Joint PhD in Classics: Università degli Studi di Padova and Swansea University

Università degli Studi di Padova

DIPARTIMENTO di: Scienze del mondo antico

SCUOLA DI DOTTORATO DI RICERCA IN: Scienze linguistiche, filologiche e letterarie

INDIRIZZO: Filologia Classica

CICLO: XXIII

COMMENTARY ON THE FIRST BOOK OF THE *EPHESIACA* OF XENOPHON OF EPHESUS

Vice Direttore della Scuola: Ch.mo Prof. Guido Baldassarri

Coordinatore d'indirizzo: Ch.mo Prof. Lorenzo Nosarti

Supervisors:

Ch.mo Prof. Davide Susanetti

Professor John Morgan (Swansea University)

Dottorando: Aldo Carlo Fernando Tagliabue

Signed declaration

This thesis has been composed by the candidate, the work is the candidate's own and the work has not been submitted for any other degree or professional qualification except as specified.

Signed:

Acknowledgments

CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

For the sake of brevity, I have used the following abbreviations of frequently occurring names throughout the commentary:

Xen. = Xenophon of Ephesus.

Eph. = *Ephesiaca*.

Char. = Chariton.

Ach. = Achilles Tatius.

Hld. = Heliodorus.

n. (as in the example 1.2.3 n.: καλός): parallel note that you may wish to consult.

In addition, as I have already shown in the list of the contents, every section has one abbreviation which will be used every time a lemma of the commentary refers to the introduction.

This is the list:

AIM = "The aim of the work"

GI = "General issues about Xen."

NA = "Narratology in the *Ephesiaca*"

LI = "Literary interpretation"

APP = "Appendix"

THE AIM OF THE WORK

One controversial topic in the study of Greek novels is the nature of Xenophon's *Ephesiaca*: as is commonly known, this text is quite different from the other four that constitute the traditional corpus, because it has a 'very simple style'[1] and its central books contain passages that seem strangely abbreviated.

Over the past centuries, different interpretations of the nature of the novel have been suggested: above all, in 1892 Bürger argued that the text that we have is an abridged version of the original. Since then, some scholars have questioned this theory: while Hägg 2004a directly and persuasively refutes Bürger's (1892) view, others suggest new explanations that rescue Xenophon as a consistent writer.

Above all, O'Sullivan 1994 illustrates that the text is constructed in a formulaic way, from single expressions to scenes, and concludes that it has an oral origin.[2] Also Upton 2006, comparing Xen.'s novel with some passages of the *Gospel of Mark*, addresses the issue of the orality, but from a new perspective: this would not affect the creation, but the reception of the novel.[3] Similarly, Shea 2008, starting from the portrait of Anthia in the procession and the embroidery of the canopy,[4] where the protagonists of the novel are depicted as statues, underlines the importance of *ekphraseis* in the text and suggests that it could be the script of a performance given in an aristocratic house in front of real ancient sculptures.[5]

A second explanation is literary: in Ruiz Montero's (2003d) view, lexical repetitions, together with the frequent use of the particle καί, suggests a literary "contrived simplicity", a style adopted by other writers of the Imperial Era and described by some contemporary rhetors.[6] Under this interpretation, Xen. would not consistently quote from previous models, as the other novelists do, but he would draw from a smaller number of authors and without textual allusions. For instance, Laplace 1994 and Doulamis 2007 list some themes of the Eph. which have a Platonic and Stoic colour.

A third approach, then, is based on "narratology", which shows that in the Eph. the author has control over the text.[7] First, Garson 1981 and Konstan 1994 illustrate how the protagonists' love

---

[1] Hägg 1983, 21.

[2] See esp. O' Sullivan 1994, 30-98.

[3] Upton 2006 expands on the general distinction made by Hägg 2004c between the composition and reception of Greek novels.

[4] See Eph 1.2.5-7 and 1.8.2-3.

[5] See Shea 1998. Another element that proves her theory is the final dedication to Artemis made by Xen. of his work (see Eph. 5.15.2). On this passage see also König 2007, 2, who gives another interpretation: in his view Xen. wants to create an image of his text here as 'being on the borderline between orality and literacy'.

[6] For more on Xen.'s style, see Ruiz Montero 1982. On the literary "contrived simplicity", see Rutherford 1997, 118-123.

[7] Since in the Eph. the narrator is mostly onniscient and external and important internal narrators are missing, I would use "author" as another definition of the main narrator of the novel.

story is built in a symmetrical way. Secondly, Morgan argues that Xen.'s originality lies in his introduction of a 'new structure of pursuit, which is powered by the identically clockwise movements of his characters'.[8] A similar conclusion is also drawn by Capra forth.: in his view the many interconnections between the journeys of Anthia, Habrocomes and Hippothous prove the existence in the narrator of an artistic intention, which follows the ancient model of the periplus and might be inspired by the structure of the Homeric *Catalogue of Ships*.[9] Chew 1998 and Bierl 2006, instead, try to explain why the central books of the novel are different: the former indicates the presence in Xen.'s representation of Eros of a shifting focalisation, which changes from external to internal at the beginning of the second book. The latter, conversely, describes the narrative style as irrational, as if based on a sort of "dream sequence", which is absent at the beginning and at the end of the work.

The fourth interpretation is philological and more general: Thomas argues that Xen.'s text, as that of other novels, might be fluid and, therefore, other versions of it may have circulated in antiquity.[10] Although this phenomenon is clearly in evidence in "biographic" romances, such as the *Alexander Romance*, *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* and the *Life of Aesop*,[11] it might occur also in the Eph., because of the uncertain status of its text and the lack of a real name for the author (GI 4).[12] Similarly, Hunter 1997 argues that the peculiarity of the Eph. is its 'open form'.[13]

Finally, Merkelbach's theory 1962 needs to be considered separately. In his view, Greek novels, almost by definition, hide a mystic meaning and the coexistence in the Eph. of a lunar and a solar principle would suggest that the text that we have is a conflation of an original *Isisredaktion* and a later *Heliosredaktion*. Although this scholar rightly notes the lack of consistency in Xen.'s religious apparatus, there is no philological evidence for such an astonishing conclusion and, thus, this theory does not make a real contribution to the discussion of the epitome theory.

While the existence of so many different views on the Eph. proves that there is a surge of interest in this novel, at the same time, it demonstrates that a comprehensive study of this text is missing. The reason for this appears to be twofold: on the one hand, the importance of the "epitome theory" has inevitably provoked scholars to adopt a reactive approach in the study of the Eph., as if the confutation or the support given to Bürger 1892 was the only possible theme to explore. On the other hand, there are scholars of the Greek novels that still think that a writer such as Xen. does not

---

[8] Morgan 2007d, 150. The importance of travel in Xenophon is briefly noted also by Ruiz Montero 2007, 268: 'There isn't any other novel so "touristic" and where so many proper names are mentioned, which belong both to people and to places'.

[9] See Capra forth.

[10] See Thomas 1998. The same issue is addressed by Sanz Morales 2006.

[11] Sanz Morales 2006, 133-139, suggests that there were more versions also of Chariton's novel.

[12] See, among others, Capra 2008a. Sanz Morales 2006, however, does not consider the anonymity of a text evidence of the existence of multiple versions of it. In fact, he suggests that novels were considered "lazy" in the Imperial Era, and not seen as classical texts because of their entertaining function. Consequently, no attention was given to the perfection of their editions and some of them were available in more than one version.

[13] See Hunter 1997, 199: 'Xenophon's open form makes Xenophon of Ephesus one of the most fascinating pagan Greek texts to have survived from later antiquity'.

merit proper consideration and does not require detailed study because of his simplicity.

As a result, since I started my PhD, I decided to fill this gap and, thus, my dissertation focuses neither on the epitome theory nor on the inconsistencies of the Eph., but aims to offer an alternative interpretation of the first book of this text. The core of this reading is that Xen.'s novel is an *Entwicklung*- and *Bildungsroman*, in which the protagonists, who at the beginning of the novel resist Eros, progressively discover what love is. This growth happens throughout a physical and spiritual journey, in which they first accept their desire, then have sex and finally, tested by numerous suitors, they are led to understand that true love is a bond based on reciprocal fidelity and which outlasts death. While this is the entire trajectory of the Eph., the first book already displays most of these motifs, because it includes three crucial events of the story which have an influence over the whole text: the falling in love, the wedding night and the oath of fidelity. Therefore, my study gives insights into the whole novel and I decided to adopt the commentary format as the best means of demonstrating the existence of this progression.[14] The result is a commentary which is not philological, although it contains philological notes, but a literary study which follows the model of the recent book on Longus written by Morgan 2004.

In addition, this clear erotic framework which Xen. introduces is the fruit of an interplay with literary intertexts, which can be classified into five categories: along with the *Odyssey*, the archetype of every Greek novel, three main erotic traditions of antiquity enter the Eph., namely Plato's dialogues in love, Greek epigrams and Hellenistic elegy, whose presence is mostly proved by parallels from Latin texts. Finally, there are also some echoes from Greek tragedy which enter the novel later. Each of these models plays a role in the construction of the ideal of love, since Xen. borrows from them a few expressions and a good number of motifs. To begin with, the *Odyssey* is the main hypotext of the Eph. and Xen. makes this clear by constructing the whole plot on three Homeric elements: first, the intratextuality between the nights of love which begin and end the protagonists' journey is supported by the intertextuality with two different Homeric scenes. Second, "true love" for the protagonists concurs with Penelope and Odysseus' fidelity and the oracle of Apollo, written as a subtle paraphrase of the Odyssean prophecy of Tiresias, establishes the power that Eros has over the whole novel. Further, both Plato's *Phaedrus* and *Symposium* support and enhance the Homeric model by placing symmetry and everlasting union at the core of the protagonists' love. Third, whenever the erotic topic is directly addressed in the text, motifs shared with ancient epigrams and Hellenistic elegy give emphasis and psychological depth to the protagonists' experience of love. Finally, when the protagonists are separated from each other, Xen. exploits tragic motifs to explore their sufferings and the persistence of their mutual feelings. This makes Anthia and Habrocomes' developing approach to Eros a constant focus of the text.

Overall, the coexistence of all these elements leads me to conclude that we are dealing with a text written by an author who has a clear literary goal in mind and who possesses a good knowledge of

---

[14] There has recently been a fierce debate among the ancient scholars about the function and the utility of commentaries. As I hope to show with my research, I believe that commentaries are very good and desirable if they aim to offer a comprehensive interpretation of the text and not only a series of long notes which lack connection each other. For this reason, I decided to follow Morgan's (2004) commentary of Longus and to write not a traditional philological commentary, but a literary one. For recent discussion, cf. Gibson - Kraus 2002 and Most 1999.

the erotic tradition. This conclusion also speaks to the reason why a work like this has been written: as in Longus' case, entertainment, which is the peculiar function of the Greek novel, is accompanied by an educative purpose which is extended from the protagonists to the readers. I hope with my commentary to highlight the content of this *Bildung*.

That being said, I am aware that, although this is not my starting point, a study of this novel has to address the issue of the epitome to avoid losing credibility. In my opinion, this discovery of an erotic and literary framework appears to confirm that the text that we have is a product of artistic quality and this makes its status as a summary less likely. In addition, I would take issue with O'Sullivan's (1994) interpretation of the Eph.: all the repetitions which this scholar considers signs of the oral origin and fruition of the text are rather proof of the intratextuality which makes our novel a literary work. In addition, I do not see why their presence should imply an unwritten origin, given the great distance between Xen. and the period in which Greek society was oral. Finally, I consider my approach to the Eph. as close to the scholars who focus on the 'contrived simplicity' of the text and on the existence of narratological themes in the whole novel. At the same time, however, I believe that my work goes beyond their results, because it demonstrates how the indisputable simplicity of the Eph. is often accompanied by a hint of sophistication, which is not necessary to follow the development of the plot, but allows Xen. to establish closer connections within the text and to explore deeper nuances of love and fidelity.

A passage of the novel which clearly shows this double level of interpretation is the first oracle: on the one hand, Apollo's words can be interpreted as a simple prophecy of the bad and the good that the protagonists will undergo (NA 1.2). On the other hand, the intertext with the *Odyssey* clarifies how it is also a foreshadower of the main events of the plot. The existence of these two lenses concerns also the dreams, which play a similar function to the oracle (NA 1.2), and the direct speeches of the protagonists (NA 3), in which Anthia's Platonic allusions give a moral foundation to her experience of lovesickness and introduce tension and competition in her relationship with Habrocomes.

That being said, I must confess that there are still some issues which cannot find a proper answer. It is especially difficult to assess the origin of the Eph.: while the geographical provenance of both the text and the author remains a grey area, the influence on Xen. of the moral interpretations of Homer might suggest a possible solution. Since this kind of reading was widespread in the Imperial schools, where also the "contrived simplicity" was studied by rhetors, it is not unlikely that our novel came from this environment. However, the exact nature of this connection cannot be defined.

As a result, with my commentary I hope not only to offer an accurate interpretation of the text, but also to present in a new form old questions about the Eph. In order to make my interpretation more understandable, I decided to explore in an introduction the most important themes of the commentary, before the analysis of each chapter of the first book.

SECTION 1:
GENERAL ISSUES ABOUT XENOPHON

CHAPTER 1: THE CONDITION OF THE TEXT

Every study of the Eph., as the present one, must face the difficulty of dealing with a sole independent witness, which is the 13th-century F.[15] This manuscript also includes the novels of Char., Longus and part of Ach., along with Byzantine texts. In accordance with Roncali (1996)'s description, it is small[16] and its 140 sheets contain more than 50 lines on every page. This high number of words suggests that this manuscript may have had a private destination.

Given this historical background, the condition of F is not good: as Zanetto argues, in F 'la grafia minuta e l'uso sistematico di abbreviazioni, oltre al cattivo stato del manoscritto, rendono ardua la lettura'.[17] Finally, 'il copista poi ci mette del suo, disseminando errori e imprecisioni di ogni genere'.[18] As a result, the possibility that the text we read is not correct is high and an example of this is the frequent adoption of the smooth spirit instead of the rough one.[19] In addition, Reardon 1982, 167 has investigated this risk in relation to Char., where it is possible to conduct this kind of analysis. His conclusions are that the version of *Callirhoe* in F contains a mistake every two lines: this high frequency inevitably raises the same suspicion about our novel.

Within this difficult situation, O'Sullivan's (2005) recent edition is certainly of great help, especially for the clarity of the textual apparatus and for the thorough collection of different readings. As Zanetto argues, the only limit of this scholar is 'una certa ineguaglianza nella strategia ecdotica'.[20] However, the adoption of a coherent approach is not easy, given the status of F and Xen.'s style, which is not always consistent.

Although my commentary is not philological, I will try to work out the most difficult passages. Overall, the impression that the text might be wrong is recurrent. In the readings offered a recurrent criterion which I applied is to preserve the figures of speech. It is surprising how often Xen. adopts chiastic or parallel structures and in these second a variation often concerns the third member (e.g.

---

[15] The complete name is "Florentinus Laurentianus Conv. Soppr. 627".

[16] Its exact dimensions are cm 17,3 x 12,8.

[17] Zanetto 2008, 295-6.

[18] Ibid., 296.

[19] Cf. 1.10.8: F has αὐτοῦ instead of the more correct αὑτοῦ; similarly, in 1.15.4 there is αὐτοῦ instead of αὑτοῦ, in 1.16.5 αὐτὴ instead of αὕτη and in 1.16.6 αὐτὸν instead of αὑτὸν.

[20] Zanetto 2008, 298.

1.9.1 n.: ἔκειντο). Second, Aristaenetus turns out to be very useful, as a good number of his passages recalls Xen. (GI 5). Conversely, the use of the other novelists to clarify some passages is not always helpful, because the words adopted by our author often have no parallels within the corpus and this anomaly opens a big question about the existence of a vocabulary peculiar to the novelistic genre.

Finally, special attention is deserved by Xen.'s use of parentheses in the first book: their presence is another sign of the instability of the text and in the first book there are seven cases: 1.2.2, 1.5.4, 1.8.1, 1.8.2, 1.13.1, 1.13.4 (bis). Overall, I would divide them into two different categories:

- three of them can be considered "functional". Since they convey a new piece of information and their presence is related with other parts of the text, they seem to be part of the construction of the narrative (1.2.2, 1.8.1 and 1.13.4);

- the other four, which I would call "unnecessary glosses", instead merely repeat an element already present in the text and, thus, they can be ascribed to the hands of the copyist.

In addition, as I will show in the commentary, the study of this second group suggests that the reason why these parentheses are introduced sometimes is a lack of comprehension of simple elements of the text. I wonder whether this might suggest something about the poor literary competence of the copyist and this would further increase the suspicions about F.

That being said, it is evident that it would be helpful to possess other witnesses of our novel. In this respect, some scholars have tried to study the possible relationship between the so-called "Antheia - fragment" and our novel. As Stephens and Winkler argue, 'the names suggest that this piece belongs in some rather self-conscious relationship to Xenophon's *Ephesiaca*'[21] and these are the pieces of evidence for this connection:

- 'Antheia and Euxeinos are characters in the *Ephesiaca*;

- Artemis and a temple [...] figure in his fragment;

- both Antheias find themselves in possession of poison'[22].

That being said, however, 'the plots, apart from the general similarities outlined above, are not alike' and this makes it unlikely that the fragment was part of the Eph. As a result, nothing more than this general conclusion can be drawn: 'the existence of the *Antheia* fragment increases our appreciation for the way in which these novels may have been interdependent'[23].

Given the negative result of this comparison, new fragments of the Eph. are even more desiderata.

_____

[21] Stephens - Winkler 1995, 278.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Ibid.

CHAPTER 2: XENOPHON, HIS DATE AND THE DRAMATIC DATE OF THE *EPHESIACA*

1) The date of the *Ephesiaca* and of Xenophon

As Ruiz Montero argues in her 'Überblick', 'nothing is known about the writer of the *Ephesiaka*'[24] and the reason for this is the absence of testimonies beyond a single unclear one given by *Suda*.

Ξενοφῶν Ἐφέσιος, ἱστορικός· Ἐφεσιακά· ἔστι δὲ ἐρωτικὰ βιβλία ι' περὶ Ἀβροκόμου καὶ Ἀνθίας· καὶ περὶ τῆς πόλεως Ἐφεσίων· καὶ ἄλλα.

To begin with, this source does not give any suggestion regarding the chronology: for this reason, the date of Xen. is a controversial issue and this difficulty is strengthened by the lack of internal references in the Eph. Usually, the text is thought by scholars to have been written in the second century AD and, thus, is classified as the second text of the corpus after that of Char., which is traditionally dated to the first century AD. As Ruiz Montero 1994, 1091-4 illustrates, the main reason for this is the mention in the Eph. of the eirenarch of Cilicia (2.13.3 and 3.9.5), an institution which is attested for the first time by epigraphs in 117 AD. The other *terminus post quem* which is usually accepted is the appearance of the governor of Egypt, a figure created in 30 BC, while the *terminus ante quem* is the destruction of the temple of Artemis in 263 AD. Finally, also language has been used to support this theory: since Xen. 'is considered to aim more generally at Atticist Greek'[25], the hypothesis of his belonging to the Atticist movement, which reached its height in the second century AD, would confirm the location of the novel in this period.

That said, as Tilg 2010, 88 states, the issue of the eirenarch has been more recently considered as less reliable, since this office could have existed before its first attestation:[26] as a result, new original proposals have emerged, which mostly place the Eph. in the first century AD. This shift is significant, because it suggests that the Eph. might have been written before *Callirhoe*, reversing the traditional order of the corpus. Since a change as this would certainly affect the interpretation of the text, it must be discussed before starting the commentary.

This is a list of the most interesting new theories:

---

[24] Ruiz Montero 1994, 1088.

[25] Tilg 2010, 90.

[26] Cf. Bowie 2002, 57: 'We have no right to suppose that our earliest epigraphic testimony is exactly contemporary with the first institution of such an office' and Morgan 1996, 200 on this: 'The inscription refers to the post *en passant* as if familiar, and Xenophon's character is designated not by the title but by a periphrasis that does not necessarily denote formal office'. Rife 2002, 94 instead defends this *terminus post quem* by remarking that 'an examination of a wide range of sources, including papyri, inscriptions, Roman law, and late Greek and early Christian literature, demonstrates [...] that the terminology employed by Xenophon for these offices corresponds with Imperial Greek literary usage'. However, this argument does not negate the possibility of an earlier origin of the eirenarchate.

- O' Sullivan 1995, 168-170 dates Xen. to c. AD 50, in the light of his consideration of the Eph. as the oral text at the origin of the corpus;
- Bowie 2002, 57 argues that the common geographical setting which characterises novels such as *Callirhoe*, *Ninus*, *Metiochus and Parthenope* and the Eph. suggests that they might also share a chronological origin and this would predate our novel to Char.'s age;
- Konstan 2009 addresses the issue of the relative chronology between Char. and Xen. from an "ideological" perspective and speculates that the different focus between the two on conjugal fidelity might be better explained if the former, who is less rigid on this topic, was deviating from the latter, whose moral concern is overriding.

In my opinion, the different nature of these proposals paradoxically confirms that it is not possible to obtain incontrovertible evidence about Xen.'s date. While O'Sullivan's (1994) interpretation of the text has already been dismissed (AIM) and this decision inevitably affects his theory about the date, it seems to me that the others also lack a solid foundation. Since the recently discovered papyri prove that a higher number of novels was circulating in antiquity than what has been preserved, it is not unthinkable that more stories set in Asia Minor had been written or that there was another novel which antedated Char. Finally, Konstan's (2009) argument is suggestive but it could easily be reversed: Xen. might be focusing on a value which Char. was simply introducing as part of a wider range of topics.

For this reason, I would address this issue only from the perspective of the intertextual relationship between Char. and Xen. In this respect, Tilg, following the most common view, argues that 'a number of parallels in motifs and language suggest that Chariton rather than Xenophon is the borrower'[27] and he mentions the displacement made by Xen. of some episodes as the main reason for this. In his view, a case in point is the departure scene, because the farewell of Chaereas' father (3.5.4) does not appear in the Eph. in the analogous departure scene, but later in Corymbus episode related to the death of Habrocomes' old tutor (1.14.4-5, n.: ὁ τροφεὺς). Personally, I would agree with this theory and I would here add three further examples and another one in the commentary (1.14.1 n.: οἱ λοιποὶ). First, the special focus on the male protagonist which characterises the beginning of the Eph. is better explained as a deviation from Char. than the other way round, because the prominence of the woman is more common in erotic literature and this is confirmed by the other novels (LI 2.1). Second, Xen.'s third dream appears a subtle version of two more traditional examples written by Char.: this makes the priority of the former more plausible (1.6.2 n.: oracle, 6.1). Third, Xen.'s scant interest in the public dimension of the final reunion of his protagonists might be another deviation from Char.'s text, in which, in obedience to a simple circular pattern, marriage is evoked and celebrated by the crowd before the conclusion of the story. Since a public dimension characterises also the finales of Longus and Hld., Xen. appears here to be the deviant one (LI 5.5). In addition, Char.'s insistence in his conclusion on Babylonian objects and his mention of a σκήνη is a possible model for the Ephesian canopy. Since Babylonia is part of

---

[27] Tilg 2010, 89.

Callirhoe's setting, the hypothesis that Xen. is borrowing this object from Char. seems more likely (1.8.2-3. n.: the only *ekphrasis*).

Finally, I would speculate that the issue of intertextuality beyond the genre might also suggest the priority of *Callirhoe*. The approach of Char. and Xen. to their literary models is quite different, because the former clearly displays his intertexts, moving from Homeric quotations[28] to precise allusions to other authors, such as Thucydides, Greek tragedy and comedy and Xenophon of Athens.[29] Conversely, as I have already suggested (AIM), Xen. refers to his models more through repetitions of situations and motifs than through textual links. As a result, the overall approach to intertextuality is more sophisticated in Char. than in Xen. and this conclusion is strengthened by Trzaskoma's (2010) recent study of the presence of Greek tragedy in Char. The discovery of an allusion to Euripides' *Heracles,* a text which was not part of the Imperial rhetorical education, suggests that 'Chariton read well beyond the syllabus'[30]. In addition, his combined use of Homer and tragedy 'creates a large super-structure of allusiveness spanning a large portion of the narrative'.[31] That being said, an exception is constituted by the knowledge of Platonic motifs, because in this field our author shows a greater knowledge. In my opinion, if Char. read Xen., his sophistication would make his omission of Platonic references strange. Conversely, the hypothesis that Xen. read Char. and still ignores some of his models can be easily interpreted as a sign of his simplicity. As a result, it seems to me that there is no need to change the "traditional" sequence of these two authors. However, since the two novels have a good number of differences and we are not dealing with a relationship of filiation between the two, a definite conclusion cannot be drawn and during my commentary I shall consider also the other possibility, if it is admitted by the comparison between the single passages.

2) The dramatic date of the *Ephesiaca*

As with the date of composition, the dramatic date of the Eph. is difficult to establish. The reason for this is that Xen. does not seem to be interested in placing his novel in a precise chronological setting.[32] This is evident in the beginning of the work, which recalls the start of folk-tales, since it is set like them in an atemporal dimension (1.1.1, n.: ἦν).

That being said, at a deeper look, the text seems to give two opposite time references. On the one hand, in his choice of places Xen. seems to look to the Hellenistic or Imperial world. As Oikonomou argues, 'institutions like that of the eirenarch of Kilikia and the archon of Egypt are

---

[28] Cf. Fusillo 1990 and Robiano 2000.

[29] On this, see Trzaskoma 2010, 219: 'It is well established in the modern study of the ancient novel that Chariton is familiar with and alludes to a range of earlier classical literature'. For some specific studies of Char.'s intertexts, see Papanikolau 1973a, 13-24 and Manuwald 2000 who both focus on citations, Fusillo 1990, 35-41 on Homer, Hirschberger 2001 on epic and tragedy, Trzaskoma 2010 on tragedy (with detailed bibliography), Trzaskoma 2009 on Aristophanes, Borgogno 1971a on Menander and Trzaskoma forth. on Xenophon of Athens.

[30] Trzaskoma 2010, 229.

[31] Ibid. Cf. Eur. *Heracl*. 1307-8 and Char. 3.10.6.

[32] On this, see Morgan 2007a, 453: 'there is no attempt to set a dramatic date'.

clearly Hellenistic'[33] and in this framework I would also include the presence of Alexandria and possibly of Rhodes. While the former is clearly Hellenistic, as it was founded in 331 BC,[34] the latter has a slightly older origin (408 BC), but then it became important a century after. Since Xen. defines Rhodes as μεγάλη καὶ καλή (1.11.6, n.) and the protagonists tour it, we are dealing with a potential post-Classical reference.

Conversely, if we look at the representations of the most important characters of the novel, from the protagonists to the pirates, they seem to recall a Classical world.[35] These are the main arguments:

a) Habrocomes' παιδεῖα reflects the Classical ideal and not the Imperial one (1.1.2 n.: παιδείαν);

b) Artemis' portrait in the procession recalls the Classical Artemis (1.2.6 n.: χίτων);

c) A departure scene like that of the protagonists from Ephesus is quite close to both Thucydides and Chariton's ones, which are set in the past, and no other parallels are available from later literature (1.10.4-10, n.: παρασκευάζετο);

d) The antithesis between Greeks and barbarians which is described by Xen. in Tyre does not fit into a Hellenistic context, since in 332 BC this city was conquered by Alexander the Great and became Greek. The same conclusion is suggested by Corymbus' and Euxinus' piratical activity. To begin with, as De Souza 1999, 214 argues, in the Imperial Era this phenomenon was suppressed. More specifically, when Cicero in the *Republic* speaks about the origin of the Romans (2.3), he makes some references to Archaic Greeks and to the advantages and disadvantages of their trade.[36] As part of this framework, he also mentions the existence of barbaric enemies: 'ita barbarorum agris quasi adtexta quaedam videtur ora esse Graeciae; nam e barbaris quidem ipsis nulli erant antea maritumi praeter Etruscos et Poenos. alteri mercandi causa, latrocinandi alteri'.[37] Interestingly, Phoenicians are here explicitly defined as pirates. As a result, his early historical context underlines the antiquity of this association: thus, the impression that Xen. has also a past world in mind is confirmed.

Overall, these two different indications require our interpretation. Since they are neither precise nor emphasised by Xen., I would consider their existence not the fruit of a mistake but the consequence of his lack of interest in this topic. That said, the emergence of a Classical context for the protagonists' presentation needs to be further discussed. Since, as I will show, the Eph. can be divided into two models of societies and the civilised one coincides with the place where the

---

[33] Oikonomou 2010, 11.

[34] On this, see Said 1994, 217, who extends the same evidence to Antioch: 'Xenophon's heroes pass through Alexandria and Antioch, which were founded during the Hellenistic period, and they face Roman magistrates such as the prefect of Egypt and the eirenarch of Cilicia' (Said, 217) and Eph. II 9.1 and II 12.2 for Antioch and III 9.1, III 10.5, III 11.1, IV 1.3, IV 3.3, V 2.2, V 4.5, V 4.11, V 5.8 and for Alexandria.

[35] This is the same conclusion drawn by Oikonomou 2010, 11: 'Xenophon's novel presupposes an idealised world broadly based on perceptions of the classical Greece of the fifth and fourth centuries BC current at the time of the author'.

[36] See Cic. *Rep*. 2.3.

[37] Cic. *Rep*. 2.9.

protagonists live and share their love, I would suggest that Xen. is interested in an ideal perception of the world and the emergence in it of a classical background would fit well into this focus.

As this element is certainly more marked in the text than the choice of different places, I would conclude that the dramatic date of the Eph. has a Classical colour.

CHAPTER 3: XENOPHON AND HIS HOMELAND

Unlike the date, the lemma of the lexicon *Suda* says something about the provenance of Xen., as it defines him as Ἐφέσιος. However, as again Ruiz Montero states, we do not know 'whether our author really comes from Ephesus or if this origin stems from the place in which the novel is set'.[38] Despite the absence of proper sources, many scholars have focused their attention on this problem.[39] Although some offer good argumentations, they adopt a disputable approach, which consists of using the Eph. as the source. Thus, they draw a positive or negative conclusion on the Ephesian origin of the author depending on the quantity of details that they find in it. Nevertheless, in a literary text of the Imperial Era even a thorough knowledge of a place can simply be the consequence of the author's study of indirect sources. Moreover, the Greek novel as a genre is generally interested only in a realism of coherence, but not of correspondence.[40] As a result, research like this cannot result in a new assessment of Xen.'s homeland. That being said, however, if in this kind of analysis a closer reference to local traditions emerged, it would be at least arguable that our author had a more direct acquaintance with Ephesus, which could be personal: this would be a partial but new discovery about his provenance.

As I will shortly show, this possibility is not unlikely because of an unexpected connection. At first glance, nothing in the Eph. suggests this. To begin with, local features are missing in the most important Ephesian element, which is Artemis' procession (1.2.2-5 n.: τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος) and the same conclusion comes from the other Ephesian issues, such as the portrait of Artemis (1.2.6 n.: χίτων) and the mention of seers and priests (1.5.6-7 n.: εἰς τέλος). As a result, Xen. does not use his text to demonstrate a special knowledge of Ephesus.

However, during my research on the *realia* of the novel, I found an interesting piece of evidence which comes from Strabo: when this author visited Ephesus in the first century BC, he found in the Artemision two artistic representations of Penelope and Eurycleia. Since in the Eph. the first heroine plays a very important role (LI 6.3), I decided to analyse this source in detail, in order to investigate whether it could shed a new light on Xen.'s focus on her.

Although we are dealing with a controversial kind of witness, since many Hellenistic works had been lost, these artistic products suggest that Xen. might have been influenced by this local tradition in his approach to Homer. Since it is unlikely that he discovered this without a personal visit to Ephesus, I would conclude that our author might be considered as a little more Ephesian than previously thought.

---

[38] Ruiz-Montero 1994, 1089.

[39] On the one hand, Dalmeyda 1926, Avaert 1948 and Rohde 1960[4] consider an Ephesian origin and they are criticized by Perry 1967, Gärtner 1969 and Lavagnini 1988. On the other hand, Henne 1936, Schwartz 1985, Sartori 1990 and Hägg 2004b underline the existence of a strong Egyptian mark in Xen. and, therefore, they implicitly allude to an Egyptian origin. Finally, Griffiths 1978 makes a sort of compromise: he argues, in fact, that Xen. could have been Ephesian, but then he would have spent most of his life in Egypt.

[40] On the lack of proper realism in the Eph., see Schmeling 1980, 17: 'Perhaps he had other goals than to write realistically about events and places' and also Susanetti 1999, 141. On the lack of realism in the novel as a genre, see Bowie 1977 and Ruiz Montero 1994, 1121.

Given this general framework, I will now conduct a detailed analysis which starts from Strabo's passage:

μετὰ δ' οὖν τὸν νεὼν τὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀναθημάτων πλῆθος εὑρέσθαι τῇ ἐκτιμήσει τῶν δημιουργῶν, τὸν δὲ δὴ βωμὸν εἶναι τῶν Πραξιτέλους ἔργων ἅπαντα σχεδόν τι πλήρη. ἡμῖν δ' ἐδείκνυτο καὶ τῶν Θράσωνός τινα, οὗπερ καὶ τὸ Ἑκατήσιόν ἐστι καὶ †τῇ κρήνῃ† Πηνελόπη καὶ ἡ πρεσβῦτις ἡ Εὐρύκλεια.[41]

'After the completion of the temple a great number of offerings were made as the fruit of the high esteem in which artists held this place and the whole of the altar was almost filled with the works of Praxiteles. I was also introduced to some works of Thrason, who built the statue of Hecate, the waxen image of Penelope and the old woman Eurycleia'.

1) Analysis of Strabo's passage

This testimony can be considered reliable, because Strabo had grown up in Asia Minor[42] and it is likely that he personally visited Ephesus.[43] Furthermore, it is promising, because it attests that Penelope and Eurycleia were represented in Ephesus. As Radt's (2005) new edition shows, the text itself has only one word which is difficult to understand, κρήνη. At a deeper look, however, the meaning of other parts is not clear[44] and must be discussed.

a) <u>Textual analysis</u>

The first part of the passage shows the typical situation of every Greek cult: the Ephesian Artemision, which, after its first foundation in the eighth century BC, was rebuilt at the beginning of the Hellenistic Era,[45] contained a πλῆθος of ἀναθημάτα[46]. This "congestion" happened τῇ ἐκτιμήσει τῶν δημιουργῶν: this obscure expression[47] might refer to a public initiative in which

---

[41] The version of the text is from Radt 2005, while the following translation is a personal adaptation from Heinemann 1960.

[42] See Bowersock 2000, 15. Already Ramsay 1890 noted that 'Strabo's authority is naturally higher in Asia Minor than in any other country'.

[43] See Radt 2005, 32, 12-4: 'Strabon kannte Ephesos also aus eigener Anschauung' . See also Dueck 2000, 24: 'Strabo's visit to Ephesus perhaps explains his knowledge of the roads from this city to the east as based on a personal experience (14.2.29)'.

[44] This kind of difficulty is recurrent in Strabo's work, especially in his books on Asia Minor. See Nicolai 2000, 227: 'The historian who has to study Strabo's Asia Minor deals with a text that is not completely clear'.

[45] This rebuilding was promoted by Alexander the Great. The destruction is attributed to Herostratos, who in 356 BC 'steckt das Artemision in Brand' (Elliger 1985, 211).

[46] On the accumulation of votive gifts typical of Greek sanctuaries, see Rolley 1994, 35. The nature of these dedications was completely different from the cultic image, which was only one (see ibid., 33; see also Burkert 1985, 93).

[47] As Radt 2005, 32 argues, 'Was mit dem Ausdruck "durch die Hochschätzung der Künstler" gemeint it, ist nicht klar'. The manuscript B offers the reading ἐκμιμήσει, which, however, is clearly inappropriate to the context.

artists were paid to produce works for the goddess[48] or to win prestige through a 'prize competition',[49] but the lack of historical proof does not allow us to resolve this issue.

Shortly after, Strabo adds that the altar of Artemis also housed works of Praxiteles, the famous Greek sculptor of the fourth century BC. This clear statement is followed by an ambiguous reference to Thrason's production: we are not told who this man was, what kind of works he did and their date, what were their locations and their real identities. To begin with, the only source referring to Thrason is Pliny, who fits him into a category of sculptors who made 'athletas autem et armatos et venatores sacrificantesque'.[50] Since the Latin writer does not add his activity as a painter, as he does with other artists,[51] scholars rightly assume that Strabo's ἔργων designate statues. On the other hand, the date is more difficult to establish:[52] Mactoux 1975, 89, in accordance with the rebuilding of the temple, proposes the fourth century BC, while the LIMC the second half of the second century BC.[53] Despite this uncertainty, Strabo's direct knowledge makes it plausible that Thrason's works were displayed in the city in the second half of the first century BC.

Similarly, their location is not explicitly stated: we only know that they were close to Praxiteles' statues and to Artemis' shrine. Since altars in Greece were usually located in front of their temple and not inside it, Thrason's statues would have been outside Artemis' temple and might either have occupied a small space on the altar near to Praxiteles' works or a *stoa* close to it, where usually votive gifts were housed.[54] This uncertainty makes their cultic value more difficult to assess.

In theory, the word οὗπερ opens another possibility: instead of being the genitive of the relative pronoun, which allows us to attribute all three statues to Thrason, it could correspond to the adverb οὗ or ὅπου, "where":[55] in this case, Thrason's paternity might become unacceptable. Nevertheless, Strabo uses οὗπερ without prepositions three other times in his work (cf. 11.4.5, 14.5.16 and 17.1.42) and in each of these occurrences it is the genitive of the pronoun. The last passage is the most significant, because in it οὗπερ has a possessive value as in ours (εἰ δ' ὥς φασιν ὁ Μέμνων ὑπὸ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων Ἰσμάνδης λέγεται, καὶ ὁ λαβύρινθος Μεμνόνιον ἂν εἴη καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἔργον οὗπερ καὶ τὰ ἐν Ἀβύδῳ καὶ τὰ ἐν Θήβαις·). In addition, the hypothesis of οὗπερ as an adverb would

_____

[48] See, e.g., Vogel 1882, 332.

[49] Tozer 1893, 302.

[50] Plin. *NH* 34.91. An extant inscription reports the existence of a statue dedicated to Artemis by Straton of Pellene. Although this name has been identified with that of Thrason, nevertheless, 'from the form of the letters of the inscription, Böckh supposes its date to be not earlier than the reign of Trajan or of Hadrian, in which case, of course, the artist must have been a different person from the Thrason mentioned by Strabo and Pliny' (Smith 1848², s.v. Thrason, 1107. See ibid. also for the reference to the inscription). As a consequence, Pliny's hypothesis is the most plausible.

[51] Before Thrason, Pliny mentions Protogenes and explicitly says that he was also a painter ('Protogenes, idem pictor e clarissimis', Plin. *NH* 34.91). For the same interpretation of Thrason as a sculptor, see Vollkommer 2007, 899, s.v. Thrason (I), who defines him as a 'griechische Bildhauer'.

[52] See P. - W. 1894 VIa, s.v. Thrason, 563: 'Die Zeit des T. ist nicht zu bestimmen' (Lippold, G.).

[53] Vollkommer 2007, 899, s.v. Thrason (I), proposes more generally the Hellenistic age.

[54] See Burkert 1985, 94.

[55] See LSJ, s.v. ὅσπερ.

require a translation of the following καὶ with 'also' to dismiss Thrason's paternity. However, the presence in the same sentence of other two καὶ hints at a correlative value shared by the three conjunctions: thus, the adverbial interpretation is incorrect.

The final problem is the identity of the subjects. On the one hand, the meaning of Ἑκατήσιον, a variant of the more common term Ἑκάταιον,[56] is straightforward: it usually designates the presence of a statue or a chapel of Hecate[57] and the former option seems here the most likely, because it matches Pliny's mention of the existence of a statue of Hecate in the Artemision.[58] On the other hand, Penelope and Eurycleia are easily recognizable as 'die Frau und die Amme des Odysseus'.[59] In the whole Greek tradition, in fact, the former's name always refers to the Homeric daughter of Icarius and Periboea. The latter's, instead, designates not only Penelope's old servant, daughter of Ops, the son of Pisenor,[60] but also a Eurycleia daughter of Athamas and Themisto[61] or mother of Oedipus by Laios.[62] Nevertheless, since these last two characters appear in minor sources and in our quotation Eurycleia follows Penelope, her Homeric origin is indisputable.

