he wishes, just as Clitophon had changed, superficially, from a man into a woman in order to escape his imprisonment. Thersander refuses to become Clitophon but he does change into what he did not expect or want: the master of Leucippe becomes her slave, a metaphor for love.

This chapter relies upon metamorphosis and the myths associated with it for structure. Clitophon becomes a woman (myth of Achilles), Melite the free-woman becomes a prisoner (myth of Iphigenia), Leucippe cries tears superior to those shed by the Heliades, and Thersander the master of Leucippe becomes the slave of Leucippe. This

²⁷⁰ Cf. Gaselee 317, n. 1.

chapter derives its program of change from chapter 5, where one of the overall themes was the transformation of Leucippe into a witch.

Chapter 7 does not follow the myth-inspired structure of the previous six chapters, but takes on a completely different tenor. While the previous chapters included love, pirates, shipwrecks, and all the other components expected in a novel, chapter 7 concentrates on only one of the elements found in the ancient Greek novels: the trial. In the trial scenes Tattius unleashes his sophistic nature, employing diverse legal terminology and manipulation. The trial nature of this chapter, however, foreshadows the mythologically inspired trials which Leucippe and Melite must undergo in the following chapter.

Chapter 8 renews the dependency on myth for structure. Thersander argues that in order to prove the innocence and virginity of Leucippe (she had been accused of violating Artemis' temple where only slaves and virgins are allowed to enter) she must undergo the trial of the pan-pipes (8.3.3). It seems that there is a grotto behind the shrine to Artemis where only virgins may enter. After a lengthy description of the pan-pipes and *aition* in which they came to be, it is revealed that in the grotto are pan-pipes which Pan gave to Artemis as a gift.²⁷¹ These pan-pipes can prove the virginity of a maiden in the following manner: the maiden whose virginity is in question is placed in the grotto and the doors of the cave are closed behind her; if the maiden is a virgin the pan-pipes are heard and the girl comes out wreathed with pine;²⁷² if she is not the pan-

²⁷¹ Tattius supplies a variation of the myth of Syrinx as found in Ovid *Met.* 1.691ff. R. M. Rattenbury, "Chastity and Chastity Ordeals in the Ancient Greek Romances," *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical & Literary Society, Literary and Historical Section* 1 (1926): 59-71, notes that "the differences [between the myth in Tattius and Ovid] are enough to make it likely that Achilles Tattius did not copy it from Ovid, but that the two authors used different versions of one popular legend" (67).

²⁷² Pine is the favorite tree of Pan; cf. Nonnus 2.118 and 42.259.

pipes are silent and in its stead a cry is heard and the maiden disappears. On the third-day after the girl's cry is heard the chief priestess of the cult of Artemis opens up the grotto and finds the pan-pipes lying on the ground but no maiden. Leucippe undergoes the test and is vindicated.

Leucippe is not the only woman who undergoes a test. Thersander accuses Melite of having had sex with Clitophon while he was presumed dead and therefore demands that she be tested in the waters of the river Styx. The test is as follows:

ὅταν τις αἰτίαν ἔχη Ἀφροδισίων, εἰς τὴν πηγὴν εἰσβάσα ἀπολούεται ἢ δέ ἐστιν ὀλίγη, καὶ μέχρι κνήμης μέσης. ἢ δὲ κρίσις· ἐγγράψασα τὸν ὄρκον γραμματεῖω μηρίνθω δεδεμένον περιεθήκατο τῇ δέρῃ. κἂν ἀψευδῇ τὸν ὄρκον, μένει κατὰ χώραν ἢ πηγῇ. ἂν δὲ ψεύδῃται, τὸ ὕδωρ ὀργίζεται καὶ ἀναβαίνει μέχρι τῆς δέρης καὶ τὸ γραμματεῖον ἐκάλυψε (8.12.8-9).

Melite passes the test on a technicality. She did commit adultery because she had sex with Clitophon while he was in prison, before he dressed up as a woman, but Thersander accused her of having committed adultery while he was presumed dead. This technicality allows Melite to enter into the Styx with the accusation carefully worded: I did not commit adultery while Thersander was away.

The two tests are similar in nature, a test of sexual promiscuity, and are connected to Pan. The creation of the pan-pipes and the myth of Syrinx has been discussed in the chapter on Longus. The myth of the trial by water is as follows: Rhodopis, a chaste attendant of Artemis, had sworn that she would never enjoy the fruits of Aphrodite. Aphrodite, as in the case of Hippolytus, heard this oath and became enraged and consequently planned the ruination of Rhodopis. She made Euthynicus, an Ephesian, fall in love with Rhodopis and Rhodopis fall in love with Euthynicus. The two made love in a cave while Artemis was away and when she returned and found out that Rhodopis had betrayed her, she turned her into a spring. Tatius does not explain Rhodopis' change in name to Styx, but we can find the connection between the Styx and Pan in Herodotus. The

historian tells us that in the Arcadian town of Nonakris the waters of the Styx are found (6.74). The connection between Pan, *the* Arcadian deity, and the waters of the river Styx may possibly be found in the last use of Herodotus by Tatius.

This last chapter of the novel receives its atmosphere from the legal tone of the previous chapter. Chapter 7 is full of legal manoeuvres and machinations and sets the stage for the trials and tribulations of Leucippe and Melite.²⁷³ The mythological elements in the last chapter are in nature Pan-myths and signal the preeminence of this Arcadian deity at the end of the novel.

In *Leucippe and Clitophon* myths thoroughly guide the plot of each chapter and dictate the development of character. In the first chapter Eros and the myths associated with this divinity set the romantic ground-work of not only the first chapter, but also of the entire novel. In the second chapter the four *aitia* of the wines prescribe the sensual atmosphere of the chapter, foreshadow the drugging of Conops, and furnish a setting for a dialogue on the merits of heterosexual and homosexual love. The paintings of Evanthes arrange the plot of the third chapter, while Love and War, in the mythological guise of Ares and Aphrodite, ordain the action of chapter four. Chapters five and six deal with transformation, specifically the transformation of Leucippe, which is paralleled by the change in scenery from light to darkness. Chapter seven deals with trials and legal manoeuvres, and foreshadows the mythologically based trials of Leucippe and Melite in the chapter eight.

²⁷³ Cf. Charles Segal, "The Trials at the End of Achilles Tatius' *Clitophon and Leucippe*: Doublets and Complementaries," *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 3rd ser. 2 (1984): 82-91.

CHAPTER VI
INNOVATIVE HELIODORUS

Heliodorus is the author of the longest and most complicated extant ancient Greek novel: the text of the *Aethiopica* runs the length of three volumes in the Budé collection and, unlike his predecessors and contrary to their rules of novelistic composition, Heliodorus does not start his novel at the beginning of the story but rather uses the epic and dramatic technique of *in medias res*. Although *in medias res* is probably the most striking example of the many innovative techniques which the novelist employs in his work, Heliodorus uses many others such as foreshadowing, flashbacks, and storylines borrowed from Homer's epics and from the tragic corpus. The last component, and its relationship to myth and plot of the novel, will be the core of this chapter.

The narrative structure and techniques of the *Aethiopica* are the foci of many scholarly works. Keyes, after examining the complexity of the plot and the allure which the intricacy of the plot supplies the reader, suggests that Heliodorus models the overall structure of the novel on Homer's *Odyssey*. He parallels the epic with the novel: the details, actions, and narrative of books one through five and six through ten of the *Aethiopica* are analogous to books one through twelve and thirteen through twenty-four of the *Odyssey*.²⁷⁴ Reardon echoes this idea when he writes: "Homère est le père non

²⁷⁴ Clinton Walker Keyes, "The Structure of Heliodorus' *Aethiopika*," *Studies in Philology* 19 (1922): 42-51.

seulement des sophistes mais aussi des romanciers, surtout d'Héliodore - ni Hérodote, ni Euripide, ni Ménandre et la Nouvelle Comédie."²⁷⁵

Sandy,²⁷⁶ Winkler,²⁷⁷ Morgan,²⁷⁸ and Futre Pinheiro²⁷⁹ are representative of the many scholars who have analyzed the complex plot and narrative of the novel by employing the approach to the *Aethiopica* established by Keyes. Sandy and Winkler survey the manipulation of the plot and the multiple storylines contained in the narrative by different story characters, in particular Calasiris. Sandy views the narrative as possibly borrowed from the stage and accordingly "each character will tell and enact his own story in full view on the 'stage'," thereby "the paths of the principal characters must cross and recross in order to facilitate shared experiences and exchanges of information that touches upon all."²⁸⁰ Winkler scrutinizes the importance of Calasiris for the novel and for the impact which the duplicity of the character has on the development and exposition of the plot. Futre Pinheiro adopts a similar approach to the character of Calasiris and proposes that the duplicitous nature of Calasiris correlates to the double motivational components of many of the events of the novel.

²⁷⁵ Reardon, *Courants Littéraires* 320.

²⁷⁶ Gerald N. Sandy, *Heliodorus* 9-89.

²⁷⁷ John J. Winkler, "The Mendacity of Kalarisis and the narrative structure of Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*," *Yale Classical Studies* 27 (1982): 93-158.

²⁷⁸ John Morgan, "The Sense of an Ending: the Conclusion of Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 119 (1989): 299-320; "Reader and Audience in the 'Aithiopika' of Heliodorus," *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 4 (1991): 85-103.

²⁷⁹ Marília Futre Pinheiro, "Calasiris' Story and its Narrative Significance in Heliodorus' 'Aethiopika'," *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 4 (1991): 69-83.

²⁸⁰ Sandy, *Heliodorus* 33.

Morgan differs in his analysis of the *Aethiopica*. He does not take the well-trod path of beginning a study of the novel by examining first the beginning of the novel and then proceeding to the rest of the narrative. Instead, he focuses on the conclusion of the novel and explores the “unpredictability of the path” which leads to the end of the novel.²⁸¹ The unpredictable quality of the narrative once again depends on the manipulated rehearsal of events by the characters and author. The conclusion of the novel, however, is not unlike the narrative itself, since “no questions are left to be asked, the text closes because there is nothing more that could be told.”²⁸² In a later article Morgan concentrates on the reader-response of the fictional and true audiences of the *Aethiopica* and concludes by proposing that Heliodorus expected the reader of the novel to share the experiences of the true-to-life, though fictional, literary audiences of the novel.²⁸³

The novelty of the narratological constituents of the *Aethiopica* have not been the only foci of scholarly research; historical events and the attendant social circumstances in Heliodorus have also been investigated. The historical research on Heliodorus is justified since the novelist from the very beginning of his narrative incorporates numerous historical allusions or details into his story. For example he locates the

²⁸¹ Morgan, “A Sense of the Ending” 319.