Having clarified this point, two elements are still to be understood: the obelised word κρήνη and the option that Thrason's works constituted a group.

First, as Radt's (2005) apparatus reports, Strabo's manuscripts offer two different readings: F has κηρίνη, while B and C κρήνη and the absence of a clear relationship of dependence among them allows both solutions.[63] At the same time, scholars have tried to correct them with κορίνη, which then was transformed into κόρη or κούρη, κοιράνη and Καρίνη. Radt 2005 in his commentary discusses all these variants: to begin with, κρήνη is almost unworthy of consideration,[64] because we

_____

[56] See LSJ, s.v. Ἑκατήσιον. See also M. Bieber,, in Thieme-Becker 1907-, vol. 33, s.v. Thrason I, 104.

[57] On the Ephesian cult of Hekate, 'protectress of Ephesian crossroads', see Aurenhammer 1995, 257-260.

[58] On this connection, see P. - W. VIa, s.v. Thrason (Lippold, G., 563). This is Pliny's passage: 'In magna admiratione est Hercules Menestrati et Hecate Ephesi in templo Dianae post aedem, in cuius contemplatione admonent aeditui parcere oculis; tanta marmoris radiatio est'. The fact that Latin writer does not mention the creator of the Hecate allows this interpretation. On this statue, cf. also Brunn 1889, 321 and LIMC 6.992, n. 103, s.v. Hekate. Pliny's testimony has also been studied in connection with the location of Thrason's works: the Roman writer's words 'in templo Dianae post aedem' literally might suggest that they were inside the temple. However, as Coulson 1980, 200 argues, "it is better, perhaps, to take in templo as meaning ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ (that is, with reference to the entire precinct) and 'post aedem' as 'behind the temple'". Further, 'Pliny's remark on the gleam of the statue's marble [...] makes it seem likely that Hecate's work was not housed in a separate ναίσκος but simply stood in the open behind the Artemisium' (ibid.). As a result, our previous hypothesis is supported and especially the former. On the other hand, Brunn 1889 and Overbeck 1972³ are clearly wrong when they interpret Strabo's expression μετὰ δ' οὖν τὸν νεὼν like 'post aedem'. On this, see again Coulson 1980, 200.

[59] Radt 2005, 33.

[60] See *Od* 1.429.

[61] See scholiast on Pi. P. 4.221; A.R. 2.1158; Valerius Flaccus 5. 461, 6.196, 197, 199; Apollod. 1.9.1. In this version, she is also the wife of Melas.

[62] See scholiast on E. *Ph*.

[63] On Strabo's five manuscripts, see Radt 2002, VII-XIX. On their dependence, see ibid. XVII: 'Meine Skepsis gegen unsere Möglichkeiten, die Abhängigkeitsverhältnisse zwischen den Handschriften immer mit völliger Sicherheit zu rekonstruieren, ist dafür zu groß'.

[64] See P. - W. VIa, 1894, s.v. Thrason, 563, where Lippold states that 'mit der "Quelle" ist nichts anzufangen'.

needed τῆς Πηνελόπης instead of the nominative to accept the existence of a spring.[65] For this reason Müller 1853-8 proposes adding ἐν ᾗ, but in this hypothesis the copyist's intervention would have been exaggerated. Conversely, the other readings are more interesting: above all, the variant κηρίνη is defended on a literary basis: Meineke 1904 uses as evidence an Ovidian passage where a picture of a woman is called 'cerae'[66] and is compared with that made by Laodamia of her husband Protesilaus, while Radt 2005 obverses that Philostratus refers to women 'made up with cosmetics'.[67] The other adjectives, instead, are conceived as Penelope's epithets, but none seems to be appropriate: as Radt shows, 'der Gebrauch [of κόρη] für "junge Ehefrau" scheint schon kaum in Epos möglich, [...] geschweige denn in der Alltagssprache', while κοιράνη 'nur im Maskulinum belegt ist'[68]. Finally, Καρίνη might be accepted as 'Klagefrau', but its common meaning is 'Carian woman' and Penelope has no relationship with this Asiatic region.

Given this framework, Radt 2005 comes to a sceptical conclusion: in my opinion, however, he wrongly overlooks the material issue, probably starting from the right assumption that the Greek sculptors did not use wax for the final stage of their works,[69] but only during the intermediate process of "lost wax".[70] Having said that, however, three cases constituted exceptions: first, the Roman masks which celebrated the dead[71] and magical figurines;[72] however, because of their originality, they do not suit our case. Second, some models of "lost wax" were simply transformed into figurines, but this phenomenon was mostly limited to the earliest examples of Greek sculpture. Finally and more interestingly, a varnish made with wax, called 'circumlitio', was often applied in its pure state to marble statues and columns, so that its pale yellowish tint would slightly tone the white rock to a warmer shade.[73] In my opinion, the mention of κηρίνη Penelope might reflect the adoption of this technique and Philostratus' passage may support this interpretation, since the effect of this patina would be comparable with that of make-up. As a result, I would follow Meineke 1904, 895 and Page 1950, 228 and keep the manuscript reading κηρίνη. Furthermore, this choice makes it more likely that Penelope's statue was made of marble.

---

[65] This textual problem is overlooked by Mactoux 1975, who thinks of 'fontaine décorée par un groupe d'acrotères représentant Pénélope et Euryclée' (89).

[66] See Ov. *Rem. am*. 723.

[67] See Philostr. *Ep*. 22: οὐδὲ ἐν ταῖς κηρίναις τέταξαι γυναιξὶν and LSJ, s.v. κήρινος, II.3.

[68] Radt 2005, 33.

[69] They usually adopt other materials according to a scale of values, in which marble and bronze are the richest ones, followed by wood, other minerals, such as combination of lead, copper and zinc and, finally, chalk and plaster (see Rolley 1994, 58).

[70] For a brief explanation available online, see Castoldi.

[71] See Flower 1996, 6.

[72] A case in point is Ov. *Her*. 6.91, where Medea makes wax figures of her husband. See also Theoc. 2.28-9, Virg. *Ecl*. 8.80-1 and Hor. *Sat*. 1.8.30. Finally, this phenomenon also occurs in a novelistic text: see the beginning of the *Alexander Romance*, where Nektanebos ἔπλαττε ἐκ κηρίου πλοιάρια (1).

[73] See Ward 1914, 156. Sometimes this varnish-wax was also mixed with colours; this "variata circumlitio" was applied as a tinted varnish to walls, columns and statues, in order to protect and revive the colours.

Compared to this issue, the existence of a group is easier to discuss: although Strabo's text does not suggest any association between Thrason's works, because of the linearity of his sentence, their topic gives an important clue. While Hecate's monument seems independent, Penelope's presence near Eurycleia cannot be casual: these two heroines, in fact, do not only belong to the same literary text, but in ancient iconography the latter appears 'always accompanied by Ulysses or Penelope'[74]. Furthermore, in the Hellenistic Era sculpture groups 'which told a story and studied the emotions of the protagonists'[75] became popular: even on the hypothesis that our statues were not originally conceived together, it is likely that the Ephesians were considering them part of the same composition.

In conclusion, it is likely that Strabo in 29 BC saw near the altar of Artemis a Homeric group of statues, one of which was depicted with a wax-varnish.

2) Identification of the scene and its marital symbolic value

As 'from the beginning of Greek society artists became the first critics and interpreters of Homer',[76] it is unlikely that our sculptor mixed generically two characters of the *Odyssey*: he may have had in mind a scene of the poems or a previous iconographical subject, which must be now identified.[77]

In the Homeric poem, the two women share the scene three times: firstly, in the fourth book, when Penelope accuses her servants, Eurycleia included, of their silence about Telemachus' departure;[78] the second episode is the famous washing of Odysseus' feet in the nineteenth book[79], where Eurycleia recognizes Odysseus, while Penelope fades into the background, because Athena distracts her mind.[80] Finally, at the beginning of the twenty-third book the old servant tells Penelope that her desired husband has come back, but her mistress does not believe the news[81]. Given this framework, the second scene cannot suit our case, since Odysseus is its protagonist: this makes the identification of Thrason's group more problematic, because in Greek iconography the washing of the hero's feet is the most popular scene.[82] On the other hand, the first or the third Homeric passages are not represented by Greek artists: the other two themes attested are Eurycleia spectator

---

[74] LIMC Eurycleia, 103.

[75] Boardman 1973[2], 231. See also Holscher 2008, 132: 'Come gli dei, anche i miti tradizionali furono fatti rivivere nel periodo ellenistico in opere scultoree di grande formato e di impressionante effetto patetico.'

[76] Lowenstam 1992, 174.

[77] On the general topic of Greek Homeric iconography, cf. Lowenstam 1992 and Snodgrass 1998.

[78] See *Od.* 4.716-758.

[79] See *Od.* 19.357-479.

[80] See *Od.* 19.478-479.

[81] See *Od.* 23.1-24.

[82] See LIMC Penelope, 19-28; LIMC Eurycleia 17.

of the suitors' massacre[83] and Eurycleia witness of the reunion of the couple,[84] but in both cases the old servant does not play the same central role as in Thrason's group.

The only possibility of solving this impasse is offered by Roman iconography: in the first century BC some reliefs, named 'Plaque Campana', were produced, in which one of the two subjects is a pensive and sad Penelope with Eurycleia standing near her.[85] As Hiller 1972 argues, a combination of these two characters alone coincides with the third scene aforementioned by us:[86] the old servant, in fact, is on the right corner, as one who has just arrived to give an announcement, and Penelope clearly is not moved by it, but remains desperate. Conversely, the first scene is less suitable, because in it Eurycleia is part of a big group of servants who surround Penelope, and, moreover, the former's speech consoles the latter: neither feature appears in the Campana reliefs. Since the Roman works are usually fruit of an imitative process, it is very likely that these "Penelope" reliefs were inspired by an older original and this suggests that the Homeric scene of the twenty-third book was part of the Greek repertoire.

Consequently, I would conclude that Strabo's group might have been a representation of this particular Homeric encounter.[87] This statement also helps us to understand what value this work had for the visitors to Artemis' temple: in Greek iconography Penelope started early to be depicted as a symbol of conjugal fidelity.[88] If we compare Thrason's works with this general attitude, it is easy to extend this value to the whole group.

3) From Thrason's group to the *Ephesiaca*: the existence of a local Homeric tradition

The results of this analysis challenge the study of the Eph., because, probably around a century or a century and a half after Strabo's testimony,[89] this novel develops the same ideal (marriage) in connection with a city (Ephesus) defined as land of Artemis and through the same literary model (Penelope). These connections might be sheer coincidence or the sign of a local emphasis on Penelope, which could have inspired Xenophon. In theory, the former option is the most likely, since Homeric iconography was very popular in Ancient Greece. In practice, however, from the available sources no other combination of Penelope's and Eurikleia's statues appears in both Greek and Roman art. Furthermore, only a statue of the heroine is previously attested, which comes from

---

[83] See LIMC Eurycleia, 22.

[84] See LIMC Eurycleia, 23.

[85] Hiller 1972, 50 calls this "Penelope-Platte". See LIMC Penelope 18 = Eurycleia 3 and 4. The reason for this denomination is that there is another Campana relief (see LIMC Eurycleia 17), which is called 'Odysseus - Platte'. This depicts the washing of feet, in which the hero is the dominant figure.

[86] See Hiller 1972, 66 and Kader 2006, 53-54, who resumes the former's view.

[87] The same conclusion is alluded to by LIMC Eurycleia 1, since Thrason's sculptures are classified with the Campana reliefs (ibid. 2-4) into the topic 'Euryclée auprès de Pénélope pensive'.

[88] On this, see APP 3.2c.

[89] See GI 2.1 for the controversial issue of the date of the Eph.

Persepolis[90] and also the "holy" location is unusual: a Penelope was painted by Polygnotos in the temple of Athena Areia in Plateiai, but in this work the dominant figure was Odysseus winner against the suitors,[91] while our heroine's virtue was not depicted.

If the strength of this demonstration is limited by the unfortunate loss of ancient works, positive evidence is also available: being a Homeric group, Thrason's work might have been one of the 'grandiose mythological compositions about the archaic epic'[92] which appeared in the first century BC. Although most of these works came from Italy, where Romans used the epic subject to build their bond with the Trojans and even with their enemies,[93] there were also Greek exemplars among which there is an Odysseus group with Polyphemus, which was set in the Ephesian Nymphaeum of Pollio.[94] In addition, a crucial event connected with this production has been the Antikythera shipwreck, which preserved 'several figures at heroic scale that could be identified as Achilles, Odysseus, and perhaps even a Diomedes from the Theft of the Palladion episode'.[95] Although Pergamon and Delos were usually thought as the possible origin of these works, Ridgway suggests an Ephesian provenance: 'the East Greek city had been in fact the theatre of many Roman political events, so that Italian thematic and sculptural preferences would have been well known'.[96]

This hypothesis, together with the Polyphemus' group, leads to the conclusion that Ephesus might have been an important centre of production of Homeric sculptures in the first century BC, and this role is interestingly attested only for this city and for Rhodes.[97] Further, if Thrason's group was really part of this artistic movement, its plausible date would become Late Hellenistic and our sculpture may fit into another general novelty: in this period, in fact, both Greek and Roman artists started to elaborate a 'new system of figurative language',[98] where art 'exemplified conceptual ideals',[99] Consequently, in sculpture figures of gods and heroes expressed increasingly 'abstract'

---

[90] See Penelope LIMC 2 and Palagia 2008.

[91] This comparison is also valuable, because this painting respects the afore-mentioned connection typical of some votive gifts between goddess and heroine: the emphasis on Odysseus' revenge hints, in fact, at the warlike nature of the goddess.

[92] Bol 2007, 312. See also Ridgway 2002, 69: 'An interest in three-dimensional renderings of the heroes of the Trojan wars is a phenomenon of the first century'.

[93] Ibid., 73.

[94] See LIMC Odysseus, 85.

[95] Ridgway 2002, 69.

[96] Ibid.

[97] Sperlonga' statues are the most representative Rhodian products. See Plin. 36.37 and Stewart 1977, 76: 'that Sperlonga' statues are not a mixture of works originally diverse in origin is evinced by the common technique and surface finish of the fragments'. Similarly with the Ephesian framework, which will be shortly given, also Rhodes seemed to have had a tradition of Homeric paintings, as a vase of the fourth century BC suggests (See LIMC Eurycleia 5). Also the famous Laocoön is considered Rhodian, as it is attributed to Agesander, Athenodorus and Polydorus. Unfortunately, its date is uncertain and oscillates from an Early Hellenistic to an Imperial one.

[98] Hölscher 2000², 68.

[99] Ibid., 70.

messages.[100] This new framework would make Thrason's connection between Penelope and marriage closer and, as a consequence, it would increase its thematic link with the Eph.

Finally, Classical and early Hellenistic Ephesus housed Homeric paintings, which might support this hypothesis of a local "epic" tradition and attribute to it an even earlier origin.[101] First, in the second half of the fifth century BC the famous painter Zeuxis of Heraclea portrayed a special Penelope,[102] in which her morality was stressed. In Mactoux's (1975) view, it is not unlikely that this work was set in Ephesus, since his 'Ménélas versant des libations'[103] had this origin. One century later, Euphranor Isthmius depicted in Ephesus Odysseus feigning madness.[104] Likewise, the contemporary painter Parrhasius, who came from Ephesus,[105] was keen on Homer too: according to Pliny, he represented a group of Telephus with Achilles, Agamemnon and Odysseus[106], another Ulysses feigning madness[107] and the dispute over Achilles' weapons between Ulysses and Ajax.[108] Finally, Apelles of Colophon is attributed with a painting of Artemis surrounded by a group of maidens offering a sacrifice, which, according to Pliny, was meant to imitate the Odyssean description of Nausicaa.[109] Unfortunately, the location of this painting is unknown, but, since Apelles later in his life probably became an Ephesian citizen[110] and he produced for the Artemision the painting of Megabyzus' procession,[111] the hypothesis that also this "Odyssean" painting was displayed there is not unlikely.

If we consider these Homeric traces altogether, the existence in Ephesus of a local "epic" tradition becomes plausible and, thus, the possibility that Xen. was influenced by this increases.

---

[100] Ibid., 72.

[101] In Mactoux's (1975) view, this would explain why 'Strabon ne voit dans le couple Pénélope-Euryclée rien d'insolite' (90).

[102] See Plin. *NH* 35.63: 'Fecit et Penelopen, in qua pinxisse mores videtur'.

[103] Reinach 1985, 233 = Tzetz. *Chil*. 8.388-391.

[104] See Plin. *NH* 35.128-129: 'Nobilis eius tabula Ephesi est, Ulixes simulata insania bovem cum equo iungens et palliati cogitantes, dux gladium condens'.

[105] See ibid. 35.67: 'Parrhasius Ephesi natus'.

[106] See ibid. Plin. *NH* 35.71: 'laudantur et Aeneas Castorque ac Pollux in eadem tabula, item Telephus, Achilles, Agamemnon, Ulixes'.

[107] See Plut. *De. Aud. Poet*. 3 = Reinach 1985 269.

[108] See LIMC Odysseus 55.

[109] See Plin. *NH* 36.96: 'Peritiores artis praeferunt omnibus eius operibus [...] Dianam sacrificantium virginum choro mixtam, quibus vicisse Homeri versus videtur id ipsum describentis'. As Reinach 1985, 342-3, n.2 suggests, 'comme il s'agit dans ces vers de chasse et non de sacrifice, on a proposé de corriger sacrificantium en silvis venantium, vagantium ou saltantium'.

[110] See Str. 14.1.25.

[111] See Plin. *NH* 35.93: 'Pinxit et Megabyzi, sacerdotis Dianae Ephesiae, pompam'.

4) The recovery of Brunn's (1836) idea: Thrason's group as the original model of the Campana Reliefs

This hypothesis might be supported by a further element, which is suggested by a deeper look at the aforementioned sculptures. I have already argued that the Campana reliefs were Roman copies of a Greek original. Since 1829 the identity of these has been discussed by scholars:[112] the more common interpretation is given by Hiller 1972, who discusses an original group composed of 'die Sitzstatue der Penelope in der Version Torso Teheran (Kat. 4)[113] mit der Statue einer stehenden Greisin zusammenbrachte',[114] which would have been reinterpreted as 'die neu gebildete Gruppe als Penelope und Eurykleia'.[115] This demonstration is based on the presence of similarities between both statues and the Penelope and the Eurycleia of Roman reliefs. On the other hand, his choice of these two Greek sculptures depends on the presence in them of common features, such as the Severe style, same dimensions, inclinations of the body and position of the feet.[116]

Given this framework, Hiller 1972 observes how the Campana reliefs house on the left two servants, whose representation marks a distinction from that of Penelope and Eurycleia, and he considers them early Hellenistic.[117] This difference is interpreted by Hiller 1972 as the proof that they were not part of the original group, in which they were probably replaced by Odysseus, since his association with Penelope was a recurrent motif in Classical Melian reliefs.[118] In my opinion, although Hiller's (1972) theory is based on interesting arguments, it must be questioned. The first objection is unconsciously raised by Brunn 1889 in his old history of Greek artists: when discussing the Campana reliefs with Penelope and Eurycleia, he in fact observes how 'das Geistige der Composition, das sich in ihr aussprechende Gefühl, das Trauern und Sinnen, zeugt dagegen von einem so tiefen künstlerichen Verständniss und einer solchen Freiheit in Beherrschung aller Mittel, dass es bedenklich scheint, hier eine Composition der alten Zeit, der Kunst vor Phidias, anzunehmen'.[119] This emotional feature seems in fact more Hellenistic than Classical.

Second, the hypothesis that the servants belong to another work because of their different style does not fit the eclectic approach that characterised Roman art: as Hölscher argues, in fact, 'in ogni fase della storia romana si è fatto ricorso alle epoche stilistiche più diverse, dal tardo arcaismo fino al tardo-ellenistico'.[120] In other words, the combination of Severe and Hellenistic styles might have

---

[112] Thiersch is the first who proposed a connection between the Campana reliefs and Greek statues (445).

[113] See also LIMC Penelope, 2.

[114] Kader 2006, 53-54.

[115] Ibid., 54.

[116] See Hiller 1972, 64.

[117] See ibid., 50.

[118] See LIMC Penelope, 20-21 and Hiller 1972, 66: 'Es wäre denkbar, daß der römische Reliefbildner die beiden Mägde als Ersatz für eine im Original verlorene Statue gegeben hat'.

[119] Brunn 1889, 422.

[120] Hölscher 2000[2],14.

depended on the choice of the original author and not on a late interpolation. Moreover, 'premesse e inizi di questo linguaggio figurativo furono prodotti non a Roma ma nella Grecia del II secolo a.C.',[121] where artists started to resume the Classical style and then 'portarono presto a Roma questa attitudine formale'.[122] Interestingly, this part of the Hellenistic Era is the period when Thrason's group could have been composed.

Thanks to these observations, I would speculate that Brunn's following general question might have a positive and precise answer: 'Sollte etwa zwischen diesen und den Werken des Thrason ein Zusammenhang anzunehmen sein?'[123] In other words, Thrason's works might have been the original of the Campana reliefs. On this hypothesis, the former were produced in the last part of the Hellenistic Era and then they were discovered by the Romans, following a route similar to that of the sculptures of the Antikythera shipwreck. At the same time, this interpretation does not exclude Hiller's (1972), because his two Severe statues might have been Thrason's model.

The reason why this new idea might be useful for our study of the Eph. is that it attributes a greater importance to our group: in fact, the production of Campana reliefs was truly significant, since it lasted from the Late Republic Era to the Imperial.[124] Further, as Kader argues, it had a "popular" development, as they 'wurden [...] zur Verkleidung der Wände von Heiligtümern oder vornehmen Häusern verwendet'.[125] Finally, the recurrence in them of Penelope was the proof of the 'Heroisierungsprozess'[126] which the heroine was receiving during the Augustan Era, as the consequence of the rise of women's 'Verantwortung und soziale Spielraum'.[127]

If this Latin development originated from an imitation of Thrason's group, we can assume that his statues were considered important and it becomes likely that the connection between Penelope the faithful wife and Ephesus was part of their fame. Thus, the hypothesis of the existence of a local tradition of Odysseus' wife is strengthened and the secret of the connection between Ephesus and Ithaca might lie here.

5) Further traces of an Ephesian Homeric presence

Having said that, other sources seem to confirm that Ephesus was a land of Homeric traditions. First, Plato introduces in his dialogue *Ion* a homonymous rhapsode who comes from Ephesus. Unfortunately, as Woodruff states, 'we know nothing about him but what Plato reveals in his

---

[121] Ibid., 89.

[122] Ibid., 90.

[123] Brunn 1889, 422.

[124] On this, see Mactoux 1975, 145: 'ces bas-reliefs ne sont que quelques spécimens de tout un ensemble de plaques murales à la mode au dernier siècle de la République et sous l'Empire jusqu'au début du IIe siécle'. Cf. also Bol 2007, 314, according to which the production of this relief was 'an answer to the needs of the Roman artistic market and of the new Roman houses'. More generally on Campana reliefs, see Borbein 1968, esp. 13-42.

[125] Kader 2006, 49.

[126] Ibid.

[127] Ibid.

dialogue'[128] and in the text he omits particular features. According to Graziosi, 'the fact that the known rhapsodes (not only Ion, but also Terpsicles and Cynaethus from Chios) tend to come from Ionia also suggests that Homeric traditions flourished in that area as late as the fifth century'.[129] Second, early Hellenistic Ephesus is connected with the story of two ancient scholars of Homer, Zenodotus and Aratus. The former, who is known as the first τῶν Ὁμήρου διορθωτὴς καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ βιβλιοθηκῶν προῦστη,[130] was born in Ephesus and his broad knowledge of the ancient poet is indisputable.[131] However, the link between his works and his Ephesian origin is not demonstrable. Conversely, this possibility seems to concern Aratus from Soloi, who spent his formative years in Ephesus,[132] where he had Menecrates as a teacher, 'a grammarian as well as a poet in the Hesiodic manner'.[133] The results of this education would be his 'fairly reliable'[134] critical edition of the *Odyssey* and the epic work *Phaenomena*. As a consequence, an early Hellenistic interest in Homeric studies seems to exist in this city.

A third witness is again Strabo: in his whole analysis of Ephesus, in fact, he surprises the readers by attributing 'a supreme importance to the origin and to the development of the traditions of this city'.[135] Particularly, he assigns to Ephesus the leadership in the Ionic Dodecapolis by mentioning the establishment in it of the royal seat of Ionians made by the mythical founder Androclus, Codrus' son.[136] This legend is quite interesting, because it contradicts the Classical version reported by Hellanicus and by Panyassis, where 'Miletus is the starting point of the ἀποικία'.[137] In Luraghi's view, this change 'could well reflect the Hellenistic and Roman Ephesus, the most important city of Asia Minor'.[138] Personally, I would like to suggest a further reason that could fit into this interpretation. As I have already said, Ionia has always been connected with the origin of the Homeric poems. Since Strabo in his books on Asia Minor shows 'a profound, nearly, obsessive

---

[128] Woodruff 1983, 5.

[129] Graziosi 2002, 84-5. Another connection is given by the linguistic correspondence between Ionic dialect and that used by Homer. On this, see also West 1988. Having said that, however, a specific connection with Ephesus is not attested and Ephesus is strangely not included in the list of early places associated which claimed to be Homer's homeland, like 'Chos, Smyrna, Colophon and Cyme' (Graziosi 2002, 84).

[130] Lexicon *Suda*, s.v. Zenodotus.

[131] On this, see Pfeiffer 1968: 'his Homeric studies may have included a treatise on the number of days in the Iliad and a Life of Homer' (116-7).

[132] See Pfeiffer 1968, 120.

[133] Ibid.. See also lexicon *Suda*, s.v. Menecrates: ἀκουστὴς δὲ ἐγένετο γραμματικοῦ μὲν τοῦ Ἐφεσίου Μενεκράτους.

[134] Pfeiffer 1968, 121.

[135] See Bellucci 2000, 250.

[136] See Str. 14.1.3.

[137] Luraghi 2000, 365.

[138] Ibid.

interest in Homer',[139] I would speculate that his emphasis on Ephesus as the new capital of the Ionia could also depend on the fact that Homeric traditions were important in this city during the first century BC.[140]

The last testimony is Aelius Aristides: in his oration *Concerning Concord*, which was performed in Pergamum in 167 AD, he asked different cities, especially Smyrna, Ephesus and Pergamum, to withdraw from the competition for the leadership. When at paragraph twenty-three he addresses the Ephesians, he praises the centrality of their πόλις in the Mediterranean Sea: οἶμαι δὲ καὶ πάντας ὅσοι στηλῶν Ἡρακλέους ἐντὸς καὶ ποταμοῦ Φάσιδος, οἰκειουμένους τὴν Ἔφεσον ὀρθῶς ἂν διανοεῖσθαι, τοῦτο μὲν τῇ τῶν λιμένων κοινότητι, τοῦτο δὲ ταῖς ἄλλαις ἁπάσαις ὑποδοχαῖς.[141] Then, after this geographical and maritime image, the orator defines Ephesus as a sort of exemplary homeland: πάντες γὰρ ὡς εἰς πατρίδα αὐτῶν κομίζονται καὶ οὐδεὶς οὕτως ἀγνώμων οὐδ' οὕτως σφόδρα ὁμόσε τοῖς φανεροῖς ἰών, ὅστις οὐκ ἂν συγχωρήσειε ταμιεῖόν τε κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας εἶναι τὴν πόλιν καὶ τῆς χρείας καταφυγήν.[142] The image of Ephesus as an Ithaca might here be echoed. In addition, at paragraph thirty-six, when referring more generally to the whole of Ionia, Aelius stresses how Homer is the κοινότατος ὁ ποιητὴς: this suggests that the connection with the poet was still important in this area during the second century AD.

This last testimony is not only important because of the value that it attributes to Ephesus, but also for its chronology: thus far, our attempted reconstruction of a Homeric presence has been made in connection with the age just prior to that of Xenophon of Ephesus. However, the history of this city shows a continuity between the first century BC and the first two AD, with an increase of its central role: relying on this fact and following Aelius Aristides' indication, I would argue that it is very likely that the local Homeric tradition did not lose popularity in the Imperial Era.

Furthermore, the whole of Asia Minor during the Roman domination was full of intellectuals who were keen on a 'Greek re-creation of the past'[143] and used Homer to achieve this aim: for instance, 'in Phrygia and adjacent areas of Asia Minor [...] Homeric names became especially popular'.[144] Finally, as the moral interpretations of Homer and epitaphs show, the Hellenistic perception of Penelope as a symbol of marriage was still alive in the Imperial Period as well as the artistic

---

[139] Kim 2007, 363. See also Biraschi 2005, 83: 'Since his undertaking has first of all a paideutic and cultural nature, the reintroduction of Homer must have seemed to him an important element in that perspective'. Although in this intent Strabo was encouraged by the Homeric studies developed in Rome in his time, his perspective is different from that of Dionysius Halicarnassensis and other Roman authors, who developed the theory of the 'Ellenicità di Roma' (Biraschi 2000, 68; cf. also Heath 1998, esp. 23-25, 32-22).

[140] On the role of Ephesus as new capital of the Ionia, see Vibius Salutaris' procession, which aims to give to the city 'a specific form of the Ionian foundation story' (Rogers 1991, 141).

[141] See par. 24.

[142] Ibid.

[143] Bowie 1974, 200.

[144] Ibid. 199.

exploitation of Odyssean themes[145] and, thus, this framework suggests that the same continuity might have concerned our Ephesus.

As a result, it is possible to argue that Xen.'s double parallel between Anthia and Penelope and Ephesus and Ithaca might have depended on the presence of both an ancient and contemporary local Homeric tradition.

6) The implausible link between the Ephesian Artemis and Penelope

The discovery of this framework leads us to investigate whether Xen.'s Artemis might also be fitted into the same local background. Since in the novel she lacks local colour, the link with Ephesus could be proved by the holy location of Thrason's group. However, Penelope's and Eurycleia's statues do not seem to perform a cultic function. In theory, we might be dealing with a heroic cult of Homeric heroines, since this phenomenon developed consistently in Ancient Greece from the eighth century BC.[146] Penelope, however, was involved in it only in the Arcadian tradition, as her tomb near Mantineia attests,[147] while Eurycleia was never worshipped. Therefore, it is implausible to attribute this function to Thrason's group.[148] Second, both heroines might have played the role of Artemis' attendants:[149] nevertheless, in Greece this goddess usually welcomed in her cult girls in whose life 'aspects of the normal transition went wrong'[150] and Penelope and Eurycleia do not fit into this framework.

Finally, Artemis' Ephesian cult could be connected with marriage and, thus, express this value through Homeric material:[151] however, the different demonstrations given by scholars on this point are not satisfactory. Some highlighted the "multibreasted" representation of this goddess, but the interpretation of these breasts as symbols of fecundity is no longer accepted, as it occurs only in

---

[145] Also Roman paintings confirm the Imperial persistence of Odyssean themes: a fresco from Pompei has been preserved with the washing of Odysseus' feet (see Penelope, LIMC 24), three contemporary ones with the recognition scene (LIMC ibid. 36-38) and a last one from Stabia (LIMC 39). All these works date in the I century AD.

[146] The birth of heroic cults was in fact connected with that of epic poetry: see Burkert 1985, 206. Their focal point was 'the presence of the tomb', which 'sometimes was substituted by chapels called *heroa*' (Larson 1995, 9).

[147] See Paus. 8.12.5; see also Larson 1995, 174, n. 3.

[148] A further obstacle to the existence of a heroic cult in our case is given by the late chronology: it is difficult, in fact, to find heroic cults in the Hellenistic Era and, among the few that existed, some were part of new queen and courtesan cults. For example, Andromache started to be worshipped as the mother of Pergamos (see ibid., 16, n. 1 and Pomeroy 1990, 28-40).

[149] This is another general attitude of Greek sanctuaries, which often housed images of hero or heroines that 'were connected to the gods to which the statue or group were offered' (see Rolley 1994, 12).

[150] Larson 1995, 117.

[151] Although some of Artemis' rituals in places like Brauron, Athens and Patrai (see respectively Dowden 1989, 20-24, Plut. *Arist*. 20 and Paus. 8.18.11) were connected with marriage, local evidence is required: as Sourvinou-Inwood 1978, 102-103 clearly argues, 'the study of Greek divine personalities should be based on specific local religious units and rely on internal evidence alone', because the Panhellenic conception of them does not correspond always to their local representations.

polemical Christian texts[152] and, in fact, they are now identified with other objects.[153] LiDonnici 1992 considers Artemis' interest in marriage as part of her protective role of the Roman Ephesus, but direct proof of this is missing.[154] Finally, Sokolowski interprets an Ephesian donation of clothes to Artemis in Sardis as the sign of her care of wives: this goddess, in fact, 'often received garments in thanks for a happy marriage or fortunate childbirth'.[155] Although this hypothesis starts from real evidence, it is undermined by the lack of the same votive gifts in Ephesus. If we combine this uncertainty with Pausanias' information that the Artemision was forbidden to married women,[156] it seems difficult to use Thrason's work to demonstrate the marital competence of the Ephesian Artemis.

As a result, the discovery of Strabo's statues seems to suggest that Xenophon's use of Penelope and Ithaca in his novel resembles a local feature of Ephesus. Despite the absence of Artemis in this framework, this conclusion is significant: in fact, it does not only confirm the Odyssean framework of this text, but it might also shed new light on the mysterious identity of the novelist. Although the lack of biographical evidence still makes it impossible to assess his provenance, his awareness of Ephesian traditions suggests that he might have had direct knowledge of the city. This conclusion brings his complete name 'Xenophon of Ephesus' closer to the truth than previously thought.

---

[152] See Oster 1990, 1725.

[153] The more popular view is given by Seiterle 1979, who interprets these protuberances as testicles of bulls, that might have been offered to the goddess during her common sacrifices. More recently, Morris 2001, 146, has suggested a Hittite origin for this decoration: 'the appendages of Artemis, transformed by a kurša, simply express in alternate form the ancient cornucopia, Greek "horn of Amaltheia"'. The cornucopia could match the hypothesis of a cult connected with fertility, but not with maternity: in fact 'there are plenty of other images, including male figures, who wear these appendages without maternal properties', such as Zeus and the Tyche of Smyrna (ibid., 146-147). Finally, Thomas 2004, 257 argues that 'rather than drawing on the maternal aspect of the indigenous goddess, the Ephesian identification represents her as the πότνια θερῶν, the mistress of the animals, a role assigned to Artemis from the *Iliad* onward in Greek myth'.

[154] LiDonnici 1992, 394. She adds also that this role could be supported by Artemis' identification with Isis, whose nursing role was well-known. The existence of an Ephesian cult of this Egyptian goddess is, however, disputed: on this, see Walters 1995.

[155] Sokolowski 1965, 428. He analyses a sentence of death of forty-five inhabitants of Sardis who were accused of maltreating a sacred embassy sent from Ephesus.

[156] See Paus. 7.2.7.

CHAPTER 4: XENOPHON AND HIS NAME

The lemma from the *Suda* does not only concern the origin of Xen., but also that of his name. In this respect, it is important to notice that the lexicon lists our Xen. among three other historians (ἱστορικοί) who have the same name: as Tilg argues, 'this seems to point to a pattern behind this choice of name'[157] and, in fact, 'it is widely held that the author of the Eph. chose "Xenophon" as a pen name to establish a link with the historian Xenophon and exploit his authority'[158].

While this conclusion is quite plausible, because the Athenian historian was one of the most important models for Imperial writers, it is less easy to understand to what extent and depth our author is using this prestigious comparison. Some scholars, such as Ruiz Montero 2003, explore this link from a stylistic point of view, showing how both Xenophon of Athens and our author write a similar kind of narrative along with a group of other authors. On the other hand, the hypothesis of a closer connection has recently been proposed by Capra 2008, who argues that the novelist owes a special debt to the *Cyropaedia* and, particularly, to the love story of Panthea and Abradates which is part of this work. Then, he explores why Xen. would have referred to this model and finds the answer in his desire to construct his novel as an anti-tragic work.

In my opinion, the strength of this study lies in how Capra 2008 proves the intertextuality between the historian and our author, which is based on the protagonists' names. His argumentation starts from an old statement made by Bagnell Bury: 'the author [Xen.] may have adapted the names of his hero and heroine, Antheia and Abrocomas, from Pantheia and Abradatas, of whom a touching story is told in the *Cyropaedia* of Xenophon the Athenian'.[159] Capra's (2008) declared aim is to prove the correctness of this intuition and to exploit it to trace a more detailed parallel between the two works. While the similarities between the names are self-evident, Capra argues that Panthea's name was so popular in the Imperial Era that, as Lucian's *Eikones* proves with its praise of Panthea, the association of Anthia with her was very easy to make. Second, Capra explains why Xen. slightly changed the form of the names: his hellenisation of them would be a consequence of the 'uncompromising contempt towards the 'barbarians'[160] which is typical of his genre, as Kuch 1996 proves. In addition, it is evident that this little shift does not weaken the connection with the original names: 'imagine a contemporary writer, known e.g. as 'Shakespeare of Sheffield', coming up with a touching love story called, say, Curleo and Liliet: would anyone fail to detect a reference to the 'real' Shakespeare among the curls and the lilies?"[161] In conclusion, every literate person of the Imperial Era would have understood which model underlay the names of Habrocomes and Anthia and Xen. was certainly using them to engage with Xenophon of Athens.

---

[157] Tilg 2010, 87.

[158] Ibid.

[159] Bagnell Bury 1889, 324.

[160] Capra 2008, 43.

[161] Capra 2008, 30-31

While this undoubtedly confirms the hypothesis of "Xenophon" as a literary nickname, it is more difficult to understand what our author is doing with the *Cyropaedia*. Although the demonstrated link proves Xen.'s interest in this work, a parallel analysis of the texts shows distant echoes more than real similarities. This makes it difficult to reach a final assessment of this relationship.

Capra 2008 provides us with a list of thematic correspondences:[162]

a) *Cyr*. 1.4.4: Araspas feels invulnerable toward love and is punished as Habrocomes (esp. 1.4.3 n.: τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς);

b) *Cyr*. 6.4.6: Panthea gives Abradates a new suit of armour and swears an oath of fidelity; this passage might be recalled by Anthia's oath to Habrocomes (1.11.3-6);

c) *Cyr*. 6.4.11: the contest of beauty between the protagonists and the prominence of Panthea's κάλλος over that of Abradates might be echoed by that of Habrocomes over Anthia in the *Eph*. (1.2.8);

d) *Cyr*. 7.3.16: Cyrus' decision to build a tumulus for Panthea might be reflecting what Habrocomes states in his monologue near Ephesus (5.10.5).

Although Capra adds that Xen.'s novel 'must be read against the background of Panthea's novella, with an obvious subversion of its tragic features',[163] as the positive end of the *Eph*. would prove, I would be more cautious about this conclusion. As I will argue in the commentary (1.4.3 n.: τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς), I believe that only in the first is Xen. probably intertexting with the *Cyropaedia*. More generally, it is interesting how Panthea, like Anthia, is focused on conjugal fidelity: as Tatum argues, in fact, 'the author's obvious desire is to create an image of a chaste wife'.[164] A case in point is Panthea's refusal of Araspas' love, where she shows a total devotion to her husband.[165] Then, before the end of the episode, this virtue is again emphasised by Cyrus in his final praise.[166] Finally, Panthea's farewell to Abradatas is quite interesting, as the former shows a tragic stature. Since the heroine confesses her fidelity openly[167] and, just before her speech, is compared with Odysseus,[168] a model which seems to work here is that of Penelope. Given this framework, it is not impossible that, like Helen (APP 4), Panthea inspired Xen. in the construction of Anthia, providing him with a tragic model of a faithful wife. However, this hypothesis is highly speculative.

---

[162] See Capra 2008, 36.

[163] Capra 2008, 37.

[164] Tatum 1994, 20. On this, see also Cataudella 1957, 75, who attributes to this "novella" 'una funzione morale [...] di esaltazione della fedeltà coniugale'.

[165] See 6.1.32: Ἡ δὲ ἀπέφησε μὲν καὶ ἦν πιστὴ τῷ ἀνδρὶ καίπερ ἀπόντι.

[166] See 7.3.12: ἐγώ σε καὶ σωφροσύνης ἕνεκα καὶ πάσης ἀρετῆς καὶ τἆλλα τιμήσω [...].

[167] See 6.4.5: εἴ τις καὶ ἄλλη πώποτε γυνὴ τὸν ἑαυτῆς ἄνδρα μεῖζον τῆς ἑαυτῆς ψυχῆς ἐτίμησεν, οἶμαί σε γιγνώσκειν ὅτι καὶ ἐγὼ μία τούτων εἰμί.

[168] Her tears, in fact, recall those of the hero in front of Alcinous, cf. Xen. *Cyr*. 6.4.3 and *Od*. 8.521-533.

CHAPTER 5: THE CIRCULATION OF THE *EPHESIACA* IN ANTIQUITY

The circulation of the Eph. in the Imperial and in the Byzantine Era has never been the object of a thorough study and my commentary does not aim to remedy this need, because this topic would require the space of another dissertation. The reason for this silence lies in the difficulty of finding appropriate witnesses: even Photius, who gives pieces of information about the other Greek novelists, is silent about Xen. That said, in my study of the first book some important readers of the Eph. have emerged, who suggest that our text was read in antiquity by authors who lived both close to and far from Xen. This conclusion challenges the traditional scholarly view about this topic, according to which 'the earliest sure reference is Gregory Pardus'.[169] My demonstration starts from a Greek novelist and then follows a chronological order.

As a premise, I must confess that there is no certainty about which version of the Eph. was in the hands of these early readers. This does not allow us to use these witnesses as certain proof of the literary consideration of the Eph. in antiquity. However, they prove that this text had a greater fortune that is usually thought and suggest that chastity and fidelity were the most appreciated themes of the novel at every stage of the reception.

1) Heliodorus

To begin with, the Eph. was certainly part of Hld.'s library. This thesis, which was already developed by Schnepf 1887, can be demonstrated just by looking at Xen.'s first book.

The most significant passage of the Eph. which Hld. uses is the procession scene. As Xen., Hld. introduces a religious ceremony in Delphi, which includes the protagonists' description, their falling in love and their subsequent lovesickness. In the commentary I will show how each of these parts recalls and expands on Xen.'s text (1.2.2-5 n.: τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος). Second, the account of the first separation between Anthia and Habrocomes includes erotic motifs such as "painful separation", "delay of the separation" and "to turn to see the beloved's eyes". Since in the novelistic corpus they appear again only in Hld. (table 2, in <u>LI</u> 2.3) in the description of Arsace's lovesickness, this makes the connection between the two passages plausible. Finally, in the scene of the fifth book of the *Aethiopica* the protagonists and Calasiris face the pirates as Anthia and Habrocomes do at the end of the first book. In addition, in Hld. the fisherman who hosts them in Zacynthus is a double of Aegialeus (1.13 intr., n.).

As this framework gives a foundation to the intertextuality between Xen. and Hld., it is interesting to explore the reasons why the latter would be imitating the former. As the first link suggests, the main reason seems to be the similar focus on divine chastity, as the double parallel between the female protagonists and Artemis indicates. This connection is further strengthened by the fact that Xen. and Hld. have a moral concern and a sincere religious devotion which is not shared by the other novelists (for more, see <u>LI</u> 2.3.bA). In addition, the fact as sophisticated a writer as Hld. is

---

[169] Henderson 2009, 210.

borrowing erotic motifs from Xen. suggests that in the Late Imperial Era the Eph. was seen as a text worthy of literary consideration. In this second case, however, our uncertainty about what version of the Eph. Hld. was reading imposes a limit on this theory.

2) Apuleius

In Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* the famous story of Cupid and Psyche has been defined by scholars as 'a miniature Greek novel inserted into Apuleius' text' (Harrison 2007b, 213). In my opinion, the first part of this story might be intertexting with the Eph., because there is a good number of shared narrative motifs, in which their sequence also seems to be respected.

Since it is very likely that Apuleius wrote after Xen., the result of this comparison sheds light on the former and especially on his use of Greek novels. At the same time, however, it appears important also for our novel, because this connection would prove how quick and wide the reception of our novel had been in the Imperial Era. Further, with the exclusion of the "epitome theory", it would also imply that the Eph. was a text commonly accepted by Imperial early "literati".

A study like this is undertaken by Harrison 2007b as part of his research about the presence in Apuleius of parallel cults drawn from the Greek novels. His main point about Xen. is that Apuleius intertexts with his oracle in Cupid and Psyche's story and this parallel opens the possibility that the latter author 'took from the former Xenophon's characterisation of Isis as protector of the heroine and used this to characterise her relationship with Lucius',[170] playing ironically with the issue of chastity and introducing a gender shift. In my opinion, although this idea offers an unusual solution for the controversial issue of the presence of Isis, we would need further proof to accept it and the oracles are not so generous: to begin with, both the situation and content of Apuleius' oracle do not coincide with those of the Eph, since Psyche's disease is not provoked by love and Apollo does not give a message of final hope.

Conversely, I would rather argue that the parallel between Xen. and Apuleius can be accepted if we start from the beginning of Cupid and Psyche's story, in which the heroine emerges as a double of Habrocomes:

a) 4.28: Psyche's beauty attracts many suitors, who worship her like Venus; this recalls Habrocomes' outstanding beauty (1.1.1) and how the Asians adore him as a god (1.1.3).

b) 29: this huge tribute to Psyche generates anger and indignation in Venus' mind ('Haec honorum caelestium ad puellae mortalis cultum immodica translatio verae Veneris vehementer incendit animos'); this divine reaction is similar to that of Xen.'s Eros (1.2.1: Μηνιᾷ [...] ὁ Ἔρως).

c) 30: Venus invites her son Eros to enter the scene of the story. The god is described as an audacious warrior (cf. 'pinnatum illum et satis temerarium' and 'quamquam genuina licentia'). Also this piece is comparable with the beginning of Xen.'s second chapter (2.1.1: φιλόνεικος γὰρ ὁ θεὸς καὶ ὑπερηφάνοις ἀπαραίτητος).

---

[170] Harrison 2007b, 216.

d) 31: Venus asks Eros to take revenge on Psyche and she defines her beauty as proud ('in pulchritudinem contumacem severiter vindica'), introducing a possible connection with Habrocomes' arrogance (1.1.4 n.).

e) 32: since nobody wants to marry her, Psyche becomes ill in her body as well as in her mind (aegra corporis, animi saucia). Also Habrocomes' sickness, despite its different origin, affects both sides of his person (1.5.5: τὸ σῶμα πᾶν ἠφάνιστο καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καταπεπτώκει).

f) 32: Psyche's worried father decides to consult the Milesian oracle of Apollo, suspecting the existence of a divine hostility to his daughter. This recalls the decision taken by Anthia and Habrocomes' parents to consult Apollo in Colophon (1.5.9).

g) 33: the two oracles are similarly long[171] and have a similar content, despite their different conclusions. More precisely, the two texts share the motif of marriage as a death: cf. τάφος θάλαμος (1.6.2, n.: oracle, v. 6) and 'funerei thalami' (2).

h) The two responses make the parents decide for the marriage of their children, although in Apuleius we are dealing with 'ferales nuptiae'.

In my opinion, this generous amount of parallels makes an intertextuality between these two authors plausible, which would be focused on the comparison between Habrocomes and Psyche. The only important difference, along with the lack of hope in Apuleius' response, lies in Habrocomes' pride, which is only once ascribed to Psyche through Venus' focalization. However, this omission could depend on the different gender: pride is considered less appropriate for a woman than for a man.

This observation leads me to a final speculation: Apuleius' substitution of the male Habrocomes for the female Psyche, which is accompanied by a variation in gods, since Aphrodite enters the scene with Eros, reminds me of *Callirhoe*. In this novel, in fact, from the beginning Callirhoe is compared with Aphrodite because of her beauty (1.2.1) and both gods are actors of the plot. As a result, I would speculate that Apuleius was also including this other novelist in the construction of his story and that he might have introduced this gender shift for this reason.

This possibility of Apuleius' subtle use of two intertexts, which would expand Harrison's point 2007b about the dependence of the author of Madaura on the Greek novels, is not only interesting for the study of the Latin author, but would also suggest something about the genre of the Greek novels. If Char. and Xen. were considered close hypotexts by a good writer like Apuleius, this might suggest that the Early Imperial sophisticated readers were already looking at them as part of the same group. In addition, Apuleius' exploitation of the Eph. in a story which focuses on gods and an oracle confirms that Xen.'s focus on religion was appreciated in antiquity.

3) **Lucian?**

Although I am aware that this is the most speculative of the four hypotheses, it is interesting that in Lucian's *Eikones* the protagonist Panthea is compared to Penelope, Nausicaa and Arete: εἰκάσθω οὖν καὶ αὐτὴ [...] καὶ Ἀρήτῃ καὶ τῇ θυγατρὶ αὐτῆς τῇ Ναυσικάᾳ, καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλη ἐν μεγέθει πραγμάτων ἐσωφρόνησε πρὸς τὴν τύχην (19). Since Xen. also is subtly associating Anthia with

---

[171] See Harrison 2007b, 215: 'Both oracles reply in verse at very similar length, in nine hexameters in Xenophon and in four elegiac couplets in Apuleius'.

Nausicaa and Arete, and Anthia shares σωφροσύνη with Panthea, it is not impossible that Lucian was aware of the existence of the Eph. and was here imitating Xen.'s approach to Homer.

A hypothesis like this is very interesting from a chronological point of view: since Lucian wrote this work between 162 and 166 BC, he would constitute, as Apuleius, a very early reader of the Eph.

4) Aristaenetus

The dependence of Aristaenetus on Xen. has been noted by Mazal 1971 in some passages, but no one has drawn a final conclusion about this relationship. In my opinion, the intertextuality between the two is clearly proven by the following parallels:

a) in Aristaenetus' sixteenth letter of the first book a timid lover manages to approach his beloved and to have sex with her. The positive result of his attempt is expressed by Aristaenetus with the words πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐφιλονεικοῦμεν δι'ὅλης τῆς νυκτός (1.16.35-37). This sentence overtly recalls Xen.'s expression ἐφιλονείκουν δὲ δι'ὅλης νυκτὸς (Xen. 1.9.9), as no other Greek author combines this verb with the temporal complement;

b) in Aristaenetus' seventeenth letter the expression μέρη τοῦ σώματος ἐγύμνωσεν ἂν τὰ δυνατά (1.27.27-9) recalls that of Xen. wedding night: ἕτερα δὲ τοῦ σώματος ἐγύμνωσε μέρη τὰ δυνατά. Since no other author apart from Xen.Eph. and Aristaenetus combines ἐγύμνωσε with μέρη and τὰ δυνατά, the intertextuality between them is here transparent.

c) in Aristaenetus' seventh epistle of the second book a servant successfully pursues her mistress's lover using Anthia's question to Habrocomes in the wedding night (cf. Aristaen. 2.7.17-18 ἆρα δοκῶ σοι καλὴ καὶ μετὰ τὴν σὴν εὐμορφίαν ἀρέσκω σοι; and Xen. 1.9.4: see δοκῶ σοι καλὴ καὶ μετὰ τὴν σὴν εὐμορφίαν ἀρέσκω σοι;). Also here no other author writes this expression.

d) Aristaenetus' second letter mentions a character called Habrocomes.

As I will show in the commentary, the first reason why the discovery of this link is important lies in the fact that the epistle writer can be used to correct Xen. in other passages which echo the Eph. In addition, since Aristaenetus, unlike the other readers of the Eph., explicitly intertexts with our novel, he can be used as the proof of the literary consideration which our version of the novel was receiving at the beginning of the Byzantine Era and suggests that the alleged epitome had been written before this period. Finally, Aristaenetus' exploitation of Anthia's eyes in his account of the Callimachean love story of Acontius and Cydippe might suggest that in antiquity our author was considered as close to Greek elegy and, more generally, that religion was the appreciated theme.

Conclusion

While I hope in the future to extend this study through a careful analysis of Byzantine novels, I dare to conclude that this brief framework seems to be enough to prove that the Eph. was more famous in the antiquity than is usually thought.

SECTION 2: NARRATOLOGY AND STYLE
IN THE *EPHESIACA*

The use of narratological devices in the Eph. does not appear to be complex as those of the other novelists. This does not mean that it is absent: a brief analysis of the text confirms that narratology plays a key role in Xen.'s. control over the whole novel. Our novelist introduces an apparatus of devices to continually remind the readers of the structure and the main events of the story. However, since the plot follows a simple pattern of pursuit between the protagonists, at a first glance Xen.'s exploitation of analepses and prolepses is basic.

That being said, however, two further nuances seem to emerge on further examination. First, as I have already suggested in the introduction (AIM), the oracle and the dreams establish subtler connections within the whole plot. Second, the analysis of analepses and prolepses shows that Xen. has a special aim in his writing: he is constantly trying to involve his readers in the protagonists' emotions and this aim is achieved through the constant presence of direct speeches and the adoption of a wide range of dramatic techniques. Although some of these devices are not strictly narratological, I decided to collect them in this section, because they offer a reason why the narrative of the Eph. is not complicated. Along with the simplicity peculiar to our author. Xen. seems to focus more on the emotions of his protagonists than on the construction of an articulated plot. This preference given to showing rather than telling appears to be the most original stylistic issue of the Eph.

For this reason, in this section I will move from a more traditional analysis of analepses and prolepeses to a discussion of Xen.'s theatricality. My hope is to show how these two different elements serve the same purpose in the Eph.

CHAPTER 1: ANALEPSES AND PROLEPSES

1) Analepses in the *Ephesiaca*

Analepses in the Eph. can be both actorial and narratorial, but the former are more numerous and significant than the latter. Xen., in fact, is not interested in extended narratorial analepses like those of Chariton.[172]

First, I will analyse the actorial: since in the Eph. most of these passages 'are in indirect speech'[173] and have a distinctive style and function, I will consider them separately from those in direct speech and afterwards I will also look briefly at the narratorial analepses.

---

[172] See Morgan 2007a, 456.

[173] Hägg 1971, 276.

a) Actorial analepses in the *Ephesiaca* in indirect speeches

Xen's actorial analepses in indirect speech consist mostly of lists of nouns, which can be either asyndetically or polysyndetically arranged: for this reason, they can be called recapitulations. Since it is possible to count 18 examples in the whole novel, this kind of analepsis is certainly the most important of the Eph.

If we collect the words that are included in these passages, there is a good number of repetitions and the most used concern the main events of the novel. This suggests that the first function of recapitulations is to help the readers to remember the plot:

- ὁ ἔρως: 3.3.1 (ἠράσθη κόρης), 3.5.2, 3.5.6 (τὸν Ἁβροκόμου ἔρωτα), 5.1.3, 5.9.12, 5.12.3;
- partner: 2.9.4 (τὸν ἄνδρα), 3.12.4, 5.1.3 (τὴν Ἀνθίαν), 5.9.12 (τὸν Ἁβροκόμην), 5.10.4 (τῆς Ἀνθίας)
- ἡ πατρίς: 1.11.1, 3.3.1 (Λέγει δὲ ὁ Ἁβροκόμης ὅτι Ἐφέσιος), 3.5.2 (noun), 5.9.12 (τὴν Ἔφεσον), 5.10.4;
- οἱ ὁρκοί: 3.5.2, 3.5.6 (ὅρκους τοὺς πρὸς ἐκεῖνον καὶ τὰς περὶ τῆς σωφροσύνης συνθήκας), 3.12.4 (ὅρκους τοὺς πρὸς ἐκεῖνον καὶ τὰς περὶ τῆς σωφροσύνης συνθήκας), 5.9.12;
- τὰ δέσμα: 3.3.1, 5.5.5, 5.7.2;
- ἡ ἀποδημία: 1.10.7, 3.3.1, 5.1.3 (τὴν πλάνην);
- ὁ γάμος: 2.12.3, 3.3.1 (ὅτι ἔγημεν αὐτὴν), 3.5.2
- οἱ πατέρες: 1.11.1, 3.5.2, 5.10.4
- ὁ χρησμός: 1.10.7, 1.11.1. 3.3.1.

This list includes all the main ingredients of the novel, from the important events (οἱ ὁρκοί, ἡ ἀποδημία, ὁ γάμος and ὁ χρησμός) to the main characters (partners, οἱ πατέρες), from a key topic such as ὁ ἔρως to the main place (ἡ πατρίς): as a result, Xen. seems to really use recapitulations 'to impress on the reader's mind a number of main points'. Two exemplary passages concern respectively Habrocomes and his servants. The first consists in the protagonists' account of his life to Hippothous in the third book: Λέγει δὲ ὁ Ἁβροκόμης ὅτι Ἐφέσιος καὶ ὅτι ἠράσθη κόρης καὶ ὅτι ἔγημεν αὐτὴν καὶ τὰ μαντεύματα καὶ τὴν ἀποδημίαν καὶ τοὺς πειρατὰς καὶ τὸν Ἄψυρτον καὶ τὴν Μαντὼ καὶ τὰ δεσμὰ καὶ τὴν φυγὴν καὶ τὸν αἰπόλον καὶ τὴν μέχρι Κιλικίας ὁδόν (3.3.1). As Hägg 1971, 269-270 argues, 'a motive for a detailed recapitulation might be found in the need to show the concrete background to Hippothous' reactions, described in 3.3.2-6. But if this were the main object, the selection of facts would look different'. As a result, the high number of events and the chronological order 'are no doubt there largely for the benefit of the reader'. The second case is Rhode's and Leucon's account of their story to Habrocomes. Since the hero seems to be completely untouched by their speech, Xen. seems to introduce this passage only to repeat to the readers the servants' plot.

That said, Fusillo 1996 argues that the reason for this technique lies in the 'fruizione aurale' of Xen's work (55); however, in my opinion this hypothesis is not likely. Along with the more general rejection of the oral theory (AIM), there is a more specific objection. Since eventual recitations of the novel would have involved only parts of the story, not all the recapitulations would find their

justification there, especially those that concern the whole plot. Thus, I would consider the presence of recapitulations as part of the simple use made by Xen. of narratological devices.

Having discovered this first function and recognized the correctness of Hägg's theory, it seems to me that, apart from the two analysed recapitulations, all the others play subtler and different roles and I would divide them into four smaller groups:

a1) "*Psychological recapitulations*"
Xen. uses five analepses to express the emotions of his characters and only in the first case (1.10.7) the protagonists are not considered, since they are "substituted" by Habrocomes' parents. The most important feature of this group is that Xen. seems to deliberately choose the objects of this list to emphasise the particular psychological situation with which Anthia and Habrocomes are dealing. First, in 1.11.1 there is a correspondence between their feelings and the words pronounced by Megamedes in his farewell (1.11.1, n.: πολλὰ ἐννοῦντες). Then, in both 3.5.2 and 3.12.4 the protagonists remind themselves of their conjugal fidelity and this is quite appropriate to the context: in the first passage Anthia is waiting for the marriage with Perilaus and ἐνενοεῖτο δὲ ἅμα πολλά, τὸν ἔρωτα, τοὺς ὅρκους, τὴν πατρίδα, τοὺς πατέρας, τὴν ἀνάγκην, τὸν γάμον. One might wonder why in this passage, unlike the first two recapitulations, the issue of the journey is missing. The answer lies in the fact that Anthia is reacting to the possibility of another marriage and this makes her think of her relationship with her husband more than any other thing. An even more specific focus emerges in Habrocomes' reaction to Cyno's proposal of sex, where πολλὰ ἅμα ἐσκόπει, τὴν Ἀνθίαν, τοὺς ὅρκους, τὴν πολλάκις αὐτὸν σωφροσύνην ἀδικήσασαν. Finally, a similar pattern emerges in a recapitulation close to the end of the novel, in which Habrocomes expresses his desperation at the loss of his dearest people. Unlike the previous cases, the moral concern is substituted by the memory of the people who are dearest to him: ἔννοια τῶν δεινῶν εἰσήρχετο, τῆς πατρίδος, τῶν πατέρων, τῆς Ἀνθίας, τῶν οἰκετῶν (5.10.4). As a result, these passages help to construct the protagonists' characterisation.

a2) *"Recapitulations in dialogues with a persuasive aim"*
In the second group recapitulations are part of dialogues that Anthia is having with other characters. Along with informing the readers about the plot, they obey to the persuasive strategy of the speaker and, thus, the choice of words is subordinated to this goal. In two cases the heroine uses her chastity as a persuasive device: in the first Anthia's aim is to have the poison from Eudoxus (3.5.6), while in the second to interrupt Hippothous' lust for her (5.9.12). Interestingly, both lists are very similar to the most significant recapitulations of the first group:
- 3.5.6: τὸν Ἀβροκόμου ἔρωτα καὶ τοὺς ὅρκους τοὺς πρὸς ἐκεῖνον καὶ τὰς περὶ τῆς σωφροσύνης συνθήκας;
- 5.9.12: τὸν Ἀβροκόμην, τὴν Ἔφεσον, τὸν ἔρωτα, τοὺς ὅρκους, τὰς συμφοράς, τὰ ληστήρια.
In my opinion, this similarity shows how Xen. is addressing internal audiences of the novel as well as the external one and this suggests that emotional involvement is a marked aim of his narrative. In

addition, the fact that only Anthia adopts this kind of analepsis is a sign of her major involvement in the display of fidelity (LI 4.2c) and of her closer commitment to the oath which establishes this virtue as the main one of the novel (LI 2.5).

Then, the heroine twice shows her performative ability in the dialogue with Lampo. First, she persuades the goatherd not to commit violence against her by revealing her noble origin: διηγεῖται δὲ ἥτις ἦν, τὴν προτέραν εὐγένειαν, τὸν ἄνδρα, τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν (2.9.4). The originality of this passage lies in the fact that this analepsis is the only passage in the novel where Anthia speaks about her εὐγένεια. Second, when Anthia asks Hippothous to forgive her murder of Anchialus, the account of her adventure in the ditch constitutes another recapitulation and moves the brigand to pity (5.9.10). Overall, these performative passages show how Xen.'s recapitulations cannot be considered as obvious and mechanical, but are part of the rhetorical ability which makes Anthia the bravest character in the novel (on this, LI 4.2c).

a3) *"Recapitulations which are part of recognition scenes"*
Two recapitulations are introduced by Xen. in scenes in which some characters discover new pieces of informations about others: the first concern Anthia's recognition of Hippothous (5.9.7), while the second Leucon's and Rhode's identification of Anthia (5.12.3).

a4) *"Recapitulations which motivate the action of the listeners"*: finally, in two cases a recapitulation motivates the actions of a character. This happens when Habrocomes discovers where Anthia is in the recapitulation attributed to Lampo (2.12.3) and when the inhabitants of Pelusium tell the Egyptian governor about Habrocomes' escape. This communication constitutes the origin of the punishment of the hero (4.2.1).

As a result, in the Eph. the recapitulations have first a structural aim and, second, a subtler range of functions, in which the character at the origin of these speeches is always emphasised. This articulated framework constitutes an originality in the novelistic corpus, because recapitulations are missing in Longus and Hld., while both Char. and Ach. prefer those in direct speech, which are few in Xen.. More precisely, in the work of the former author, 'the actorial analepses are presented in direct speech, as part of one of the novel's scenes'.[174] In addition, they mostly play the other function of 'clarifying how much of the story a character knows' (ibid.), which is extraneous to the Eph., with the exception of Hippothous' story to Habrocomes in 3.3.3, which I will analyse shortly.

b) Actorial analepses in the *Ephesiaca* in direct speech
The actorial analepses in direct speech are eight and can be divided into two categories:
- three, which belong to Anthia's laments (3.8.6, 5.5.5, 5.7.2), are composed of lists of nouns and, therefore, they can be considered as "psychological recapitulations";

---

[174] Morgan 2007b, 439.

- the other five are instead 'a fairly detailed retelling of a restricted part of the action'[175] and, thus, they cannot be classified as recapitulations. More precisely, they consist of two oral accounts made by Hippothous (3.3.3-5) and Chrysion (3.9.5-8), of a letter written by Manto to her father (2.12.1), and of the exceptional couple of speeches of the final night in Rhodes (5.14).

That being said, however, since this latter type performs a wide range of functions which is comparable with that of the former and of the analepses in indirect speech, Xen. seems to have conceived together all these passages, playing with a difference in length and sophistication.

Given this framework, I will now focus on the two different categories, in order to prove that they both perform subtle roles. On the one hand, the analepses pronounced by Anthia occur in the two most difficult situations of the heroine's life, her "Scheintod" in Tarsus and her misadventure in the brothel. The first shows how Anthia reflects on her experience, since she compares the brigands who are carrying her away from Tarsus to Corymbus and Euxinos (3.8.6: Πάλιν [...] λῃσταὶ καὶ θάλασσα, πάλιν αἰχμάλωτος ἐγώ [...]). Thus, it is evidently part of her characterisation and it also provokes the readers to make the same comparison (see for more 1.14.3 n.: τίς ὑμᾶς). In the second and in the third Anthia makes a list of her past trials:

- 5.5.5: οἱ τάφοι, οἱ φόνοι, τὰ δεσμά, τὰ λῃστήρια;
- 5.7.2: αἱ πρότερον συμφοραί, τὰ δεσμά, τὰ λῃστήρια.

The fact that these two passages are similar is certainly not casual: they work not only as a reminder for the readers, but they also show how the heroine knows that the experience of the brothel is the apex of her suffering. Since this episode is important for the construction of the *Bildung* of the protagonists (LI 3.2b), the recapitulation places an emphasis which goes beyond the mechanical repetition of events.

On the other hand, each of the analepses of the second category constitutes a reminder of the main events of the plot. In addition, on further examination, subtler function emerge. To begin with, Manto's letter is comparable to the group of "recapitulations which motivate the action of the listeners", because it makes Habrocomes decide to start the search for Anthia (2.12.2). This letter is also original because 'it gives false information in some details (notably πολλὰ διαπραξαμένην κακά about Anthia)',[176] as reasons for the heroine's removal to Syria. Since Manto's aim is to persuade her father, this existence of 'tendentious reasons' makes this recapitulation similar to 'recapitulations in dialogues with a persuasive aim'.[177] Second, Hippothous' and Chrysion's oral stories have a special form, since they both lack superfluous details and contain differences of focalization: Hippothous' account is focused on Anthia and not on Hippothous and his brigands as in the main narration (see 2.11.11 and 2.13.1-3), while that of Chrysion centres on Perilaus and not on Anthia (2.13.3-2.13.8, 3.5-3.8). In addition, Hippothous 'is ignorant of Anthia's identity' (Morgan 2007a, 457): this element is crucial, because this is what leads Perilaus to describe the heroine and allows Habrocomes' recognition of her. As a result, here Xen. is showing

---

[175] Hägg 1971, 274.

[176] Hägg 1971, 274.

[177] Ibid.

an interest in focalization which is unusual in his text. Finally, along with the form, the effect of these two passages on the characters of the stories is also noteworthy: in both cases they provoke two emotional reactions in Habrocomes. In both cases, he regains hope: in the first to find Anthia, while in the second to find her body, as the following exclamations prove cf. ἐπὶ Κιλικίαν τραπώμεθα, ἐκείνην ζητήσωμεν· (3.3.5) and ἀλλὰ νῦν μὲν σαφῶς τέθνηκεν Ἀνθία καὶ τάφος ἴσως αὐτῆς ἐστιν ἐνθάδε καὶ τὸ σῶμα σῴζεται (3.9.7). As a result, these passages have an effect which is comparable with those of the "psychological recapitulations": the only difference lies in the subject involved, which is not the speaker but the listener to the passage. This further proves the interconnection between analepses in direct and in indirect speech.

While the varied function of these passages already proves how Xen. has a sophisticated approach to them, the confirmation of this comes from the final dialogue between the protagonists in Rhodes, which is certainly the best written sample. To begin with, the artistic quality is proven by the fact that 'it is rhetorically arranged',[178] as emerges from the substitution of the chronological order with a division into 'logical categories'[179] and from the pluralization of most of the nouns, which leads to a generalization of the misadventures. Second, different functions seems to be intermingled here: since both protagonists try to prove their fidelity, this dialogue certainly has the same aim as the "recapitulations in dialogues with a persuasive aim". At the same time, the topic focused on love and chastity, and Anthia's insistence suggests to us also something about her psychology, thus recalling the "psychological recapitulations".

This is the last confirmation of Xen.'s interest in the elaboration of this type of analepses.

That being said, comparison with the other novelists shows how, unlike the previous case, in the whole corpus this kind of analepsis is more explored. To begin with, as I have already stated, 'large actorial analepses' appear more distinctly in Char., who 'on several occasions reproduces in full the participating characters' re-telling to each other of courses of action which have already been narrated directly to the reader'.[180] This pattern is exploited by Char. in many soliloquies which are characterised by 'a tendentious and partial review of the character's experience'[181] and by Ach. in his last book. In fact, when in 8.5.1 Cleitophon makes a recapitulation of his life, he starts with a list of nouns that recalls those of Xen (see 8.5.1) but then he starts an account in the first person in which he purposely introduces distortions from reality to defend his chastity (see 8.5.2-8 and Hägg 1971, 284). Since this subtle level of ambiguity clearly surpasses what has emerged in Manto's letter, Xen. loses his apparent originality and sophistication.

Only the final dialogue can resist this competition: if we look at the end of the novels, Char. also contains a special recapitulation in direct speech, which is given by Chaereas in front of the whole population of Syracuse (see 8.7-8). Its aim, however, is the opposite of that of Xen., because it is 'to

---

[178] Morgan 2007a, 458.

[179] Hägg 1971, 273.

[180] Hägg 1971, 286.

[181] Morgan 2007b, 439.

reduce the private character of the story and make it the concern of all the people'.[182] The same trajectory toward a public dimension concerns Hld.'s grand finale, which can be interpreted as a personal re-elaboration of the recapitulation.[183] Overall, this comparison suggests that Xen. is exploiting the same motif as the other novelists. At the same time, since he omits a public dimension, this can be interpreted as a new reading of the τόπος which presents his novel as a 'private and sentimental' story (see Fusillo 1996, 57).

This hypothesis confirms how our author has the potential to create original and artistic analepses in direct speeches.

<u>c) Narratorial analepses in the *Ephesiaca*</u>

Unlike the actorial analepses, the narratorial ones play only 'the most important function to effect transitions between and co-ordinate the separate narrative threads'.[184] On this technique, see <u>NA</u> 3c.

2) Prolepses in the *Ephesiaca*: a two-level-system

In the previous analysis it has been emerged that Xen. gives to analepses the basic function of reminding the readers of the plot and adds further nuances. This attitude becomes even more evident in the prolepses of the Eph. On the one hand, they play the simple role of foretelling to some characters and the readers whether bad or good is going to happen in the scene. Second, they introduce the same audience to a subtler anticipation of the different elements of the plot. For this reason, I decided to call this apparatus of prolepses 'a two-level-system' and I cited this earlier in the introduction as important proof of how Xen. offers two different lenses in the reading of the Eph.

Given this framework, I will now consider each type of prolepsis, starting from the elementary ones, which perform only the first function.

As Morgan clearly argues, in the Eph. prolepses can be categorised as:

- 'narratorial';

- 'statements by the narrator about the intentions of the gods';

- 'prophetic dreams and oracles';

- 'actorial prolepses'.[185]

As I have already suggested, all these passages serve a simple function of foretelling that something positive or negative is going to happen. Since, as Morgan notes, this is achieved 'without giving an accurate or coherent view of the way that the plot will actually develop'[186], the effect that prolepses

---

[182] Hägg 1971, 259.

[183] See on this Fusillo 1996, 60: 'Hld. riprende lo schema narrativo già adottato da Caritone per il suo finale, amplificandolo e dilatandolo lungo tutto il decimo libro e facendolo culminare nello scioglimento del plot a svolgersi di fronte a tutto il popolo di Meroe'.

[184] Morgan 2007a, 456.

[185] Morgan 2007a, 460.

[186] Ibid.

have on the narratees is more emotional than an increase of knowledge: they can bring hope or drive to desperation. As a result, we find here another way in which Xen. uses his narratological devices to mark the importance of emotions for his text.

The performance of this basic role is clear in the narratorial prolepses, which 'deliver an immediate effect of foreboding'.[187] The most significant case appears in 2.13.5: just before Perilaus' pity for Anthia is transformed into an incontrollable love, the narrator comments: εἶχε δὲ ἄρα μεγάλης ἀρχὴν συμφορᾶς ὁ ἔλεος Ἀνθίᾳ. Second, in the Eph. the only clear divine intention which is mentioned is that of Eros. The prolepses which refer to him allude to his fearful action of revenge, which similarly lacks more specific details (1.2.1, n.: μηνιᾷ, 1.4.5, n.: Ἔρως, 1.10.2, n.: τὸν εἱμαρμένον and 2.1.2).

While these two categories are composed of simple passages, the third is certainly the most articulated, as Xen. chooses to introduce an oracle which plays a key role in relation to the structure of the whole novel and three dreams which are hyper-enigmatic passages. On the one hand, they perform the same basic function as the other prolepses with a focus on the happy ending. This emerges clearly in Apis' oracle (5.4.11), which is exceptionally linear: its content, which literally coincides with the end of the novel (Ἀνθία Ἁβροκόμην ταχὺ λήψεται ἄνδρα τὸν αὑτῆς), cheers Anthia up. However, also Apollo's oracle focuses on the polarity between bad and good, as is proven by the immediate emotional reaction of the protagonists' fathers and of the protagonists themselves (1.7.1, n.: οὐτὲ γὰρ τίς and 1.7.4, n.: παντὸς δεινοῦ). Similarly, Xen's dreams, which 'appear at pivotal moments of the narrative' (MacAlister 1996, 198, n. 32), are prophetic and not subjective: in fact, they are twice defined as τὸ ὀνείρον (cf. 1.12.4 and 5.8.7) and three times as ὄναρ (cf. 2.8.2, 5.8.5 and 5.8.6), while ἐνύπνιον, which designates the second type, is omitted. In addition, they focus differently on bad or good: while Habrocomes' first dream centres on the first negative pole (1.12.4 n.: dream), the second is focused on the positive, since it foretells Habrocomes' liberation from the prison and his successful search for Anthia (2.8.1). Finally, in the last dream both poles are included, since the initial positive image of the wedding is transformed in the nightmare of a betrayal (see 5.8.5-6). Overall, the effect of these visions on the protagonists is emotional: after the first dream, Habrocomes ἐταράχθη (1.12.4) while he becomes μικρὰ εὔελπις after the second (2.8.2). Conversely, Anthia, after her interpretation of her nightmare wants to commit suicide (see 5.8.9).

Finally, the same aim characterises the only 'actorial prolepsis' of the Eph., in which Hippothous reacts to Habrocomes' account of his love story with a reference to the positive reunion between Habrocomes and Anthia (3.3.2). While the content of this passage fits well into the Eph., since it hints at the positive end of the story like the oracle, Hippothous' encouragement is unexpected, because there is no clear proof in the novel that the brigand knows the destiny of the protagonists' love. In theory, this reference might be interpreted as a narratological "mistake". However, since Hippothous' speech follows a recapitulation which contains Habrocomes' life, I would rather interpret it as a deliberate provocation made by Xen. to his audience to read beyond the list of nouns

---

[187] Ibid.

and assume that he might have told Hippothous about the outcome foretold in the oracle. The discussion of this exceptional case, however, does not eliminate the comprehensive assessment that the first fruit of Xen.'s prolepses is to offer a reading of the novel as a simple sequence of good and bad events.

That said, in this third category there are many enigmatic images which are difficult to understand and constitute the starting point of the second function performed by these prolepses. The proof that this second level of interpretation was in Xen.'s mind is given by the reaction of the protagonists' fathers to Apollo's oracle, where they question the meaning of the single elements mentioned by god (1.7.1 n.: οὐτὲ γὰρ τις). Although these characters do not find an answer to all their questions, this passage seems to indicate that Xen. is interested in using the images of his oracle as foreshadowings and he is engaging his readers in a subtle game of interpretation.

As I will show in the commentary, the result of this enquiry is unexpected, since Apollo's response seems to play the role of scanning the events of the novel as Tiresias' prophecy in the *Odyssey*, which constitutes its literary model (1.6.2, n.: oracle, 4). In addition, the logic of the connections between the events listed and those of the novel allows more than one interpretation: thus, we are dealing with both a systematic and unsystematic web of references and the last three verses seem to also contain an external prolepsis. In addition, this subtle proleptic function seems to concern the dreams. This is clear in the first dream, where the 'narratorial statement' καὶ τὸ δεινὸν ἐγίνετο suggests that Corymbus' episode is the fulfillment of Habrocomes' dream, while the possibility of this association is then left to the readers in the second dream. Conversely, in the third this attitude is confirmed by Xen.'s explicit comment about Anthia's interpretation of her vision (5.8.7). For this reason, in my analysis of dreams I would adopt this narratological approach as the key which can help to interpret these passages, giving more relevance to these than to oneirocriticism. Interestingly, both the second and third dreams seem to suggest something about the final outcome of the story and this makes their function even closer to that of the oracle. Within this framework, the most unexpected result of my interpretation is the suggestion that Anthia's dream is another external prolepsis, which constitutes a parallel with the last part of Apollo's oracle (1.6.2, n.: oracle).

3) Comparison with the other novels: the apparatus of dreams and oracles

Given this framework, a comparison with the other novelists helps us to understand where Xen's originality lies. On the one hand, the other authors of the genre exploit more kinds and functions of prolepses: this emerges already in Char. in which, above all, there are 'explicit narratorial prolepses', which 'provide a "formal reassurance" that what has just been told is not the end of the story'.[188] Second, this author introduces an external actorial prolepsis, which concludes the novel

---

[188] Morgan 2007b, 441.

(Char. 8.8.16) and, finally, 'statements by the narrator about the intentions of the gods' are considerably more numerous.[189]

On the other hand, Xen.'s originality lies in his combined use of oracle and dreams to offer prolepses which concern the end of the novel. In the novelistic corpus an 'apparatus of predictive devices'[190] like this is exploited only by Hld., as Char. and Longus omit divine responses, while Ach. introduces only an oracle whose fulfillment is swift.

That said, the *Aethiopica* provides us with a somewhat more sophisticated proleptic system, which demonstrates Xen.'s approach to be more basic. Hld.'s originality lies in his insistent engagement of characters (and of the readers with them) in a game of interpretation of both oracles and dreams.

First, this technique already emerges in the oracle given by the Pythia in Delphi, which focuses like Xen.'s oracle on the whole plot. Immediately after its delivery, this response appears incomprehensible (2.36.1), so that Calasiris himself declares that χρησμοὶ γὰρ καὶ ὄνεροι τὰ πολλὰ τοῖς τέλεσι κρίνονται (2.36.2). However, later in the text, when the priest is spending the night trying to interpret the oracle,[191] he has a vision of Apollo and Artemis leading Theagenes and Charicleia by the hand. This provides him with an explanation of the oracle and, from this moment onwards, he tries to fulfill its message. First, he leads the protagonists to marriage; in 4.13.3 he even explains the oracle to Charicleia (καὶ ἅμα ὑπεμίμνησκον τὸν χρησμὸν καὶ ὅ τι βούλοιτο ἔφραζον) and he leaves Delphi with them. Finally, the importance of this response for the whole novel is clarified by its occurrence at the end of the story, when each single element has become clear, as Charicles explicitly declares.[192]

On the other hand, the same approach becomes subtler with dreams, because Hld. emphasises the partiality or failure of the interpretative attempts made by the characters. This happens already in the first dream of the novel, in which Thyamis has a vision of Isis and Charicleia (1.18). His interpretation, which implies his sexual union with her, makes Hld. say: καὶ τὸ μὲν ὄναρ τοῦτον ἔφραζε τὸν τρόπον οὕτως αὐτῷ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἐξηγουμένης (1.19.1). In addition, the apex of this freedom of interpretation is the concession given to the characters of a revision of their previous assessments. Our test case is again precious, since later in the text Thyamis, when he is in front of a marsh full of the blood of the battle, recalls his dream and interprets it as an anticipation of Charicleia's death.[193] Finally, it is surprising how the existence of false or different interpretations is not only an element of characterisation, but also it exerts an influence on the plot, since they 'give rise to actions that in turn fulfill what the dream really foreshadowed' (Bartsch 1989, 98). In our

---

[189] See, e.g., Morgan 2007b, 443: 'It is characteristic that the greatest number of Char's prolepses is associated in some form with divine activity'.