²⁸² Morgan, “A Sense of the Ending” 320.

²⁸³ Morgan, “Reader and Audience” 85-103. On the structure and narratological patterns of the *Aethiopica* also cf. O. Weinrich, “Heliodor und sein Werk,” *Der griechische Liebesroman* (Zurich: Artemis, 1962) 32-55; T. Szepessy, “Die Aithiopika des Heliodorus und der griechische sophistische Liebesroman,” *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 4 (1957): 241-259; O. Mazal, “Die Satzstruktur in den Aithiopika des Heliodor von Emesa,” *Wiener Studien* 71 (1958): 116-131; E. Feuillatre, *Études sur les Éthiopiennes D’Héliodore: contribution à la connaissance du roman grec* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966) 11-102.

opening scene of the novel in the Heracleiote mouth of the Nile (1.1), proceeds to disclose that the leading characters of the novel are in an area called the Land of the Herds (1.5), strengthens the historical allusion by borrowing from Herodotus (5.16), and then links the topographical data to Athenian judicial information.²⁸⁴

Morgan demonstrates that the “story-patterning” of an incident in Heliodorus is “sometimes modeled closely on the shape of an event in history.”²⁸⁵ Morgan proceeds to suggest that this historical quality does not mean that Heliodorus’ primary aim in writing the *Aethiopica* is to write history but rather that he wants to lend some authenticity to his work. The attribution of some possibly authentic detail to a novel, as previously mentioned, possibly stems not from a premeditated plan of composing history, but rather from the inescapable certainty that an author cannot compose in a vacuum and so may turn to contemporary or historical minutiae. This is not to say that Heliodorus cannot be used as a source for information about Heliodorus’ world.²⁸⁶

The historical characteristics of the novel can be divided into two categories: 1) coincidental details which are pertinent to the circumstances at hand, e.g. the setting of

²⁸⁴ Heliodorus quotes Demosthenes (*Against Meidias* 21.138) in book 1.7, and then refers to the Upper Council of the Areiopagos (1.9), the Panathenaia (1.10), the phratria (1.13), and the barathron (1.13).

²⁸⁵ Morgan, “History, Romance” 248.

²⁸⁶ Georges Rougemont, “Delphes chez Héliodore,” *Le monde Grec: Actes du colloque international tenu à l’École Normal Supérieure (Paris 17-19 d’octobre 1987)* (Paris: Presses de L’École Normale Supérieure, 1992) 93-100, appraises the information which Heliodorus supplies about Delphi and compares the novelistic data with known fact. Patrice Cauderlier, “Réalités égyptiennes chez Héliodore,” 221-231, examines the specificity and technical aspects of Heliodorus’ language when he writes about Egypt. Cf. Marília Futre Pinheiro, “Aspects de la problématique sociale et économique dans le roman d’Héliodore,” *Piccolo Mondo Antico: Le donne, gli amori, i costumi, il mondo reale nel romanzo greco*, eds. P. Liviabella Furiani and A. M. Scarcella (Perugia: Università degli Studi di Perugia, 1989) 15-42.

the opening scene must take place somewhere and what better place, following the dictates of novelistic writing, for a shipwreck to occur than in Egypt. Heliodorus makes the setting historical by identifying the site with a verifiable historical name: the Heracleiote mouth of the Nile (1.1). 2) The author also calls upon and uses literary sources to lend an historical flavor to his work,²⁸⁷ but the use of these sources is not meant to convey the notion that Heliodorus is writing an historical work; rather he is supplying his reader with verifiable details to which the reader can relate. At the same time the novelist is showing that he is conversant with historical works.

Historical sources are outnumbered by the Homeric lines which abound in the *Aethiopica*.²⁸⁸ The addition of quotations from the Homeric epics serves the same purposes as the borrowings from historical sources: to embellish the work, to show the novelist's erudition, and to make the work acceptable to an audience which is thoroughly

²⁸⁷ For example: Hdt. 5.16: 1.5.2; Dem. *Meid.* 21.138: 1.6.2; Hdt. 2.134-5: 2.25.1; Hdt. 1.65: 2.27.1; Hdt. 2.19: 2.28.5; Philostr. *Heroikos* 19.5: 2.35,1; Plut. *Mor.* 680c-683b: 3.7.3; Plut. *Mor.* 681a: 3.7.5; Plut. *Mor.* 3.10.5; Dem. *De Cor.* 248: 5.29.6; Dem. *De Cor.* 97: 6.4; Thuc. 1.2.2: 6.10.2; Hdt. 4.183: 8.16.4; Hdt. 3.23: 9.1.5; Philon of Alexandria *Life of Moses* 2.195: 9.9.3; Strab. 17.1.48: 9.22.4; Hdt. 3.18: 10.1.3; Hdt. 1.216: 10.6.5

²⁸⁸ For example: *Il.* 1.46-7: 1.2.5; *Il.* 6.202: 1.14.5; *Il.* 4.450f. and 8.65: 1.22.5; *Il.* 6.312ff.: 1.27.3; *Il.* 6.490-3: 1.28.1; *Il.* 4.45 and 8.65: 1.30.3; *Od.* 17.222: 2.19.1; *Il.* 11.474ff.: 2.19.5; *Il.* 16.799 and *Od.* 9.58: 2.19.6; *Il.* 11.241: 2.20.2; *Il.* 2.311ff.: 2.22.4; *Od.* 17.287, and *Il.* 19.155ff., 19.216ff: 2.22.5; *Il.* 18.437: 2.33.3; *Il.* 9.59 and *Od.* 3.154: 3.2.1; *Od.* 11.613-4: 3.4.2; *Od.* 7.137f.: 3.5.1; *Od.* 19.547: 3.12.1; *Il.* 13.71f.: 3.12.2; *Il.* 1.199f: 3.13.3; *Il.* 9.381ff.: 3.14.2; *Il.* 18.571f.: 4.3.3; *Il.* 13.636f.: 4.3.3; *Il.* 16.21: 4.7.4; *Il.* 17.103f.: 4.19.3; *Od.* 19.392ff: 5.5.2; *Od.* 6.180: 5.11.3; *Il.* 3.65: 5.15.2; *Od.* 8.499ff.: 5.16.5; *Od.* 18.74, 13.332, *Il.* 19.47ff.: 5.22.1; *Il.* 5.79ff.: 5.32.6; *Il.* 1.106f.: 6.5.3; *Il.* 8.491: 6.13.6; *Od.* 11.24ff.: 6.14.3; *Il.* 22.136ff: 7.6.3; *Il.* 24.3ff.: 7.9.3; *Il.* 6.234ff.: 7.10.5; *Il.* 6.234ff.: 9.2.1; *Od.* 1.22ff.: 9.6.2; *Il.* 11.678f.: 9.23.1; *Il.* 4.141: 10.15.2; *Od.* 19.209ff.: 10.15.2; *Il.* 9.612: 10.17.9.

familiar with the Homeric corpus. Heliodorus, in other words, is carrying on the novelistic tradition.²⁸⁹

The sources used by Heliodorus are not limited, however, to historical or epic works. He cites Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Works and Days*, the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, Plato's *Phaedo* and *Gorgias*, Moschos' *Megara*, Aratus' *Phaenomena*, and Lucian's *On Dancing* in the novel.²⁹⁰ Although the Homeric epics supply the largest number of borrowings, tragedy is a close second as a source for Heliodorus.²⁹¹

Much ink has been spilt over the use of tragedy in the *Aethiopica*.²⁹² The interest in the dramatic stems not only from the generous borrowing of lines and passages from tragedy but also from the stage-terms used in the novel and from the very fact that Heliodorus at different times in the narrative calls or designates his narrative as tragedy. The novel starts at daybreak with a ship moored at the mouth of the Nile:²⁹³

²⁸⁹ Cf. R. W. Garson, "Notes on Some Homeric Echoes in Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*," *Acta Classica* 18 (1975): 137-40; cf. chapter II.

²⁹⁰ Aratus *Phaen.* 96-136 or Hes. *Op.* 197f.: 1.14.4; Pl. *Phd.* 99c: 1.15.8; *Hymn. Hom. Hermes* 289: 2.20.2; Moschos *Megara* 21ff.: 2.22.4; Pl. *Grg.* 447a: 3.10.1; Hes. *Theog.* 984f.: 4.8.3; Lucian *Salt.* 18: 9.19.3.

²⁹¹ The lines and passages borrowed from the tragedians are: Eur. *Med.* 1317: 1.8.7; Soph. *Aj.* 293 and Eur. *Heracl.* 476: 1.21.3; Eur. *Hec.* 612: 2.4.3; Eur. *Or.* 1625: 2.18.4; Aesch. *Pers.* 599 and Soph. *OT* 1527: 3.15.3; Eur. *Phoen.* 625: 4.6.7; Soph. *OT* 1409: 4.10.2; Eur. *Hipp.* 439: 4.10.5; Eur. *Ion* 927ff.: 5.20.1; Eur. *Alc.* 301: 5.25.3; Aesch. *Cho.* 64: 5.27.3; Soph. *Aj.* 131f.: 7.5.2; Eur. *Hipp.* 802: 8.15.2.

²⁹² Cf. J. W. H. Walden, "Stage-Terms in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 5 (1894): 1-44; Rosanna Rocca, "Eliodoro e i due «Ippoliti» euripidei," *Materiali e Contributi per la Storia della Narrativa Greco-Latina 1* (Perugia: Istituto di Filologia Latina Dell'Universita di Perugia, 1976) 25-31; Anderson, *Eros Sophistes* 33-40.

²⁹³ The opening scene of the novel has been interpreted in terms of cinematic technique; cf. W. Bühler, "Das Element des Visuellen in der Eingangsszene von Heliodors *Aithiopika*," *Wiener Studien* 10 (1976): 177-85.

‘Ημέρας ἄρτι διαγελώσης καὶ ἡλίου τὰς ἀκρωρείας καταυγάζοντος (1.1.1).²⁹⁴ This opening scene is then quickly supplied with its first actors: ἄνδρες ἐν ὄπλοις ληστρικοῖς ὄρους ὑπερκύψαντες, ὃ δὴ κατ’ ἐκβολὰς τοῦ Νείλου καὶ στόμα τὸ καλούμενον ‘Ηρακλεωτικὸν ὑπερτείνει (1.1.1).