[190] Morgan 2007c, 496.

[191] Hld. 3.11.4: ἄυπνος τὰ πρῶτα διῆγον ἐπὶ τῆς εὐνῆς ἄνω καὶ κάτω τὴν περὶ τῶν νέων φροντίδα στρέφων καὶ τοῦ χρησμοῦ τὰ τελευταῖα τί ἄρα βούλοιτο ἀνιχνεύων.

[192] Hld. 10.41.2: οὗ γεγονότος ἐνθύμιον τοῦ χρησμοῦ τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς ὁ Χαρικλῆς ἐλάμβανε καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις βεβαιούμενον τὸ πάλαι παρὰ τῶν θεῶν προαγορευθὲν ηὕρισκεν [...].

[193] Hld. 1.30.4: καὶ πρὸς τὰ ἐναντία τῶν προτέρων τὴν ὄψιν συνέβαλλεν […].

case, Thyamis is moved by it to pursue Charicleia's love and this will lead him to hide her in a cave, from which the following step of the story originates.

As a result, while in the parallel construction of oracles and dream Xen. does more than Char., Longus and Ach., the comparison with Hld. does not allow us to call the proleptic system of the Eph. sophisticated.

4) Appendix: a note on Bierl's interpretation

Bierl 2006 in his analysis of dreams suggests that 'Xenophons fiktionale Erzählung aufgrund ihrer imaginären und onirischen Qualität mit einer Traumsequenz in Beziehung zu setzen'.[194] In his view this technique, which would characterises the text from 1.12.2 to 5.10.6-10, represents the whole of the protagonists' journey as an 'Inner Reise',[195] which is composed of three principles typical of our irrationality: 'ichdezentrierung, dissémination and Signifikantenkette'.[196] The first emerges in the shared 'conflict of emotions' of the couple (1.9.1, n.: ἔκειντο), which shows the lack of individual reactions while the second is suggested by the oracle, in which there is 'der Sinnstreuung, die Eros bewirkt'.[197] Within this dispersion, the protagonists as well as the readers are provoked to catch the different topics of the story through the 'Signifikantenkette'.[198]

In my opinion, this theory, like mine, has the merit of emphasising the existence in the Eph. of a subtle use of prolepses, which establishes different and not always transparent connections in the text. In this respect, his view can be taken as a partial answer to the epitome theory, because the emergence of a narrative control in the whole novel makes the hypothesis of its abridgment less plausible. Oracles and dreams, in fact, seem to occur at strategic points of the text and have many correspondences with other passages: the possibility that an epitome would preserve all these elements would require too attentive a epitomizer.

At the same time, Bierl's (2006) interpretation of the journey as interior lacks evidence, because, as I will show in the Corymbus episode, Xen. seems to exploit the difference between the "phantastic" image of the dream and the concrete enemies which the protagonists have to face, like pirates and brigands. In addition, the language which describes their journey offers a framework of time and space, which betrays an interest in making the adventure real. Finally, his interpretation of the oracle according to which Apollo's words find their fulfillment in the wedding night is not acceptable (1.6.2, n.: oracle, 9).

Overall, I have more sympathy with Bierl's (2006) method and approach than with his final conclusions.

---

[194] Bierl 2006, 82.

[195] Ibid.

[196] Ibid., 85.

[197] Bierl 2006, 87.

[198] Ibid., 85.

CHAPTER 2: TIME IN THE *EPHESIACA*

1) Rhythm

Like every narration, the Eph. is composed of "scenes", in which 'events are told in great detail and summaries',[199] which are characterised by 'chronological arrangement, concentration on concrete facts [...] and a medium distance maintained throughout'.[200]

Although, as Hägg argues, 'it is very difficult to find the borderline between the two',[201] in the first book scenes are more important. As the following list shows, 'Xen. makes often things happen under readers' eyes':[202]

- 1.2.2-1.2.9: scene 1: description of the procession (number of details);
- 1.3.1-1.3.3: scene 2: falling in love of the protagonists (change of scene: temple);
- 1.3.4-1.5.1: scene 3: night of sufferings (direct speeches);
- 1.5.3-1.5.4: scene 4: second meeting at the temple (change of scene: temple);
- 1.8.1-1.9.9: scene 5: wedding night (change of scene: Habrocomes' house and direct speeches);
- 1.10.4-1.11.1: scene 6: departure scene (number of details);
- 1.11.3-1.11.6: scene 7: oath (direct speeches);
- 1.12.1-1.12.2: scene 8: visit to Rhodes (number of details);
- 1.13.1-1.14.6: scene 9: Corymbus' attack (number of details);
- 1.14.6-1-16.7: scene 10: the double erotic proposal to the protagonists (direct speeches).

This list confirms that in the first book a good deal of space is dedicated to scenes: this makes the basic rhythm of the narration slow and seems to invite the readers to focus not on the sequence of the events, but on the topics that are introduced Interestingly, the presence of summaries characterises mostly the second part of the book.

Overall, this priority of scenes over summaries in the first book constitutes an exception in the Eph.: throughout the whole novel the latter element is usually predominant and the pace of the narration is faster. This point is very important: as Xen. throughout his novel repeatedly introduces similar situations such as oaths, attacks on the protagonists and erotic proposals, rhythm seems to constitute the real difference between their first appearance and the following ones. In this respect, at the end of the novel there seems to be a return to the first book: in fact, in the protagonists' dialogue in Rhodes and in Ephesus the rhythm slows down again.

In my opinion, the discovery of this pattern is significant, because it offers a new way to interpret the whole novel: the first book with its scenes has an exemplary value, because the readers would be helped by these richer passages to expand the content of those of the following books. In addition, it is interesting that, as the variation in the summaries proves, this change of rhythm

---

[199] De Jong 2007, 11.

[200] Hägg 1971, 98.

[201] Ibid., 87.

[202] Liddel 1953, 57.

happens before the end of the first book and coincides with the protagonists' departure: as a result, the events in Ephesus are not described in the same way as the adventures outside of Ephesus.

Finally, in the first book, along with scenes and summaries there seems to be a third important element: a good number of sections is dedicated to the narratorial description of the protagonists' emotions. Since there are eight paragraphs which perform this function (see 1.5.5, 1.5.9, 1.7.1, 1.7.4, 1.10.1-2, 1.11.1, 1.16.1), this feature must be considered as peculiar to this book and confirms Xen.'s interest in this topic.

2) Time

In the Eph. time scheme is generally 'vague' and its marking 'stereotyped'.[203] As this feature is more evident in Xen. than in other novelists, we are dealing with another trait of his simplicity. The clearest proof of this is the use of "day and night": the fact that this pattern is the most followed by our author proves his lack of interest in a detailed chronology. In addition, Xen. adopts also more generic expressions of time, as we discover from the following list:

- 1.3.4: ἐπειδὴ εἰς ὕπνον ᾔεσαν: night A;
- 1.5.1: ὡς δὲ ἡμέρα ἐγένετο: day A;
- 1.5.2: τοῦτο ἐπὶ πολὺ ἐγίνετο καὶ πλέον οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς ἦν: suspension;
- 1.8.1: παννυχίδες ἤγοντο and ἠκούσης τῆς νυκτός: night B;
- 1.10.1: ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἡμέρα ἐγένετο: day B;
- 1.10.3: χρόνου δὲ διελθόντος ὀλίγου: suspension;
- 1.10.6: ὡς δ᾽ἦλθεν ἡ τῆς ἀγαγωγῆς ἡμέρα: day C;
- 1.11.2: κἀκείνην μὲν τὴν ἡμέραν: mention of the day C;
- 1.11.2: δειπνοποιησάμενοι: reference to the lunch of the day C;
- 1.11.2: νυκτὸς ἐπιγινομένης: night C;
- 1.12.1-2: day D;
- 1.12.3: ὀλίγας ἡμέρας ἐν τῇ νήσῳ μείναντες: suspension;
- 1.12.3: κἀκείνην τε τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ τὴν ἐπιοῦσαν νύκτα ἐφέροντο: day E and night E;
- 1.12.3: τῇ δὲ δευτέρᾳ: day F;
- 1.13.4: ἦν μὲν περὶ μέσον ἡμέρας: midday of the day F;
- 1.14.6: διανύσαντες ἡμέραις τρισὶ τὸν πλοῦν: suspension.

Overall, this list reveals three important features of the Eph. First, the recurrent introduction of "suspensions" suggests that Xen. is often silent about the concrete connotations of the story and this feature fits well with his preference for imperfects instead of aorists or historical presents at the beginning of the novel (1.1.1, n.: οὗτος). Second, the occurrence in the first book of only six of the sixty days counted by Hägg confirms that in the first book the rhythm is generally slower than in those that follow. Finally, the fact that ten of the seventeen time indicators concern the protagonists' journey and their higher specificity (e.g. 1.13.4, n.: ἦν μὲν περὶ μέσον ἡμέρας) suggest that time becomes less vague at the beginning of the protagonists' journey. This novelty, then, characterises

_____

[203] Hägg 1971, 83.

the whole novel until the last scene in Ephesus, where Xen. introduces again three imperfects (5.15.3-4: διῆγον, ἦσαν and διῆγεν) instead of a detailed chronology.

In my opinion, if we combine rhythm and time, we might conclude that the events in Ephesus belong to a sort of atemporal framework, which contrasts with the temporal setting of the protagonists' journey. Since the departure from Ephesus introduces Anthia and Habrocomes to the discovery of the hardship of reality, time with its concreteness seems to support this second element.

3) Simultaneity

Since symmetry between the protagonists is a typical feature of the Eph. (LI 5.3a2), it also affects the protagonists' spatial arrangements[204] and the narration of the events which shape the life of the couple. As a result, 'the action switches between Anthia and Habrocomes more than thirty times'.[205] While this is the general framework of the novel, the fifth book constitutes a partial exception: since the protagonists spend most of their time together, simultaneity is simply used to underline that both Anthia and Habrocomes perform together the same actions.

Along with narratorial analepses (NA 1.1c), other expedients are used by Xen. to express simultaneity:

a) the repeated use of ἑκάτερος during the primary narration (see, e.g. 1.2.9, 1.3.4 [bis], 1.5.9 [bis], 1.6.1, 1.9.1);

b) the rhetorical use of parallelisms with variations (see, e.g., 1.2.9);

c) the antithesis μὲν [...] δέ (see the following sentence of 1.5.1: ᾔει μὲν [...] ᾔει δὲ [...]), which is already Homeric;[206]

d) the use of adverbial expressions such as ἐν τούτῳ (1.10.7 and 1.14.4; see also ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ in 1.16.1).

As however, Morgan notes, with each of these four techniques 'the simultaneity is only between the last sentence or so of the first section and the opening of the new one'.[207] In addition, the last category, which would be the most used in a context like this, is extremely rare. As a result, the episodes or the action 'are conceived as successive and in chronological order rather than simultaneous with temporal backtracking at transitions'.[208] Given this framework, the few cases of the first book in which simultaneity affects bigger pieces of the narrative will be carefully considered (1.5.1, n.: ταῦτα and 1.13.1-4, n.: ἔτυχον).

---

[204] See on this Konstan 2002, 9.

[205] Morgan 2007a, 462.

[206] On this, see De Jong 2007b, 31.

[207] Ibid., 464.

[208] Ibid.

CHAPTER 3: THE DIRECT SPEECHES OF THE *EPHESIACA*

As the fourth chapter of the first book clearly shows, Xen. is keen on introducing direct speeches in his novel. This decision is original: as Morgan argues, 'in contrast to Chariton, the narrator of our novel is often content to let the characters speak for themselves: roughly two-thirds of the text can be classified as showing rather than telling'.[209] This attitude is a clear proof of Xen.'s interest in emotions.

On the one hand, in the whole novelistic genre, as Crismani 1997 argues, direct speeches support the dramatic effect of the texts and give significant insights into the personality of the characters. This is particularly true and evident in laments, the most popular form of direct speeches in the novels. Birchall in his analysis of them supports this conclusion by showing that laments are similar to the rhetorical exercises *ethopoiiai*, whose purpose was to 'portray the character and the feelings of the speaker'.[210]

On the other hand, since in the Eph. direct characterisation is avoided, the role of direct speeches in this text becomes even more marked. It is for this reason that I decided to dedicate this third chapter to their analysis. Leaving aside the already explored analeptic and proleptic values that concern some of them, I will now focus on their form and distribution throughout the Eph.

1) The forms of direct speeches in the *Ephesiaca*

For sake of clarity, I will divide the direct speeches into the categories of "dialogues" and "monologues". The former class begins with "simple dialogues", in which the distribution of the speech between the speakers is equal. Conversely, the introduction of more specific situations create more unbalanced dialogues with more peculiar styles and purposes, such as "proposals", "threats", "consolations" and "wishes".

Within this framework, a special role is played by the so-called "dialogues in movement" (NA 4), whose speakers belong to two different parts of the scene. Finally, I will also include in the "dialogues" the "stories" told by secondary narrators, on whose interactive function I have already focused in the previous chapter.

Unlike the dialogues, the classification of the monologues is simpler, since Xen. simply introduces "exclamations", "laments", "prayers" and "oaths". Since the second are the most popular novelistic form of speeches, I will adopt here a more detailed classification: while some focus on characters' feelings (see the subheading "sentimental"), they can also contain either 'un colloquio con se stessi e la decisione oggettivata'[211] taken by a character before starting an action, or be a reminder of one

---

[209] Morgan 2004a, 491.

[210] Birchall 1996, 2.

[211] Ferrini 1990, 79.

or more past events. Thus, I will define the second type "reflexive-deliberative",[212] while the third "summaries".[213]

2) Dialogues in the *Ephesiaca*: a list

2a) <u>Simple dialogues</u>
- 1.9.2-3; 4-5; 7-8: Habrocomes and Anthia on the wedding night.
- 1.11.3-4, 5: Anthia and Habrocomes on the ship.
- 2.1.2-4, 5-6: Anthia and Habrocomes after the first rivals' proposal.
- 5.10.10: Leucon and Habrocomes in Rhodes.
- 5.14.1-4: Anthia and Habrocomes in Rhodes.

2b) <u>"Proposals" with possible "answers"</u>
- 1.16.3-5: Euxinus to Habrocomes on behalf of Corymbus and 1.16.6: Habrocomes' answer.
- 2.10.2: Apsyrtus to Habrocomes and 2.10.3: Habrocomes' answer.
- 2.11.7: Lampo to Anthia and 2.11.8: Anthia's answer.
- 2.14.2-3: Hippothous to Habrocomes.
- 3.2.15: Hippothous to Habrocomes.

2c) <u>"Threats" with possible "decisions"</u>
- 2.3.5 and 2.3.7-8: Manto's threat to Rhode and Rhode's communication of it to Leucon (indirect; see ibid. lament); 2.6.5: Leucon's decision.
- 2.4.1-2: Leucon's communication of Manto's threat to Habrocomes; 2.4.3-4: Habrocomes' decision.
- 2.6.1: Apsyrtus to Habrocomes and 2.6.5: Apsyrtus to Anthia.
- 3.11.5: Anthia to Psammis.
- 5.5.3-4: Rhenaea to Anthia.

2d) <u>"Dialogues in movement"</u>
1.10.9: Ephesians and protagonists' crew.
1.14.3: Protagonists and their dying servants.

2e) <u>"Consolations" with possible "answers"</u>
5.9.6: Hippothous to Anthia and 5.9.7-8: Anthia's answer.
5.12.5: Leucon and Rhode to Anthia.

---

[212] See 'monologhi deliberativi' in Fusillo 1989, 37, n. 48.

[213] See 'monologhi riassuntivi dell'intreccio' in ibid.

2f) "Wishes"

1.10.10: Megamedes to the protagonists.

2g) "Stories" with possible "reactions"

- 3.1.1-14: Hippothous to Habrocomes.
- 3.3.3-5: Hippothous to Habrocomes and 3.3.5-6: Habrocomes' reaction.
- 3.9.4-6; 8: Chrysion's story to Hippothous and Habrocomes, 3.9.6: Hippothous' reaction and 3.9.7, 3.10.2-3: Habrocomes' reaction (see also ibid. lament).
- 5.1.4-11: Aegialeus to Habrocomes and 5.1.12-13 Habrocomes' reaction (see also 5.1.13: Habrocomes' prayer to Apollo).
- 5.7.6-9: Anthia's ghost story.

3) Monologues in the *Ephesiaca*: a list

3a) Exclamations

- 1.2.8-9: Ephesians' exclamation on Habrocomes' beauty.
- 1.2.9: Ephesians' exclamation on the protagonists' marriage.
- 4.2.10: Egyptian governor on Nile's miracle.
- 4.5.3: Anthia in the pit.
- 5.13.3: Rhodians' reaction to protagonists' reunion.

3b) "Laments":

"Sentimental"

- 2.8.1: Habrocomes when Anthia leaves his prison (ἔκλαιεν).
- 2.11.4-5: Anthia to the goatherd (see esp. 2.11.4: ἀνεκώκυσέ τε καὶ ἀνωδύρετο).
- 3.3.2: Hippothous shares with Habrocomes a lament about Hyperanthes' death (συνανεθρήνησεν).
- 3.7.2-3: Perilaus about Anthia's Scheintod (3.7.2: τὴν ἐσθῆτα περιρρηξάμενος, ἐπιπεσὼν τῷ σώματι, 3.7.3: Ὁ μὲν τοιαῦτα ἐθρήνει).
- 3.8.6-7: Anthia after having been kidnapped by the brigands (3.8.6: θρηνοῦσα καὶ ὀδυρομένη).
- 4.6.6-7: Anthia in the ditch with dogs (4.6.7: ταῦτα ἔλεγε καὶ ἐπεθρήνει συνεχῶς).
- 5.8.3-4: Habrocomes in the quarry (5.8.3: πολλάκις κατοδυρόμενος τὴν αὑτοῦ τύχην).
- 5.10.8: Habrocomes in Rhodes in front of the stele (μέγα ἀνωδύρετο, "ὦ πάντα" ἔλεγεν "ἐγὼ δυστυχής [...]·).

"Reflexive and deliberative"

- 1.4.1-3: Habrocomes after having fallen in love (1.4.1: φεῦ μοι τῶν κακῶν, ἔφη, τί πέπονθα δυστυχής;).
- 1.4.6-7: Anthia after having fallen in love (1.4.6: τί ὦ δυστυχὴς πέπονθα;).

- 2.3.7-8: Rhode to Leucon about Manto's passion (2.3.7: ὦ Λεύκων ἀπολώλομεν τελεως· and 2.3.8: σκόπει τοίνυν τί δεῖ ποιεῖν).
- 2.10.3: Habrocomes after Apsyrtus' offerings (τί δὲ ἐλευθερίας ἐμοι; [...] ἐκείνην [...] εὕροιμι; this is not a lament, but only a reflection).
- 2.11.2: Manto after the discovery of her husband's love for Anthia (πασῶν δυστυχεστάτη γυναικῶν ἐγώ).
- 3.5.2-4: Anthia before being married to Perilaus (3.5.1: ἐπαύετο δὲ οὔτε νύκτωρ οὔτε μεθ'ἡμέραν δακρύουσα).
- 3.6.2-3: Anthia before being married to Perilaus (3.6.2: ἡ δὲ ἀνωδύρετο καὶ ἐδάκρυεν).
- 3.8.1-2: Anthia after the discovery of poison's ineffectiveness (3.8.1: στενάξασα καὶ δακρύσασα).
- 3.10.2-3: Habrocomes after Anthia's *Scheintod*: (3.10.1: μεγάλως ἀνωδύρετο, 3.10.3: ταῦτα ἔλεγεν ὀδυρόμενος).
- 5.7.1.2: Anthia in the brothel (μεγάλα ἀνακωκύσασα "Φεῦ μοι τῶν κακῶν [...]").
- 5.8.7-9: Anthia after her nightmare (5.8.7: ἀνέθορέ τε καὶ ἀνεθρήνησε).
- 5.9.5: Hippothous reflects upon the just-recognised Anthia (see esp. ibid. πολλὰ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐλογίζετο: this is the only "reflexive-monologue" where the lament is missing).
- 5.10.4-5: Habrocomes while approaching Ephesus (5.10.4: ἀναστενάξας).

"Summaries"
- 5.5.5: Anthia in the brothel (κλαίουσα καὶ ὀδυρομένη).

3c) <u>"Prayers"</u>
"Prayers to gods":
- 1.4.4-5: Habrocomes to Eros (1.4.4: νενίκηκας Ἔρως and 1.4.5. ἱκέτην ἔχε κα<ὶ> σῶσον [...]);
- 2.11.8: Anthia to gods and Artemis (θεοὶ καὶ Ἄρτεμι πατρῴα [...] ἀμείψασθε).
- 4.2.4-5: Habrocomes to the god Nilus (4.2.4: ὁ δὲ ἀποβλέψας εἰς τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὸ ρεῦμα ἰδὼν τοῦ Νείλου "ὦ θεῶν φιλανθρωπότατε [...]" and 4.2.6: ταῦτα ηὔξατο).
- 4.3.3-4: Anthia to Isis (4.3.3: ηὔχετο τῇ Ἴσιδι στᾶσα πρὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ· "ὦ μεγίστη θεῶν [...]" and 4.3.5: ταῦτα εὔχετο).
- 5.1.13: Habrocomes to Apollo (ὦ τὰ πάντων ἡμῖν Ἄπολλον χρήσας χαλεπώτατα, οἴκτειρον [...]);
- 5.4.6: Anthia to Isis (ἐπὶ τὸ τῆς Ἴσιδος ἱερὸν ἔρχεται καὶ ἱκέτις γενομένη "σύ με" εἶπεν "ὦ δέσποινα Αἰγύπτου [...]").
- 5.4.10-11: Anthia to Apis (5.4.10 ἐλθοῦσα δὴ καὶ ἡ Ἀνθία προσπίπτει τῷ Ἄπιδι· "ὦ θεῶν ἔφη φιλανθρωπότατε [...]" and 5.4.11: εἰποῦσα καὶ καταδαρύσασα ἐξῄει τοῦ ἱεροῦ).
- 5.11.4: Anthia to Helios (ὦ τὰ πάντων ἔφησεν ἀνθρώπων ἐφορῶν Ἥλιε, μόνην ἐμὲ τὴν δυστυχῆ παρελθών and 5.11.5: ταῦτα ἔλεγε καὶ πολλὰ ἐπεδάκρυε).
- 5.13.4: Anthia and Habrocomes together to Isis (ibid. σοὶ ὦ μεγίστη θεά [...] χάριν οἴδαμεν).

"Prayers to human beings"
- 1.13.6: Anthia and Habrocomes to Euxinus (δέσποτα [...] φεῖσαι).

- 1.14.4-5: Habrocomes' old tutor to his pupil (1.14.4: τί με καταλείπεις, τέκνον and 1.14.5: αὐτὸς ἀπόκτεινόν με).

- 1.16.6: Habrocomes to Euxinus (ἐπίτρεψον, δέσποτα).

- 2.4.1-2: Leucon to the protagonists (2.4.1: τί ποιοῦμεν, σύντροφοι; and 2.4.2: σῶσον ἡμᾶς).

- 2.4.5-6: Anthia to Habrocomes (2.4.5: δέομαί σου, [...] μὴ προδῷς ἑαυτὸν[...]).

- 2.5.6-7: Manto to Apsyrtus (2.5.5: οἴκτειρον […] πάτερ. […] Σὺ […] εἴσπραξαι […]).

- 2.11.5: Anthia to the goatherd (ἀλλὰ δέομαί σου, Λάμπων αἰπόλε, [...] θάψον).

- 3.3.5-6: Habrocomes to Hippothous (3.3.5: Ἱππόθοε and 3.3.6: μή με ἑκὼν ἀδικήσῃς [...]).

- 3.5.7-8: Anthia to Eudoxus (3.5.7: σὺ τοίνυν βοηθὸς ἡμῖν γενοῦ [...]).

- 3.6.5: Anthia to Habrocomes (ὦ φιλτάτη Ἁβροκόμου ψυχή, [...] δέχου με [...]).

- 3.8.4-5: Anthia to brigands (3.8.4: ἄνδρες [...] τὸν κόσμον [...] κομίζετε [...]).

- 5.5.6: Anthia to Clytus (ἀλλ', ὦ δέσποτα [...] μή με ἐπ'ἐκείνην τὴν τιμωρίαν προαγάγῃς).

3d) "Oaths"
- 2.7.5: Anthia's promise to Habrocomes.

4) A key role in the transmission of the message of the novel

Although this classification is intended to be as precise as possible, there are inevitable overlaps between the different forms: for example, the first part of Anthia's speech to the goatherd has been classified as a "sentimental lament" and the second as a "prayer" (2.11.4-5). Analogously, Anthia's lament in the brothel (5.7.2), which has been defined as "reflexive and deliberative", contains also a recapitulation of the story and, thus, it suits also the label of "summary lament". On the other hand, it is interesting that the "simple dialogues" seem to be a mere juxtaposition of the same kind of speeches which are monologues in the Eph. A case in point is the dialogue of the eleventh chapter, which is composed of two "oaths". The reason for this is that ancient Greeks did not draw a clear distinction between "monologues" and "dialogues" and never emphasised the solitude of the speaker. That said, there are two "stories" which constitute exceptions because of their content and function: as many scholars note[214], Hippothous' first account to Habrocomes (3.2.1-14) and Aegialeus' one to Habrocomes (5.1.4-11) appear to be so close to the protagonists' story that they constitute a parallel with them and seem to play an educative role for Habrocomes. For this reason, Morgan 2007a, argue that they 'function more clearly as didactic analogies'.[215]

Given this formal analysis, I would like to stress how three of the four dialogues between the protagonists occur in the first part of the novel and, if we consider also the protagonists' first monologues, three chapters of the first book are almost entirely dedicated to their conversation. In addition, Euxinus' proposal to Habrocomes is certainly the longest one of the novel and it is immediately followed by a indirect speech, which seems to establish a device which will become more frequent in the following books (1.16.7 n.: ὁ δὲ Κόρυμβος).

---

[214] On Hippothous' story, see Schmeling 1980, 54: 'Xenophon pictures the troubles of Hippothous and Hyperanthes as a love affair very much like Anthia's and Habrocomes'.

[215] Morgan 2004a, 491.

Overall, the existence of this pattern confirms our analysis of the rhythm of the novel (NA 2.1) and the aforementioned exemplary value seems to concern particularly direct speeches. Although the rest of novel contains a similar number of speeches, with the sole exception of the fourth book, their form does not vary. For this reason, our author seems to display his rhetorical abilities at the beginning of this work: this confirms that the first book is important to understand the whole novel (AIM).

Finally, throughout the whole novel, there are two other episodes in which the number of direct speeches increases: Perilaus' episode, with its three prayers (3.5.7-8. 3.6.5 and 3.8.4-5) and six laments (3.5.2-4, 3.6.2-3, 3.7.2-3, 3.8.1-2, 3.8.6-7 and 3.10.2-3), and the last book. Since Perilaus' episode makes Anthia reflect deeply upon her conjugal fidelity and at the end of the novel the same happens in the brothel and in Rhodes, this confirms how direct speeches play an important role in conveying the message of the novel.

5) A focus on the protagonists' speeches: a first suggestion of Anthia's leadership in the couple

DIALOGUES

	SIM DIAL	PROP receiv	THRE receiv	THRE made	DIAL MOV	WISH receiv	STOR receiv	STOR made	TOTAL
A	2/5	1/5	1,5/4	1/4	1/2	0,5/1	0/5	1/5	8/ 31
H	2,5/5	4/5	1,5/4	0/4	1/2	0,5/1	3,5/5	0/5	13/ 31

MONOLOGUES

	EXCL made	LAM sentim	LAM ref-del	LAM summ	PRAY divine	PRAY human	OATH	TOTAL
A	1/5	3/8	6/13	1/1	5,5/9	6,5/11	1/1	24/48
H	0/5	3,5/8	4/13	0/1	3,5/9	2,5/11	0/1	14/48

Although these tables do not count the effective length of each direct speech, it is interesting to note that a high percentage of the speeches of the Eph. is delivered by and addressed to the protagonists. Out of a total of 79 monologues and dialogues, only 20 concern other characters. These numbers confirm that Xen. focuses his story on Anthia and Habrocomes and suggest that direct speeches play an important role in their characterization.

Also, we can see that Anthia and Habrocomes share almost the same number of speeches, 32 against 27. However, a subtler difference emerges if we look at the nature of the different monologues and dialogues: Anthia, unlike Habrocomes, is more a speaker than a listener and she

exploits a variety of speeches. This lack of balance introduces for the first time the hypothesis that Anthia might have a more active role through the whole novel (LI 5.2c).

CHAPTER 4: MIMETIC AND THEATRICAL LANGUAGE

While in the previous chapters I have explored how Xen.'s interest in emotions involves different devices, in this last one of the section I will focus on the most evident sign of this attitude. As Lalanne argues in her analysis of theatricality in the Greek novels, 'Xénophon d'Ephèse recourt pour sa part plus volontiers aux multiplex artifices que peut offrir le spectaculaire'.[216] In my opinion, this statement is true and particularly suits the first book because of the higher number of scenes described by Xen. (NA 2.1). In this analysis, I will move from the simplest to the most sophisticated techniques.

1) Theatrical gestures and laments

A first feature which occurs repeatedly in the text is theatrical body language, which characterises the protagonists when they pronounce their laments (e.g.: 1.4.1, n.: λαβὼν). Its repetition, which is stressed by the adoption of formulae, makes this device a simple marker of laments (NA 3) and contributes to their tragic tone.

2) Description of extraordinary events

In the fourteenth chapter of the first book the fire of the ship appears to be the first cruel event of the novel and it can be compared with other 'scènes de théâtre macabres',[217] such as the 'torture ou crucifixion d'Habrocomès' (Eph. 2.6.2-4 and 4.2.2-7), the 'sacrifice d'Anthia à Arès' (Xen. 2.13.1-3), the 'enfermement d'Anthia dans une caverne et tentative de viol' (Xen. 4.5.1-6) and the 'explosion de fureur de Rhénaea' (Xen. 5.5.2-4).[218] Overall, the main reason for this insistence seems to be mostly Xen.'s desire to hold the attention of the readers. This seems to be suggested by the author himself, when in the first book he explicitly comments on the fire by saying: ἦν δὲ τὸ θέαμα ἐλεεινόν (1.14.2). A similar statement occurs also during the death of the old tutor (1.14.4-5, n.: ὁ τροφεύς) and again in relation to Habrocomes' torture (see 2.6.4). In addition, the narrator seems to also to use spectacle to place an emphasis on the developing hardship which the protagonists have to undergo and this is clear in the episodes set in Egypt and which concern the male protagonist.

3) "Conflicts of emotions"

With this label Fusillo describes a technique typical of the Greek novels, according to which his authors 'often describe the state of emotions of a single character or of a group of people as the result of a conflict between a series of feelings, usually listed in a cumulative manner'.[219] From a

---

[216] Lalanne 1998, 5.

[217] Ibid., 13.

[218] Ibid.

[219] Fusillo 1999, 64.

stylistic perspective, the syntactical construction most adopted is the *asyndeton*, which since Classical prose 'coexists with the tendency to abstract expressions'[220] and, within this framework, Fusillo points out how Xen. 'uses this τόπος in its purest form'.[221]

As I will shortly argue, this conclusion is only partially true. For instance, it certainly suits well the last 'conflict of emotion' of the novel: after the protagonists' reunion in Rhodes, the list of nouns which describes Anthia and Habrocomes' feelings lacks depth, since it is composed of five obvious reactions.[222] Conversely, there is a passage in the first book which, although it similarly concerns the protagonists (1.9.1), serves the purpose of characterising the protagonists, where their past shame is opposed to their present joy (n.: ἔκειντο). The same aim concerns the rich list of emotions in 1.11.1 (NA 1.1a and n.: πολλὰ ἐννοῦντες): although this passage technically is a "psychological recapitulation" and not a "conflict of emotions", because it does not contain opposite feelings, it emphasises the emotions shared by the protagonists and, thus, it is clearly linked to that at the beginning of the wedding night.

As a result, I would conclude that these "conflicts", when ascribed to the protagonists, become part of the characterization of the protagonists rather than being a mechanical list of feelings. In addition, the fact itself that this τόπος refers to the couple as a whole also supports the construction of the protagonists' union and symmetry.

Finally, another conflict which in the Eph. has a peculiarity occurs in the third book, when the narrator describes the turmoil which happens in Perilaus' house after Anthia's *Scheintod*: θόρυβός τε πολὺς τῶν κατὰ τὴν οἰκίαν ἦν καὶ πάθη συμμιγῆ, οἰμωγή, φόβος, ἔκπληξις (3.7.1). This passage is significant, because it involves a collective audience and, since this reaction immediately follows the discovery of Anthia's body, with this Xen. gives a theatrical effect to the whole episode. This links our author with the other novelists, in which there are more occurrences of the τόπος which 'implies a group of characters and assumes more theatrical dimension'.[223] As a result, we can see that Xen. enjoys variating this τόπος.

That being said, there are also nuances that are not introduced in the Eph.: Xen. is not interested as Ach. in pseudo-scientific theories.[224] Furthermore, as Repath 2007 shows, again Ach. and Hld. address psychological issues through the help of the Platonic divisions of the soul, but Xen., like Chariton, is extraneous to this philosophical classification. This is certainly a trait of our author's simplicity.

4) Audiences: crowd and protagonists

In the Eph. Xen. often introduces the events through the eyes of different crowds. The high frequency in the first book seems to draw a great distinction between public and private scenes: the

---

[220] Fusillo 1999, 65.

[221] Ibid., 72.

[222] 5.13.3: ἡδονή, λύπη, φόβος, ἡ τῶν πρότερον μνήμη, τὸ τῶν μελλόντων δέος.

[223] Fusillo 1999, 67.

[224] Ibid., 73.

first chapter in which crowds are not mentioned is the third, which focuses on the protagonists' falling in love and, from there onwards, the life of Anthia and Habrocomes alternates periods of "privacy" and periods when other characters look at them.

More precisely, these are the passage where the crowd enters the action of the novel in the first book:
- 1.1.3, n.: προσεῖχον, b: the Ephesians worship Habrocomes as a god;
- 1.2.7, n.: ἐπὶ τοῦ τέμενους: the Ephesians worship Anthia as a god;
- 1.2.9, n.: ἡ περὶ ἀλλήλων [...] δόξα: the Ephesians create the fame of marriage;
- 5.13.3: the Rhodians celebrate the protagonists' reunion.

In each of these cases, the involvement of the crowd creates a mimetic image, since the real readers are invited to have the same reaction as the Ephesians. In addition, in the third listed passage the Ephesians play a more active role than in the other ones, since they move the plot, inducing the protagonists' desire for meeting each other. Since this case is a one-off in the Eph., Xen.'s use of the crowd remain anchored on a simplicity: the Eph. does not contain anything comparable to Hld.'s initial identification between the reader and the bandits (see Morgan 1991, 85-90 on the narrative role of novelistic crowds)..

That said, it is interesting that, apart from the final exception in Rhodes, after the Tyrian greeting of Anthia and Habrocomes (2.2.4) the crowd fades away and the intimate dimension acquires more importance. This trajectory finds its completion in the last book of the novel, where Habrocomes and Anthia become the real 'audience' of the novel: to begin with, the former's desperate reaction to Aegialeus' story (5.1.12) plays an important role, because it is the only case in the novel in which a protagonist's reaction offers a cue which is needed to interpret this dramatic account. Without this, the fisherman's account would have been difficult to judge, because of the strange love with the mummy. Finally, in the last dialogue in Rhodes both protagonists become literally the audience of the novel, since they tell each other all their misadventures. As I have already suggested (NA 1.1b), this produces a contrast with the public audiences which characterise the end of Char.'s and Hld.'s novels and might suggest that Xen. has a private readership in his mind.

5) "Dialogues in movement"

The last dramatic technique of the Eph. is the apex of Xen.'s use of theatricality: in two episodes of the first book our author introduces a dialogue which involves two groups of speakers, one of which is moving far from the other. In order to create a mimetic scene, Xen. insists on shifting the points of view of the action, so that the readers continually have to turn their attention from one speaker to the other. The effect is the creation of a dramatic scene, which fits very well into the context in which it is introduced. Both situations, in fact, contain a farewell: in the first case the protagonists are departing from Ephesus (1.10.9-10, n.: βοὴ δὲ), while in the second they are moving away from their ship, which is burning because of Corymbus' fire (1.14.2-3, n.: οἱ μὲν ἔλεγον). Interestingly, both these passages explore the same topic, as they symbolise the protagonists' separation from their homeland.

The importance of this technique is increased by the difficulty of finding a parallel among the other novelists. One is suggested by the use of the adjective ἐξάκουστον, which Xen. introduces in the tenth chapter to stress that Megamedes' words were heard by the people on the ship (1.10.10). Also Hld., who is considered the master of theatricality, adopts the same word in two of his five passages where different audiences of the novel interact. In the first, the inhabitants of Syene cry loudly in order to be heard by enemies (9.5.1), while in the second Charicleia speaks similarly to attract King Hydaspes' attention (10.11.3). Conversely, in the other three passages the addressee of the sound is more generic (cf. 9.3.5, 9.27.1 and 10.35.1).

A possible parallel to this theatrical scene might also be found in Char. 8.6.10, where in the Syracusan harbour a mixture of the voices which come from the land and from the sea is heard; however, the technique is here less sophisticated, since no direct speech is involved.

<u>Conclusion: Xenophon's focus on the spectacular</u>

That said, unlike the other novelists, our author does not introduce expressions which belong to the language of the theatre, apart from Hippothous' definition of his love story as πολλὴν ἔχοντα τραγῳδίαν (3.1.3). This confirms that Xen. is more interested in spectacle than in recalling Classical tragedy. For this reason, Xen. seems to go against the tendency of the genre: as Lalanne argues, 'les cinq romans se conforment-ils aussi bien à la définition aristotélicienne de la tragédie qu'à une conception plus moderne de la théâtralité prenant davantage en compte la mise en scène et, en règle générale, la dimension du spectaculaire'.[225]

In conclusion, Xen.'s focus on emotions really has its own peculiarity.

---

[225] See on this again Lalanne 1998, 6.

SECTION 3:
LITERARY INTERPRETATION OF THE TEXT

This section of the introduction is the most significant, because it offers the main interpretation of the whole novel. As I have already suggested in the introduction (<u>AIM</u>), Xen. uses intertextuality and intratextuality to convey the message of his text. Since both these devices play an important role in the Eph., in this section I will focus on each of them in sequence. That said, I am aware that any attempt to draw a distinction might result in being artificial. However, I decided to do this for the sake of clarity. For the same reason in the first five chapters, which address the issue of intratextuality, I will include intertexuality within the genre and I will mention those models that are necessary for the comprehension of the passages of the novel. I hope in this way to show how the Eph. is carefully constructed by Xen. and I also invite the readers to guess the presence of the other intertexts which are presented in the sixth, seventh and eighth chapters.

CHAPTER 1: THE WORLD OF THE *EPHESIACA*

1) A world divided into two societies

As Capra argues, 'Xenophon of Ephesus is notorious for overwhelming his readers with both geographical and personal names'[226] and, thus, he introduces many places in his novel. While this pattern often leaves the readers with the impression of an imprecise framework, it also suggests a deeper point: Xen. is not interested in detailed descriptions, but in offering a bipartite vision of the world in which a civilised society is opposed to an uncivilised one. This distinction starts from the existence in the Eph. of two kinds of cities. On the one hand, Xen. introduces πόλεις in which entire populations live and share the religious life, praying and making offerings in public shrines. On the other hand, there are other cities which house neither public events nor institutions.[227] Each of these is merely inhabited by a family which exercises its authority over people who are subjected like slaves. In addition, in this second category most of the actions are set in the countryside near the urban centres.[228]

Although the first model clearly echoes what a Greek city was like, the reason for this division is neither geographical nor cultural, but is focused on the protagonists: the civilised society is the one where the protagonists live together, while the uncivilised is where they face different perils alone.

---

[226] Capra 2007/2008, 1.

[227] On this point, see Scarcella 1996, 244: 'There is no portrayal of politics and administrations'.

[228] For this reason, it assumes some connotations of what Saïd calls 'rural' society, although the presence of cities does not allow us to accept this definition.

For this reason, the first appears to be the good and ideal society, while the second the bad and closer to reality.[229] In the following paragraphs I will look more carefully at the characteristics of the two societies. Finally, I dedicate the fifth chapter to the study of the society which is introduced at the end of the novel, which shows the final ideal of Xen.'s text.

2) Civilised society: examples and main features

Without any doubt, Ephesus and Rhodes are the clearest representations of the civilised society: in the former the temple of Artemis, although distant from the city, is its virtual centre, since it is mentioned five times (1.2.2, n.: τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος, 1.2.7, 1.3.1, 1.5.3 and 5.15.2) and the last occurrence is just before the end of the novel, where Anthia and Habrocomes offer the goddess an inscription which contains the account of their misadventures. In addition, along with the great procession, collective sacrifices to the goddess are constantly repeated (cf. 1.3.1, 1.8.1, 1.10.5) and, moreover, the whole population takes part in the celebration of the protagonists' wedding (1.7.3, n.: μεστὴ, and 1.8.1) as well as in their departure (1.10.4-10, n.: παρεσκευάζετο). Finally, the narrator also introduces another holy temple, that of Apollo in Colophon, as part of the Ephesian territory, where the protagonists' parents request the help of the god (1.6.1, n.: τὸ ἱερὸν). Religious and public gatherings also characterise Rhodes, since the whole population welcomes the protagonists with an ἑορτὴ (1.12.2 n.: τὴν ἑορτήν) and then the protagonists make an offering to Helios (1.12.2, n.: οἱ ξεῖνοι). As a result, Ephesus and Rhodes are introduced as the environment in which the protagonists' relationship grows: for this reason, we are dealing with an idealistic representation.

Finally, Ephesus is introduced as a rich city and wealth is mostly focused on the male protagonist: from the first lines we are told that Habrocomes belongs to one of the richest and noblest families of this city (1.1.1, n.: ἀνὴρ) and the richness of the marriage ceremony (1.7.3, n.: μεστὴ) and of the canopy confirm this representation (1.8.2-3, n.: the only *ekphrasis*). Conversely, the only indication of wealth referring to Anthia is her χίτων ἀλουργής (1.2.6, n.). This status of the couple fits well into the traditional image of Ionia as a land of luxury. Athenaeus gives a clear proof of this, when he introduces the Ephesians in the list of luxurious peoples:[230] their τρυφή clearly emerges in the work *On the temple of Ephesus* written by Democritus of Ephesus, who describes local garments which interestingly include Persian and golden clothes. More generally, the whole of Ἰωνία is labelled through Callias' expression τρυφερὰ καὶ καλλιτράπεζος.[231] Finally, this feature might be extended to Rhodes, because the protagonists dedicate to Helios a golden panoply (1.12.2, n.: οἱ ξεῖνοι), but the silence on its origin does not allow us to draw a definite conclusion. As a result, prosperity is part of Xen.'s civilised society. That being said, however, this element is not emphasised, because, as the marriage shows, Ephesus is less rich than other novelistic cities and especially than Char.'s Syracuse (1.7.3, n.: μεστὴ, c).

---

[229] On this distinction, see Alvares 1995, 397, who identifies the existence of a 'locus eroticus insulated by wealth, fine breeding and the favours of the gods' and of 'a world [...] in which violence dominates'.

[230] See Athaen. 12.525c-e.

[231] See Athaen. 12.524f.

Overall, this portrait of the civilised society also concerns Samos, Perinthus and Sparta: religion characterises the first (1.11.2: τὴν τῆς Ἥρας ἱερὰν νῆσον), while public feasts the other two (cf. 3.2.3: ἑορτῆς ἐπιχωρίου καὶ παννυχίδος and 5.1.5: παννυχίδος). In addition, Perinthus has a gymnasium (3.2.1: ἐν γυμνασίοις), while in the latter Aegialeus, like Habrocomes, belongs to the group of ephebes: both elements enrich the structure of the society (cf. 5.1.5 and 5.1.6 with 1.2.2). Finally, both Perinthus and Sparta include rich families (cf. 3.2.1 and 5.1.4). Their inclusion confirms the distinction drawn by Xen.: while in Samos the protagonists are still together, both Perinthus and Sparta are part of the 'didactic'[232] stories that resemble the main one and which hosts love stories (NA 3.4). For this reason, they support the idea that Xen.'s ideal society is focused on the protagonists.

Only Memphis is difficult to classify: the double mention of the temple of Isis (cf. 4.3.3 and 5.4.6) and Anthia's consultation of Apis' oracle (5.4.8-11) certainly make this city important for the novel and similar to Ephesus and Rhodes. However, the absence of public events and Xen.'s detailed explanation of the original deliverance of oracles, in which young interpreters are involved (see 5.4.11: οἱ παῖδες πρὸ τοῦ τεμένους παίζοντες), gives it an original touch, which seems to reflect the "exotic" interest in Egypt of our author.[233]

3) Uncivilised society: examples and main features

As Ephesus in the first society, Tyre, which is the first πόλις of the uncivilised society, is its most appropriate representative. To begin with, the description of its spaces starts from the countryside, where Apsyrtus spends part of his life with his band (1.14.7 and 2.2.1: πλησίον δέ τι χωρίον). Later, when the scene moves to the city, it is limited to Apsyrtus' house (2.1.5), which includes a familial temple (2.3.4: τὰ πατρῷα ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας ἱερὰ) and Habrocomes' prison (2.7.1). In addition, Xen. attributes to the Tyrian family an element of despotism, which emerges in Manto's uncontrolled anger and in Apsyrtus' accusation of Habrocomes, which is made without considering any proof (2.6.1).

A similar pattern concerns the following cities which are part of the protagonists' journey, such as Antioch, Tarsus and Pelusium. To begin with, Antioch is not described, but Anthia goes to live ἐπ'ἀγρὸν (2.9.4) and the narrator refers to this place with three occurrences of τὸ χωρίον (cf. 2.9.4, 2.10.1, 2.11.1): thus, neither the inside of the city nor the population are described. The same happens in Tarsus, where the scene is only set in Perilaus' house and in two places out of the city, from where offerings for marriage come (see 3.3.7: ἐκ τῶν χωρίων) and where Anthia is buried (see 3.7.4: τοὺς πλησίον τῆς πόλεως τάφους [...] ἔν τινι οἰκήματι). In addition, the narrator emphasises how Perilaus' family is present to celebrate the marriage:[234] in 3.3.7 we read συμπαρῆσαν δὲ αὐτῷ οἵ τε οἰκεῖοι καὶ συγγενεῖς and, afterwards the former sing the *hymenaeus* (3.6.1) and then assist

---

[232] Morgan 2004a, 491.

[233] See also his consideration of the mummy in Aegialeus' story in 5.1.10 and Borgogno 2005, 483, n. 186: 'Questo singolare cenno alla mummificazione in terra siracusana è un'ulteriore prova dell'interesse dell'autore per la civiltà egizia'.

[234] For more on this, 1.7.3 n.: μεστὴ, c.

Perilaus in the celebration of Anthia's funeral (3.8.1). The only exception to this framework is the presence of πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ τῶν πολίτων at the marriage (3.3.7): Tarsus, although more allusively than Tyre, is part of Xen.'s uncivilised society. The same conclusion concerns Pelusium because of its legal system: the immoral Cyno involves the population in her plot against Habrocomes (3.12.6, where she goes ἔνθα τὸ πλῆθος τῶν Πηλουσιωτῶν ἦν) and, as in Apsyrtus' case, the accusation is proven without any interrogation.

Finally, the existence of the uncivilised society is also supported by the analysis of those people whom the protagonists meet during their journey:

Table 3.1: The social position of the members of the uncivilised world of the *Ephesiaca*

Eph.	Name	Protagonist involved	Social position
1.13.1 ff	Corymbus and Euxinus	Anthia and Habrocomes	Pirates
2.2.1 ff.	Apsyrtus	Anthia and Habrocomes	Pirates / Brigands
2.3.1 ff.	Manto, Moeris	Anthia and Habrocomes	Pirates / Brigands
2.8.3 ff.	Lampo	Anthia	Others
2.11.9 ff.	Cilician merchants	Anthia	Merchants
2.11.11 ff.	Hippothous	Anthia (Habrocomes from 2.14.1)	Brigands
2.13.5 ff.	Perilaus	Anthia	Political authority
3.4.1 ff.	Eudoxus	Anthia	Others
3.8.3 ff.	Brigands	Anthia	Brigands
3.11.1 ff.	Merchants found in Alexandria	Anthia	Merchants
3.11.2 ff.	Psammis	Anthia	Merchants
3.12.2 ff.	Araxus and Cyno	Habrocomes	Others
4.2.1 ff.	Egyptian governor	Habrocomes	Political authority
4.5.1 ff.	Anchialus	Anthia	Brigands
4.6.4 ff.	Amphinomus	Anthia	Brigands
5.1.2 ff.	Aegialeus	Habrocomes	Others
5.4.4 ff.	Polyidus, Rhenaea	Anthia	Political authority
5.5.4 ff.	Clytus	Anthia	Servant

Eph.	Name	Protagonist involved	Social position
5.5.7 ff.	Attendants of the brothel	Anthia	Others

To begin with, this list contains mostly enemies of the protagonists and the number of brigands is very high: after the pirates Corymbus and Euxinus, Habrocomes and Anthia have to deal with Apsyrtus, who is the chief of the same band (1.14.6, n.: ὑπηρέτης). Then, in 2.11.1 Hippothous, the main λῃστής of the novel, enters the action and Anchialus and Amphinomus are his companions. Finally, other λῃσταί who play a significant role are the Egyptians who capture Anthia in her grave in Tarsus (3.6.3) and sell her to merchants in Alexandria (3.11.1).

Overall, their portrait reflects the main characteristics of the novelistic bandits, which are collected by Hopwood: 'distinctive appearance'[235] (see the description of Corymbus in 1.13.3 n.: νεανίας), 'drinking habits'[236] (see the behaviour of Hippothous' band in 3.10.4), 'disorder'[237] (see Hippothous' attempted human sacrifice in 2.13.1-2), 'own rules and punishments'[238] (see Anthia's trial with the dogs in 4.6.4-7)[239] and 'life in separated environments'[240]. Since we are mostly dealing with moral behaviour, I would conclude with Dowden that 'the bandits of Xenophon [...] serve to indicate an extreme of the unacceptable bios', since 'they are particularly inclined to key philosophical negatives: sex, drink, and violence'.[241] In addition, bandits do not worship Greek gods and only few of them have a religious attitude which is comparable to a primitive form of superstition and devotion. The first element concerns Lampo (2.11.7: θεοὺς δεδιὼς) and Psammis (3.11.4: δεισιδαίμονες), the second Hippothous and his sacrifice to Ares in the second book: although the god is Greek, the ritual does not belong to the Greek custom, being a violent human sacrifice (2.13.1-2). Finally, when bandits worship Greek gods, this appears an exception to their normal attitude. This conversion involves Psammis who starts to worship Isis (3.11.5), Amphinomus, the only "human" brigand of Hippothous' band, who swears an oath by Helios (5.2.5) and Polyidus, who invokes Isis after having tried to rape Anthia (5.4.7). Thus, religion can be included in the criteria for Xen.'s division into two societies.

Having described the pattern of brigands in the Eph., it seems to me that it can also be extended to other inhabitants of the uncivilised society: to begin with, the merchants do the same job as pirates

---

[235] Hopwood 1998, 201.

[236] Ibid., 197.

[237] Ibid.

[238] Ibid., 201.

[239] This scene is considered as a special example of the life of the bandit community by Dowden 2007, 140.

[240] See Hopwood 1998, 201: 'Bandits live well away from the haunts of normal men'. See Hippothous' forest in 2.9.11 and cave in 2.14.1, 2.14.5, 3.3.4, 4.1.5, 4.3.6, 4.4.1, 4.5.1, 4.5.3, 4.5.6 bis, 4.6.4, 5.2.3.

[241] Dowden 2007, 140.

and brigands, since they sell goods and slaves (see Cilician merchants in 3.11.1). A case in point is Psammis, who is defined as ἄνθρωπος βάρβαρος καὶ τραχὺς (3.11.4). Then, the same attitude concerns the political authorities.[242] The first is Perilaus, whose military violence emerges in his first action in the novel (2.13.4). The Egyptian governor, instead, is primitive in his approach to punishments, since he condemns Habrocomes only on the basis of the evidence of the inhabitants of Pelusium (4.2.1). Then, also Polyidus enters the novel attacking and killing brigands (5.3.1) and the same attitude concerns his wife Rhaenea while approaching Anthia (see 5.5.2-4): there is no real difference between these different groups, which similarly point out the dangerous nature of Xen.'s uncivilised society. Finally, the category "others" includes Cyno, whose immorality has already been highlighted. A similar conclusion can be extended to the attendants of the brothel, who are traditionally incontinent people.

Overall, only Lampo, Eudoxus and Aegialeus are exceptional, since they try to help the protagonists. However, the last two belong the civilised society, since Eudoxus comes from Ephesus while Aegialeus from Syracuse. The first, instead, although he has pity for Anthia, is unable to save the heroine because of his status of lowest slave of Apsyrtus (2.9.2: τῶν ἀτιμοτάτων, αἰπόλῳ τινὶ ἀγροίκῳ). Thus, he decides to sell her to Cilician merchants and this will be the start of new misadventures for her (2.11.9). As a result, no member of this second society is a helper of Anthia and Habrocomes.

That said, the figure of Hippothous merits further consideration, since he is linked with both sides of Xen.'s world (for more, LI 4.5c): although he acts as a brigand, 'like Habrokomes and Anthia, Hippothoos was bred and born a Hellenic citizen'.[243] However, since his noble origin belongs only to his past, in the Eph. Hippothous is clearly part of the uncivilised society. The reason why he leaves the civilised one is his violent murder of Aristomachus (3.2.10) and since that moment his rapacious nature has often moved his life, as the killing of many people and the acquisition of many goods show. As a result, his behaviour further clarifies why Xen.'s second society, unlike the first, can be called realistic, because it lacks any appeal and appears to be a mix of obstacles which can really harm the protagonists.

4) Slavery at the core of the uncivilised society

A social feature which further characterises Xen.'s uncivilised society is slavery. Although in the Eph. slaves belong to both societies, on closer examination their presence is stronger among the protagonists' enemies: slavery constitutes the main activity of pirates and brigands[244] and also political authorities adopt it to exercise their power.[245] As a result, slaves easily become part of the rivals' families and for this reason they are often defined as οἰκέται, which mean 'household

---

[242] Billault 1996, 120 call them 'enforcers of the law'.

[243] Watanabe 2003, 5.

[244] See Scarcella 1996, 250: 'the profits of slave trade [...] are indeed considerable' and 1.13.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.5, 2.11.7, 3.9.1, 3.11.1, 3.11.3, 5.5.8.

[245] See Wiedemann 1981, 6.

slaves' (LSJ) and has twenty-five occurrences in the Eph. Apsyrtus has many of them[246] and Lampo's introduction suggests a negative connotation which is part of this category.[247] Then, also Perilaus (see 3.6.4), Polyidus (see Clytus in 5.5.4) and Hippothous in Sicily have slaves (see 5.9.1 and 5.9.2).

In addition, in the civilised society the most important slaves are Leucon and Rhode, who have a special status, since they were raised together with the protagonists.[248] For this reason, they are repeatedly called συντρόφοι (2.3.3, 5.6.3, 5.10.8, 5.11.1 and 5.15.4) and in Tyre Leucon and Rhode twice apply the same attribute to the protagonists (2.3.7 and 2.4.1). Finally, this closeness is enhanced by personal names: Ῥόδη, being the name of a flower, matches Ἀνθία. Overall, this parallel makes them servants rather than slaves and confirms that slavery is more developed in the uncivilised society. Further, the only other example related to the protagonists is constituted by other Ephesian slaves, who are soon killed by Corymbus and never replaced (1.10.6, n.: οἱ πολλοὶ). As a result, I would suggest that normal slaves are not a fundamental part of Xen.'s ideal society.

This distinction leads to a final consequence which directly involves our protagonists: since Anthia and Habrocomes spend most of their journey in the second environment, they become slaves for a long part of the novel:

Table 4.1: Slavery of the protagonists in the *Ephesiaca*

Passage	Anthia	Habrocomes	Master / Masters
1.13.6 - 2.2.2	SLAVE	SLAVE	Corymbus and Euxinus
2.2.2 - 2.9.3	SLAVE		Apsyrtus
2.2.2 - 2.10.2		SLAVE	Apsyrtus
2.9.3 - 2.11.9	SLAVE		Lampo
2.11.9 - 2.11.11	SLAVE		Cilician merchants
2.11.11 - 2.11.4	SLAVE		Hippothous
2.11.4 - 3.8.3	PRISONER		Perilaus
3.8.3 - 3.11.1	SLAVE		Brigands who opened Anthia's grave
3.11.1 - 3.11.3	SLAVE		Merchants in Alexandria
3.11.3 - 4.3.5	SLAVE		Psammis

---

[246] See two anonymous messengers in 2.2.5 and 2.12.1.

[247] See 2.9.1: οἰκέτῃ [...] τῶν ἀτιμοτάτων, αἰπόλῳ τινὶ ἀγροίκῳ.

[248] On the realistic presence of this type of servants, see Wiedemann 1981, 1: 'home-born slaves were more highly regarded than slaves bought from outside the household' (7).

Passage	Anthia	Habrocomes	Master / Masters
3.12.3 - 3.12.6		SLAVE	Araxus
3.12.6 - 4.4.1		PRISONER	Araxus, governor of Egypt
4.13.5 - 5.2.3	PRISONER		Hippothous
5.5.4 - 5.5.7	PRISONER		Rhenaea, Clytus
5.5.7 - 5.9.9	SLAVE		Brothelkeeper
5.9.9 - 5.9.13	SLAVE		Hippothous

Overall, after the departure from Rhodes Anthia is always a slave or a prisoner and she regains her freedom only shortly before her return to Rhodes. The nadir of her condition of inferiority takes place in Alexandria, when Rhenaea cuts her hair (5.5.4). Conversely, Habrocomes' slavery is shorter: he is first freed by Apsyrtus (2.10.2) and then, after the second enslavement made by Egyptian shepherds and by Araxus (3.11.2), he achieves his freedom through the concession of the Egyptian governor (4.4.1). That said, however, the effect of slavery on him is minor only in length of time: in Tyre Habrocomes suffers from tortures which are defined as typical of slaves (see 2.6.3: τὸ σῶμα πᾶν ἠφάνιζον βασάνων ἄηθες ὂν οἰκετικῶν) and then in Egypt he has to face the terrible crucifixion and pyre (see 4.2.1 and 4.2.8). Thus, Habrocomes like Anthia knows the hardship of slavery.

This shared condition, which is obviously unusual for noble people like them, is stressed by Xen. in two other ways: first, through the aforementioned parallel between them and Leucon and Rhode, which becomes closer in Tyre. Second, in the whole novel Xen. rarely uses δοῦλος, which, unlike οἰκέτης, describes a pure slave who does not belong to the household and has heavier tasks. Interestingly, each of the four occurrences refer to the protagonists and are focalised: first, Habrocomes defines himself as δοῦλος in his answer letter to Manto (2.5.4), then Apsyrtus and Cyno do the same with him (cf. 2.10.2 and 3.12.6) and Anthia calls herself δούλη in her tragic monologue to Helios (5.11.4). In addition, the word δουλεῖα is exclusively pronounced by the protagonists and in emphatic passages: the first occurrence is the shared exclamation before the separation from their dying crew (1.14.3, n.: οἱ μὲν ἔλεγον), while the second is in Anthia's lament to Habrocomes (see 2.1.5) which follows the same episode. Finally, the last two mentions belong to two monologues which seem to be conceived as a pair (cf. 5.8.3 and 5.8.8) and in which Habrocomes is commenting on his experience in the quarry and Anthia on hers in the brothel. Since all the occurrences of δουλεῖα coincide with the most significant example of slavery in the novel - Corymbus' case because it is the first, while the quarry and the brothel are for the protagonists the hardest to bear - Xen. seems to use this word to emphasise their terrible destiny.

As a result, in the whole text Xen. is not only focusing on slavery, but also on the unusual involvement of the protagonists in it. Although the real reason for this focus has still to be

understood, I would like to show how the extension of this pattern has no parallel in the other novels.

5) Comparison with the other Greek novels: Xen.'s special focus on the protagonists' slavery

Since every Greek novel has many slaves[249] and some of them are particular characters, as the servants 'skilful at achieving criminal goals',[250] such as Hld.'s Thisbe and Cybele, quantity and variety do not constitute Xen's originality. His novelty lies exactly in his focus on the protagonists as slaves: in the other novels no other main character lacks freedom for such a long time as Anthia and Habrocomes and slavery constitutes simply a transitional and brief moment of their life. The only other exception is Hld., who will be carefully analysed.

To begin with, Char. ascribes slavery to the protagonists, but only for a very short time. In the first book, Callirhoe is sold as a slave by Theron (1.11.2). However, as soon as the heroine displays her nobility and beauty in Miletus, 'she very quickly regains the trappings of high position' (Perkins 1995, 56). A similar pattern also concerns Chaereas, who becomes a slave of Mithridates, the satrap of Caria, at the end of the third book. His situation has similarities to that of Xen.'s protagonists: his hard task, digging,[251] is not far from that of Habrocomes in the quarry (Xen. 5.8.2). In addition, both suffer in the body and in the soul are unable to endure the hardship of their work.[252] Despite this common framework, the two scenes have a different epilogue: in Char. his friend Polycharmus, who has been enslaved like him, finds the way to work also for Chaereas (4.2.2-3), while Habrocomes leaves Nucerium for Ephesus (5.10.1). This difference is emphasised few paragraphs later, when Mithridates' slaves are condemned to tortures and crucifixion, as other prisoners have tried to escape (4.2.5). Although Chaereas seems to be going to face what Habrocomes has undergone (see 4.2.10), Polycharmus' subsequent mention of Callirhoe moves Mithridates' pity and interrupts the punishment (4.2.13-14). Conversely, Habrocomes has to try to work in the quarry and then, after his flight, his search for Anthia is still characterised by poverty (5.10.3) and desperation (5.10.4-5).

This difference might be further highlighted by the possibility that Xen. is here using Char. as his hypotext and this is very plausible, since the former displaces tortures and crucifixion, while the latter introduces them together.[253] Part of this variation would also be Xen.'s exclusion of a friend, which places a further emphasis on the solitude and on the hardship of Habrocomes. As a result, while in Char. Chaereas' slavery, like that of Callirhoe, is a one-off in the construction of the protagonist, in Xen. it is part of a more consistent framework.

---

[249] Cf., e.g., Ach., where, in Scarcella's view 1996, 241, 'male and female slaves are everywhere'.

[250] Billault 1996, 117.

[251] See 4.2.1: σκάπτων.

[252] Cf. Char. 4.2.2: Χαιρέαν ἐργάζεσθαι μὴ δυνάμενον and Eph. 5.10.1: οὐκέτι φέρων τοὺς πόνους.

[253] See GI 2.1 for the issue of displacement and 1.14.1 n.: οἱ λοιποὶ for a wider analysis of this parallel.

A similar conclusion can be extended to the comparison between our author and Ach. In his novel both protagonists are imprisoned by the βούκολοι in the third book (3.9.3 onwards), an event which is anticipated by the painting of Andromeda and Prometheus (3.6.3). However, Clitophon manages quickly to flee away from these bandits, exploiting the arrival of soldiers (3.13.5-6) and, after her *Scheintod*, Leucippe joins her beloved (3.17.7). As a result, this imprisonment is short and the protagonists manage to face it with a certain amount of confidence.[254] Then, later in the novel, only Leucippe is identified with a slave: when Melite and Clitophon arrive at Ephesus, on the road they meet a woman σχοίνοισι παχείαις δεδεμένη, δίκελλαν κρατοῦσα, τὴν κεφαλὴν κεκαρμένη (5.17.3). Lacaena - this is her fictitious name - has also suffered from torture, as her scar proves (5.17.6) and she expresses her condition with the antithesis ἐλευθέραν μέν, ὡς ἔφυν, δούλην δὲ νῦν (5.17.3). This low status is recalled afterwards by Leucippe herself, when she writes a letter to Clitophon. Interestingly, she here uses the verb σκάπτω, which is a possible intertext with Char., since it occurs in both novelists only to describe their episodes of slavery.[255] That said, also in this case Melite immediately frees Leucippe from chains and has her cleaned by her servant and brought back to the city (5.17.10). While the physical suffering of Leucippe is comparable to that of Habrocomes and her hair to that of Anthia (5.5.4), her slavery is not, because of its short length.

An opposite conclusion is suggested by the analysis of Hld.: in the *Aethiopica* the protagonists are first imprisoned by Thyamis' brigands in the first two books and then they are prisoners and slaves both in Egypt and in Ethiopia.[256] More precisely, there is an episode in the eighth book in which a closer connection between Xen. and Hld. emerges: in Theagenes' torture (8.6) the hero refers to the variety and cruelty of the αἰκίαι (8.6.2): interestingly, this word is used three out of four times in Hld. with reference to this episode (cf. 7.25.4 above and 8.13.2) and occurs once in the Eph., when Apsyrtus foretells to Habrocomes the punishment he will undergo (2.6.1: τοῖς ἄλλοις οἰκέταις τὴν σὴν αἰκίαν ποιήσομαι παράδειγμα). In addition, in the same episode Hld. introduces one of his five references to soul and body to emphasise Theagenes' interior strength.[257] This opposition recalls Xen.'s identical exploitation of this motif in relation to Habrocomes' torture (2.4.4 above) and in this parallel of motifs also Charicleia's pyre might be included, as it recalls Habrocomes' fire (cf. Hld. 8.9 and Xen. 4.2.8-9). However, the lack of textual connections, the fame of the τόπος and the different conclusion make this hypothesis less plausible.[258]

---

[254] See Cheyns 2005, 279, who uses the expression 'la grande sobriété de la scène d'emprisonnement, qui se déroule dans le plus grand silence'.

[255] Cf. also Ach. 8.5.4, where Clitophon addresses Leucippe's slavery and Char. 4.2.1, 4.2.15, 4.3.10 and 8.8.2.

[256] See Scarcella 1996 on this: 'Theagenes and Charicleia themselves are slaves: they are called δοῦλοι [7.24.1, 7.24.4, 7.25.4, 7.26.2] and also δούλους τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους [8.3.8]'.

[257] 8.6.4: τὸ μὲν σῶμα καταπονούμενος τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν ἐπὶ σωφροσύνῃ ῥωννύμενος. See LI 4.5a for the analysis of the others occurrences of body and soul in the *Aethiopica* and in the whole novelistic genre.

[258] Unlike Habrocomes, Charicleia needs neither a divine rescue nor water to survive, because it is her virtue which preserves her.

As a conclusion, only Hld. focuses on the protagonists' slavery like Xen.: although it is not possible to argue that the former is drawing this feature from the latter, this parallel proves that our author's focus is not a common cliché of the novel.

That being said, one might wonder whether Longus could play any role in this pattern: since his novel is mostly set in the countryside, it contains many poor people and slaves, starting from Lamon and Myrtale, and specific differences are drawn between those who work as authentic slaves and those who are instead regularly paid. Within this peculiar context, Daphnis also has grown up as a servant. However, this condition does not bear any negative trait: as Scarcella argues, 'there is "a social affinity" between the free aristocrats on the one side and the slaves on the other'.[259] The opposition, which is at the origin of the mistreatment of slaves in the other novels, is only rarely introduced and in relation to the city: a case in point is Gnathon's violent approach to Daphnis (4.11.2). However, this pattern is not frequent and, thus, the closeness between Xen. and Hld. is not affected by this consideration of Longus.

6) Comparison with the other Greek novels: the emergence of a limited but meaningful antithesis

This discovery of the great involvement of Anthia and Habrocomes in slavery makes it clear that Xen.'s two societies are antithetical, since at the beginning of the text the protagonists are noble and rich inhabitants of Ephesus. This statement completes the first part of our analysis and leads us to start a deeper comparison with the other novels, in order to assess the value of this twofold division of the world of the Eph. The result of this study shows how Xen. is following a simple pattern. That said, I believe that this assessment does not only underline a lack of sophistication, but clarifies also how the Eph. has a special focus on the protagonists' love.

a) The lack of geographic boundaries

To begin with, apart from Longus, who does not introduce travel in his text, the novelists usually construct the journey of their protagonists with the help of geography and their choice of places reflects the existence of different areas, among which Greece is distinguished from other lands. This is already clear in Char., who separates the West from the East through two geographic boundaries: 'first the sea which separates Syracuse from Miletos (and Athens), and second the river Euphrates [...]',[260] which marks the beginning of the Persian world. In addition, since the second land is close to the borderline, it is possible to conclude that 'Syracuse, Ionia and Babylon each host a distinct and distinctive section of the plot'.[261] This twofold division is amplified by Hld., where 'the complex action is thus distributed between three distinct geographical zones: Greece, Egypt, and Ethiopia'.[262] The second land, Egypt, plays a similar role also in Ach., where it is opposed to Sidon

---

[259] Scarcella 1996, 258.

[260] Morgan 2007d, 143.

[261] Ibid., 144.

[262] Ibid., 152.

and Ephesus. The interest of this novelist in geography is also confirmed by his introduction in Egypt of the βούκολοι (3.9.2-3) and his special description of Alexandria (5.1-2).

Interestingly, the same desire does not seem to attract Xen.: it is not possible to divide the world of the *Eph.* into different areas. Greece is only echoed through Sparta, while Asia Minor, Egypt and Italy are not considered by Xen. as different parts of the world. This lack of characterisation has its nadir in the fifth book, where Syracuse in Sicily and Taras in Italy are not described and the Greek presence in these places is completely omitted. As a result, our author does not explore the real world through the medium of fiction: the protagonists simply move to reach each other and the direction which they follow, the periplus,[263] has a circular form which suits well the absence of a meaningful route.

In conclusion, unlike the more common novelistic attitude, in the Eph. space has an abstract dimension.

b) The merely hinted opposition between Greekness and barbarity

This demonstration leads to an inevitable consequence: along with his geographical silence, Xen. does not introduce cultural differences in his text. The only exception is his partial exploitation of the classical opposition between Greek and barbaric world. This draws another difference from the novelistic attitude.

To begin with, in *Callirhoe* the introduction of areas which have a different ideology is evident: as Morgan 2007d, 143 argues, 'since the centre is constituted by Syracuse, a fully developed democratic Greek πόλις, and the ultimate margins by the Persian empire, with its institutions of absolute autocracy, the romantic mapping of the world can easily be read as a culturally Hellenocentric one, with centre and periphery defined as respectively Greek and non-Greek'. Similarly, Hld. explores a wide range of themes. First, he introduces the issue of barbarity in a precise way: the βούκολοι, the bandits who capture the protagonists at the beginning of the novel, are unable to speak Greek (1.4.1). Since the incomprehensibility of language is at the origin of the ancient concept of barbarity,[264] this passage establishes the identification between Egyptians and Barbarians. Other confirmations of this cultural division come from the description of Memphis, 'whose imposing and barbaric architecture affects the characters emotionally and provides an atmospheric backdrop to the action' (Morgan 2007d, 151; see 7.12.3) and from the scene of necromancy which happens in Bessa (6.15.5-7.1.1). This second episode is very important, because it shows that in Hld.'s view foreign "worlds" are characterised by a foreign *ethos*. Finally, this model of barbarity is used more subtly to show how Ethiopia, the third pole of his world, becomes 'an idealised Hellenic community' because of the presence of the protagonists. This unexpected value is conveyed through 'Theagenes' victory over an Ethiopian giant in a wrestling competition' (Morgan 2007d, 155), which symbolizes 'the Greek skill triumphing over barbarian

---

[263] See Capra forth.: 'Xenophon's travels, as we have seen, are arranged into geographical units, which are introduced clockwise'.

[264] This criterion is already at play in Homer. See Ross 2005.

brutishness' (ibid.). Finally also Ach. is not extraneous to barbarians, since also his Egyptian bandits do not speak Greek (3.9.2).

Conversely, the issue of barbarity is limited by Xen. to the Tyrian episode and, thus, it does not affects a bigger area. In the presentation of Corymbus' episode our author refers five times the adjective βάβαρος to Manto,[265] one to all the Tyrians (2.2.4) and one to a servant (2.5.3). As a result, the whole society in Tyre is depicted as barbarian.[266] Further, this representation also affects the behaviour of Corymbus and Euxinus, whose greed (see 1.13, n.: introd.) and violence make Habrocomes define them as barbarians.[267] Although this pattern produces a contrast with the presentation of Ephesus and Rhodes as "Greek" cities, it does no longer appear in the novel, apart from two little exceptions. First, at the beginning of the third chapter there is the only reference to linguistic difference, which concerns the Cappadocians (3.1.2). However, since the Tyrians and the other members of the uncivilised society can easily speak with the protagonists, in Xen.'s mind language is clearly not a key element to differentiate populations. Second, shortly later, Xen. uses βαρβαρός to feature Psammis' superstition (3.11.4: δεισιδαίμονες δὲ φύσει βάρβαροι). As Morgan 2007d, 149 argues, however, this statement is not really important, since 'Psammis' behaviour is indistinguishable from that of all the other important men with whom Anthia is involved at various stages'. As a result, here, as more generally in the novel, barbarity is not the foundation of ethnic differentiation. This is particularly evident in Cyno's case: although her immorality is bigger than that of Manto, she is not barbaric.

This definitely proves that Xen.'s societies are not two different cultural worlds and gives the impression that Xen. is using the label βάρβαρος without a deep aim but only as a way to make the first enemies of the protagonists more terrible at his readers' eyes.

c) The simplicity and peculiarity of Xenophon's model

In conclusion, while in the other novels it is easy to see 'the growing accommodation [...] with real travel literature, resulting in a new interest in the physical settings of the story, an enhanced concreteness and specificity, and at last a sense of important and functioning cultural difference being explored and defined',[268] Xen. is not interested in this complex approach: his division of the world is simpler. The same point is suggested by another consideration: the uncivilised society of the Eph. lacks any land which is positive for the protagonists, as Xen.'s countryside is never a 'sweet refuge'.[269]

As I have already suggested, in my opinion this simplicity might be not only a sign of lack of sophistication but also the result of Xen.'s deliberate choice to focus his societies on the protagonists' love. Thus, the presence or absence of the beloved becomes more important than the

---

[265] Cf 2.3.5, bis; 2.3.8; 2.4.2; 2.4.5; see also 2.5.3, where a Phoenician servant receives the same definition.

[266] On this, see also Kuch 1996, 218.

[267] 2.1.2: τί ἄρα πεισόμεθα ἐν γῇ βαρβάρων, ὕβρει παραδοθέντες [πειρατῶν];

[268] Morgan 2007d, 150-1.

[269] Scarcella 1996, 244. See, e.g., the coast of Mytilene in Longus 2.12.2 and the grove at Sidon in Ach. 1.2.3.

usual connotation of every specific place and distance is often painful to accept. This exclusive erotic mark also affects the protagonists' movement: as Konstan argues, 'Xenophon's spatial arrangements are as complex as they are because he is expressing by means of them one aspect of the symmetry between male and female heroes, through the introduction of parallel movements'.[270] The emergence of this perspective is quite interesting: in Morgan's view, another feature of the novelistic journey lies in the fact that 'it becomes a metaphor for some inner affective or spiritual development'.[271] This pattern seems to be unexpectedly part of our novel and makes our author particularly close to Longus, who, although he 'eliminates the element of travel almost entirely',[272] makes the 'journey between country and city [...] the road leading from childhood to maturity, from ignorance and sterile, if charming, innocence to responsibility and marital fecundity'.[273] In other words, the erotic *Bildungsroman*, which is evident in *Daphnis and Chloe*, might also concern our novel, giving an originality to its system of societies.

This leads us back to the differences between Xen.'s world and that of the other novels, in which cultural and political themes are explored. In particular, it is quite significant to compare Char.'s Syracuse with Xen.'s Ephesus. Unlike the latter, the former city does not only centre on the protagonists' love, but it is also characterised by rivalries between the noble families (1.1.3), by the memory of the historical victory over the Athenians (1.1.1) and by the physical gathering of the assembly (1.1.11). As a result, love does not eliminate the military and political sides (see 1.1.13, where the protagonists' marriage is defined as a day ἥδιον τῆς τῶν ἐπινικίων). The existence of this framework further clarifies that Xen.'s focus is instead more restricted. For this reason, the only way to explore his world is to study which kind of love characterises the civilised and the uncivilised society and in the following chapters I will explore this theme. In addition, since it is not unlikely that our author read *Callirhoe* (GI 2.1), it is not unthinkable that Xen. deliberately decided to focus his text on love.

---

[270] Konstan 2002, 9.

[271] Morgan 2007d, 150.

[272] Ibid.

[273] Ibid.

CHAPTER 2: LOVE IN THE CIVILISED SOCIETY

After the study of Xen.'s societies, I will start to look at how the erotic theme is explored in each of them. In the civilised society, the protagonists' relationship contains the following elements:

1) Habrocomes' (and Anthia's) hostility to love (1.1.1 - 1.2.1);

2) Falling in love (1.3.1);

3) Lovesickness (1.3.1-1.6.2);

4) Marriage and first wedding night: sexual love; (1.7.2-1.10.2);

5) Oath and promise of fidelity (1.11.3-6).

Overall, the discovery of this sequence is enough to conclude that the protagonists' love follows a progression: it is here that the definition of the Eph. as an *Entwicklungsroman* already becomes clear. In addition, since Xen. focuses on each step of his protagonists' reaction to love, it seems plausible that our novel is also a *Bildungsroman*. That being said, the readers are progressively introduced to the discovery of this twofold dimension of the text and there are passages, such as the wedding night (LI 2.4) and especially the clash between the protagonists and the rivals (LI 4) in which this value emerges more clearly. I will comment on this at each stage.

In addition, as the fifth section of this chapter suggests, in the civilised society the fidelity between the protagonists is not yet achieved, but is only a desire shared by Anthia and Habrocomes. This is another sign of the progression which characterises the Eph.: the whole novel is needed to fulfil the protagonists' deep wish.

1) **Hostility to Eros**

The Eph. starts from Habrocomes, the male protagonist, and from his arrogance towards Eros. This impious attitude is accompanied by an immoral preference for the beauty of his body, which overcomes that of his soul: both these features suggest that Habrocomes is an immature and selfish boy.

As a result, the novel becomes the story of Eros' revenge against him (1.2.1, n.: μηνιᾷ[274]): the god makes Habrocomes' meeting with Anthia happen immediately and provokes the following misadventures: in this respect, the introduction of the heroine is functional to the development of the hero and of the novel. The discovery of this pattern is very significant, because it gives a divine foundation to love, emphasising its uncontrollable nature and establishing it as the leitmotif of the novel.

This presentation of Habrocomes has always been connected by scholars to Hippolytus. In my opinion, however, the Euripidean tragedy is not here Xen.'s main intertext. As I will shortly show, the arrogance of the lovers (1.1.4 n.: ἐφρόνει), as well as Eros' revenge against them (see table 3 in LI 2.3) are two common Hellenistic motifs. Further, our author is characterising his protagonist as a Platonic ἐρώμενος, like Lysis and the beloved described in the *Phaedrus*. This is a real surprise for

---

[274] On this role of Eros in the plot of the Eph., see Ruiz Montero 1994, 1127: 'Eros is the 'Anstifter des Handlungs-gefüges'.

the readers, who would have never expected to find a future husband in this role. This asymmetry constitutes the opposite of the Classical custom, according to which the male member of the couple had the leadership in the relationship. As a result, from the beginning Plato is an important presence in the Eph. which lies at the core of the protagonists' relationship (for more, LI 7.3).