These brigands proceed to survey the scene, which is meant not only to be seen by them but also by the reader:

μικρὸν ἐπιστάντες τὴν ὑποκειμένην θάλατταν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐπήρχοντο καὶ τῷ πελάγει τὸ πρῶτον τὰς ὄψεις ἐπαφέντες, ὡς οὐδὲν ἄγρας ληστρικῆς ἐπηγγέλλετο μὴ πλεόμενον, ἐπὶ τὸν πλησίον αἰγιαλὸν τῆ θέα κατήγοντο (1.1.1).

The men are even able to supply some information to the reader about the ship:

Καὶ ἦν τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ τοιάδε· ὀλκὰς ἀπὸ πρυμνησίων ὥρμει τῶν μὲν ἐμπλεόντων χηρεύουσα, φόρτου δὲ πλήθουσα· καὶ τοῦτο παρῆν συμβάλλειν καὶ τοῖς πόρρωθεν· τὸ γὰρ ἄχθος ἄχρι καὶ ἐπὶ τρίτου ζωστήηρος τῆς νεῶς τὸ ὕδωρ ἀνέθλιβεν (1.1.2).

The ship is not the only stage-prop which must be examined because special attention is paid to the shore, the bodies of the crew, the remains of a celebration, and the tableware which had been used as weapons:

‘Ο δὲ αἰγιαλός, μεστὰ πάντα σωμάτων νεοσφαγῶν, τῶν μὲν ἄρδην ἀπολωλότων, τῶν δὲ ἡμιθνήτων καὶ μέρεσι τῶν σωμάτων ἔτι σπαιρόντων, ἄρτι πεπαῦσθαι τὸν πόλεμον κατηγορούντων. Ἡ δὲ οὐ πολέμου καθαροῦ τὰ φαινόμενα σύμβολα, ἀλλ’ ἀναμέμικτο καὶ εὐωχίας οὐκ εὐτυχοῦς ἀλλ’ εἰς τοῦτο ληξάσης ἔλεινὰ λείψανα, τράπεζαι τῶν ἐδεσμάτων ἔτι πλήθουσι καὶ ἄλλαι πρὸς τῆ γῆ τῶν κειμένων ἐν χερσὶν ἀνθ’ ὄπλων ἐνίοις παρὰ τὴν μάχην γεγενημέναι· ὁ γὰρ πόλεμος ἐσχεδίαστο· ἕτεροι δὲ ἄλλους ἔκρυπτον, ὡς ζῶντο, ὑπελθόντας· κρατῆρες ἀνατετραμμένοι καὶ χειρῶν ἔνιοι τῶν ἐσχηκότων ἀπορρέοντες τῶν μὲν πινόντων τῶν δὲ ἀντὶ λίθων κεχρημένων· τὸ γὰρ αἰφνίδιον τοῦ κακοῦ τὰς χρείας ἐκαινοτόμει καὶ βέλεσι κεχρησθαι τοῖς ἐκπώμασιν ἐδίδασκεν. Ἐκειντο δὲ ὁ μὲν πελέκει τετρωμένος, ὁ δὲ κάχληκι βεβλημένος αὐτόθεν ἀπὸ τῆς ῥαχίας πεπορισμένω, ἕτερος ξύλῳ κατεαγῶς, ὁ δὲ δαλῶ κατάφλεκτος, καὶ ἄλλος ἄλλως, οἱ δὲ πλεῖστοι βελῶν ἔργον καὶ τοξείας γεγενημένοι (1.1.3-5).

²⁹⁴ The text of Heliodorus is from *Héliodore: Les Éthiopiennes* 3 vols., R. M. trans. and eds. Rattenbury and T. W. Lumb (Paris: Société d’ Edition “Les Belles Lettres,” 1935-43).

Heliodorus concludes the description of the opening scene with a brief summation employing stage-terminology:

Καὶ μυρίον εἶδος ὁ δαίμων ἐπὶ μικροῦ τοῦ χωρίου διεσκεύαστο, οἶνον αἵματι μιάνας, καὶ συμποσίους πόλεμον ἐπιστήσας, φόνους καὶ πότους, σπονδὰς καὶ σφαγὰς ἐπισυνάψας, καὶ τοιοῦτον θέατρον λησταῖς Αἰγυπτίοις ἐπιδείξας (1.1.6).

If the phrases *μυρίον εἶδος* and *τοιοῦτον θέατρον λησταῖς Αἰγυπτίοις ἐπιδείξας* are not explicit enough to insinuate that Heliodorus is putting on a stage production, he reinforces the dramatic quality of his opening by writing:

Οἱ γὰρ δὴ κατὰ τὸ ὄρος θεωροῦς ἑαυτοὺς τῶνδε καθίσαντες οὐδὲ συνιέναι τὴν σκηνὴν ἐδύναντο, τοὺς μὲν ἐαλωκότας ἔχοντες, οὐδαμοῦ δὲ τοὺς κεκρατηκότας ὀρῶντες, καὶ τὴν μὲν νίκην λαμπράν, τὰ λάφυρα δὲ ἀσκύλευτα, καὶ τὴν ναῦν μόνην ἀνδρῶν μὲν ἔρημον τᾶλλα δὲ ἄσυλον ὥσπερ ὑπὸ πολλῶν φρουρουμένην καὶ ὥσπερ ἐν εἰρήνῃ σαλεύουσιν (1.1.7).

Although the brigands do not understand what has occurred or where the victors of the battle were, they nevertheless proceed to take the spoils of the battle.

The second act of the opening scene reveals the hero and heroine of the novel to be Theagenes and Charicleia:

Ἦδη δὲ αὐτοῖς κεκινήκοσιν ἄποθεν μικρὸν τῆς τε νεῶς καὶ τῶν κειμένων θέαμα προσπίπτει τῶν προτέρων ἀπορώτερον· κόρη καθῆστο ἐπὶ πέτρας, ἀμήχανον τι κάλλος καὶ θεὸς εἶναι ἀναπείθουσα, τοῖς μὲν παροῦσι περιαλοῦσα φρονήματος δὲ εὐγενοῦς ἔτι πνέουσα. Δάφνη τὴν κεφαλὴν ἔστεπτο καὶ φαρέτραν τῶν ὤμων ἐξῆπτο καὶ τῷ λαιῷ βραχίονι τὸ τόξον ὑπεστήρικτο· ἡ λοιπὴ δὲ χεὶρ ἀφροντίστως ἀπήωρητο. Μηρῷ δὲ τῷ δεξιῷ τὸν ἀγκῶνα θατέρας χειρὸς ἐφεδράζουσα καὶ τοῖς δακτύλοις τὴν παρεῖαν ἐπιτρέψασα, κάτω νεύουσα καὶ τινα προκείμενον ἔφηβον περισκοποῦσα τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀνεῖχεν. Ὁ δὲ τραύμασι μὲν κατήκιστο καὶ μικρὸν ἀναφέρειν ὥσπερ ἐκ βαθέος ὕπνου τοῦ παρ' ὀλίγον θανάτου κατεφαίνετο, ἦνθει δὲ καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἀνδρείῳ τῷ κάλλει καὶ ἡ παρεῖα καταρρέοντι τῷ αἵματι φοινηττομένη λευκότητι πλέον ἀντέλαμπεν. Ὁφθαλμοὺς δὲ ἐκείνου οἱ μὲν πόνοι κατέσπων, ἡ δὲ ὄψις τῆς κόρης ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν ἀνεῖλκε καὶ τοῦτο ὄραν αὐτοῦς ἠνάγκαζεν, ὅτι ἐκείνην ἐώρων (1.2.1-3).

Although the novelist does not identify Theagenes and Charicleia by name, he describes the female as a goddess, θεὸς εἶναι ἀναπειθουσα, and the male as the victim of an assault which has made him even more handsome:

‘Ο δὲ τραύμασι μὲν κατήκιστο καὶ μικρὸν ἀναφέρειν ὥσπερ ἐκ βαθέος ὕπνου τοῦ παρ’ ὀλίγον θανάτου κατεφαίνετο, ἤνθει δὲ καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἀνδρείῳ τῷ κάλλει καὶ ἡ παρειὰ καταρρέοντι τῷ αἵματι φοινιττομένη λευκότητι πλέον ἀντέλαμπεν.

In the same chapter the divinity of Charicleia is mentioned in more specific terms: the Egyptians conjecture that she is either Artemis or Isis (1.2.6). It is more probable that Heliodorus wants the reader, who has already been cued in to the stage qualities of this novel, to associate the young girl, Charicleia, with Artemis for when he described the maiden he could only have been thinking of Artemis. What other goddess is usually depicted with a quiver, bow, and arrows? More importantly, as will be learned later on in the novel, the victor of the battle is Charicleia, who has used her bow and arrows to slaughter the crew of the ship.

If Charicleia is portrayed as Artemis, who then is Theagenes? This question is one of many for which answers must be sought in the complex narrative of the novel; attention, therefore, must not be given only to the intricacies of narratological nuance, but also to what the author wants the audience to interpret. Although Heliodorus is most definitely writing a romance novel which incorporates historical, epic, and tragic elements into its structure, nevertheless he is also playing a game with his reader: Heliodorus is writing a detective story. Heliodorus wants the reader to investigate and to discover the true identities of many of the characters: Charicleia, Cnemon, Thisbe, Calasiris, Thyamis, and Sisimithres. All of the identities of these characters are eventually revealed by themselves, by objects, or by other characters. It is only Theagenes' identity which is left to the reader to discover through means of the stage

elements employed by Heliodorus, and hence the problem of Theagenes' persona will only be solved by examining the dramatic component of the novel and its relationship to the myths used in the novel and in the stage-plays.²⁹⁵

In the opening scene of the novel the author shows us a battle-scene in which the main participants are not identified. Instead, he identifies, through analogue, one of the characters as Artemis but not before framing the plot in dramatic terms. The identity of the young man depicted alongside Charicleia, however, remains to be discovered. The obvious narrative answer of course is Theagenes, but identification through mythological analogue is accomplished only when the dramatic components of this novel are examined more closely. Ironically, heretofore scholarship has focused on the enigma of Charicleia's true identity:

Throughout the ten books of her adventures, which are spent mainly with pirates, soldiers, and other nonvirginal types, Chariclea pursues, unremittingly, three objectives. The first is to marry Theagenes; the second is to solve the mystery of her origin and find out who she is; the third is to defend her virginity from everyone, including Theagenes, until after the mystery is dispelled.²⁹⁶

I shall show that the answer to the riddle of the identity of the young man will be found in the mythological plots of the tragedies evoked in the *Aethiopica*.

It is necessary, first of all, to show that Heliodorus does intend his reader to perceive his novel as a dramatic show-piece. The stage-terms in the opening scene of the novel prefigure the numerous tragic references in the novel, but the previously

²⁹⁵ Elizabeth Hazelton Haight, "Ancient Greek Romances and Modern Mystery Stories," *The Classical Journal* 46 (1950): 5-10, examines the novel genre in terms of the modern detective story. She, however, does not examine the stage trappings of the novel, but opts to analyze the religious component.

²⁹⁶ e.g., Northrop Frye, *The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1976) 73.

listed allusions or references to the texts of the tragedian are not the only manner in which Heliodorus conveys the notion that his novel receives its inspiration from tragedy: Heliodorus deliberately uses technical terms from the stage. Walden enumerates the uses of stage-terms of Heliodorus in his novel: 1) δράμα is used twice as a play, six times as an adventure, action, or event, and three times as an action that has occurred. 2) θέατρον is used nine times to refer to the actual structure, an auditorium, an audience, and a spectacle. 3) σκηνή appears in five passages denoting a stage and in another five instances as meaning a spectacle. 4) The terms λαμπάδιον δράματος, ἐπεισοκκλέω are used possibly to refer to comedy. 5) Heliodorus uses ἐπεισόδιον three times to designate digressions or interruptions in the narrative. 6) Myriad other dramatic terms such as ἐπιτραγωδέω, τραγικός, τραγωδός, κωμικός, προσωπεῖον, σκηνογραφέω, σκηνογραφική, σκηνοποιία, and μηχανή are also used. The preponderance of stage-terms points to the actuality that the dramatic is an integral component of the novel and to the possibility that Heliodorus might have intended to ask the reader to seek the identity of Theagenes in stage productions.

If the identity of Theagenes by analogy is to be discovered in a play, a quick survey of some of the tragic passages used in Heliodorus is in order. Line 1317 of Euripides' *Medea* appears in 1.8.7 when the hero and heroine ask Cnemon Τύχη τί νι κεχρημένον and he responds τί ταῦτα κινεῖς κάναμοχλεύεις echoing Medea's τί τάσδε κινεῖς κάναμοχλεύεις. This line does not help much in revealing the analogous identity of Theagenes since it is spoken by Cnemon about himself. The next tragic borrowings are found in 1.21.3 and they are Sophocles' *Ajax* 293 and Euripides' *Heraclidae* 476. It is Cnemon who once again speaks in tragic terms when he says πρέπειν γὰρ λόγος οἶμαι γυναικὶ μὲν σιγῆν ἀνδρὶ δὲ ἀπόκρισιν ἐν ἀνδράσι. He is saying this about Charicleia, who had been asked by the brigand Thyamis for her hand in marriage even though she loves

Theagenes. The Sophoclean line is the answer given by Ajax to Tecmessa's interfering in his affairs: γύναι, γυναιξί κόσμον ἢ σιγή φέρει. The Euripidean line reads γυναικί γὰρ σιγή τε καὶ τὸ σωφρονεῖν κάλλιστον and is the response given by Macaria to Iolaus. The *Heraclidae* deals, of course, with unwanted marriage in one way or another and seems appropriate to the passage in the novel but has nothing to do with discovering Theagenes' mythological identity.

The marriage or bridal motif is continued in *Aethiopica* 2.4.3 which has Theagenes, who thinks that Charicleia is dead, crying out 'Ἄλλ' ὧ τί ἄν σὲ τις ὀνομάσειε; νύμφην; ἄλλ' ἀνύμφευτος; γαμετήν; ἄλλ' ἀπείρατος. He is mimicking Hecuba, who says of Polyxena νύμφην τ' ἀνυμφον παρθένον τ' ἀπάρθενον (*Hecuba* 612). The next borrowing is from Euripides *Orestes* 1625 in 2.18.4 where Theagenes is encouraging Cnemon to accompany Thermouthis on a reconnaissance mission with these words: 'Ἄλλὰ θῆγε τὸ φρόνημα καὶ οὐχ ἤκιστα τοῖς νῦν. The Euripidean line, λῆμ' ἔχων τεθηγμένον, is spoken by Apollo to Menelaus asking that he check his anger; these two lines are not tied together thematically.

Up to now the lines from the play have in no way reflected upon or served to delineate Theagenes' character. Calasiris, while recounting his own story and what he knows about the hero and heroine, recalls lines 598-9 of Aeschylus' *Persians*, κλύδων κακῶν, and line 1527 from Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*, κλύδωνα δεινῆς συμφορᾶς,²⁹⁷ when he tells Cnemon κλύδων μέ τις εἶχε φροντισμάτων (3.15.3). Once again these lines are of no help in determining the analogous identity of Theagenes.

The first borrowed line which tells us anything about Theagenes' character is line 625 from Euripides' *Phoenicians*: ὡς τάχ' οὐκέθ' αἵματηρὸν τοῦμόν ἀργήσει ξίφος.

²⁹⁷ The text of Sophocles is from *Sophoclis Fabulae*, ed. A. C. Pearson (1924; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).

The line serves as the model for Theagenes' threat, οὐχ οὕτως ἦδε ἡ χεὶρ καὶ ξίφος τοῦμόν ἀργήσει (4.6.7), implying that he will not let anyone marry Charicleia while he stands idly by. This first glimpse, through tragedy, at Theagenes' true identity is closely followed by this passage, which starts to make clear, through its association with a play, the tragic personality of the hero:

Ἄλλ' ἐπειδὴ περ ἅπαξ ἔρωτος, ἐπήσθου καὶ φανείς σε Θεαγένης ἤρηκε, τοῦτο γὰρ ὁμφὴ μοι θεῶν ἐμήνυσε, σὺ μὲν ἴσθι μὴ μόνη καὶ πρώτη τὸ πάθος ὑποστᾶσα ἀλλὰ σὺν πολλαῖς μὲν γυναιξὶ τῶν ἐπισήμων σὺν πολλαῖς δὲ παρθένοις τῶν τὰ ἄλλα σωφρόνων (4.10.5).

Even though the lines from the novel are spoken by the heroine Charicleia, nevertheless, this passage, based on line 439 from Euripides' *Hippolytus*, ἐρᾶς; τί τοῦτο θαῦμα; σὺν πολλοῖς βροτῶν, begins to associate Theagenes with Hippolytus.

The insertion of this Euripidean line into the narrative of the novel is suggestive. In the opening scene of the novel, as previously mentioned, the identity of the wounded young man next to the maiden resembling Artemis is not made clear. The girl is proclaimed to be Artemis or Isis but the identity of the young man is disregarded for the time being. The nameless hero and heroine are then captured by brigands, not the band mentioned at the outset of the novel but rather a larger band of brigands, and taken to their hideout where they meet a Greek called Cnemon. It is at this moment (1.8) in the narrative that the leading characters' names are actually revealed. Between this scene (1.8) and the opening moments of the novel the characters had lost all of the divine aspects which the brigands had attributed to them, and they had become mortals in their eyes and accordingly could be named.

Cnemon, the hero's and heroine's fellow captive, reveals to Theagenes and Charicleia that he had been exiled from Athens on account of plots and lies of his step-mother Demainete and her slave Thisbe. Demainete had fallen in love with her step-son

and had attempted to seduce him, but Cnemon refused and spurned her advances and she like the Euripidean Phaedra plotted his doom. To make a long story short, Demainete, with the help of Thisbe, contrived the downfall of her step-son. She attains only the exile of Cnemon. This incident in Cnemon's life is interesting because he has taken the place of Hippolytus in the amorous intents of Demainete. The intertwining of the mythological, theatrical, and real-to-life adventures of Cnemon is the first example of many of Heliodorus' clues to the analogous identity of Theagenes.

Back at the camp of the brigands, Thyamis, the chief robber, has fallen in love with Charicleia. Inspired by a dream which tells him that he will have Charicleia and not have her, slay her and not slay her, he plans to marry Charicleia as soon as feasibly possible, but his plans came to naught since a rival band of brigands attacks and thereby diverts Thyamis' attention. Thyamis had interpreted the dream as implying that he would slay her in a sexual way, i.e. deflower, and not physically kill her. Thyamis returns to the cave where he had hidden Charicleia in order to kill her but mistakenly kills Thisbe, who had managed to get to Egypt after having caused the death of Demainete. In the hands of the dead Thisbe is a tablet containing a letter to Cnemon, in which Thisbe relates what had happened in Athens since his absence.

The actor Thyamis, like Theagenes and Charicleia, is looking to recapture his true identity. It seems that Thyamis, the son of an important priest of Memphis, had been expected to succeed his father in his religious office, but his younger brother had managed to have him exiled. The murder of Thisbe by Thyamis calls to mind the mythological story of Pyramus and Thisbe, the tragic Assyrian lovers. Aside from the similarity of both names, in both stories a cave is mentioned and people thought dead are actually alive.²⁹⁸ More importantly Thisbe parallels the actions of the nurse in the

²⁹⁸ Cf. Rattenbury and Lumb n. 16, n.1.

myth of Hippolytus. She planned to help her mistress seduce her step-son and had communicated important information through a letter. This letter, however, served the opposite purpose to that of the letter in the myth for it conveyed information which exonerated rather than accused. Once again the myth of Hippolytus has been brought to the fore.

Thyamis escapes the besieged village leaving behind a corpse which he thought was Charicleia. In the cave Charicleia, Cnemon and Theagenes agree to leave the ruined camp and head out to rendezvous in a designated town. Cnemon, who had been sent out first, meets Thyamis' father, Calasiris, who in turn relates his own adventures to Cnemon, the first story-teller of the novel. Calasiris, it seems, had left Memphis and gone to Delphi, where he met Charicles, a priest of Apollo. Charicles, the third story-teller of the novel, had revealed to Calasiris that he had a daughter by the name of Charicleia. Charicleia, it turns out, was not his real daughter, for she had been entrusted to the priest of Apollo by Sisimithres, an Ethiopian sage.