That said, if we compare this "prologue" with the other novels, Xen. appears to be both conservative and original. His exploitation of Eros is a common τόπος of the genre: all the novels use him as the personification of the 'irresistible (not necessarily benevolent) power of love'[275] and as an important actor in the plot. That said, however, Xen. has an original approach to this theme, because he clearly expresses the reason why Eros takes the lead in the plot: while Hld. follows Xen. in making Charicleia hostile to love like Habrocomes (Hld. 2.33.5), Char. and Ach. introduce a different pattern. In the former, as Cummings argues, 'there is very little emphasis on the reason for the conflict of love, since Chaereas and Callirhoe are both notable for their passive acceptance of the emotion'.[276] Only later in the text does Char. introduce Chaereas' jealousy as a reason for Aphrodite's anger (8.1.3). Similarly, in Ach. Eros' mistreatment of Clitophon lacks motivation.[277] Finally, Longus constitutes an exception in the corpus, since his powerful Eros is a benign presence, who as a shepherd (4.39.2) makes both Daphnis and Chloe grow.[278] For this reason, in this novel no character resists love.[279]

Similarly, Xen.'s decision to introduce Habrocomes before Anthia appears original within the corpus, where the female protagonist usually enters the action of the novel first: this happens clearly in Char., where Callirhoe precedes the hero[280] and the same order appears in Hld.[281] Both these cases follow the more traditional pattern according to which female beauty provokes the active male response. Only Longus describes Daphnis before Chloe, but his main aim is to underline a perfect symmetry between the protagonists (cf. 1.2.3 and 1.5.3). That said, in my opinion Xen.'s decision to focus the beginning of his story on Habrocomes does not exclude that also Anthia is actively involved in the main plot. Her representation as a σώφρων Artemis seems to ascribe also to her a hostility to love (1.2.6, n.: ὀφθαλμοὶ, c). In addition, since she shortly develops an internal conflict and in vain tries to resist love, I would conclude that Eros' action has also Anthia as his target. This increases the originality of Xen.'s first exploration of love.

---

[275] Morgan 2004, 179. See 1.2.1-2 n.: ὁ θεὸς for more on this.

[276] Cummings 2009, 102.

[277] Cf. 1.2.1: τοσαύτας ὕβρεις ἐξ ἔρωτος παθών and 5.28.2 where Melite expresses her view.

[278] See, e.g., 1.6.2: Ἔρωτι ὑμῶν μέλει, but also 3.6.5, 4.36.2.

[279] See Cummings 2009, 105: 'Daphnis and Chloe are seeking love. It makes no sense for them to consciously fight against it'.

[280] See 1.1.2 for the woman's introduction, which is followed by the presentation of the man in 1.1.3.

[281] See 1.2, where Charicleia precedes Theagenes.

- Appendix: a controversial issue: Eros' disappearance from the *Ephesiaca*

While Eros' importance in the Eph. is indisputable, it is strange that after the beginning of the second book he no longer enters the scene of the novel. This lack of consistency, which appears to be a deviation from his continuous action in the other novels, has led scholars to use this argument as a proof of the epitome or to offer other explanations, like Chew's (1998) narratological one.[282] In my opinion, however, Eros is always present in the story as its leader and Xen. did not need to insist on him later in the text as he does in the first book, because the extensive role of this god in the plot is fixed by the oracle (1.6.2, n.: oracle).

To begin with, the passages in which the god appears are not few and always present interesting elements. After the start of his revenge (1.2.1, n.: μηνιᾷ), Eros' first victory comes at the end of the Ephesian ceremony, where he arouses in the protagonists the desire of meeting (1.2.9: Καὶ ταῦτα ἦν πρῶτα Ἔρωτος τέχνης μελετήματα). The second achievement is Habrocomes' falling in love with Anthia (1.3.1), which is accepted by the former after a vain attempt at resistance (1.4.4). That said, the god is still unsatisfied and plans a more terrible revenge: ὁ δὲ Ἔρως ἔτι ὠργίζετο καὶ μεγάλην τῆς ὑπεροψίας ἐνενοεῖτο τιμωρίαν [τὸ] πράξασθαι τὸν Ἀβροκόμην (1.4.5). After this narratorial statement (NA 1.2 and 1.4.5, n.), Eros is mentioned in only other two passages: in the Ephesian canopy his absolute power is symbolised by his control over Ares (1.8.2-3, n.: the only *ekphrasis*). This passage is also important for another reason: since Anthia is identified with the god of the war, we are dealing with another confirmation that the female protagonist also is part of Eros' revenge which concerns the whole novel. The second occurrence confirms this, since in Tarsus Anthia expresses her consecration to Eros and Death (3.8.5: δυοῖν ἀνάκειμαι θεοῖς, Ἔρωτι καὶ Θανάτῳ). This even suggests an inner development: her submission to the unique real god which moves the plot has become devotion.

That said, it is strange that after the canopy and this brief passage Eros disappears from the scene of the novel. However, since in Apollo's proleptic oracle (NA 1.2) the second verse introduces the motif of 'love as the only remedy for love', I will later demonstrate that Xen. seems to establish here Eros' relation to the whole plot. This would make further explicit allusions unnecessary. A confirmation of this would come from Habrocomes' lament after the Corymbus episode, where he connects the start of his and Anthia's misadventures with both the oracle and Eros' punishment (2.1.2: ἄρχεταί τὰ μεμαντευμένα· τιμωρίαν ἤδη με ὁ θεὸς τῆς ὑπερηφανίας εἰσπράττει). Finally, the hidden presence of Eros in the whole novel seems to have two significant proofs. First, two subtler representations of the god are suggested through the woman of Habrocomes' dream (1.12.4, n.: dream) and Corymbus (1.16.2, n.: λέγει, b). Second, when in the fifth book Habrocomes reacts to Aegialeus' story, he uses the expression ἔρως ἀληθινὸς (5.1.12): this formula confirms that ἔρως remains a concern of this protagonist.

---

[282] Chew 1998, 210 interprets Eros' disappearance as the consequence of 'a shift of focalisation' according to which in the books that follow the first 'the narrator tells the story mainly from the mortal characters' points of view', introducing an 'internal focalization'. In my opinion, this theory is difficult to accept: to begin with, as Chew 1998 herself illustrates, in Egypt the presence of divine agents is important and constitutes a good objection to the existence of this pattern. In addition, as I will show in the introduction of lovesickness and in other passages, the internal focalisation appears already in the first book. As a result, I would consider this theory unacceptable on its whole.

As a result, I would conclude that Eros is the main actor of the whole novel.

2) Falling in love

The falling in love of the protagonists follows the procession for Artemis in Ephesus. While this setting is typical of erotic literature, the desire which makes Anthia and Habrocomes yearn for their meeting does not arise in the traditional way, but through the fame of the Ephesians. This fact is significant: from the beginning, the population of Xen.'s civilised society proposes itself as the origin of the protagonists' love.

In addition, the precise moment of the falling in love has an unexpected variation: Anthia falls in love with Habrocomes, but Habrocomes with Eros. This difference suggests that Xen. wants to exploit two different kinds of love, which will be further explored.

3) Lovesickness

Immediately after falling in love, both protagonists are imbued with erotic desire, which is the origin of their sufferings. Since from this part onwards Xen. introduces a list of erotic motifs, I will analyse them in order to discover what is the nature and the origin of the protagonists' passion.

Before that, however, I would point out that Xen.'s narration contains four plot motifs that are not important to reconstruct the erotic background, but whose consideration helps to recognise how lovesickness is approached by the protagonists: 'unfulfilled desire to confess the passion' (1.4.7), 'parents' inability to recognise love and consequent worry' (1.5.5-6), 'vain request for help made to seers and priests by the parents' (1.5.6-7, n.: εἰς τέλος) and 'request for help made to the oracle by the parents' (1.5.9). The importance of these themes will be discussed shortly.

Table 3.1: Lovesickness in the *Ephesiaca*

Eph.	Greek	Type of motif	A/H	A Anthia	H Habrocomes
1.1. 5, 1.4.2	Ἔρωτά γε μὴν οὐδὲ ἐνόμιζεν	attempt at resisting Eros			✔
1.1. 5, 1.4.3	οὐδε ὑποταγείη τῷ θεῷ μὴ θέλων	love and free will			✔
1.2. 1	Ἔρως φιλονεῖκος [...] ἐστράτευεν	Eros' attack			✔
1.2. 1	ὑπερηφάνοις ἀπαραίτητος	Eros' revenge against the arrogant lovers			✔

Eph.	Greek	Type of motif	A/H	A Anthia	H Habrocomes
1.3. 1	ἀλίσκεται Ἀνθία [...], ἥττᾶται δὲ [...] Ἀβροκόμης	falling in love at first sight			✔
1.3. 1	ἀπαλλαγῆναι τῆς ὄψεως ἐθέλων οὐκ ἐδύνατο	eye fixation			✔
1.3. 2	διέκειτο δὲ καὶ Ἀνθία πονήρως	love as suffering		✔	
1.3. 2	ὅλοις [...] τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τὸ Ἀβροκόμου κάλλος εἰσρέον δεχομένη	to receive love through the eyes		✔	
1.3. 2	ἐλάλησεν ἄν τι, ἵνα Ἀβροκόμης ἀκούσης	desire to talk to attract the beloved		✔	
1.3. 2	μέρη τοῦ σώματος ἐγύμνωσεν	desire to display the body		✔	
1.3. 3	ἀπηλλάττοντο λυπούμενοι	painful separation	✔		
1.3. 3	ἀλλήλους βλέπειν ἐθέλοντες, ἐπιστρεφόμενοι	to turn one's eyes toward the beloved	✔		
1.3. 3	ὑφιστάμενοι πολλὰς προφάσεις διατριβῆς ηὕρισκον	delay of separation	✔		
1.3. 4	ὡς δὲ ἦλθον ἑκάτερος παρ᾽ἑαυτόν, ἔγνωσαν τότε οἷ κακῶν ἐγεγόνεισαν	love as evil	✔		
1.3. 4	ἔννοια ἑκάτερον ὑπήει τῆς ὄψεως θατέρου	obsessive presence of the beloved's image	✔		
1.3. 4	ὁ ἔρως ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀνεκαίετο	love as a fire	✔		
1.3. 4	τὸ περιττὸν τῆς ἡμέρας αὐξήσαντες τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν	increase of passion	✔		
1.3. 4	ἐπειδὴ εἰς ὕπνον ᾔεσαν, ἐν ἀθρόῳ γίνονται τῷ δείνῳ	apex of suffering in bed	✔		
1.4. 1, 1.4.4	ἑάλωκα καὶ νενίκημαι	to be defeated by Eros			✔
1.4. 1	παρθένῳ δουλεύειν ἀναγκάζομαι	love and slavery			✔
1.4. 2	οὐ καρτερήσω νῦν;	attempt at resisting Eros			✔

Eph.	Greek	Type of motif	A/H	A Anthia	H Habrocomes
1.4. 4	ὁ θεὸς σφοδρότερος	vehemence of love			✔
1.4. 4	ὁ θεὸς εἷλκεν	love as one who drags his victims			✔
1.4. 4	ὁ θεὸς [...] ὠδύνα	love as suffering			✔
1.4. 4	οὐκέτι δὴ καρτερῶν	failure to resist Eros			✔
1.4. 5	τὸν πάντων δεσπότην	Eros' power over gods and nature			✔
1.4. 5	πικρὸς	bitter love			✔
1.4. 6	διέκειτο δὲ καὶ Ἀνθία πονήρως	love as suffering		✔	
1.4. 6	οὐκέτι φέρειν δυναμένη	failure to resist Eros		✔	
1.4. 6	πειρωμένη τοὺς παρόντας λανθάνειν	attempt at hiding erotic passion		✔	
1.4. 6	μαίνομαι	the lover's madness		✔	
1.4. 7	τί τὸ πέρας τοῦ κακοῦ;	no limit to evil		✔	
1.5. 1	ἑκάτερος αὐτῶν δι'ὅλης νυκτὸς ὠδύρετο	nocturnal lament	✔		
1.5. 1	εἶχον δὲ πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν τὰς ὄψεις τὰς ἑαυτῶν	obsessive presence of the beloved's image	✔		
1.5. 2	τὰ σώματα ἐκ τῆς παρελθούσης νύκτος πεπονηκότα	-sleepless nights -physical exhaustion	✔		
1.5. 2	τὸ βλέμμα ἄθυμον	a spiritless sight	✔		
1.5. 2	οἱ χρῶτες ἠλλαγμένοι	change in the skin's colour (pallor)	✔		
1.5. 3	διημερεύοντες ἐνεώρων ἀλλήλοις, εἰπεῖν τὸ ἀληθὲς φόβῳ πρὸς ἑκατέρους αἰδούμενοι.	-silence due to fear and shame -neglect of the usual activities	✔		

Eph.	Greek	Type of motif	A/H	A Anthia	H Habrocomes
1.5. 3	ἐστέναξεν ἂν ποτε Ἁβροκόμης καὶ ἐδάκρυσε καὶ προσηύχετο τῆς κόρης ἀκουούσης ἐλεεινῶς	erotic prayers and moans			✔
1.5. 4, 1.9.8	λυπουμένη μὴ παρευδοκιμηθῇ φοβουμένη	jealousy		✔	
1.5. 5	οὐκέτι τὸ μειράκιον ἐκαρτέρει	failure to resist Eros			✔
1.5. 5	τὸ σῶμα πᾶν ἠφάνιστο καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καταπεπτώκει	-physical exhaustion -fall of the soul			✔
1.5. 6	τὸ μὲν κάλλος μαραινόμενον	fading of beauty		✔	
1.5. 8	ἔτι μᾶλλον ὁ ἔρως ἀνεκαίετο	love as a fire	✔		
1.5. 9	ἔκειντο μὲν δὴ ἑκάτεροις νοσοῦντες, πάνυ ἐπισφαλῶς διακείμενοι	love as a disease	✔		
1.5. 9	ὅσον οὐδέπω τεθνήξεσθαι προσδοκώμενοι	love and death	✔		
1.5. 9	κατειπεῖν αὐτῶν τὴν συμφορὰν μὴ δυνάμενοι	silence due to fear and shame	✔		
1.6. 2	ἀμφοτέρους μία νοῦσος ἔχει· λύσις ἔνθεν ἀνέστη	love is the only remedy for love	✔		
1.9. 7	ἐνθέντες τῇ ἐμῇ κέντρον ψυχῇ	the goad of love		✔	

3a) Xen's lovesickness: character focalisation and solution

To begin with, in these first chapters of the Eph. Xen. introduces different definitions of the passion that is affecting the protagonists: along with three occurrences of ὁ ἔρως (1.3.4 bis and 1.5.8) and one mention of ἡ ἐπιθυμία (1.4.7), love is named τὸ κακόν (1.4.7), τὸ δεινόν (1.5.6, 7), ἡ συμφορά (1.5.6, 9) and ἡ νόσος (1.5.9, 1.6.2 and 1.7.1). While last term is directly associated with lovesickness, the other three more generally designate a bad event. Evidence of this is found in the seventh chapter, where the same words describe the protagonists' misadventures foretold by Apollo (1.7.4: παντὸς δεινοῦ, αἱ συμφοραὶ and τῶν ἐσομένων κακῶν, n.). An identical connotation is implied also by the dramatic exclamation οἴμοι τῶν κακῶν and φεῦ τῶν κακῶν (see 1.4.1, n.).

That said, if we look more carefully at these "negative" definitions, it is striking how they are expressed only by the protagonists, their parents and the strange seers who come to visit Anthia.

This is clear in Habrocomes and Anthia's monologues, where the protagonists respectively say φεῦ τῶν κακῶν (1.4.1) and τί τὸ πέρας τοῦ κακοῦ (1.4.7), but the other passages also suggest the same conclusion, despite the presence of indirect speech:

- 1.5.6: καὶ ὁ Μεγαμήδης καὶ ἡ Εὐίππη καὶ περὶ τῆς Ἀνθίας καθειστήκεισαν, ὁρῶντες αὐτῆς τὸ μὲν κάλλος μαραινόμενον, τὴν δὲ αἰτίαν οὐ φαινομένην τῆς συμφορᾶς: focalisation through the parents;
- 1.5.6: εἰς τέλος εἰσάγουσι παρὰ τὴν Ἀνθίαν μάντεις καὶ ἱερέας, ὡς εὑρήσοντας λύσιν τοῦ δεινοῦ: focalisation through the parents;
- 1.5.7: καὶ προσεποιοῦν<το> ὡς εἴη τὸ δεινὸν ἐκ τῶν ὑποχθονίων θεῶν: focalisation through the seers;
- 1.5.9: κατειπεῖν αὐτῶν τὴν συμφορὰν μὴ δυνάμενοι: focalisation through the protagonists;
- 1.5.9: τέλος πέμπουσιν οἱ πατέρες ἑκατέρων εἰς θεοὺς μαντευσόμενοι τήν τε αἰτίαν τῆς νόσου καὶ τὴν ἀπαλλαγῆν: focalisation through the fathers.

This frame of occurrences leads to the conclusion that in the Eph. lovesickness is focalised through the characters and, thus, is not the way in which Xen. approaches love. Second, a distinction must be drawn between the protagonists and their parents: the former are aware of being in love, while the latter do not recognise ἔρως. This means that Xen. focuses love on Anthia and Habrocomes: what prevents them from accepting their passion is shame, which is typical of young and innocent people like them. This suggests that Xen. is introducing a new step in the construction of his protagonists: their hostility to love has here been transformed into fear. In addition, the inclusion of Anthia in this development is here more explicit than before, since her reaction to love is more active than that of Habrocomes. This is proved by the sequence of the following motifs which exclusively concern her: "love as suffering", "to receive love through the eyes", "desire to talk to attract the beloved" and "desire to display the body". In addition, in her first monologue Anthia calls Habrocomes ἐρώμενος (1.4.7). This fact is significant, because it confirms the female leadership in the protagonists' couple and, thus, the asymmetry which characterises it at the beginning of the novel.

That said, the parents' reaction is also important, but for another reason: their lack of recognition of love leads them to consult the oracle. This decision is very important, because Apollo's words allow them to understand the origin of the passion and to decide in favour of the marriage of their children: this is important for the progress of the plot. In addition, the presence of the oracle, the divine institution peculiar to Greek πόλεις, strengthens the association between the protagonists' love and the divine and social sphere. First, this pattern highlights how the oracle is important not only in the progression of the novel, but also in relation to the first part. Second, it emphasises the protagonists' dependence on their civic and familial bonds. The role of the civilised society, which has already emerged in the falling in love scene, is here further highlighted by the failure of the seers' and magicians' interpretation, whose strange behaviour contrasts with the Ephesian environment and with the efficacy of the oracle (1.5.7, n.: εἰς τέλος). Conversely, family here becomes important here, due to the parents' active role. In addition, Anthia stresses it with her self-definition as παρθένος [...] φρουρομένη (1.4.7).

In conclusion, Xen.'s message is that the only way in which young lovers can accept their passion is through the help of civilised society, and that the real destination of love is marriage.

3b) Comparison with the other Greek novels: lovesickness
The attribution of lovesickness to the protagonists is a τόπος of the genre: the only exception, which concern Ach.'s Leucippe, is not significant, because her feelings cannot be revealed through the internal narrator Clitophon. In addition, the character focalisation of this theme is similarly typical: this confirms that love is never conceived as an evil by the novelists and this fits their desire to propose in their texts a positive erotic message.

b1) Plot motifs
If we look more carefully at the role played by lovesickness in the plot of each novel, there are two other shared elements. The first is the presence of shame: silence concerns Char.'s Chaereas (1.1.8) and especially Callirhoe (ibid.), Ach.'s Clitophon (1.4.5 and 1.10.2-3 for Clinias' theoretical discussion of modesty) and Hld.'s Theagenes (3.17.1). Finally, Longus' protagonists and Charicles, one of Chariclea's fathers (3.18.2 and 4.5.2), are silent too, but for a different reason: like Anthia and Habrocomes' parents, they do not recognise love. The second common element is the choice of marriage as the destination of the protagonists' love (LI 2.4).
That being said, every novelist adopts a different method to overcome the aforementioned inner impasse:
- in Char. the parents play the role of intermediaries for Chaereas (1.1.8), while the nurse performs a similar function with Callirhoe, giving her the news of the marriage (1.1.14);
- in Longus the ἐρωτοδιδάσκαλος Philetas (2.7.2-7), a figure commonly attested in Roman Elegy, explains the nature of love to the protagonists;
- in Ach. Clinias (1.7.3) and Satyrus (2.4.4) play the same role as Philetas and then Clitophon decides to break his silence with a direct declaration (from 2.6.2 onwards);
- in Hld. Calasiris leads Theagenes and Chariclea to admit their passion (3.17.2 and 4.10), while the doctor Acesinus reveals love to Charicles (4.7.7).
Overall, this list confirms how in the genre the basic starting point - the lack of an immediate confession of love - is then developed in different ways by the novelists through a deliberate interplay with the figures of interpreters. This makes it very important to analyse why Xen. might have chosen the oracle as his resolutive device.
In addition, on further examination, it is found that within the corpus another variation concerns the length of the protagonists' shame: Anthia and Habrocomes' silence and their consequent lack of initiative appear two distinctive elements, which are missing in both Char. and Ach. and have instead parallels in Longus and in Hld. The comparison with Char. is quite significant, since Chaereas' behaviour is almost the opposite of Habrocomes': as soon as the former recognises the contingent exhaustion of his body (1.1.8: τοῦ σώματος αὐτῷ φθίνοντος), he immediately breaks his silence. Then, the origin of his disease is soon discovered by his friends (1.1.10: τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς νόσου). As a result, given the hypothesis of the connection between the two authors (GI 2.1), it is

clear that one is deviating from the other and, since Xen.'s posteriority seems more plausible, the focus on shame in the Eph. appears further marked.

Conversely, the slow reaction to love of both Daphnis and Chloe is close to that of Anthia and Habrocomes. Another possible parallel lies in Longus' presentation of lovesickness within a symmetrical pattern.[283] This parallel is interesting: as Longus clearly chooses this model to emphasise the erotic *Bildung* of his protagonists, the same function might be ascribed to Anthia and Habrocomes' long silence and this will become clearer in the following stages of their relationship, where a progression will clearly emerge. Finally, Hld.'s case is even closer: although his description of lovesickness lacks symmetry, because Theagenes' agony[284] is clearly shorter than that of Charicleia,[285] the latter explicitly addresses the issue of shame in her dialogue with Calasiris.[286] In addition, her fear of love disappears when the prophet explains to her that marriage is a bond in which love and σωφροσύνη can go together (4.10.6). The same contrast is addressed by Habrocomes and Anthia in their first monologues.[287]

Finally, the link between these two authors concerns also the choice of plot motifs: like Xen., Hld. exploits the τόπος of the parents' failure in interpreting lovesickness and introduces in Calasiris the figure of a wizard who considers love as the evil eye (3.7.2) and performs a magic ritual in front of Charicleia. In this second case, his fictitious behaviour becomes clear, since Calasiris pretends to be ἐπὶ σκηνῆς τῆς ὑποκρίσεως (4.5.3), burns incense (ibid.: τόν τε λιβανωτὸν ἐθυμίων) and whispers some prayers (ibid.: ψιθύροις τοῖς χείλεσι κατευξάμενος). This scene recalls Xen.'s brief mention of the arrival at Ephesus of seers and priests, who simply diagnose that the protagonists' sickness is a divine godsend (1.5.6-7, n.: εἰς τέλος).[288] Finally, a plot connection with Hld. is suggested by the oracle too, since also the *Aethiopica* includes a response formulated by Apollo which plays a similar role in the love story of Theagenes and Charicleia (NA 1.2b). These connections between Xen. and Hld. require interpretation. First, the identical focus on σωφροσύνη and oracle is a clear proof that both authors share a moral concern (GI 5.1) and a sincere trust in the divine sphere. The first issue is particularly significant, since Hld. seems to focus this topic on Charicleia, because he wants to imitate Anthia, as their portrait and the connection of both heroines with Artemis suggests (1.2.2-5, n.: τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος and 1.2.6, n.: ὀφθαλμοί, f). In addition, this sharing of motifs offers the

---

[283] See Pattoni 2005, 93: 'a una sezione narrativa in cui la malattia amorosa dei due protagonisti è descritta nei suoi sintomi prevalentemente fisici (1.13.5-6 e 17.3-4) fa seguito un patetico monologo in cui ciascuno dei due pastorelli dà voce al proprio tormento interiore'.

[284] See 3.10.5-6 and 3.11.1 for the description of few symptoms.

[285] Charicleia's agony is often described by Calasiris in 3.7.1, 3.19.1, 4.4.5, 4.9.3, by Charicles in 3.18.2, 4.5.2 and by the doctor Acesinus in 4.7.7.

[286] See Hld. 4.10.2: ἔασόν με σιωπῶσαν δυστυχεῖν, αὐτὸς ὡς βούλει γνωρίσας τὴν νόσον, καὶ τὴν γοῦν αἰσχύνην κερδαίνειν, κρύπτουσαν ἃ καὶ πάσχειν αἰσχρὸν καὶ ἐκλαλεῖν αἰσχρότερον.

[287] On the expression of this contrast in the novelistic corpus, see Cummings 2009, 63.

[288] See on this parallel Cummings 2009, 61: 'Heliodorus reflects the theme of deception found in Xenophon of Ephesus, albeit in a more developed and nuanced way'.

possibility of an intertextuality. However, this kind of relationship seems less likely here than in other episodes of the *Aethiopica*, apart from the presentation of the female protagonists (GI 5.1). In conclusion, Xen.'s overall presentation of lovesickness aims to highlight how young people cannot accept love alone, because they are afraid of their passion.

b2) Erotic motifs

After the study of plot motifs, it is interesting to look how the other novelists deal with the erotic τόποι introduced in the Eph. In the following table I will try to show whether Xen. is original in his choice of motifs. As a premise, I am aware that a more detailed study would be needed to cover this topic, since love is the most important issue of the novelistic genre, but this would go beyond the scope of my dissertation. For this reason, I will focus here on the differences between the erotic framework of the Eph. and that of the other novels. To achieve this aim, in the analysis I have also included the motifs which belong to descriptions of lovesickness which concern characters other than the protagonists, because they help us to assess the novelists' knowledge of the erotic tradition. The most significant examples are Manto in Xen. (for more LI 3.2 and 1.16.2, n.: λέγει), Dionysius (Char. 2.4.1) and the Persian king (6.7.1-2) in Char., Philetas (Longus 2.7.4-7) and Gnathon (4.17.3-6) in Longus, Melite (esp. 5.15.4-5) and Thersander (esp. 6.6.6-4) in Ach. and Demainete (esp 1.10.2), Arsace (7.8.6-7.9.4) and Achaemenes (7.23.5) in Hld.

Table 3.2: Comparison with lovesickness in the novelistic corpus[289]

Eph.	Type of motif	Novelistic occurrences
1.1.5, 1.4.2	attempt at resisting Eros	Char. 2.4.4-5, 6.3.2, Hld. 4.7.1, 4.9.3, 4.10.3.
1.1.5, 1.4.3	love and free will	Xen. 5.13.3, Ach. 1.10.6-7.
1.2. 1	Eros as a warrior	Char. 1.1.4, 2.4.5, 4.7.6, 6.3.2, 6.4.5, Long. 1.7.2, 2.6.1, 2.7.1, 4.34.1, Ach. 1.1.13, 2.4.5, 2.5.2, 4.7.3, 8.12.5-6, Hld. 4.1.1, 4.2.3.
1.2. 1	Eros' revenge against the arrogant lovers	Char. 2.4.5, Ach. 1.7.3.
1.3. 1	falling in love at first sight	Xen. 3.2.1, 3.11.3, 3.12.3, 5.1.5, Char. 1.1.6, Char. 2.3.6, Ach. 1.4.4, Hld. 3.5.4.

---

[289] I have adopted the label "general" to designate motifs which are so common in erotic literature that the search for a specific model is not worth conducting.

Eph.	Type of motif	Novelistic occurrences
1.3. 1	eye fixation	Char. 6.1.7, 6.4.5, Longus 1.13.5, Ach. 1.4.5, 1.13.5, 1.24.1, 2.1.1, Hld. 1.2.3, 7.8.6, 7.9.2.
1.3.2, 1.4.4, 1.4.6, 1.9.7	love as suffering	"general"
1.3. 2, 1.9.7	to receive love through the eyes	Ach. 1.4.4, 1.9.4-5, 5.13.4, 6.6.3-4, 6.7.5, Hld. 1.2.3, 1.2.9.
1.3. 2	desire to talk to attract the beloved	
1.3. 2	desire to display the body	
1.3. 3	painful separation	Hld. 7.9.1
1.3. 3	to turn one's eyes toward the beloved	Hld. 1.28.2, Hld. 7.9.1.
1.3. 3	delay of separation	Hld. 3.6.1, Hld. 7.9.1.
134	love as evil	Char. 1.1.9, 2.4.7, Ach. 1.6.3, 1.9.2, 5.25.2.
1.3.4, 1.5.1	obsessive presence of the beloved's image	Char. 2.4.3, 2.9.6, 6.4.5, 7, Ach. 1.9.1, 1.19.2, 2.13.2, 5.13.4.
1.3.4, 1.5. 8	love as a fire	"general"
1.3. 4	increase of passion	Char. 1.1.9, 2.4.5, Ach. 1.6.3, Hld. 4.5.2.
1.3. 4	apex of suffering in bed	Char. 1.1.8, Ach. 1.6.2-3, Hld. 1.8.1, 3.15.2.
1.4. 1, 1.4.3	to be defeated by Zeus	"General"
1.4. 1, 1.4.4 , 1.9.7, 1.9.8.	love and slavery	Char. 4.2.3, Ach. 1.7.2, 5.2.6, Hld.3.19.1, 4.4.4, 5.2.10.
1.4. 4	vehemence of love	Char. 2.4.5, 6.3.2, Ach. 2.3.3, 4.7.4.
1.4. 4	love as one who drags his victims.	Ach. 1.4.5, 1.6.3, 2.8.3, 5.13.4.

Eph.	Type of motif	Novelistic occurrences
1.4.4, 1.4.6, 1.5.5	failure to resist Eros	Xen. 2.2.3, Char. 2.7.4, 3.1.1, 6.3.2, Ach. 2.5.2, Hld. 1.10.1, 4.7.1, 5.9.3, 7.19.6, 7.23.2.
1.4. 5	Eros' power over gods and nature	Char. 6.3.2, Longus 2.7.2-4, Ach. 1.2.1, 1.17-18, Hld. 4.10.5.
1.4. 5	bitter love	Longus 1.14.2, 1.18.1, 3.14.3.
1.4. 6	attempt at hiding erotic passion	Xen. 2.2.2, 2.11.1, Char. 1.1.8, 2.4.1, Hld. 1.10.2 (failed).
1.4. 6	the lover's madness	Longus 1.25.2, 2.2.2, Ach. 2.3.3, 2.37.8, 4.9.2, 5.19.4, 5.26.2, 6.11.3. Hld. 1.14.6, 1.15.4, 2.14.3, 4.2.3, 5.20.6, 5.29.5, 5.31.2, 7.9.4, 7.23.1.
1.4. 7	no limit to love	
1.5. 1	nocturnal lament	Hld. 1.8.1.
1.5. 2	sleepless nights	Char. 2.4.3, 2.4.6, 2.9.6, 4.4.9, 6.1.8, 6.7.2, Longus 1.13.6, 1.14.4, 2.7.4, 2.8.2, 3.4.2, Ach. 1.6.2, 1.7.3, 1.9.1, Hld 3.7.1, 3.15.2.3, 3.18.2, 4.4.5, 4.7.7, 5.2.1, 7.9.3, 7.15.5.
1.5.2, 1.5.4, 1.9.1	physical exhaustion	Char. 1.1.8, Longus 1.13.6, 1.17.4, 2.8.2, Hld. 4.9.3.
1.5. 2	a spiritless sight	Char. 2.8.1, Hld. 3.19.1, 4.7.7.
1.5. 2	change in the skin's colour (pallor)	Char. 4.2.4, Longus 1.13.6, 1.17.4, Ach. 2.6.1, 3.7.3, 5.19.1, Hld. 3.5.6, 3.19.1, 4.7.7, 7.15.5.
1.5. 3, 1.5.9, 1.9.1	-silence due to fear and shame	Char. 1.1.8, 1.1.14, 2.5.4, 4.1.9, 5.5.9, Longus 1.17.4, Hld. 3.17.1, 4.10.2.
1.5.3	-neglect of the usual activities	Char. 1.1.9, Longus 1.13.6, 1.17.4, 1.18.2, 2.8.2.
1.5. 3	erotic prayers and moans	Hld. 7.7.5.

Eph.	Type of motif	Novelistic occurrences
1.5. 4, 1.9.8	jealousy	Char. 1.2.5, 1.3.4, 4.7.6-7, Longus 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 3.25.4, 3.26.1, Ach. 6.11.1, 7.3.7, Hld. 1.11.5, 2.8.1, 2.8.5, 7.8.6, 7.10.6, 7.21.5, 7.29.1, 8.7.1.
1.5. 5	fall of the soul	
1.5. 6	fading of beauty	Longus 1.18.2, Hld. 3.19.1, 4.7.7.
1.5. 9	love as a disease	Char. 1.1.10, Longus 1.14.1 (bis), 1.18.2, 2.7.5, Ach. 1.6.2-3, Hld. 3.7.1, 3.11.1, 3.18.2, 4.5.2, 4.5.6, 4.7.6-7, 4.9.3, 4.10.2, 6.5.4, 7.9.4.
1.5. 9	love and death	Char. 1.1.10, Longus 2.7.5.
1.6. 2	love is the only remedy for love	Char. 6.3.7, Long. 2.7.7, Ach. 1.17.4, 5.26.2, 5.27.2, Hld. 4.7.7.
1.9. 7	the goad of love	Hld. 1.14.6.

Overall, this table shows how Xen's erotic τόποι are mostly shared by the other novelists: the only blank spaces are:

- "desire to display the body";
- "desire to talk to attract the beloved";
- "no limit to love";
- "fall of the soul".

This very small number suggests that Xen. has a limited originality in the use of erotic τόποι and this appears to be a sign of his simplicity. This impression is strengthened if we consider that there are many motifs which appear in other novels and are missing in Xen (see below table 3.4).

That said, before looking at these exceptions, it is important to remember that Xen. very probably wrote before Longus, Ach. and Hld. As a result, within the novelistic corpus the study of the origin of the motifs of the Eph. concerns only Char. In addition, if we accept the likely possibility that our author read him, all the motifs that appear in the Eph. and not in *Callirhoe* become interesting to analyse, since our author would be the first of the genre to introduce them. I provide here a list of them, with the reference to the other novelists who introduce them:

- "bitter love" (Longus);
- "delay of separation" (Hld.);
- "erotic prayers and moans" (Hld.);
- "love as one who drags his victims" (Ach.);
- "love and free will" (Ach.);
- "lover's madness" (Longus, Ach., Hld.);

- "nocturnal element" (Hld.);
- "painful separation" (Hld.);
- "to receive love through beauty" (Ach.);
- "to turn one's eyes toward the beloved" (Hld.);

Overall, it is interesting that in most of these cases only one other novelist uses the same motif as Xen., because this suggests that our author's choice of these motifs does not follow a common trend. This becomes clearer in the case of Hld., who seems to draw two motifs from our author, namely "delay of separation" and "to turn one's eyes toward the beloved" (1.3.3, n.: ὑφιστάμενοι).

Given this list, it becomes important to see how lovesickness is described by the other Greek and Latin authors, in order to investigate whether Xen. might be drawing these themes from earlier models

3c) Comparison with Greek and Latin erotic literature: lovesickness

Conducting an analysis of how lovesickness is addressed by Greek and Latin authors is not an easy task, because many texts merit consideration.[290] As is commonly known, the first two are Sappho's poetry and the Euripidean *Hippolytus*. Furthermore, in the Hellenistic Era the two most significant examples are constituted by Medea's lovesickness in Apollonius Rhodius and by the description of love of Theocritus' *Idyllia*.[291]

Then, the Augustan and the Imperial Eras offer a big collection: while Parthenius explores this topic in seven of his *Erotica Pathemata* (see 5, 6, 11, 13, 17, 31, 36), Latin poets are keen on lovesickness too. Virgil explores this topic with Dido[292] and is followed by elegists such as Catullus, Ovid and Propertius[293] and by Seneca with his *Phaedra*. Later on, in the first century AD, Valerius Maximus offers us the first version of the famous story of Antiochus and Stratonice, which explores the lovesickness of the former for the latter and was well known in the antiquity both in

---

[290] This topic in the Greek literature is carefully studied by Toohey 1992; however, I would take issue with his main thesis that the novelists' lovesickness, being 'depressive' and not 'manic' (266), has its first model in Theocritus' second *Idyll*. In my opinion, this distinction was not clear in ancient authors' minds and, thus, I would consider also earlier models such as Sappho and Euripides as possible intertexts of Xen. In this respect, I consider Lateiner's interpretation 1998 as more adequate: 'the *nosos* love-syndrome extends back to Theocritus and traces some of its symptoms back to Euripides' *Hippolytus*' (1998, 187, n. 51).

[291] A small description comes also from Herondas' *Mimiambi* 1.56-60.

[292] See *Aen*. 1.695-756 and 4.1-172. Other briefer descriptions concern Corydon in *Ecl*. 2, Cornelius Gallus in *Ecl*. 10 and Orpheus in G. 4.

[293] See Catull. 64, Tib. 1.8, Prop. 1.5 and Ov. *Am*. 1.2, *Her*. 4 and 6 and *Met*. 3.339-510, with the story of Echo and Narcissus.

Greek and Latin versions.[294] Finally, in the late *Historia Augusta* (Marcus Antoninus 19.12) and in Quintus Smyrnaeus (1.716-722) lovesickness leads to the achievement of a macabre cure through sexual congress, but both examples are chronologically too far from Xen. to be considered.

On the other hand, Galen also offers descriptions of lovesickness.[295] Although this author has motifs similar to those of the novels, it is unlikely that his exploitation of this theme was connected with Xen. and not only for a chronological reason. As Amundsen argues, Galen 'clearly recognised the psychosomatic basis of lovesickness and divorced it from the mystical realm, assuring his readers that there was nothing preternatural about it'.[296] As a result, Xen.'s stress on the power of Eros offers an opposite interpretation of the same phenomenon.

Given this framework, the issue of readership must be explored, because some of the listed models might have been ignored by the novelists. On the Greek side, knowledge of Euripides in the Imperial Era is indisputable and the same conclusion can be extended to Sappho and Theocritus, as they were clearly read by Longus,[297] while uncertainty concerns Apollonius Rhodius. On the Latin side, rather, this issue is more problematic. A connection between these texts and the Greek novels is not impossible: as Tilg argues in his recent book on Char, 'it is certainly true that, compared with the impact of Greek literature in the Roman world, reception in the other direction is by and large insignificant. It would be wrong, however, to assume that this direction did not exist at all'[298] and some proof of this has already been discovered. That said, since Xen. is not a very sophisticated author and no specific evidence has emerged, I would consider it implausible to assume that he was able to read Latin texts and to use them for his composition. As a result, I will interpret these parallels with Roman Elegy as an indirect suggestion that Xen. might have shared with this genre the reading of Hellenistic Greek texts, which were later lost.

c1) Plot Motifs: Xenophon's original exploitation of the oracle in ancient literature

---

[294] As Romani 2000, 275 resumes, 'il racconto figura pure in Plutarco (*Demetr.* 38) e Appiano (*Syr.* 308-362)' and 'cenni rapidi ne dà Luciano anche nell'*Icaromenippus* (15), nel Qu*omodo historia conscribenda sit*' (35) e nel *De Saltatione* (17, 347a-348a)' (cf. also an echo in Pliny *HN* 7.29.5 and 123). Other two later sources are constituted by Julian (*Mis.* 347a6-348b1) and possibly by Aristaenetus (1.13) and a brief occurrence is also in Rufus of Ephesus in his short treatise Περὶ τῶν δι᾽ ἔρωτα πυρεσσόντων (see fr. 157-160; on the sources of this story, see Mesk 1913, 366). In addition, echoes of this story appear in two passages of Latin novels, in which a woman suffers from the same lovesickness as Antiochus: the first is Apuleius' stepmother at the beginning of the tenth book (*Met.* 10.2-12; on Apuleius' debt to Plutarch *Demetr.*, see Florencis and Gianotti 1990, 101-2), while the second is the king's daughter in *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* 17.22. Finally, Lucian's *On the Syrian goddess* attributes to Stratonice also another lovesickness which involves her and the servant Combabos (19-27).