It then is revealed through a ribbon containing the story of Charicleia that she is the white daughter of the black king and queen of Ethiopia. It seems that when the royal couple were making love the queen had happened to look upon a painting of Andromeda,²⁹⁹ who was white, and this had caused the child to be born white.³⁰⁰ The queen, fearing that her husband might accuse her of adultery, exposed the child, which eventually makes its

²⁹⁹ For a discussion on the myth of Andromeda, its importance to the narrative of the *Aethiopica*, and its place in classical literature see A. Billault, "Le mythe de Persée et les *Ethiopiennes* d'Héliodore: légendes, représentations et fiction littéraire," *REG* 90 (1977): 56-68.

³⁰⁰ The true identity of Charicleia is revealed in book four; for an intriguing discussion of the strange conception of Charicleia and related literary incidents see M. D. Reeve, "Conceptions," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 215 (1989): 81-112.

way into the hands of Charicles via the Ethiopian sage. Once again myth plays an important role in the novel by not only merging the narrative of the novel with a mythological story but by also giving the impetus for the start of the novel.

At Delphi Charicleia had fallen in love with Theagenes, a Thessalian youth taking part in a religious ritual at Delphi, even though she had been betrothed to a relative of Charicles. As in all the novels the young couple yearn for each other and consequently suffer ill effects on account of their unrequited love. Calasiris, in the meanwhile, receives an oracle which tells him that he should return Charicleia to Ethiopia. Accepting that the oracle should be obeyed, he quits Delphi, taking Theagenes and Charicleia. From Delphi they sail to Zacynthus where a pirate named Trachinus captures them and takes them to the Heracleiote mouth of the Nile, where Trachinus' second in command, another love victim of Charicleia, mutinies against his captain. A battle ensues and the only survivors are Theagenes, Charicleia, and Calasiris.

It is at this point in the story, when the identities of the leading characters have been established, book five, that the novel actually begins. Theagenes, in the time that Calasiris had been filling Cnemon in on the backgrounds of Theagenes and Charicleia, had first been captured by the troops of the Persian king and sent to Oroondates, a satrap, and then by Bessan pirates under the command of Thyamis. Charicleia, on the other hand, had made it safely to the village where Calasiris and Cnemon were. When the unfortunate news of Theagenes' adventures are reported, Calasiris and Charicleia, disguised as beggars, head out to Bessa, only to discover that Theagenes and the pirates have gone to Memphis in order to install Thyamis in his brother's place as king. Charicleia and Calasiris then make for Memphis where, outside of the city, Thyamis and his brother are fighting it out for control.

This scene in the narrative is full of surprise recognitions: his two sons recognize Calasiris and refrain from fighting, and Theagenes recognizes Charicleia. All does not go well, however, for our hero and heroine: quite soon after the recognition scenes Calasiris dies and Thyamis goes into ritual mourning and seclusion, leaving Theagenes and Charicleia on their own.

Arsace, the wife of Oroondates, the satrap of Memphis, in the meanwhile begins to lust after Theagenes and arranges it so that he and Charicleia would stay in the royal residence with her. Charicleia is also in a quandary because she had been engaged to the son of a slave and would have been forced to go through the marriage if the engagement had not been broken off by Arsace. It seems that Theagenes had refused the amorous advances of Arsace and had only agreed to have sex with her if she put a stop to the marriage of Charicleia. Arsace agreed to do so only to her detriment, for when the slave's son found out that he would be denied Charicleia he went to Oroondates, who was away fighting a war against the Ethiopians, and told the satrap what his wife was plotting.

Back in Memphis Arsace attempts to keep Theagenes to his promise, but he refuses to carry out his end of the bargain. Arsace orders Theagenes to be tortured, and he is soon joined by Charicleia on the charge the Charicleia had killed her once-future mother-in-law. Oroondates, however, aware of what his wife was up to, orders that the young couple be brought to him. When the orders of Oroondates are made known, Arsace kills herself and the news of suicide is reported to the young couple in Euripidean style: τέθνηκεν Ἀρσάκη βρόχον ἀγχόνης ἀψαμένη (8.15.2). The line closely echoes the report given by the chorus to Theseus when he enquires about his wife: βρόχον κρεμαστὸν ἀγχόνης ἀνήψατο (*Hippolytus* 802).

The identification of Theagenes is now almost complete. Both the passage 4.10.5 and line 439 from Euripides' *Hippolytus*, ἐρᾶς; τί τοῦτο θαῦμα; σὺν πολλοῖς βροτῶν, in the passage began to identify Theagenes as Hippolytus. This identification is further strengthened by the clear cut allusions to the Hippolytus myth in the love affair of Demainete and Cnemon and by the absolving letter of Thisbe. The announcement of the death of Arsace in Euripidean language also reinforces further the Theagenes-Hippolytus persona: if Arsace is the Phaedra, Theagenes must be Hippolytus.

On the way to Oroondates the pair of lovers are taken as the first prisoners of war by the forces of the Ethiopian king Hydaspes, who is at Syene. Once the young couple has been taken to Hydaspes all of the characters leave Syene and go to Meröe, the capital of Ethiopia. In Meröe Theagenes and Charicleia are prepared to be sacrificed according to the ancient Ethiopian custom, which demands that the first prisoners of war should be sacrificed to Helios. The sacrificial victims, however, have to be virgins, and Heliodorus, like Tattius, includes tests of virginité in his novel: Charicleia and Theagenes must prove their innocence by holding on to a grate which will burn all but the pure. The couple passes the test with flying colors and therefore are judged suitable sacrifice.

As they are led to the sacrifice, Charicleia produces the ribbon and other tokens which can prove that she is the daughter of the king and queen of Ethiopia and thereby saves herself from being slaughtered. Sisimithres then comes forth and supports Charicleia's claim to nobility, and after many a debate she is recognized as the legitimate daughter of the Ethiopian royal couple.

Theagenes, on the other hand, does not fare so well. It does not matter an iota to the Ethiopians who he is or what he wants, and since his virginité has already been vouched for by the magic grate, he is led away to be sacrificed. The hero, however, is

bent on proving his true nature to the Ethiopians and consequently wrestles a bull which he defeats. This is the last piece of the puzzle of Theagene's identity: Hippolytus, in most versions of the myth, e.g. Euripides' *Hippolytus*, also encounters a bull, but he does not fare as well as Theagenes does since he dies.

Unlike his mythological model, Theagenes does not die in his encounter with a bull, but rather, he is judged that much more suitable to be sacrificed to the god Helios. Heliodorus, however, would not write a sad ending to his story, and so, just as he had employed a theatrical device, *in medias res*, at the beginning of the novel he uses *deus ex machina* at the end to bring about a happy ending. It just so happens that Charicles, Charicleia's foster father, had made his way to Ethiopia, where he prevents the sacrifice of Theagenes to the god Helios. Charicles reveals everything to everyone thereby causing all to rejoice that the legitimate daughter of the royal couple has been returned and to celebrate that such a fine specimen of youth as Theagenes has been spared death. The novel then ends with Theagenes and Charicleia wed and made priests of Helios.

In conclusion, Heliodorus begins his novel in an innovative way by using the stage technique of *in medias res* and thereby draws up a dramatic blueprint for his novel. He shows the reader a young couple on the beach and suggests the maiden is Artemis, but leaves unclear the identity of the young man. Using the *Hippolytus* as the source for the clues which reveal the identity of Theagenes, the reader solves the mystery of the analogous identity of the young man on the beach as Hippolytus. The identification is proper in that Hippolytus is the follower of Artemis and in that Theagenes and Hippolytus share common qualities and experiences. Theagenes is as chaste as Hippolytus, he is associated with Artemis, and fights off the unwanted sexual attentions of an older woman. A bull also plays an important part in Theagenes' story, much like the bull in his mythological counterpart. The Hippolytus facet of the novel is also

clarified by the letter of Thisbe, the amorous adventures of Cnemon with his step-mother, and the borrowing of lines from Euripides' *Hippolytus*.

CONCLUSION

My study has primarily focused on the relationship between the diminution of historical detail and the increase of mythological and literary allusion in the development of the ancient Greek novel. I have generally concentrated on the various literary functions of myth introduced into the novel as the genre evolved, and specifically on the central part which literary allusions to myth serve in the later novels.

The first chapter of the dissertation explored the available data on the five canonical novels. Chariton, as one may recall, wrote the earliest extant ancient Greek novel, and the abundance of historical minutiae in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* suggests that Chariton was relying upon the major preexisting prose form to give his erotic work a respectable veneer. Other preexisting forms, which serve as building blocks for the novel genre are epic, New Comedy, Alexandrian erotic poetry, and *periegesis*. A specific form, however, cannot be designated as *the* progenitor of the novel.

Pervo remarks that although there are many common ingredients shared by all the novels, such as aristocratic couples, pirates, travelling, and false-deaths, this does not mean that the combination of this list of ingredients will always result in a novel. It may be more profitable, though more difficult, to examine the nature of the audience of these erotic novels. The middle-class, the somewhat educated class, scribes, women, youths, the poor-in-spirit, and the intelligentsia have been put forth as possible readers. I have shown that clues to the nature of the audience of the ancient novel are found in the high literary complexity of the ancient Greek novel. The interplay between

the literary allusions to myth and the subtle manner in which they were included in the novel can only have been appreciated by an extremely educated author writing for an equally educated audience. This is not to say that the ancient Greek novel could not have been read by people other than the intelligentsia, but it does suggest that the author was very learned and may have expected *some* of his readers to understand and appreciate the intricacies and nuances of literary allusion.

Chapter II examined *Chaereas and Callirhoe* in terms of mythological allusion and Homeric influence. Myth and mythological allusions serve two functions in Chariton's novel; firstly, the author developed his major characters through analogue. Callirhoe was likened to Aphrodite, Ariadne, Artemis, Helen of Troy, the nymphs, and Medea. Chaereas was compared to Achilles, Nireus, Hippolytus, and Alcibiades.

Since the analogues were mythological in nature, I examined Chariton's accuracy in his use of literary antecedents for his analogues. This examination led me to the conclusion that Chariton relied heavily upon literary predecessors for the depiction of his characters and for the formation of his plot. For example, the persona of Callirhoe is greatly dependent upon the mythological Ariadne found in Paeon's account of the Theseus myth. Identical narratological elements, verbal echoes, and a similar treatment of the mythological Ariadne imply that Chariton may have either read Plutarch's *Theseus*, where Paeon's version of the Theseus-Ariadne myth is located, or Paeon himself. If the novelist did read Plutarch, a revision in the dating of *Chaereas and Callirhoe* is necessary.

The second literary use of myth is plot structuring through Homeric quotation. Chariton introduced into the narrative lines and passages from the Homeric epics, which, at first glance, may seem to be decoration or erudition. A closer look at these borrowings shows that the Homeric lines and passages had to be reinterpreted in an

intertextual manner. The original locations and backgrounds of the Homeric borrowings had to be considered when analyzing their new surroundings in the novel. Once this new interpretation is accomplished it is quite plain to see that the Homeric quality of the novel was not ornamental, at least in the first four books. The very idea that this reinterpretation should occur may help to identify the audience of the ancient Greek novel: only an educated reader could see what Chariton's plan was, and only an educated reader could reinterpret the Homeric lines and passages.

Characterization through mythological analogue and plot structuring through Homeric borrowings occur most frequently in the first four books of the novel. In the second-half of the work there is a noticeable drop in the employment of myth, Homer, and allusion. The diminution of mythological detail gives way to historical features, as witnessed by the importance given to the "Battle of Champions" passage. Overall, the historical nature of Chariton's opus overwhelms the mythological quality.

I noted in Chapter III that the mythological in Xenophon's *Ephesiaca* is minimal and the historical almost nonexistent. The approaches taken to the analysis of this novel, characterization through myth, the oracle as history, and the adventures of Habrocomes and Antheia as having analogues in myths, however, point to the possibility that Xenophon may have based his plot on some Euripidean plays. Echoes of the *Ino*, the *Hippolytus*, and the *Electra* resonate throughout the play, with special emphasis on the *Hippolytus*.

Xenophon likens Antheia to Artemis, and partially derives Habrocomes' character from the stories of Hippolytus, Bellerophon, and perhaps even Potiphar. Part of the *Ephesiaca's* plot derives its narrative sequence from the *Hippolytus*: the women in love with Habrocomes, Manto and Kyno, mirror the actions of Phaedra. A second set of love stories, those of Hippothous and Hyperanthes, and Aegialeus and Thelxinoe, are included

by Xenophon in order to counterbalance the actions of Manto and Kyno. The homosexual relationship of Hippothous and Hyperanthes, doomed from the start, parallels the adventures of the novel's hero and heroine, and the marriage of Aegialeus and Thelxinoe seems to be presented by Xenophon as the marriage *par excellence* which the young couple should emulate with due moderation.

Notwithstanding Witt's theory that Xenophon would have been at a loss without the myth of Io, mythological allusions are very limited in the *Ephesiaca*. This may be due to the possible abridgement of the novel, but one cannot be sure. What is certain is that the mythological details outnumber the historical aspects, which shows that even by the time of Xenophon, the genre was moving away from the custom which demanded that prose should be used only for the writing of history.

Chapter IV presented an analysis of the relationship between, literary and mythological allusions and the *aitia* in *Daphnis and Chloe*, and the function of the *aitia* and the story or myth of Chloe. There are problems, however, when examining *Daphnis and Chloe*, because it does not seem to resemble structurally its novelistic forerunners. This dissimilarity has caused some scholars to label this novel as a sub-genre.

The analysis of this novel comprised inquiries into the possible historical characteristics of the novel, mythological allusions, and the importance and function of the *aitia*. The historical facet of *Daphnis and Chloe* is found in the preface, in which Longus inversely mirrors the *archaeologia* of Thucydides. The juxtaposition of Thucydidean phraseology with Longus' preface results in the conclusion that the novelist was acknowledging his literary predecessors, specifically Thucydides, but at the same time, distancing himself from them. The words εἶδον, γραφήν, ἱστορίαν, φήμην, ἰδόντα, ἀντιγράψαι, ἀναζητησάμενος, ἐξηγητήν, βιβλους, βλέπωσι, and γράφειν form the procedure, according to Longus, by which one may go about writing history. The author,

however, does not go on to write history, but only wants to show that he knows how to write history. It is true that these words may also be applied to painting, but in light of the direct influence of Thucydides, these words have to be understood in historiographical terms. History, in fact, is not the only genre acknowledged in the preface, because the words ἡμῖν δὲ ὁ θεὸς παράσχοι σωφρονοῦσι τὰ τῶν ἄλλων γράφειν clearly recall the opening lines of the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, and *Aeneid*.

Some characterization through mythological analogue is used in this novel. Daphnis is likened to Dionysus, and the *aition* of a spring called Daphnis is mentioned. Chloe is said to be a Bacchant, and is subtly likened to Echo. Gnathon, the parasite of the novel, compares his situation through mythological *exempla* to those of Anchises, Branchus, and Ganymede. The important point of the literary allusion of the novel is that Longus relies upon Hellenistic authors, primarily Theocritus, as the source for his myths.

The phrase, παρθένον ἐξ ἧς Ἔρως μῦθον ποιῆσαι, is all-important because it is the author's own statement of purpose. Longus wanted to write the myth of Chloe, and decided to do so by giving his readers the *aition* of Chloe's change from a virgin to a sexually experienced wife. He supplied three *aitia* dealing with sex, which set the stage for the *aition* of Chloe. The *aition* is spread throughout the entire novel and reaches its climax in the last part of the fourth book. Included in the same book is the often overlooked *aition* of the spring called Daphnis, which may foreshadow the sexual union between the hero and heroine of the novel: Daphnis, like his namesake spring, finally ὕδωρ ἐπωχέτευσε (4.1) at the end of the novel.

Chapter V discussed the use of myth in *Leucippe and Clitophon* as having a programmatic function. Myth directed the action of both the plot of the individual chapter and of the overall novel. The first instance of myth, the story of Europa, in the

novel derived its impetus from an historical work: Herodotus seems to have served as the author upon whom Achilles Tatius, much like Longus and his use of Thucydides, based his introduction. The historical aspect of the introduction is not that apparent, but nevertheless it still is there. It seems that Tatius, even though far removed from Chariton's time, followed the novelistic tradition of giving the opening to his work an historical flavor.

In *Leucippe and Clitophon* myths program the plot of each chapter and dictate the development of character. I did not analyze the development of character through mythological analogue because Laplace had already done so. Instead I placed emphasis on the relationship between the inclusion of myths in each chapter and the progress of the narrative.

In Chapter 1 Eros and the myths associated with him dictated the movement the first chapter, and consequently of the entire novel. Four *aitia* on the wine set up the romantic relationship between Leucippe and Clitophon, likened the drugging of Conops to that of Polyphemus, and set the stage for a debate on heterosexual and homosexual love. In the third chapter Evanthes' paintings dictated the plot, and Love and War, in the mythological guise of Ares and Aphrodite, did the same for chapter four. Metamorphosis was the theme of the fifth and sixth chapters, in particular the transformation of Leucippe, and it paralleled the change in the lighting of the scenery. The legalistic nature of the seventh chapter foreshadowed the trials of Leucippe and Melite in the final chapter.

Literary allusion played a great role in *Leucippe and Clitophon*. Tatius recalled Herodotus, Athenaeus, Theocritus, Homer, and the enigmatic oracle found in *Anthologia Palatina* 14.34, and through references to the mythological elements found in these authors' works Tatius constructed a novel dependent solely upon myth for its narrative.

Even when he employed an historian, namely Herodotus, he only selected mythological subjects, such as the story of Europa and the story of the Phoenix.

Chapter VI focused on the analogous identity of Theagenes in the *Aethiopica*. Heliodorus seems to be writing a mystery in which clues to the mythological identity of the hero of the novel are to be found in the tragic subtext of the novel.³⁰¹ Heliodorus uses passages, lines, and myths found in the *Persians* of Aeschylus, the *Ajax* and *Oedipus Rex* of Sophocles, the *Phoenicians*, *Medea*, *Hecuba*, *Heraclidae*, *Orestes*, and *Hippolytus* of Euripides to enable the reader to identify Theagenes. The *Hippolytus* supplies the majority of signs which point to the solution of the analogous identity.

Literary allusion is not limited to tragedy. Heliodorus also includes references to Hesiod, Homer, Plato, Aratus, and Lucian; even historical works are employed. The historical, however, is limited to affording some authenticity to the novel.

In Heliodorus, myth reaches its ancient apex as a literary tool. In Chariton history gives the backdrop for the novel, sets the stage for the action, identifies the characters, and puts the reader at ease by supplying him with a literary genre, although new, which owes a great deal to history. Myth is marginal in Chariton. Xenophon, in possible imitation of Chariton, begins his work by identifying the leading characters of his novel in an historical manner. Longus breaks away from the historical approach to novelistic writing by preferring to show that he knows historical theory but opts, instead, to use idyllic myth as the source for his characters' delineation and for the structure of his novel. Achilles Tatius follows the lead of Longus and like the author of *Daphnis and Chloe* begins his work with an ekphrasis which has undertones of history but for the most part uses myth to lend structure.

³⁰¹ In a recently published essay, "The *Aithiopika* of Heliodoros: Narrative as Riddle," J. R. Morgan examines several passages in the novel which must be interpreted. These passages are in the form of riddles, whose solutions are found in the narrative.

Heliiodorus does away with the historical or ekphrastic manner of opening a novel and chooses to use the stage techniques of *in medias res* (to begin) and *deus ex machina* (to end). Like the Sophistic novelists he employs myth, though more subtly. No longer are the characters constantly likened to mythological personae, no longer is Homer used to dictate plot or mythological context, no longer is the mythological element one of many components of the novel: mythical allusion is *the* constituent of the *Aethiopica*. Only with the help of the mythological subjects of the tragic corpus can the novel be properly understood: Heliiodorus, at the outset of the novel, gives his reader a mystery to be solved and clues to be found; hence the solution to the riddle of Theagenes' identity, if the reader plays the role of detective and finds the evidence and literary culprit in the tragic-mythological substratum of the novel.