[295] See, e.g., Galen, *Praenot.* 14.632-635.

[296] Amundsen, 1977, 334.

[297] On Sappho there is also the important testimony given by Plutarch, who in his version of Antiochus' story states: ἐγένετο τὰ τῆς Σαπφοῦς ἐκεῖνα περὶ αὐτὸν πάντα. In Zimmerman 2000, 74's view this statement, along with that of [Longinus] *De subl.* 10.2, suggests that her poem 'was indeed a textbook example', which was probably used as 'a basis for the exercise in paraphrasing poetry in prose' (Stark 1957, 325 f.).

[298] Tilg 2010, 279.

Before collecting the different motifs, I would like to focus on the way in which these different cases of lovesickness are solved.

To begin with, we do not know of a literary text in which the oracle plays the same role as in Xen. and in Hld. Parthenius often introduces oracles, but his divine responses lack a connection with lovesickness (cf. 1.3.4, 1.6, 3.1, 5.6 and 35.3). However, there are two particular texts which contain a divine response related to erotic passion and I would like to analyse them briefly. The result of this study shows that Xen.'s focus on love and society might reflect the attitude of Classical Greece, with a possible link with Greek elegy.

First, in the following passage we find that a response about lovesickness was really given to an unidentified Diogenes in Delphi (L90 in Fontenrose 1978). The description of his request, Pythia's answer and the relative conclusion is reported in a fragment collected by the *Suda* which Adler ascribes to Aelian (fr. 103 Hercher). As the oracle's date is not given by Aelian,[299] it is very likely that this text was older than the Eph., since the preserved Delphic oracles usually belong to the Classical Era.

- SUDA Δ 1145 = Aelian fr. 103 Hercher

Pythiae oraculum
ὅτι Διογένης εἶχεν ἐρῶντα παῖδα καὶ πικρὸς ὢν πατὴρ οὐ συνεγίνωσκε νέου ῥαθυμίᾳ, ἀλλὰ ἀνείργων αὐτὸν καὶ ἀναστέλλων τοῦ πόθου μᾶλλόν οἱ τὸ πάθος παρώξυνε. καὶ ἦν τοῦ κακοῦ δεινὴ ἐπίτασις· ἐξερριπίζετο γὰρ ὁ ἔρως, ἐμποδὼν ἱσταμένου τοῦ Διογένους, καὶ ἐς τὴν παροῦσαν νόσον μᾶλλον ἐξήπτετο ὁ νέος. ἧκεν οὖν ἐς Δελφούς, ὡς ἑώρα φιλόνεικον ὂν τὸ κακόν, καὶ δυσανασχετῶν τε ἅμα καὶ περιαλγῶν ἐρωτᾷ εἴ οἱ πεπαύσεται νοσῶν ποτε ὁ παῖς. ἡ δὲ ὡς εἶδεν οὐ πάνυ τι φρενήρη γέροντα οὐδὲ ἐρωτικαῖς συγγνώμονα ἀνάγκαις λέγει ταῦτα·

λήξει παῖς σὸς ἔρωτος, ὅταν κούφῃ νεότητι
Κύπριδος ἱμερόεντι καταφλεχθῇ φρένας οἴστρῳ
ὀργὴν οὖν πρήυνον ἀμειδέα, μηδ' ἐπιτείνειν
κωλύων· πράσσεις γὰρ ἐναντία σοῖσι λογισμοῖς.
ἢν δ' ἐφ' ἡσυχίην ἔλθῃς, λήθην τάχος ἕξει
φίλτρων καὶ νήψας αἰσχρᾶς καταπαύσεται ὁρμῆς.

ἀκούσας τοίνυν ὁ Διογένης ταῦτα τὸν μὲν θυμὸν κατεστόρεσεν, ἐλπίδος δὲ ὑπεπλήσθη χρηστῆς, ἔχων τῆς τοῦ παιδὸς σωφροσύνης ἐγγυητὰς ἀξιόχρεως· καὶ ἐν ταὐτῷ βελτίων ἐγένετο ὁ πατήρ, ἡμερωθείς τε καὶ πραϋνθεὶς τὸν τρόπον. τοῦτό τοι καὶ ὁ τραγικὸς Αἵμων ὁ τοῦ Σοφοκλέους ἀπεδείξατο τῆς Ἀντιγόνης ἐρῶν καὶ πικρῷ ζυγομαχῶν πατρὶ τῷ Κρέοντι· καὶ γάρ τοι καὶ ἐκεῖνος ὁμοίως ἐλαυνόμενος ξίφει πρὸς τὸν ἔρωτα καὶ τὸν πατέρα τὴν νόσον ἐλύσατο.

---

[299] See Fontenrose 1978, 351: 'the story has much resemblance to episodes of romances. It is impossible to say when Aelian supposes this event to have occurred, whether in his own lifetime or earlier. Hence to assign any date is pure guesswork'.

'Because Diogenes had a son in love and because he was a harsh father, he did not condone his son's brashness, but shutting him up and hindering his desire, he sharpened the passion all the more. And the vehemence of the evil was terrible, for the love flared up. Since the father stood in his way, the young man was impelled even more into his present disease. When Diogenes saw that the ill was battling back stubbornly, he came to Delphi and in his vexation and distress asked if the boy would ever leave off being sick. And [the Pythia], since she saw that the old man was neither completely sound of mind nor indulgent toward the necessity of love, spoke as follows:

"The boy will cease from love when with lightness of youth he will have consumed his mind with the lovely passion of the Cyprian. Thus calm your pitiless anger and do not increase it by trying to prevent it, for you are acting against your intent. But if you arrive at composure, the magic (of love) will quickly be obliterated and he, being sobered, will cease from his shameful impulse".

When he heard this, Diogenes calmed his passion and was filled with good hope, having worthy assurances of his son's self-control; and thereby he became a better father, for he had become milder and gentler in nature. This, too, the tragic hero Haemon, Sophocles' character demonstrated, when he was in love with Antigone and quarreled with his father Creon; for you see he likewise charged with a sword to his love and settled matters with his father in respect of the disease' (Translation from Suda online).

Overall, although the uncertain date of this passage makes comparison with our novel difficult, its content shows some similarities. To begin with, the boy's passion is described as a disease and as an evil (cf. ὁ νόσος and τὸ κακόν). Then his father Diogenes asks help from the oracle and the answer, which is given in hexameters, contains the same order pronounced by Apollo in the Eph.: only with the accomplishment of love his son will again find his self-control. That being said, however, since the beginning the father had recognized the nature of the son's malady and, thus, the main topic of this passage is not lovesickness but his father's concern that love might be an obstacle to his son's σωφροσύνη. This difference is significant and it means we cannot take this oracle as a possible model of Xen. At the same time, it can still be considered as proof that a divine and moral concern very close to that of the Eph. belonged to the Delphic oracle. Since Delphi played a key role in the formation of the ideals of Classical Greece, this oracle might suggest that one of them was a civic and "religious" consideration of love. As a result, I would speculate that with his plot Xen. might be acknowledging this spirit.

The second text is more famous, since it is the Callimachean elegy of Acontius and Cydippe. As I will show in the following list, this text shares a good number of motifs with our novel. However, on closer examination, they do not seem to prove that the Eph. has an intertextual relationship with this text. As a result, another reason for these similarities must be found and I wonder whether the status of Callimachus' text and its focus on Artemis might play a role. Greek Elegy has been considered an archetype of the Greek novel since Rohde 1960[4], 126-9, who underlines how this

genre shares the traditional motifs of the protagonists' beauty and nobility (e.g. Call. *Aet*. fr. 67.1, 8) and the happy ending (e.g. Call. *Aet*. fr. 75.52).[300] In my opinion, however, the link between love, religion and society might be part of this connection. Although few texts have been preserved, the religious and civic setting of the Callimachean Elegy seems to have been common in Greek Elegy and I would speculate that Xen. could be drawing from this genre the scenario of his description of lovesickness.

Having illustrated the main result of this comparison, I offer here a list of the shared motifs:

a) fr. 67, 6: ἐπὶ βουφονίην: as Anthia and Habrocomes, Acontius and Cydippe fall in love in Delos while attending a religious event.

b) 67.21: Cydippe's eyes are described like Anthia's ones (see 1.2.6, n.: ὀφθαλμοὶ), while those of the male characters are overlooked;

c) 68: 'le occasioni in cui spicca la bellezza della giovane Cidippe sono i contesti rituali' (D'Alessio, 477, n.59); similarly, Anthia spends her days in the Artemision (Eph. 1.5.1);

d) 68-69: Acontius is surrounded by male lovers in school and in thermal baths: as ἐραστής, a late gloss of εἰσπνήλας, suggests, he is comparable to a Platonic ἐρώμενος and this situation might be echoed by Xen. in 1.2.8, when Habrocomes' presence attracts all the ephebes;

e) 73.2: Callimachus uses an expression typical of Greek inscriptions to indicate Cydippe's beauty (Κυδίππην ὅσσ' ἐρέουσι καλήν); likewise, Xen attributes it to both Anthia (see 1.2.7: Ἀνθία ἡ καλή) and Habrocomes (see 1.2.8: Καλὸς Ἁβροκόμης);

f) 74: Acontius delivers a dramatic monologue, as does Habrocomes in Eph. 1.4.1-3;

g) 75.20-1: Cydippe's father decides to consult Apollo's oracle to discover the origin of her disease; similarly, in Xen. both protagonists' fathers send messengers to Apollo's oracle (Eph. 1.5.9).

h) 75.45: marriage is shortly followed by sexual union (75.45): the same sequence characterises the Eph. (1.8-9).

In my opinion, these parallels are very interesting, because they confirm the existence in Callimachus of a conception of society similar to that of the Eph., in which public and religious spaces are important and parents are strict towards their children. That said, however, the lack of intertextuality between the two authors makes this connection looser.

This conclusion is supported also by the relevance of some contrasts between the elegy and our novel:

a) 67.1-3: in Callimachus Eros' intervention is a lesson given to Acontius (ἐδίδαξε [...] τέχνην); conversely, in the Eph. the god's action - again called τέχνην (1.2.1) - is against the male protagonist and does not include any teaching (cf. Call. 70 and Xen. 1.3.1);

b) 75.12-15: Cydippe is afflicted by a νοῦσος [...] ἱερὴν, which is a serious and real illness, while Anthia is lovesick (Xen. 1.5.2); conversely, a link with her pretended "holy" disease in Taras is less likely, since this belongs to a different part of the novel: see 5.7.4-9);

---

[300] On this statement, cf. also Rocca 1976, 43 n. 44 and Fusillo 1989, 197.

c) 75.22: in the oracle Artemis is revealed as the one responsible for the oath which forbids Cydippe's wedding, since this act was performed in front of Artemis' sanctuary in Ceus (8: κατὰ τὸ Ἀρτεμίσιον). In Xen., by contrast, no oath is an obstacle to the wedding.

d) 75.43: the oracle's response pushes Cydippe's father to make the other marriage happen. This motif is missing in the Eph.

Overall, these last points confirm that there are some differences between Callimachus and our novelist: their existence makes our speculative hypothesis of Xen.'s debt to Greek Elegy not unlikely but ultimately difficult to assess.

c2) Xenophon's unparalleled focus on erotic shame in the ancient literature

Even more than the oracle, the two other main features of Xen's lovesickness, the lovers' never-ending shame and lack of initiative, remain unparalleled in the ancient literary context. In all the other explorations of this theme, the victim's attempt at hiding his passion is soon interrupted and the lover decides either to confess his passion directly to his beloved or, more often, to ask the help of a intermediary. The second option occurs in the following texts:

a) the Euripidean *Hippolytus*, in which Phaedra makes a progressive revelation of her disease to the nurse;[301]

b) in Theocritus, where Simaetha asks her slave for help (*Id*. 2.95);

c) in Virgil, where Dido promptly speaks very soon with her sister Anna (see *Aen*. 4.9-29);

d) in Seneca's *Phaedra*, in which 'the heroine does not make much of an effort to hide her passion from the nurse'.[302]

On the other hand, Parthenius introduces both approaches, as direct confession occurs twice (cf. 17.2 and 36.3), while the intermediary route is employed five times (5.2, 6.4, 13.1, 16,1 and 21.2). Furthermore, in Stratonice's love for Combabos Lucian seems to vary the first theme, as the queen decides to drink in order to overcome her shame and talk (see 22: ἅμα δὲ οἴνῳ εἰσιόντι παρρησίη το ἐσέρχεται). Finally, the episode in which shame is most emphasised is Apollonius Rhodius' account of Medea, where the heroine strenuously fights with her modesty (3.645-664, 681-2) before making a false confession to a servant (3.688-692).

As a result, Anthia's and Habrocomes' inability to overcome their shame and speak is a feature deliberately chosen by Xen. This conclusion is strongly supported by the analysis of the different versions of Stratonice's story, which all start from the protagonists' shame and the introduction of worried and impotent parents. This impasse, however, instead of being solved with an oracle, is overcome by the intervention of a doctor, who plays the role of revealing the protagonist's passion

---

[301] See, following Paduano's classification 2000, her 'rivelazione traslata' in 207-231, which is followed by the 'rivelazione equivocata' in 310-335 and by the 'rivelazione diretta' in 337-352.

[302] Toohey 1992, 281.

to his parents.[303] Although we are already familiar with this pattern because of Hld., it is interesting that this story was widespread at Xen's time and Hld. himself seems to owe a debt to this. This leads me to conclude that our author's choice of prolonging the silence might be a deliberate one, which would have probably appeared strange to Imperial readers.

The same conclusion is suggested by the analysis of Latin novels, where an intermediary always interrupts lovesickness. However, since these texts seem to be later than the Eph., they do not merit particular attention. Two examples are worth mentioning: the first is Apuleius' story of the stepmother in the tenth book of the *Metamorphoses*, which constitutes one of the numerous re-elaborations of Phaedra's lovesickness. While the heroine soon confesses her love to her son (*Met.* 10.3), as is typical, Apuleius addresses an apostrophe to doctors, in which he explicitly states that the experience in love and not that in medicine is required in order to understand love (ibid.). In my opinion, this invective seems to further underline how the involvement of medicine in the diagnosis of love was widespread in the Imperial Era[304] and this confirms that Xen.'s omission of intermediaries might be not casual.

The second comes from the late novel *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* and is more traditional: lovesickness is explored in relation to the king's daughter and the doctors who are consulted 'aegritudinis nullam causam inveniunt' (18). This failure pushes the victim to express her love to her father first with a letter (20) and then directly (22): thus, the silence is also here broken, unlike what happens in the Eph.

c3) Xen's minor but original exploitation of different erotic traditions

After the study of plot motifs, the last step of this research focuses on literary motifs. As I did before, I have provided a list of the main occurrences of the erotic τόποι, in order to reach an assessment of those which Xen. seems to introduce first in the novelistic corpus. For sake of clarity, in the following table I will write their names in italics.

---

[303] See Val. Max. 5.7.1, where, as Romani 2000, 275 notes, 'ancora dubbia è l'identificazione di Erasistrato': 'hanc tristitiae nubem Leptinis mathematici vel [...] Erasistrati medici providentia discussit'), Plut. *Demetr*. 38.3 (Ἐρασίστρατὸν δὲ τὸν ἰατρὸν αἰσθέσθαι μὲν οὐ χαλεπῶς ἐρῶντος αὐτὸν) and Luc. *Syr. D*. 17 (Ὁ δὲ ἰητρός ἔγνω τὴν νοῦσον ἔρωτα ἔμμεναι). Only two authors introduce a variation: the first is Appian, since "his" Eresistratus fails temporarily his diagnosis (see *Syr*. 310: οὐδ' ὁ περιώνυμος ἰατρὸς Ἐρασίστρατος [...] εἶχε τεκμήρασθαι τοῦ πάθους), because he focuses his attention only on the good condition of Stratonice's body and not on the anxiety of her soul. This new elaboration is significant, since it introduces an opposition between sickness of the body, from which love is excluded, and sickness of the soul (see 310: εἴκασεν εἶναι τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν νόσον, ἣ δὴ καὶ ἐρρωμένῃ καὶ νοσούσῃ τὸ σῶμα συναίθεται). The same distinction appears also in Aristaenetus' thirteenth epistle (see 1.13-6 and then 23), in which the protagonists have different names and the casualty of the beloved' appearance makes the doctor finally understand the nature of the disease.

[304] Another reason for this "attack" might be a general discredit toward the medical profession: see on this Amundsen 1977, 320: 'the references to physicians most commonly quoted from Greek and Latin authors of the period of the late Roman Republic and the Empire are decidedly slanted against the medical profession'.

Table 3.3: Comparison with lovesickness in the erotic Greek and Latin Literature

Eph.	Type of motif	Possible origin and significant occurrences in Greek literature	Significant occurrences in Latin literature
1.1.5, 1.4.2	attempt at resisting Eros	Theoc. *Id*. 30.12-23, AP. 5.93, 5.179, 12.120.	Catull. 8.11, 12, 19; 76.11, 13-14, Tib. 1.2.87-88, 1.4.5, 2.6.5, Prop. 1.5.12, 1.14.7, 3.2.5, 3.19.10, Ov. *Am*. 1.2.9, 2.9.6, 3.11.7, *Her*. 4.151, 16.137, 16.189, *Ars am*. 1.84, 1.127, 2.178, 2.273, *Rem. am*. 423, 675.
1.1.5, 1.4.3	*love and free will*	Sapph. 1.23-24, Xen. *Cyr*. 5.1.11, Theoc. *Id*. 30.28-29.	Tib. 1.8.8, Ov. *Am*. 1.2.17, 1.4.65-6 Ov. *Ars. am*. 1.666, 700, *Rem. am*. 268.
1.2. 1	Eros as a warrior	Soph. *Ant*. 781-90, Eur. *Hipp*. 525-528, AP. 5.179.1-2, 5.180.1-2, 12.50.3, Ap. Rhod. 3.275-4, Moschus 2.23.	"General". Some examples: Tib. 1.1.75, Prop. 2.9.38, 2.13.2, 3.11.6, Verg. *Aen*. 1.689-90, Ov. *Am*. 1.11.12, 2.9.3, 2.12.13.28, 3.11.49-52.
1.2. 1	Eros' revenge against the arrogant lovers	AP 5.176.4, 12.101.3, Plut. *Amat*. 757a.	Tib. 1.8.7-8, Ps. Tib. 3.6.13-14, Prop. 2.3.49, Ov. *Am*. 1.2.17-18, Apul. *Met*. 4.31.
1.3. 1	falling in love at first sight	"General". Few examples, Ap. Rhod. 3.284-298, 443-447, Theoc. *Id*. 2.82, AP 12.106.	"General"
	eye fixation	Pl. *Phdr*. 253a, Luc. *Eikones* 1.	Prop. 1.3.19 Ov. *Am*. 2.17.12.
1.3. 2, 1.9.7	*to receive love through the eyes*	Pl. Phdr. 251b, 251c, 255c, Luc. *Dom*. 4.	Tib. 4.13.4, Prop. 2.15.12, 3.10.15, 3.24.2, 4.4.32, Ov. *Am*. 1.10.10, 2.17.12, 3.3.42, *Her*. 15.234, 16.100, *Ars. am*. 1.44, *Rem. am* 346.
1.3.2, 1.4.4, 1.4.6	love as suffering	"General". Few examples: AP 5.106.2, 5.220.4, 12.49.4, 12.99.6, 12.172.2 and 12.212.2.	"General"
1.3. 2	*desire to talk to attract the beloved*		Ps. Tib. 2.19.2, Prop. 2.23.16, 3.23.18.

Eph.	Type of motif	Possible origin and significant occurrences in Greek literature	Significant occurrences in Latin literature
1.3. 2	*desire to display the body*	AP 5.69.3, 5.83.2, 5.104.4, 12.40.1 and 12.161.4.	Ov. *Am.* 1.5.17-24, Ov. *Ars. am.* 3.307-8, Apul. *Met.* 10.31.
1.3. 3	*painful separation*		Catull. 56.21,64.197-201, 249-250, 66.29-30, Prop. 2.8.29, 2.9.9-15, Ov. *Am.* 1.4.61-2 Ov. *Her.* 5.45-50, 10.31-46, 10.133-150, 11.91-2, 13.85, 18.117.
1.3.. 3	*to turn one's eyes toward the beloved*		Ov. *Her.* 18.118.
1.3. 3	*delay the separation*		Tib. 1.3.15-16, Ov. *Her.* 2.94-5, 5.51-2, 13.85 and 18.115, *Ars am.* 1.703.4 and 2.689-690, *Met.* 11.461.
1.3. 4, 1.4.7	*love as evil*	Eur. *Hipp.* 48, Pl. *Phdr.* 254b, Theoc. *Id.* 30.5, App. *Syr.* 315 and 317, Luc. *Syr. D.* 17 and 22.	Verg. *Ecl.* 10.61, Sen. *Phaed.* 90, 360
1.3.4, 1.5.1	obsessive presence of the beloved's image	Pl. *Phdr.* 255d5-6, 255d9-e1, Ap. Rhod. 3.453-6.	Verg. *Aen.* 4.83, Ov. *Her.* 6.25, *Pont.* 2.4.8, *hist. Apoll. reg. Tyr.* 18.
1.3.4, 1.5. 8	love as a fire	"General"	"General"
1.3. 4	increase of passion	Parth. 17.2, 36.3.	Apul. *Met.* 10.2.
1.3. 4	apex of suffering in bed		Ov. *Her.* 8.105-114.
1.4.1, 1.4.3	to be defeated by Eros	"General"	Ov. *Am.* 1.2.20, 22, 50; 2.9.6, *Her.* 4.153, 9.26.
1.4.1, 1.4.4, 1.9.7, 1.9.8	love and slavery		Catull. 51.98, 65.14, Tib. 1.2.97, 2.3.30, 2.4.3, Ps. Tib. 4.5.13, Prop. 2.13.36, 3.11.2, Ov. *Am.* 1.2.18, 2.9.11, 3.11.3, *Her.* 12.83.

Eph.	Type of motif	Possible origin and significant occurrences in Greek literature	Significant occurrences in Latin literature
1.4. 4	vehemence of love	Aesop. 54, Pl. *Leg*. 837a, AP 5.25.5-6, 12.16.2, 12.37.2, 12.84.3, 12.85.4, Parth. 14.4, 31.1, Nicol. fr. 12, Luc. *Dial. D*. 9.3.	Catull. 68.52, Tib. 2.1.79, Ps. Tib. 4.12.1, Prop. 1.1.4, 1.9.24, 3.21.6, Ov. *Am*. 1.2.17, 46, *Rem*. 530.
1.4. 4	*love as one who drags his victims*	AP. 5.25.5-6, 12.84.3 and 12.85.4.	
1.4.4, 1.4.6, 1.5.5	failure to resist Eros / love	Theoc. *Id*. 30.25-27, Parth. 5.2, 13.1, 16.1, 17.1, 36.3.	Tib. 1.8.8, Verg. *Ecl*. 10.69, Ov. *Am*. 1.2.9-10, Ov. *Her*. 4.151-4, 8.38, Apul. *Met*. 10.2.
1.4. 5	Eros' power over gods and nature	Hes. *Theog*. 120-2, Soph. *Trach*. 441 ff., Eur. *Hipp*. 1269 ff., Pl. *Symp*. 178a-d, 186a-b, 188d, AP. 5.177.5-6, 180.6.	Sen. *Phaed*. 185.
1.4. 5	*Bitter love*	Sapph. fr. 130.2 LP, Eur. *Hipp*. 348, Pl. *Epigr*. 8.2, AP 5.134.4, 5.163.3-4, 12.50.4, 12.54.4, 12.109.3.	Catull. 68.18, Tib. 1.6.2.84, 1.9.20, 1.6.84, Prop. 2.8.3, Ov. *Ars. am*. 2.185.
1.4. 6	*the lover's madness*	Sapph. fr. 1.17-18, Eur. *Hipp*. 241, 248, 1274, Pl. *Phdr*. 249e3-4, Theoc. *Id*. 2.82, 11.11, Parth. 27.1, 29.2, Luc. *Syr. D*. 21.	Catull. 63.4, 31, 38, 78, 79, 92, 64.197.254, 100.7, Tib. 4.13.17, Prop. 1.1.11, 1.13.20, 2.6.17, 2.6.18, 2.14.18, 2.15.29, 2.34.25, 3.17.3, Verg. *Ecl*. 10.44, *Aen*. 4.69, 78 Ov. *Am*. 2.4.4, 3.11.25, Ov. *Her*. 4.37-8, 6.131, 12.193, *Ars. am*. 1.372, 1.527, 2.106, 2.591, 2.563, 2.691, Sen. *Phaed*. 268, 339, 363.
1.4. 7	*no limit to love*	Pl. *Phdr*. 254b2, Septuag. *Salom*. 14.27, Max. Tyr. 12.6a.	
1.5. 1	*nocturnal lament*	AP. 5.120, 151, 168, 191, 229.	Seneca, *Phaed*. 370, Apul. *Met*. 10.2.
1.5. 2	*sleepless nights*	Ap. Rhod. 3.751-2, Theoc. *Id*. 10.10, AP 5.152.3, 166.1, 191.4, 212.3, 215.1, 279.4, Gal. *Praen*. 14.631 and 635, Ruf. fr. 157.	Tib. 1.2.76, 1.8.64, Prop. 1.5.11, 1.9.28, 1.11.3, 1.16.40, 3.15.2, 3.20.22, Verg. *Aen*. 4.5, Ov. *Am*. 1.2.3, 1.9.7, *Her*. 12.169, *Ars am*. 1.735, *Met*. 3.396 and 437, Apul. *Met*. 10.2, *hist. Apoll. reg. Tyr*. 18.

Eph.	Type of motif	Possible origin and significant occurrences in Greek literature	Significant occurrences in Latin literature
1.5.2, 1.5.4, 1.9.1	physical exhaustion	Eur. *Hipp*. 131-8, 174, 199, 274-5, Theoc. *Id*. 2.89-90, Plut. *Demetr*. 38.2, App. *Syr*. 311, Luc. *Syr. D*. 17, Galen, *Praenot*. 14.632, Jul. *Mis*. 247b2-3, and 247c1-2, Aristaenet. 1.13.9-10.	Plaut. *Trin*. 225, Catull. 64.189, Prop. 1.5.22, Ov. *Am*. 1.6.5-6, *Met*. 3.396, 397-8, Val. Max. 5.7.1, Sen. *Phaed*. 345, *hist. Apoll. reg. Tyr*. 18.
1.5. 2	a spiritless sight	Sapph. fr. 31.11, Ap. Rhod. 3. 962-3, Plut. *Demetr*. 38.4, Luc. *Syr. D*. 17.	Sen. *Phaed*. 379-380.
1.5. 2	change in the skin's colour (pallor)	Sapph. fr. 31.14-15, Eur. *Hipp*. 175, Ap. Rhod. 3.297-8, 963 Theoc. *Id*. 2.88,, Plut. *Demetr*. 38.4, Luc. *Syr. D*. 17, Galen, *Praen*. 14.632.	Prop. 1.5.21, Hor. *Carm*. 1.13.5 ff., Ov. *Am*. 1.7.51, *Ars. am*. 3.269, 2.5.30, Val. Max. 5.7.1, Apul. *Met*. 10.2.
1.5. 3, 1.5.9, 1.9.1	-silence due to fear and shame	Sapph. fr. 31.7-8, Eur. *Hipp*. 40, Ap. Rhod. 3.648, Parth. 16.1; 36.3, App. *Syr*. 309, 312, Luc. *Syr. D*. 22, Gal. *Praen*. 631.	Verg. *Aen*. 4.27, Ov. *Her*. 4.9, Val. Max. 5.7.1, Plut. *Dem*. 38.5.
1.5.3	-neglect of the usual activities	Sapph. fr. 102 V, Theoc. *Id*. 10.1-6, 11.12-13, 73-74.	
1.5. 3	*erotic prayers and moans*		"General". Some occurrences: Catull. 50.19, Tib. 1.4.71-2. Ov. *Am*. 2.2.66, *Her*. 6.73.75, 16.229-230.262, Ov. *Ars. am*. 3.795, *Fast*. 4.111, Apul. *Met*. 4.29.
1.5. 4, 1.9.4, 1.9.8	jealousy	Parth. 7.4; 15.3; 19.	Prop. 1.5, 2.6.9-13, 2.20.1-8, 2.34.19, Ov. *Ars. am*. 2.426, 3.673-682, *Rem. am*. 768.
1.5. 5	*fall of the soul*	Pl. *Phdr*. 248c7-8, Max. Tyr. 11.10.	
1.5. 6	*fading of beauty*	Theoc. *Id*. 2.83: τὸ δὲ κάλλος ἐτάκετο	

Eph.	Type of motif	Possible origin and significant occurrences in Greek literature	Significant occurrences in Latin literature
1.5. 9	love as a disease	Eur. *Hipp*. 40, 131, 176, 186, 269, 279, 283, 394, 405, Pl. *Phdr*. 231d, 238e, 244d and 255d, Ap. Rhod. 3.676, Theoc. *Id*. 2.85, 30.1, Call. *Epigr*. 44, Parth. 5.2, 6.4, 11.1, 13.1, 17.2. 31.2, 36.3, Plut. *Demetr*. 38.3.2 (bis), Sor. *Vita Hipp*. 5, App. *Syr*, 309, 312, Luc. *Syr. D*. 17 and 22, Aristaenet. 1.13.11.	Plaut. *Trin*. 269,, Catull. 76.25, Tib. 2.5.110, Ps. Tib. 3.4.19, Prop. 2.1.38, 2.4.11, Verg. *G*. 4.531-2, *Aen*. 4.90 Ov. *Rem*. 81, 109, 115, 313, 314, Apul. *Met*. 10.2, *hist. Apoll. reg. Tyr*. 18.
1.5. 9	love and death	Sapph. fr. 31.15-16, Eur. *Hipp*. 39, 139-140, Ap. Rhod. 3.806-9, Herod. 1.60, App. *Syr*. 309.	Plaut. *Trin*. 239, Cat. 30.7, Prop. 1.6.26, 1.13.17, 2.1.47, 2.3.45-46, Verg. *Ecl*. 2.7,, Ov. *Am*. 2.7.10, *Ars. am*. 1.372, Val. Max. 5.7.1.
1.6. 2	love is the only remedy for love	Pl. *Phdr*. 252a, Plut. *Demetr*. 38.5, *Amat*. 759b, Syr. *App*. 312.	Tib. 2.3.14, Prop. 1.5.28, 2.1.57-8, Verg. *Ecl*. 10.60, Ov. *Her*. 5.149, *Rem*. 91-2, *Met*. 1.523.
1.9. 7	the goad of love	Eur. *Hipp*. 38-39, 1301-3, Pl. *Phdr*. 253e6-254a1.	

Overall, this analysis shows how many of these motifs are not only common in the novelistic genre, but also in erotic literature. While this is not surprising, it is striking that with Xen.'s unusual motifs this general tendency often fades away: this suggests that we are dealing with themes that are more original and the search for their origin becomes more interesting.

That said, the analysis of the three motifs that are exclusive to Xen. also sheds a light on the other themes: the first, "desire to talk to attract the beloved", appears in Roman Elegy, the second, "desire to display the body", in Greek epigrams and the last two, "no limit to love" and "fall of the soul", in the Platonic *Phaedrus*. These different traditions are those where also the other original motifs are attested:

a) Roman Elegy contains "painful separation", "to turn one's eyes toward the beloved", "delay of separation", "nocturnal lament" and "erotic prayers and moans";

b) Greek epigrams contains "desire to display the body" and "love as one who drags his victims and "nocturnal laments";

c) Plato is the model for 'to receive love through the eyes".

Given this list, the remaining five motifs are more difficult to assess. Both "bitter love" and "the lover's madness" are first attested in Sappho and in Euripides' *Hippolytus*. While Xen. does not seem to intertext with the second work, although some scholars have argued this (LI 2.1), I would

argue that our author is not keen on Sappho: he introduces only three motifs peculiar to this poetess, while he omits five which appear in the other novelists.

- Sapphic motifs included: "Change in the skin's colour", "Silence due to fear and shame", "Neglect of the usual activities".
- Sapphic motifs excluded: "Blushing", "Cold flushes", "Face more green than grass", "Sweat of love", "Throbbing of the heart" (see table 3.4 below).

Since the second list includes motifs which construct an emotive reaction to lovesickness which cannot pass unnoticed by the partner, in my opinion they might have been deliberately neglected by our author: Sappho's emphasis on the power of erotic desire might have appeared exaggerated to Xen. and not appropriate to more controlled lovers such as Anthia and Habrocomes (for more on this, 1.5.2 n.: οἱ χρῶτες).

As a result, I would speculate that, following the chronology, in both "bitter love" and "the lover's madness" the third model might be the one that Xen. is following: while the former has many occurrences in Greek epigrams, the latter is explored by Plato. Thus, I would fit both into the previous threefold classification. For the same reason, both the motifs of "love as an evil" and that of "goad of love" seem to have a Platonic origin: the first is introduced by Xen. through a very plausible allusion to the *Phaedrus* (1.4.7 n.: τί τὸ πέρας τοῦ κακοῦ) and the second appears only in the *Hippolytus* before than in Plato.

Conversely, a more special consideration concerns "love and free will": since in this case also Sappho's model is unlikely, the *Cyropaedia* of Xenophon of Athens, which provides the second attestation of this, might be Xen.'s intertext, as I will demonstrate in the commentary (1.4.3 n. : τοῖς σοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς).

In conclusion, apart from this last exception, in the few cases where Xen.'s knowledge of erotic motifs appears to be original within the novelistic corpus, our author seems to follow three traditions:

- the Platonic theory of love;
- Greek epigrams;
- Latin elegy.

Xen.'s approach to each of these is different: while in Plato's case there is a coexistence of motifs, textual allusions and puns (LI 7.1-2), in the two other cases Xen. recalls some themes, following McGill's assumption 2000, 325 that many of the erotic τόποι in the Imperial Era 'stood as public literary property'. In addition, Xen.'s exploitation of these traditions seems to follow a criterion of appropriateness to the context. This is evident in his approach to epigrams, which appear mostly in two specific parts of the first book. The first is Habrocomes' first monologue, where we find all the three original motifs introduced by Xen. Since this passage presents love as an uncontrollable force and contains a prayer to Eros, our author seems to use the epigrammatic tradition to increase the literary quality of the prayer and the forcefulness of his speech. The second is the wedding night (LI

2.4), in which the main reason for using epigrammatic motifs seems to be different: their emphasis on sexual love.

The same pattern can be extended to Roman elegy: Xen.'s elegiac motifs focus on the lovers' first reactions to love and on their painful separation, in which two different views on love are combined: a stress on sexual desire and on the lovers' sufferings. While the first connotation is also carried by Greek epigrams, the second seems peculiar to elegy. As a result, it seems to me that the reference to this model here would help our author to underline their pain and I would define the separation of Anthia and Habrocomes as an elegiac scene. Interestingly, a similar colour seems to concern also the way in which Habrocomes focuses on his interior conflict in his aforementioned monologue (1.4.4-5 n.: intr. a).

Overall, these hypotheses are significant, because they suggest that Xen.'s accommodates different literary traditions in his text according to the specific situation he is describing and this is a hint of sophistication. A final confirmation of this comes from Plato. Although this author is echoed throughout the whole novel, the intertextuality with him concerns essentially Anthia's lovesickness and our author seems to view this theme as a starting point to emphasise Anthia's unexpected leadership in this first step of the protagonists' love (LI 7.4a-b). As a result, this analysis proves that Xen. could be a more literary author than is generally recognised.

Table 3.4: Appendix: erotic motifs missing in the *Ephesiaca* but present in the other Greek novels

Erotic τόπος	Occurrences in the other novelists	Famous model
beauty like lightning	Hld. 1.21.3, 5.8.5, 7.10.3.	
blushing	Char. 2.5.5, 2.7.5, 3.2.3, 4.2.13, 5.3.8, 6.3.1; Long. 1.13.6, 1.17.2; Ach. 1.10.4, 3.7.3, 4.17.5, 5.19.6; Hld. 2.7.1, 3.17.1, 4.10.4, 4.18.2, 5.34.2, 6.9.4, 10.18.2, 10.24.2.	Sapph. 31.14.V.
caressing the breast	Ach. 2.37.7.	
cold flushes	Long. 1.17.2, 2.7.5.	Sapph. 31.13.V., Theoc. *Id.* 2.106.
confession to a friend	Char. 2.4.6-8.	Eur. *Hipp.* 207-231, 310-335 and 337-352.
confusion provoked by love	Char. 2.3.8. 2.4.7, 8.1.7, Ach. 2.6.1, 2.37.10.	
emotional displacement	Char. 6.4.4, Longus 3.26.1, 4.28.2, Hld. 1.10.2.	

Erotic τόπος	Occurrences in the other novelists	Famous model
Eros / Aphrodite mystery cult	Char. 4.4.9, Ach. 1.2.2, 1.9.7, 1.10.5, 1.18.3, 2.19.1, 5.15.6, 5.16.3, 5.25.6, 5.26.3, 5.26.10, 5.27.4, 8.12.4.	Pl. *Phdr*. 249c, 250b.
erotic wound	Char. 1.1.7, 2.4.1, 4.1.9, 4.2.4, 6.3.3, 8.5.6, Longus 1.14.1, Ach. 1.4.4, 1.6.2-3, 2.7.6, 2.13.1, 4.6.1, 4.7.4, 5.26.3, 8.12.7, Hld. 3.7.5, 7.10.1, 7.10.3, 7.28.1.	
face more green than grass	Longus 1.17.4.	Sapph. 31.14 LP.
honey-sweet kisses	Longus 1.18.1, Ach. 2.7.6, 2.37.7, 4.8.1.	Theocr. *Id*. 1.146.
unstable emotivity	Longus 1.13.6, Hld. 3.10.5.	
kiss and bite	Long. 1.17.2, 1.25.2, Ach. 2.37.7.	Pl. *Symp*. 218a.
kiss and heat	Long. 1.17.1, Hld. 1.9.3.	Pd. fr. 123.5-6.
kiss and poison	Char. 2.8.1, Long. 1.18.2.	Xen. *Mem*. 1.3.12, Mosc. 1.27.
loss of appetite	Longus 1.13.6, 1.17.4, 2.7.4.	
loss of thirst	Longus 1.17.4, 2.7.3.	
love and hunting	Char. 6.4.4-6, Ach. Tat. 1.9.1, Hld. 2.25.1.	
love and lamps	Char. 1.1.15-16, Hld. 7.9.1.	
love and wine	Char. 4.3.8, Long. 2.2.2, Ach. 1.6.1, 2.3.3, Hld. 3.10.5, 7.27.3.	
love hurts like a bee	Longus 1.14.2, Ach. 2.7.6.	
melting provoked by love	Char. 4.2.3, Longus 1.18.1, 1.21.1, 3.13.3, Ach. 5.25.5.	Theocr. *Id*. 2.28
soul - ache	Longus 1.13.5, 2.7.5.	Ap. Rhod. 3.288-9, 298.
sweat of love	Char. 4.2.13, Hld. 4.11.1.	Sapph. 31.13.V.

Erotic τόπος	Occurrences in the other novelists	Famous model
to talk only about the beloved	Longus 1.13.5.	
throbbing of the heart	Longus 1.17.2, 1.18.1, 2.7.5.	Sapph. 31.5.V.
wet eyes	Hld. 3.7.1, 3.19.1.	