REFERENCES

- Achilles Tattius. *Achilles Tattius: Leucippe and Clitophon*. Ed. Ebbe Vilborg. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1955.
- Achilles Tattius*. Trans. S. Gaselee. 1917. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1969.
- Altheim, F. *Literatur und Gesellschaft im ausgehenden Altertum*. Vol. I. Halle, 1948.
- Anderson, Graham. "The Mystic Pomegranate and the Vine of Sodom: Achilles Tattius 3.6." *American Journal of Philology* 100 (1979): 516-8.
- Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelist at Play*. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1982.
- Ancient Fiction: The Novel in the Graeco-Roman World*. London/Sydney: Croom Helm, 1984.
- "Achilles Tattius: a New Interpretation." *The Greek Novel AD1-1985*. Ed. Roderick Beaton. London/New York: Croom Helm, 1988. 190-3.
- "The *pepaideumenos* in Action: Sophists and their Outlook in the Early Roman Empire." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*. 2.33.1 (1989): 79-208.
- Aristotle. *Poetics*. Ed. D.W. Lucas. Oxford: Oxford Classical Texts, 1968.
- Bartsch, Shadi. *Decoding the Ancient Novel*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1989.
- Behr, C. A. *Aelius Aristides and The Sacred Tales*. Chicago: Argonaut, Inc., 1968.
- Billault, A. "Le mythe de Persée et les *Ethiopiennes* d'Héliodore: légendes, représentations et fiction littéraire." *REG* 90 (1977): 56-68.
- Bonnard, Andre. *Greek Civilization: From Euripides to Alexandria*. New York: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1961.
- Borgeaud, Philippe. *The Cult of Pan in Ancient Greece*. Trans. Kathleen Atlass and James Redfield. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Bowie, Ewen. "Theocritus' Seventh Idyll, Philetas and Longus." *Classical Quarterly* 35 (1985): 67-91.

- "The Readership of Greek Novels in the Ancient World." *The Search for the Ancient Novel*. Ed. James Tatum. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1994. 435-60.
- Brillante, Carlo. "History and the Historical Interpretation of Myth." *Approaches to Greek Myth*. Ed. Lowell Edmunds. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins UP, 1990.
- Bühler, W. "Das Element des Visuellen in der Eingangsszene von Heliodors Aithiopika." *Wiener Studien* 10 (1976): 177-85.
- Bürger, K. "Zu Xenophon of Ephesos," *Hermes* 27 (1892): 36-67.
- Cauderlier, Patrice. "Réalités égyptiennes chez Héliodore." *Le monde Grec: Actes du colloque international tenu à l'École Normal Supérieure (Paris 17-19 d'cembre 1987)*. Paris: Presses de L'École Normale Supérieure, 1992. 221-231.
- Chalk, H. H. O. "Eros and the Lesbian Pastorals of Longos." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 80 (1960) 32-51.
- Chariton. *Le Roman de Chairéas et Callirhoé*. Trans. Georges Molinié. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1979.
- Deligiorgis, Stavros. "Longus' Art in Brief Lives." *Philological Quarterly* 53 (1974): 1-9.
- Dowden, Ken. *The Uses of Greek Mythology*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Durham, Donald Blythe. "Parody in Achilles Tattius." *Classical Philology* 33 (1938): 1-19.
- Eckermann, Johann Peter. "Sonntag, den 20. März 1831." *Eckermanns Gespräche mit Goethe in den letzten Jahren seines Leben*. Basel: Verlag Birkhäser, 1945.
- Edwards, Douglas E. "Surviving the Web of Roman Power: Religion and Politics in the Acts of the Apostles, Josephus, and Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*." *Images of Empire*. Ed. Loveday Alexander. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Elsom, Helen E. "Callirhoe: Displaying the Phallic Woman." *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*. Ed. Amy Richlin. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992. 212-30.
- Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina cum Planudeis et Appendice Nova*. Ed. Fred. Dübner. Paris: Instituti Imperialis Franciae, 1864.
- Erim, Kenan T. *Aphrodisias: City of Venus Aphrodite*. New York: Facts on File Publications, 1986.
- Euripides. *Fabulae*. Ed. J. Diggle. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.

- Fayûm Town and Their Papyri*. London, 1900.
- Festugière, André-Jean. *Personal Religion Among the Greeks*. Berkeley, 1954.
- Feuillatre, E. *Études sur les Éthiopiennes D'Héliodore: contribution à la connaissance du roman grec*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966.
- Frye, Northrop. *The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1976.
- Fusillo, Massimo. "Textual Patterns and Narrative Situations in the Greek Novel," *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* vol. 1. Ed. H. Hofmann. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1988.
- Garson, R. W. "Notes on Some Homeric Echoes in Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*." *Acta Classica* 18 (1975): 137-40.
- Giangrande, G. "On the Origins of Greek Romance." *Eranos* 60 (1962): 132-59.
- Gill, Christopher. "Plato on Falsehood - not Fiction." *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*. Eds. Christopher Gill and T. P. Wiseman. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1993. 38-87.
- Green, P. "Longus, Antiphon, and the Topography of Lesbos." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 102 (1982): 210-14.
- Hadas, Moses. "Cultural Survival and the Origins of Fiction." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 51 (1952): 253-60.
- Three Greek Romances*. Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing, 1953.
- Hellenistic Culture*. New York: Columbia UP, 1972.
- Hägg, Tomas. "Die Ephesiaka des Xenophon Ephesios - Original oder Epitome?" *Classica et Mediaevalia* 27 (1966): 118-161.
- Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances*. Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen, 1971.
- "The Naming of the Characters in the Romance of Xenophon Ephesius," *Eranos* 69 (1971): 25-59
- The Novel in Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- "Callirhoe and Parthenope: The Beginnings of the Historical Novel." *CIAnt* 6 (1987): 184-204.

- "The Beginnings of the Historical Novel." *The Greek Novel AD1-1985*. Ed. Roderick Beaton. London: Croom Helm, 1988. 169-81.
- Haight, Elizabeth. "Ancient Greek Romances and Modern Mystery Stories." *The Classical Journal* 46 (1950): 5-10.
- Harlan, E. C. "The Description of Paintings as a Literary Device and Its Application in Achilles Tatius." Diss. Columbia University, 1965.
- Heiserman, Arthur. *The Novel before the Novel: Essays and Discussions about the Beginnings of Prose Fiction in the West*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.
- Helms, Johannes. *Character Portrayal in the Romance of Chariton*. The Hague: Mouton, 1966.
- Herodotus. *Historiae*. Ed. Carol Hude. Oxford: Oxford Classical Texts, 1954.
- Hesiod. *Carmina*. Ed. A. Rzach. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1958.
- Hetteger, G. "Über des Mythologie bei Chariton." I^o Teil 42. *Jahresberichte des Staatsgymnasium Krumau*. 1914/1915. 1-14.
- Homer. *Opera*. Ed. Thomas W. Allen. Oxford: Oxford Classical Texts, 1952.
- Hunter, R. L. *A Study of Daphnis & Chloe*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.
- Jones, C. P. "Hellenistic History in Chariton of Aphrodisias." *Chiron* 22 (1992): 91-102.
- Juvenal. *Satires*. Trans. and Eds. Pierre de Labriolle and François Villeneuve. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1983.
- Kerényi, K. *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1927.
- - - -*Der Antike Roman*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971.
- Kestner, Joseph. "Ekphrasis as Frame in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*," *Classical World* 67 (1974): 166-71.
- Keyes, Clinton Walker Keyes. "The Structure of Heliodorus' *Aethiopika*." *Studies in Philology* 19 (1922): 42-51.
- Konstan, David. *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Le Texte Du Roman*. Paris: Mouton, 1970.

- Revolution in Poetic Language*. Trans. Margaret Waller. New York: Columbia UP, 1984.
- Laplace, M. "Les légendes troyennes dans le 'roman' de Chariton *Chairéas et Callirhoe*." *REG* 93 (1980): 83-125.
- "Légende et fiction chez Achille Tatius: Les personnages de Leucippé et de Iô." *BAGB* (1983): 311-18.
- "Achille Tatius, 'Leucippé et Clitophon': des fables au roman de formation." *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* vol. 4. Ed. H. Hofmann. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1991. 35-56.
- Lavagnini, B. *Studi sul romanzo greco*. 1921. Messina/Firenza: G. d'Anna, 1950.
- Letters of Alciphron, Aelian, and Philostratus*. Trans. Allen Rogers Benner and Francis H. Fobes. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1948.
- Lightfoot, C. S. "Fact and Fiction - the third siege of Nisbis (A.D. 350)." *Historia* 38 (1988): 107-25.
- Lindsay, J. *Daphnis & Chloe*. London: The Daimon Press, 1948.
- Longus. *Longus: Pastorales*. Trans. and Ed. Jean-René Vieillefond. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1987.
- Lucian. Ed. Carol Jacobitz. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1966.
- Ludivosky, J. *Recky Roman Dobrodruzny, Le roman grec d'aventures: étude sur sa nature et son origine*. Prague: Publ. Fac. Philos. Prague, 1925.
- MacLeod, A. M. G. "Physiology and medicine in a Greek novel: Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 89 (1969): 97-105.
- MacQueen, Bruce D. "Longus and the Myth of Chloe." *Illinois Classical Studies* 10 (1985): 119-34.
- Myth, Rhetoric, and Fiction*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1990.
- Magie, David. *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1950.
- Maróth, M. "Le siège de Nisbe en 350 ap. J.-C. d'après des sources syriennes." *Acta Antiqua Hungarica* 17 (1979): 239-43.
- Martial. *Epigrammata*. Ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1990.
- Mason, H. J. "The Roman Government in Greek Sources." *Phoenix* 24 (1970): 150-9.

- “Longus and the Topography of Lesbos.” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 109 (1979): 149-63.
- Mazal, O. “Die Satzstruktur in den *Aithiopika* des Heliodor von Emesa.” *Wiener Studien* 71 (1958): 116-131.
- McCulloh, William E. *Longus*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1970.
- Merkelbach, R. “Daphnis und Chloe: Roman und Mysterium.” *Antaios* 1 (1960) 47-60.
- Roman und Mysterium*. München/Berlin: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962.
- Die Hirten des Dionysos. Die Dionysos-Mysterien der römischen Kaiserzeit und der bukolische Roman des Longus*. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1988.
- Mittelstadt, Michael C. “Longus: *Daphnis and Chloe* and the Pastoral Tradition.” *Classica et Mediaevalia* 27 (1966): 162-77.
- “Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe*, and Roman Narrative Painting.” *Latomus* 26 (1967): 752-61.
- Morgan, J. R. “History, Romance, and Realism in the *Aithiopika*.” *CLAnt* 1 (1982) 221-65.
- “The *Aithiopika* of Heliodoros: Narrative as Riddle.” *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*. eds. J. R. Morgan and Richard Stoneman. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- “The Sense of an Ending: the Conclusion of Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*.” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 119 (1989): 299-320.
- “Reader and Audience in the ‘*Aithiopika*’ of Heliodoros.” in *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* vol. 4. Ed. H. Hofmann. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1991. 85-103.
- Müller, C. W. “Chariton von Aphrodisias und die Theorie des Romans in der Antike.” *Antike und Abendland* 22 (1976): 115-36.
- O'Connor, Eugene. “A Note on the Nightingale's Itsy Song in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*.” *Classical Bulletin* 63 (1987): 82-84.
- Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Ed. Rudolph Merkel. Leipzig: Teubner, 1875.
- Oxyrhynchus Papyri* vol. VIII. London, 1910.
- Packinska, M. “Motywy Homerowe w romansie Charitona.” *Meander* 21 (1966): 149-57.

- Paduano, G. "Uno dei tanti: l'eroe comico di Menandro." *Introduzione à Menandro, Commedie, a cura di G.P.* Milan, 1980.
- Papanikolaou, A.D. *Chariton-Studien: Untersuchungen zur Sprache und Chronologie der griechischen Romane.* Göttingen, 1973.
- Xenophon Ephesius: Ephesiacorum Libri V.* Leipzig: BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1973.
- Papyri Michaelidae.* Aberdeen, 1955.
- Parke, H. W. *Greek Oracles.* London: Hutchinson University Library, 1967.
- The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor.* London: Croom Helm, 1985.
- Perry, B. E. *The Ancient Romances: A Literary Historical Account of Their Origins.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.
- Pervo, Richard I. *Profit With Delight.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Philippides, Marios. "Longus: Antiquity's Innovative Novelist." Diss. State University of New York at Buffalo, 1978.
- "The 'Digressive' *Aitia* in Longus." *Classical World* 74 (1981): 193-99.
- Picard, C. *Éphèse et Claros.* Paris: Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 1922.
- Pinheiro, Futre Mária. "Aspects de la problématique sociale et économique dans le roman d'Héliodore." *Piccolo Mondo Antico: Le donne, gli amori, i costumi, il mondo reale nel romanzo greco.* Eds. P. Liviabella Furiani and A. M. Scarcella. Perugia: Università degli Studi di Perugia, 1989. 15-42.
- "Calasiris' Story and its Narrative Significance in Heliodorus' 'Aethiopika'." in *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* vol. 4. Ed. H. Hofmann. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1991. 69-83.
- Plato. *Platonis Opera* vol. 4. Ed. John Burnet. 1902. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992.
- Plutarch. *Vies.* Trans. and Eds. Robert Flacelière, Émile Chambry, and Marcel Jumeaux. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1964.
- Pollard, John. *Birds in Greek Life and Myth.* Great Britain: Latimer Trend & Company Ltd., 1977.
- Rattenbury, R. M. "Chastity and Chastity Ordeals in the Ancient Greek Romances." *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical & Literary Society, Literary and Historical Section* 1 (1926): 59-71.

- Reardon, B. P. *Courants Littéraires Grecs des IIe et IIIe Siècles Après J.-C.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1971.
- "Novels and Novelties, or Mysteriuser and Mysteriuser." *The Mediterranean World: Papers Presented to Gilbert Bagnani.* Peterborough, Ontario: Trent University, 1975. 79-100.
- - - - -*The Form of Greek Romance.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991.
- Reeve, Michael D. *Longus: Daphnis et Chloe.* Leipzig: Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Latinorum Teubneriana, 1982.
- "Conceptions." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 215 (1989): 81-112.
- Rhetores Graeci.* Ed. Leonard Spengel. Leipzig: Teubner, 1883-1886.
- Rhetorique a Herrenius.* Trans. and Ed. Guy Achard. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1989.
- Rocca, Rosanna. "Eliodoro e i due «Ippoliti» euripidei." *Materiali e Contributi per la Storia della Narrativa Greco-Latina 1.* Perugia: Istituto di Filologia Latina Dell'Universita di Perugia, 1976. 25-31.
- Rogers, Guy MacLean. *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos: Foundation Myths of a Roman City.* London: Routledge, 1991.
- Rohde, E. *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer.* 1876. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1960.
- Rohde, Georg. "Longus und die Bukolik." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 86 (1937) 23-49.
- Rougemont, Georges. "Delphes chez Héliodore." *Le monde Grec: Actes du colloque international tenu à l'École Normale Supérieure (Paris 17-19 d'octobre 1987).* Paris: Presses de L'École Normale Supérieure, 1992. 93-100.
- Ruiz-Montero, Consuelo. "Una Observacion Para La Cronologia De Caritón De Afrodiasias." *Estudios Clásicos* 24 (1980): 63-69.
- "The Structural Pattern of the Ancient Greek Romance and the *Morphology of the Folk tale of V. Propp.*" *Fabula* 22 (1981): 228-38.
- "Caritón de Afrodiasias y el mundo real." *Piccolo Mondo Antico: Le donne, gli amori, i costumi, il mondo reale nel romanzo antico.* Perugia: Università degli Studi di Perugia, 1989. 107-50.
- Sandy, Gerald N. *Heliodorus.* Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1982.
- Scarcella, A. M. "La donna nel romanzo di Longo Sofista." *GIF n.s.* 3 (1972): 63-94.

- Schmeling, Gareth. *Chariton*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1974.
- Xenophon of Ephesus*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1980.
- Schönberger, Otto. *Hirtengeschichten von Daphnis und Chloe*. Berlin, 1960.
- Schwartz, E. *Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman*. 1896. Berlin: DeGruyter, 1943.
- Schwyzler, E. *Dialectorum Graecarum Exempla epigraphica potiora*. Leipzig, 1923.
- Scobie, Alexander. *Aspects of the Ancient Romance and its Heritage*. Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1969.
- More Essays on the Ancient Romance and its Heritage*. Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1973.
- Segal, Charles. "The Trials at the End of Achilles Tatius' *Clitophon and Leucippe*: Doublets and Complementaries." *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 3rd ser. 2 (1984): 82-91.
- Shepard, Arthur. *Sea Power in Ancient History: The Story of the Navies of Classic Greece and Rome*. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1925.
- Sinko, T. "De ordine quo erotici scriptores Graeci sibi successisse videantur." *Eos* 41 (1940-1946): 113-58.
- Sophocles. *Fabulae*. Ed. A.C. Pearson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Steiner, G. "The graphic analogue from myth in Greek Romance." *Classical Studies Presented to B. E. Perry*. Urbana, Illinois, 1969. 123-37.
- Stephens, Susan A. "Who Read Ancient Novels?" *The Search for the Ancient Novel*. Ed. James Tatum. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1994. 405-18.
- Szepessy, T. "Die Aithiopika des Heliodorus und der griechische sophistische Liebesroman." *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 4 (1957): 241-259.
- "Le siège de Nisbe et la chronologie d'Héliodore." *Acta Antiqua Hungarica* 24 (1976): 247-76.
- Thiele, G. "Zum griechischen Roman." *Aus der Anomia*. Ed. C. Robert. Berlin, 1890. 124-33.
- Thucydides. *Historiae*. Ed. Henry Stuart Jones. Oxford: Oxford Classical Texts, 1953.
- Todd, F. A. *Some Ancient Novels*. Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1940.

- Trapp, M. B. "Plato's *Phaedrus* in Second-Century Greek Literature," in *Antonine Literature*. Ed. D. A. Russell. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990. 141-74.
- Turcan, R. "Le roman «initiatique»." *RHR* 163 (1963): 149-99.
- Turner, Paul. "*Daphnis and Chloe: An Interpretation.*" *Greece and Rome* 7 (1960): 117-23.
- Valley, Gunnar Valley. *Über den Sprachgebrauch des Longus*. Uppsala: Berling, 1926.
- Vergil. *Opera*. Ed. R. A. B. Mynors. 1969. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1983.
- Vernant, Jean-Pierre. *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*. New York: Zone Books, 1988.
- Veyne, Paul. *Did the Greeks Believe in Their Myths?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Vieillefond, Jean-René. *Pastorales (Daphnis et Chloé)*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1987.
- Vogliano, A. "Un papiro di Achille Tazio." *Stud. Ital. di Fil. Class.* 15 (1938): 121-30.
- Walden, J.W.H. "Stage-Terms in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 5 (1894): 1-44.
- Weinrich, O. "Heliodor und sein Werk." *Der griechische Liebesroman*. Zurich: Artemis, 1962. 32-55.
- Wesserling, Berber. "The Audience of the Ancient Novels." *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel*. Groningen, 1987. 67-79.
- Wilcken, U. "Ein neuer griechischer Roman." *Hermes* 28 (1893): 161-93.
- Wilhelm, F. "Zu Achilles Tattius." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*. 57 (1902): 55-75.
- Williamson, Margaret. "The Greek romance." *The Progress of Romance*. Ed. Jean Radford. London and New York, 1986. 23-45.
- Winkler, John J. "The Mendacity of Kalarisis and the narrative structure of Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*." *Yale Classical Studies* 27 (1982): 93-158.
- Witt, R. E. *Isis in the Graeco-Roman World*. New York: Cornell UP, 1971.
- Xenophon. *Xénophon D'Éphèse. Les Éphésiaques ou Le roman D'Habrocomès et D'Anthia*. Trans. Georges Dalymeda. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1926.

Zeitlin, Froma. "Configurations of Rape in Greek Myth." in *Rape*. Eds. Sylvania Tomaselli and Roy Porter. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1986. 122-51.

Zimmerman, F. "Chariton und die Geschichte." *Sozialökonomische Verhältnisse in alten Orient und klassischen Altertum, Tagung der Sektion Alte Geschichte der Deutscher Historiker Gesellschaft 12-7 Okt. 1959*. Berlin, 1961. 329-345.

VITA

The author, Edmund Paul Cueva, was born in Esmeraldas, Ecuador. In May, 1987, Mr. Cueva received his degree of Bachelor of Arts in Latin from the University of South Florida, Tampa. In August, 1987, he entered the University of Florida, Gainesville, receiving the degree of Master of Arts in May, 1989. He received his second M.A. in Classical Studies from Loyola University Chicago in December of 1993. In August, 1993, Mr. Cueva was granted a dissertation fellowship at Loyola University Chicago, enabling him to complete his Doctor of Philosophy in 1994.

Approval Sheet

The thesis submitted by Edmund P. Cueva has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Brian M. Lavelle, Director
Associate Professor, Department of Classical Studies
Loyola University Chicago

Dr. John F. Makowski
Associate Professor, Department of Classical Studies
Loyola University Chicago

Dr. Edwin P. Menes
Assistant Professor, Department of Classical Studies
Loyola University Chicago

Dr. Gareth L. Schmeling
Professor, Department of Classics
University of Florida

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

31 October 1994
Date

B. M. Lavelle
Director's Signature