4) **Marriage and sex**

4a) Marriage as an intermediate step in the protagonists' life

After the oracle, the parents arrange the wedding of their children. This event is introduced by Xen. as a public occasion and following a standard Greek pattern (1.7.3, n.: μεστὴ μὲν ἤδη). As it is clearly a new step in the protagonists' love, it is important to assess what value it really has in Xen.'s mind. As Apollo's oracle suggests (1.6.2, n.: oracle), marriage is the cure for the protagonists' lovesickness and thus provides them relief. However, at the same time, it is shortly followed by misadventures: thus, it is only an intermediate step in the *Entwicklung* of the novel.

This statement is confirmed by the fact that marriage is often mentioned in the Eph.: Xen. ascribes the desire for marriage also to the protagonists' suitors (Euxinus in 1.16.7, Lampo in 2.12.3, Amphinomus in 5.2.5 and Rhenaea and Polyidus in 5.5.1 and 5.5.3). Perilaus even celebrates a marriage which is very similar to that of Ephesus (2.13.8 ff.). This suggests that in Xen.'s mind marriage is an important element but it is not enough to achieve true love: only time and fidelity will make the protagonists reach the fulfillment of their love.

4b) Comparison with Chariton: the silence about marriage at the end of the novel as the proof of its "temporary" value

A confirmation of this assessment comes from the end of the novel, where Xen. does not explicitly refer to this event, although the protagonists meet again in Rhodes and return to the land of their wedding, Ephesus (for a development of this interpretation, LI 5.4d). This creates an opposition not only with Longus, Ach. and Hld., who place marriages at the end of their texts, but also with Char. Although this author starts his novel with the protagonists' marriage as does Xen., he then recalls it in the finale of the story: after the reunion of Chaereas and Callirhoe, Char. introduces a narratorial comment about their parade: καὶ πολέμου καὶ εἰρήνης ἦν ὁμοῦ τὰ ἥδιστα, ἐπινίκια καὶ γάμοι (8.1.12). The reason for this lies in a new value assigned to marriage. In the first book this event appears to the Syracusans sweeter than the victory over the Athenians (1.1.13) and is the fruit of Hermocrates' hands. Conversely, in the last book 'the martial element of the victory celebration

invests the couple with a new dynamic',[305] which has its foundation in Chaereas' personal victory. As a result, in Char. marriage has a public resonance both at the beginning and at the end of the novel and it becomes the instrument for Chaereas' heroic growth. This draws an important distinction between the two earliest novels: when Anthia and Habrocomes meet again, the Rhodians do not recall their wedding, but simply exclaim: πάλιν ὁρῶμεν Ἀβροκόμην καὶ Ἀνθίαν τοὺς καλούς (5.13.3). Then, the protagonists share a prayer to Isis (5.13.4) and their thoughts on the wedding night. In my opinion, the reason for this silence lies in the fact that Xen. is more focused on the issue of their fidelity than on that event. Further, since in this case it is likely that our author is intertexting with Char., (1.7.3 n.: μεστὴ μὲν ἤδη) this deviation from Char. would be deliberate.

4c) Comparison with the whole corpus: a standard exploitation of the motif

Unlike Xen., the other novelists play also more subtly with marriage: Longus displaces the ceremony to the countryside, while Ach. subverts the traditional pattern. While he dedicates only a section of the last chapter of his text to his wedding, he spends many words on the attempted marriage between Clitophon and Melite: instead of using this issue to emphasise the start of a faithful union, he underlines the infidelity. This serves as proof that Xen.'s presentation of marriage is more standard and lacks a particular originality.

Finally, there is a last point which needs to be considered: our author omits any reference to the generation of children, while all the others include it:

- Char. does it directly through Callirhoe and Chaereas' son (e.g. 3.7.7);
- Longus mentions Daphnis and Chloe's son at the end of the novel (4.39.2);
- Ach. makes Melite refer to her and Clitophon's future son (5.16.6);
- Hld. introduces παιδογονίας as a duty of marriage (10.40; see also 1.19.7, where the same concept is expressed by Thyamis).

Since, as Egger argues, Hld.'s statement is an 'Attic convention',[306] Xen.'s omission is unexpected and might suggest a desire for going beyond marriage: see LI 5.6a for more on this.

4d) Sex as the distinctive aspect of marriage

Along with the standard public dimension of the Ephesian wedding, in the Eph. the real aim of this event is the first erotic consummation of the protagonists. This value is not only suggested by the dedication of an entire scene - the ninth chapter - to the wedding night, but by many other expedients:

- from the seventh chapter, sex is introduced as a dimension of marriage by the Ephesians, who defines Anthia as happy because ἡ δὲ οἵῳ μειρακίῳ συγκατακλιθήσεται (1.7.3);
- the wedding night is foreshadowed by the only *ekphrasis* of the novel, the union of Ares and Aphrodite depicted on the canopy, which is the most significant sexual relationship of the

---

[305] Smith 2007, 95.

[306] Egger 1994, 270.

Odyssey; in addition, the object itself, having a Babylonian style, is a symbol which underlines different nuances of human desire, from wealth to lasciviousness (1.8.2-3 n.);

- after the consummation, Xen. emphasises the joy of the protagonists, which is the direct consequence of this act (1.10.1n. : ἡδίονες).

That being said, it is significant how in this positive portrait some contrasting hints are introduced: Ares and Aphrodite's love is often considered immoral, given its focus on pleasure (1.8.2-3, n.: the only *ekphrasis*, 3b). In addition, the protagonists' joy is accompanied by forgetfulness of the oracle (1.10.2, n.: ἑορτὴ). In my opinion, the combination of the two elements confirms the previous definition of marriage as an intermediate step in the protagonists' relationship: as this event is focused on the pleasure of sex, it does not involve all the qualities which a true love has and that will be revealed later in the novel. For this reason, Xen. does not seem to be saying that sex is immoral, but to suggest it as a partial conquest of the protagonists.

5e) The protagonists' initiation to sex: the proof of an authentic *Bildung*

Having shown the importance of marriage in Xen.'s progressive conception of love, I would also suggest that the same progression works as a pattern on a minor scale: within this scene Anthia and Habrocomes have a sort of initiation to sex, in which the event itself occurs at the end of the wedding night and of a crescendo of erotic motifs. The reason why both Anthia and Habrocomes need to walk along this path is to overcome their shame, which is still in them even after the revelation of their love and the celebration of marriage.

To begin with, the existence of an *Entwicklung* is realised through an attentive use of erotic motifs, which help our author to reconsider all the previous feelings, such as desire, shame, physical exhaustion etc. in the new positive context of the presence of the beloved. Oveall, nine main erotic motifs are introduced by Xen. through his literary material:

1) Impatience, which from the beginning proves the new positive approach adopted by the protagonists toward love (1.8.1, n.: (βραδύνειν;);

2) Shame and fear of erotic pleasure (1.9.1, n.: ὑφ᾽ἡδονῆς);

3) Expression of erotic desire (1.9.2, n.: ἡ δὲ ἐδάκρυε);

4) Response to erotic desire (ibid.);

5) Spiritual union (1.9.5, n.: συμφύντες);

6) Suggestion of an everlasting union (1.9.5, n: καταβρέχωμεν δὲ καὶ τοὺς στεφάνους);

7) Empathy (1.9.6, n.: ὅσα ἐνενόουν διὰ τῶν χειλέων ἐκ ψυχῆς εἰς τὴν θατέρον ψυχὴν);

8) Fidelity (1.9.8, n. τηρήσατε);

9) Sex (1.9.9, n.: τῶν Ἀφροδίτης ἔργων).

As this list already suggests, the order of these motifs is not casual and it suggests a progressive emergence of erotic desire which leads the protagonists to a reciprocal union and consummation. This trajectory is significant, because it introduces a new direction in the protagonists' relationship. After the initial asymmetry and Anthia's unexpected leadership, Habrocomes progressively

becomes more important and acquires a more active role. On the wedding night this move is only part of the hero's mind, since he calls himself ἐραστήν (1.9.4, n.), but it will shortly become concrete (LI 2.5).

Second, the evidence that this *Entwicklung* constitutes also a *Bildung* for the protagonists is provided by the *ekphrasis*, which is directly seen only by Anthia and Habrocomes. This is not only suggested by the educative value which an Odyssean theme like Ares and Aphrodite's love had in antiquity (1.8.2-3, n.: the only *ekphrasis*), but also by the fact that the first side of the canopy offers analeptic images of love which seem to be part of the aforementioned ninefold sequence (1.8.2-3, n.: ibid.). Finally, it is significant that the canopy, being an exclusive fabrication (1.8.2: ἦν δὲ αὐτοῖς) and focusing on a Phaeacian story, can be considered as a metaliterary image of the novel. As a result, Xen. seems to extend the educative aim of this passage to the whole novel: our interpretation of the Eph. as a *Bildungsroman* is here introduced by the author himself.

5f) An attentive introduction of erotic motifs: the confirmation of Xenophon's dependence on three main traditions

Having revealed the main aim and focus of the wedding night, I would like to analyse the numerous erotic motifs introduced by Xen. As I did before, I collect them in a table:

Table 4.1: the motifs of the erotic consummation in the *Ephesiaca*

Eph.	Greek text	Type of motif
1.7.4 (bis.), 1.9.1, 1.10.1	ἡ Ἀνθία ἥδετο μὲν ὅτι Ἁβροκόμην ἕξει	sexual pleasure
1.8.1, 1.9.4	βραδύνειν δὲ πάντα ἐδόκει Ἁβροκόμῃ καὶ Ἀνθίᾳ	impatience of lovers
1.8. 2	Ἔρωτες παίζοντες	Erotes playing
1.8 .2	οἱ μὲν Ἀφροδίτην θεραπεύοντες	love and slavery
1.8. 2	οἱ δὲ ἱππεύοντες ἀναβάται στρουθοῖς	lovers as sparrows
1.8. 2	οἱ δὲ στεφάνους πλέκοντες	weaving of garlands
1.8. 3	Entire section	Ares and Aphrodite's love
1. 9. 1	οὔτε προσειπεῖν ἔτι ἀλλήλους ἠδύναντο [...] αἰδούμενοι, φοβούμενοι	silence due to fear and shame
1.9. 1	ἔκειντο	to lay in bed

1.9. 1	ὑφ' ἡδονῆς παρειμένοι	weakness and pleasure
1.9. 1	πνευστιῶντες	difficulty to breathe
1.9. 1	ἐπάλλετο δὲ αὐτοῖς τὰ σώματα καὶ ἐκραδαίνοντο αὐτοῖς αἱ ψυχαί	trembling of body and soul
1.9. 2	σύμβολα τῆς ἐπιθυμίας τὰ δάκρυα	sweet tears = tears symbol of erotic desire
1.9. 3	νέκταρος ποτιμώτερα	tears sweeter than nectar
1.9. 4	ἄνανδρε καὶ δειλέ	cowardice of love
1.9. 4	πόσον ἐβράδυνας ἐρῶν χρόνον	the slow lover
1.9. 5	δάκρυα μὲν ὑποδέχου	to drink the beloved's tears
1.9. 5	ἡ καλή σου κόμη πινέτω πόμα τὸ ἐρωτικόν	the hair drinking tears
1.9. 5	συμφύντες ἀλλήλοις ἀναμιγῶμεν	reciprocal union
1.9. 5	καταβρέχωμεν δὲ καὶ τοὺς στεφάνους	to dip the garlands with tears
1.9. 6	τὰ χείλη τοῖς χείλεσι φιλοῦσα συνηρμόκει	kiss as an encounter of lips
1.9. 6	ὅσα ἐνενόουν διὰ τῶν χειλέων ἐκ ψυχῆς εἰς τὴν θατέρου ψυχὴν	kiss as the instrument for exchanging thoughts between the souls
1.9. 7	φιλοῦσα δὲ αὐτοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς	to kiss the eyes

Overall, this list shows how Xen. uses many literary motifs also to describe the protagonists' sexual consummation. More precisely, along with three previous motifs, such as 'love and slavery', 'silence due to fear and shame' and 'trembling of body and soul', our author introduces a good number of new ones, which fit well into the context of an erotic consummation. Interestingly, also the "old" motifs are introduced in this new key: this shows a first hint of the variation which our author seems to adopt here. In addition, Xen. focuses particularly on two main elements of human body, tears and eyes, to suggest this progression. This physical and at the same time metaphorical approach to love is original in the novel and might correspond to Ach.'s pseudo-scientific explanations.

The emergence of this attitude suggests that we might be dealing with a part of the novel which is characterised by a rich literary framework, as happens with lovesickness. For this reason, I will conduct an analogue analysis of the motifs, in order to understand whether Xen. is following the same traditions that emerged before.

Table 4.2: comparison with the motifs of the erotic consummation in the other novels and in the erotic literature

Eph.	Type of motif	Significant occurrences in the novelistic corpus	Significant occurrences in Greek authors	Significant occurrences in Latin authors
1.7.4, etc.	sexual pleasure		"General"	"General"
1.8.1, 1.9.4	impatience of lovers	Ach. 2.1.1, 2.10.3, 5.15.4-6	AP 5.172, 12.114.	
1.8. 2	Erotes playing	Ach. 1.1.13.	Ap. Rhod. 3.119-122, AP 5.214.1, 12.46.	
1.8. 2	lovers as sparrows		Sapph. 1 LP, 9-10, Arist. *Lys*. 723, Ath. 9.46.	Apul. *Met*. 6.6.3.
1.8. 2	weaving of garlands	"General"	"General"	"General"
1.8. 3	Ares and Aphrodite's love		*Od*. 8.266-367, Pl. *Symp*. 196d, Ap. Rhod. 1.742-746, AP. 5.180.3-4, 5.238.3-4.	Lucr. 1.29-40.
1.9. 1	to lay with the lover	Longus 2.7.7, 2.10.1, 3.18.3, 4.40.3.	Pl. *Symp*. 191e, *Phdr*. 255e, 256a.	Ov. *Am*. 1.13.5, 2.4.34, 3.8.12, *Her*. 5.15.87, AP. 5.300.2
	weakness and pleasure			Cat. 64.99, Prop. 1.13.15, Ov. Her. 13.116.
	difficulty to breathe	Longus 1.18.1, 1.32.4, Ach. Tat. 2.37.9.	Theoc. *Id*. 30.6.	Apul. *Met*. 10.2.
	trembling of body and soul		Sapph. fr. 31.13-4, Ibyc. fr, 286 and fr. 297 Camp. 5, Luc. *Syr. D*. 17.	Prop. 1.5.15. 638, 760.

1.9. 2	sweet tears = tears symbol of erotic desire		Eur. *Hipp.* 525-5, AP 5.166.2. 5.177, 5.178.4, 5.212.2, 7.419.3, 12.72, 12.132.6, 12.142.6, 12.167.2.	
1.9. 3	tears sweeter than nectar			
1.9. 4	cowardice of lo-ve	Ach. 4.4.4, 4.5.1		
1.9. 4	the slow lover			Tib. 2.6.36, Ps. Tib. 4.11.6, Prop. 1.6.12, 1.15.4, 2.14.22, 2.33.25, Ov. *Am.* 1.8.76, 3.6.60, *Her.* 2.23, 6.17, 18.70, *Ars. am.* 2.357, 3.573.
1.9. 5	to drink the beloved's tears	AP. 5.250.5-6, 12.132.6.		
1.9. 5	the hair drinking tears		AP 5.145.5-6.	
1.9. 5	reciprocal union	Longus 4.6.3, Ach. 1.3.3, 3.17.7, Hld. 5.4.5.	Pl. *Symp.* 191a, Plut. *Ant.* 66.4, Phryn. *PS* 128.	
1.9. 5	to dip the garlands with tears		AP 5.136, 5.145.1-3, 5.191.5-6, 12.116.1-2.	
1.9. 6	kiss as an encounter of lips		AP 5.128, 5.171.3.	Ov. *Am.* 3.14.9, Ov. *Her.* 13.117, 15.319, Ars. am. 1.682, 3.650.
1.9. 6	kiss as the instrument for exchanging thoughts between the souls		AP. 5.14.4, 5.78, Ach. 2.8.2.	
1.9. 7	to kiss the eyes			Catull. 9.8-9.

Overall, this analysis seems to show that in this passage Xen. is more sophisticated than in his description of lovesickness, since no motif has a parallel in more than one novelist and, especially, in this comparison Char. never occurs. That said, each of the previous traditions is confirmed. Both Greek epigrams and Roman Elegy have a similar importance, since they are used by Xen. to describe the excitement of the protagonists and their numerous acts of love. This marks a difference from lovesickness, where Greek epigrams mostly emphasise the power of Eros as a god and Roman Elegy the suffering of the separation. Thus, Xen. proves here to be able to approach the same traditions to achieve different goals.

A similar variation concerns Xen.'s relationship with Plato: while *Phaedrus* is still mentioned but only in Anthia's references to the past sufferings and to the traditional role of eyes in welcoming beauty, we find here a new exploitation of Aristophanes' union of the beloved: also in this case, Xen. seems to move from a model where suffering is the main mark of love to one focused on the joy given by sex and union with the beloved. Overall, I would conclude that the wedding night constitutes the clear proof that Xen. is able to be a sophisticated author when he so wishes.

5) Oath and fidelity

Both Habrocomes and Anthia's speeches on the wedding night end with a request to the partner to be faithful. These suggestions, however, are certainly not the main theme of their intervention, but only a final hint: an attentive reader might be even disappointed by the brevity of this reference, since marriage is a theme which naturally invokes thoughts of an everlasting companionship.

Having acknowledged this strange silence, it is significant that just two chapters later Xen. returns to this topic, as he introduces an oath between the couple which is focused on conjugal fidelity. In my opinion, the choice to address this issue in a setting which is separated from the sexual consummation is the sign that our author considers this moment as a new step in the protagonists' relationship. In addition, the sophisticated style of Anthia and Habrocomes' speeches seems to suggest that this topic is more important than the previous ones (1.11.3-5, n.: oath of fidelity, b-c). More precisely, the analysis of some expressions leads to an unexpected discovery: words and themes of the oath and the event itself is recalled during the novel while the protagonists deal with their erotic rivals. This is particularly true for Anthia, whose connection with fidelity seems stronger than that of Habrocomes. This discovery is very important, because it not only confirms the importance of fidelity in Xen.'s mind, but it also suggests that it becomes a protagonists' virtue through the progression of their misadventures. As a result, the oath seems to play an "initiatory" role in relation to fidelity, allowing the author to accommodate it in the novel and to use its content as a cornerstone of the entire text (for this role, see also LI 4.3).

Finally, in Habrocomes' speech there is a second hint at his progressive acquisition of a leadership: his promise to Anthia that he will not marry another woman includes a reference to building a new family (συνοικήσαιμι[307]). This suggests that Habrocomes wants to show his masculine personality

---

[307] 1.11.3-5, n.: oath of fidelity, c.

and he is ready to take the leadership in the relationship, in order to make the everlasting and faithful relationship with Anthia possible.

The conquest of this ideal, however, is still far from the protagonists in the first book: after their first erotic *Bildung*, which has its conclusion in the oath of fidelity, a second phase starts, which is set in the uncivilised society. For this reason, I will now approach the second world of the Eph. from the same erotic perspective adopted in this chapter.

CHAPTER 3: LOVE IN THE UNCIVILISED SOCIETY

If civilised love corresponds to that of the protagonists and has its fulfilment in marriage, love in the uncivilised society involves more characters: interestingly, it mostly concerns pirates and brigands:

Table 0.1: The uncivilised lovers of the *Ephesiaca*

Eph.	Name of the lovers	Protagonist involved	Social position
1.14.6 ff	Corymbus	Habrocomes	Pirates
1.15.4 ff	Euxinus	Anthia	Pirates
2.3.2 ff.	Manto	Habrocomes	Pirates / Brigands
2.11.1 ff.	Moeris	Anthia	Pirates / Brigands
2.13.5 ff.	Perilaus	Anthia	Political authority
3.8.3 ff.	Brigands	Anthia	Brigands
3.11.2 ff.	Psammis	Anthia	Merchants
3.12.3 ff.	Cyno	Habrocomes	Others
4.5.1 ff.	Anchialus	Anthia	Brigands
4.6.4 ff.	Amphinomus	Anthia	Brigands
5.4.4 ff.	Polyidus	Anthia	Political authority
5.9.11 ff.	Hippothous	Anthia	Brigands
5.5.7-8, 5.7	Attenders of the brothel	Anthia	Others

This table shows how all the brigands are the protagonists' erotic suitors and the other characters, such as Psammis, Perilaus, Polyidus and Cyno, can be compared with them, since they have a common violent behaviour which I will shortly describe. Finally, the apex of the danger for the protagonists comes from the last rivals: in the brothel in Taras there are many potential suitors - not just one - and they are willing to pay for sex (5.7.3). This combination of money, number and lust makes them the harshest enemies of Anthia.

Overall, this pattern seems to suggest that Xen. is connecting love to the conception of society, identifying civilisation with positive love which leads to marriage and lack of civilisation with instinctive love outside marriage. In the following paragraphs I will prove the correctness of this statement. Interestingly, the origin of this distinction does not lie in the nature of feelings: as the following list shows, both protagonists and rivals share the same ἔρως, ἐπιθυμία and, to an extent,

also the way in which passion is born in them. What differentiates them is their personal answer to these feelings: unlike the protagonists, all the suitors prove to be active in love.

1) The sharing of feelings between protagonists and rivals: the common language of eros

Throughout the *Eph.*, the word ἔρως is related to the inhabitants of both Xen.'s societies:

- Protagonists' ἔρως: 1.3.4 (bis), 1.5.8, 1.9.7, 3.5.2, 3.5.6, 5.1.3, 5.8.5 and 5.9.12;
- Rivals' ἔρως: 1.15.3 (Corymbus), 1.16.7 (Euxinus), 2.3.3, 2.3.4 (Manto); 2.3.6 (Rhode and Leucon); 2.11.1, 2.11.2 and 2.12.3 (Moeris); 2.13.6 (Perilaus); 3.2.4 (Hippothous and Hyperanthes); 3.2.7 (Aristomachus' love for Hyperanthes); 4.5.4: (Anchialus).

This list of occurrences is a sign of a wider tendency of the Greek novels, according to which 'eros is uniform and motivates the meanest villains, male or female, in the same way as it does the protagonists themselves'.[308] Within the same framework, the word ἐπιθυμία with its cognates can also be included.

- Protagonists' ἐπιθυμία: 1.4.7, 1.9.2.
- Protagonists' ἐπιθυμία: 2.1.3 (Corymbus), 2.1.5 (Euxinus), 2.3.3, 2.4.5 (Manto), 3.12.3 (Cyno), 4.5.6 (Anchialus), 5.7.3 (the guests of the brothel) and (5.9.11) Hippothous).

Apart from one occurrence (3.8.1), ἐπιθυμία always designates an erotic and physical desire and the same connotation concerns its cognate verb ἐπιθυμέω and ἀπολαύειν.

- Protagonists' ἐπιθυμέω: 1.2.9, 1.10.1.
- Rivals' ἐπιθυμέω: 3.10.2 (brigands who open Anthia's grave), 5.7.4 (attenders of the brothel).

- Protagonists' ἀπολαύω: 1.9.9 and 1.10.1;
- Rivals' ἀπολαύω: 2.1.5 (Euxinus), 3.12.3 (Cyno) and 5.1.8 (Aegialeus).

Overall, the combination of these words appears to be in a way parallel to the military metaphor in which Xen. portrays love as an irresistible force which conquers every one (1.2.1-2, n.: ὁ θεὸς). A final confirmation of this is provided by some other expressions which are part of the same basic erotic vocabulary.

- Ἀλίσκομαι describes the falling in love not only of Anthia, but also of Manto (2.3.2), Perilaus (2.13.6), Aristomachus (3.2.6), Psammis (3.11.3) and Amphinomus (4.6.5);
- the formula πονήρως διακεῖμαι, which is part of lovesickness, concerns not only Anthia (1.3.2 n., 1.4.6), but also Euxinus (1.15.4) and Manto (2.3.3 and 2.4.2);

---

[308] Konstan 1994, 41.

- love as a fire concern the protagonists (1.3.4), Anthia (1.9.8), Manto (2.3.3) and Anchialus (4.5.4);
- the formula οὐκέτι καρτερέω, which expresses the motif of "failure to resist Eros" is referred twice to Habrocomes (1.4.4 and 1.5.5), but also to Corymbus (1.15.2), to Manto (2.3.3 and 2.5.1) and Hippothous (3.2.10);
- the formula σφοδρὸν ἔρωτα, which expresses the "Vehemence of love", refers to Habrocomes (1.4.4: ὁ θεὸς σφοδρότερος, n.), Corymbus (1.14.7 and 1.16.4), Euxinus (1.15.4), Manto (2.3.7), Moeris (2.11.1) and Polyidus (5.4.5).

Since these motifs focus on the violence and irresistibility of love, they are part of the same connotation expressed before. In addition, it is worth noticing how Manto's presence is constant. Since she suffers from lovesickness, as do Anthia and Habrocomes, this means that this important theme too is not exclusive to the civilised society.

2) <u>The rivals' different approach to love</u>

That being said, in the use of erotic motifs Xen. also draws an important distinction, since a good number of these is ascribed only to the rivals:
- birth of love because of a repeated sight: Corymbus (1.14.7), Moeris (2.12.1), Perilaus (2.13.6), Anchialus (4.5.4);
- increase of love through living together: Corymbus (1.14.7), Manto (2.3.2);
- care of the beloved as part of the strategy for conquering the beloved (θεραπεύω): Corymbus (1.15.2), Perilaus (2.13.6), Psammis (3.11.3);
- confession to a friend: Corymbus (1.15.3), Manto (2.3.3-5);
- potential erotic persuasion: Corymbus (1.15.1 and 1.15.3), Manto (2.3.2);
- real erotic persuasion: Corymbus and Euxinus (1.15.6 and 1.16.7), Euxinus (2.1.5), Anchialus (4.5.2), Polyidus (5.4.5);
- potential violence (βιάζεσθαι and ὑβρίζειν): Corymbus (1.15.1), Euxinus (2.1.6), Lampo (2.9.3), Perilaus (2.13.8);
- real violence: (βιάζεσθαι and ὑβρίζειν): Psammis (3.11.4), Anchialus (4.5.4 and 4.5.5), Polyidus (5.4.5).

2a) Rivals' action versus protagonists' passivity
Overall, this list shows that the rivals adopt a subtle erotic strategy: they confess their passion to a friend, they pretend to take care of their partner, they try to persuade him and sometimes commit

violence. In other words, the suitors are active in love.[309] This idea is clearly expressed by Konstan: 'the pirates are distinguished in their role as lovers from Habrocomes and Anthia by virtue of their active courtship of the beloved'.[310]

Although action in love in itself is not negative, since it is typical of Greek erotic relationships, within Xen's construction of this novel it seems to assume a negative connotation for three reasons: first, it is the exact opposite of the protagonists' behaviour, which is passive. A character in which this clearly emerges is Hippothous, whose activity leads him to kill Aristomachus (3.2.10) and this interestingly constitutes the origin of his belonging to the uncivilised society (for more on him, <u>LI</u> 4.5). Second, the rivals' passion has both protagonists as the dominated member, with no gender distinction. This makes the position of Habrocomes unnatural: being a man, he should play the dominant role in love and this unnatural position is expressed by the protagonist himself in his lament after the pirates' proposal (1.16.2, n.: λέγει, d1). Finally, the recurrent inclusion of violence inevitably portrays the rivals as immoral lovers.

2b) <u>The existence of a climax in the rivals' immoral love</u>
That being said, the way in which the action is performed by rivals is not identical throughout the whole novel, because there is a distinction between the idea and the real performance of their active approach to love. Interestingly, those who limit themselves to the first element (Corymbus, Lampo and Perilaus) appear in the novel before those who pursue the second (Psammis, Anchialus, Polyidus). In addition, in Manto's episode Apsyrtus gives up his anger and offers liberation to Habrocomes (2.10.2). Conversely, Xen. emphasises the immorality of Psammis by calling him explicitly ἄνθρωπος [...] τραχὺς (3.11.4) and Anchialus' act of violence is so dangerous that it pushes Anthia to kill him (4.5.5). Finally, the peak of this activity is certainly the brothel, where Anthia is seen as an object in the hand of many suitors.

---

[309] To an extent, also the motif of the 'birth of love through a repeated sight' might be considered as part of this novelty: as this τόπος leaves more freedom of action to lovers than the "coup de foudre", it can be interpreted as another sign of a more active approach to love. That said, however, I would not emphasise the opposition between these two motifs, as love at first sight also concerns rivals:

- Love at first sight: protagonists (1.3.1), Psammis (3.11.3) and Cyno (3.12.3).
- Love as a fruit of sharing of life: Corymbus (1.14.7), Moeris (2.12.1), Perilaus (2.13.6).
- Not expressed: Anchialus (4.5.1, 2), Amphinomus (4.6.5 and 5.2.3) and Polyidus (5.4.5).

In addition, I would take issue with Konstan 1994, 40-41 who argues that 'the passion of Corymbus and Euxinus for Habrocomes and Anthia seems to have been stimulated as much by the character, or *ethos*, of the pair as by their attractiveness' (40-41). In my opinion, this statement lacks proof, because the pirates do not refer to the protagonists' behaviour, apart from Habrocomes' desperation (1.15.1). Conversely, I would rather interpret this longer falling in love as a possible narrative device. With this Xen. seems to be able to connect the second part of this episode, the dialogue on love, to the first, based on the pirates' attack on the protagonists' ship.
At the same time, since Moeris and Perilaus' cases belong to more linear episodes, the prolonged time appears here to be a simple way to emphasise the strength of erotic desire. As a result, I would conclude that Xen. enjoys varying the two τόποι on the birth of love, without following any clear distinction.

[310] Konstan 1994 39. See ibid., 36: the relationship between rivals and their beloved follows a pattern of 'asymmetry of power and feeling'.

As a result, the erotic rivals become progressively more dangerous. The discovery of this pattern leads me to partially revisit the previous statement that both protagonists and rivals have the same erotic feelings. While this is certainly true in the first part of the novel, as the parallel between the protagonists and Perilaus' wedding shows (LI 2.4, a), in the second part the increase of immorality and lust in the rivals seems to be accompanied by a silence on the protagonists' sexual desire. This is proved by the erotic vocabulary: after the wedding night ἐπιθυμία, ἐπιθυμέω and ἀπολαύω are focused only on rivals but never on Anthia and Habrocomes. This distinction makes me conclude that the physical and most instinctive love progressively becomes a trait of the uncivilised society and the brothel, being a uncivilised society in miniature, constitutes again the clearest piece of evidence.

3) Comparison with the other Greek novels: an original focus on brigands as erotic suitors

This insistent and progressive exploitation of erotic brigands made by Xen. is not only significant in the Eph., but is also original within the generic corpus. All the other novels, in fact, include noble lovers among the main rivals of the couple. This is clear in Char.'s text, in which 'tous les personnages amoureux de Callirhoé se situent à un degré élevé de l'échelle sociale':[311] the suitors in Syracuse (1.1.2) are followed by Dionysius (1.12.6 ff.), the satraps Mithridates and Pharnaces and the Persian king. Then, the other novelists also introduce noble rivals, although in a small number, such as Thersander and Melite in Ach.'s novel and Achaemenes in Hld. As a result, the Eph. is the only text which excludes these figures.

In addition, as I will prove in the case of pirates (1.13, n.: intr.), the number of erotic brigands is low in the novels: only Hld. introduce three of them, who are Thyamis, Trachinus and Pelorus. While on the second and the latter he might be inspired by Xen. (1.13. n: intr.), the first is a special brigand, as the following elements prove:

a) he is Calasiris' son (1.19.4);

b) when he falls in love with Charicleia, he asks his companions to let him keep her as personal loot with a speech in which he 'adopts an almost stoic philosophical persona';[312]

c) among the reasons for having her, he includes the continuity of the family and Charicleia's nobility (see 1.19.7-1.20);

d) unlike other erotic rivals, Thyamis asks the consent of the woman (see 1.21.2) and his moderation is acknowledged by Cnemon (2.17.4: πρὸς τὸ σωφρονέστερον ἄρχοντος ἀμοιροῦσιν);

e) later on, when in the seventh book Thyamis is an arch-bandit threatening to destroy an entire city, we discovered that Arsace fell in love with him because he was νεανίσκῳ χαρίεντι καὶ ἀκμάζοντι (7.2.2) and this passion is still alive years later (7.4.4). This lack of a true brutality distinguishes Thyamis even more from the other brigands and pirates.

---

[311] Guez 2001, 102.

[312] Watanabe 2003, 21. See also Hld. 1.14.6.

As a result, Thyamis cannot be considered as a typical brigand as Xen.'s characters are. This allows me to conclude that in the Eph. there is a special focus on outlaw suitors. This pattern seems to conform to an elementary rule of fiction: we are dealing with the creation of a stereotyped and repeated model of "enemy". This makes the novel a fight between good and bad people, in which the former progressively become better and the latter worse. While this is the basic foundation of the *Entwicklung* of the novel, I will show in the following chapter how this representation is the starting point for a deeper construction.

CHAPTER 4: FIDELITY UNTIL DEATH

1) The whole journey of the protagonists as a *Bildungsroman*

While the behaviour of the erotic rivals becomes increasingly worse, it is important to study how it affects the protagonists throughout the whole novel: as Dowden 2007, 140 argues, their encounter with brigands and suitors is a "crash" between two different kinds of existence. The result of this is that Anthia and Habrocomes refuse the uncivilised love and strengthen their fidelity. While this virtue is already introduced in the oath (LI 2.5), the different ways in which it is progressively tested throughout the novel transform it into the heroic ideal of the Eph.

To begin with, I would investigate how the protagonists behave in front of the different suitors:

Table 1.1: The protagonists' reaction to their erotic suitors

Eph.	Name of the lovers	Protagonist involved	Protagonist' reaction	Outcome of the reaction
1.14.6 ff.	Corymbus	Habrocomes	Cry and request for time, desperation.	Not Applicable (the episode is interrupted)
1.15.4 ff.	Euxinus	Anthia	Request for time, desperation.	N/A.
2.3.2 ff.	Manto	Habrocomes	Letter and refusal of the relationship.	Negative: prison and tortures.
2.11.1 ff.	Moeris	Anthia	Desperation.	Positive: Lampo's compassion.
2.13.5 ff.	Perilaus	Anthia	- Delayed acceptance of marriage; - Request for the poison; - Decision to die of starvation	- Positive. - Negative: failure of suicide. - Negative: failure of suicide.
3.11.2 ff.	Psammis	Anthia	False tale about Isis.	Positive.
3.12.3 ff.	Cyno	Habrocomes	Negative reaction, promise and flight.	Negative: crucifixion and pyre.
4.5.1 ff.	Anchialus	Anthia	Murder	Positive: Anchialus' death. Negative: punishment in the ditch.

Eph.	Name of the lovers	Protagonist involved	Protagonist' reaction	Outcome of the reaction
4.6.4 ff.	Amphinomus	Anthia	Fear and suspicion	N/A (Amphinomus' nature is exceptionally good).
5.4.4 ff.	Polyidus	Anthia	Flight into the temple of Isis in Alexandria.	Positive.
5.5.7-8	Men of the brothel	Anthia	Fiction of the holy disease and ghost story.	Positive.
5.9.11 ff.	Hippothous	Anthia	Egyptian tale and personal confession	Positive.

Overall, this table shows how in the protagonists' reaction to the erotic suitors there is a progressive growth of personality,[313] which begins after the episode with the pirates. This concerns first Habrocomes, who cries at Euxinus' proposal (2.1.1), refuses to have sex with Manto (2.5.4) and leaves Cyno's house (3.12.5). Later on, it also involves Anthia, since in the last two books of the novel she kills Anchialus (4.6.5) and creates a false story to defend herself from the brothel's lustful visitors (5.7-6-9). Since after each of these episodes both protagonists progressively emphasise their commitment to fidelity, I would conclude that the whole journey plays the same role of *Bildungsroman* which has emerged on the wedding night (LI 2.4, 3).

That being said, it is possible to notice that there are differences in the way in which Habrocomes and Anthia experience a personal growth. On the one hand, the main pattern of the journey after the separation is Habrocomes' search for Anthia: following the suggestion of the dream (see below, 5b and LI 7.4), the hero leaves Apsyrtus' house to look for his wife (2.12.2). As a result, the former plays the active role of pursuer, which lasts until the final reunion in Rhodes and is emphasised by the formula τὴν Ἀνθίαν εὑρίσκειν, which has six occurrence in the novel (cf. 2.10.4. 2.12.3, 2.14.4, 3.6.3, 5.6.1, 5.12.2). During this journey, he twice refuses the erotic offers made by two rivals, namely Manto and Cyno.

On the other hand, Anthia meets six rivals more than her husband and, moreover, she does not only manage to preserve her fidelity, but she also defeat her enemies. The only exceptions are her *Scheintod* and Anchialus' murder, in which, however, the negative outcome is used by Xen. as a way of continuing the plot. Conversely, Habrocomes' behaviour is successful only from a moral point of view: he saves his chastity by sending a letter to Manto (2.5.4) and by fleeing from Cyno (3.12.5), but later on he cannot avoid being punished according to the "Potiphar motif": in the

---

[313] On this point I would take issue with Cheyns 2005, 275, who argues that the protagonists 'sont façonnés une fois pour toutes, et uniquement en fonction du modèle qu'ils doivent représenter'. In my opinion, in Xen.'s focus on fidelity repetition goes together with progression.

second book he is imprisoned and tortured (2.6.2-4) and in the fourth crucified and almost burnt (4.2.1-9). Further, in each of these cases the liberation is not the fruit of his initiative.

In addition, unlike Habrocomes, Anthia adopts different stratagems against her enemies. To begin with, in the Perilaus episode she asks for as delay of the wedding (2.13.8) and she decides to commit suicide by poison (3.5.7) and refusing food (3.8.2). Then, in the fourth book she tells Psammis a false story about her consecration to Isis (3.11.4-5), she goes so far as to kill Anchialus (4.5.5) and manages to escape from Polyidus (5.4.6). Finally, in the brothel she pretends to be affected by the holy disease (5.7.4) and she creates the strange story of a ghost (5.7.6-9). The last lie concerns her meeting with Polyidus, where she presents herself as Egyptian (5.9.7).

Overall, this pattern suggests that Anthia has a strong personality and that her fidelity has more public recognition than that of Habrocomes, and, thus, it appears to be more important.

2) <u>The three main virtues of Anthia and Habrocomes: σωφροσύνη and ἀνδρεῖα</u>

While these conclusions are simply suggested by the plot, a deeper analysis of the text proves the existence of three themes which throughout the novel constitute the steps of the protagonists' growth.

2a) Asymmetry

When Habrocomes' react to the episode of the pirates, he defines himself as ἀνήρ (2.1.3: πόρνη μὲν ἀντὶ ἀνδρὸς γενομένῳ). Since in the Greek tradition this term designates the husband, which played the most important role in the conjugal relationship, this statement appears a declaration of Habrocomes' acquisition of a leadership in the couple. This sentence confirms what the hero has already suggested during the wedding night and the oath of fidelity (LI 2.5) and introduces a more traditional asymmetry in his relationship with Anthia, after her unusual leadership of the beginning of the novel (<u>LI</u> 2.1, 2.3a). Interestingly, this new pattern then becomes reality when the hero becomes the pursuer of Anthia: as a result, the main plot motif of the novel can be interpreted as the effective realisation of the growth desired by Habrocomes. This proves the existence of a *Bildung* in the construction of the protagonists in the Eph.

2b) Σωφροσύνη

Along with this structural feature, Xen. also explores the reaction of Habrocomes and Anthia to the uncivilised society ascribing to them two cornerstones of ancient morality, such as σωφροσύνη and ἀνδρεῖα.

The first virtue is the most important, because it is a byword for conjugal fidelity. This association is typical of the genre: although σωφροσύνη, which is 'primary among the Greeks',[314] from the sixth century BC onwards is linked with 'a general idea of restraint or even abstinence',[315] the Greek novel, following an attitude proper of the Imperial Era, accommodates σωφροσύνη in a

---

[314] North 1966, VIII.

[315] Ibid., 21. See, e.g., the Platonic reflection on this virtue in *Phdr*. 237e and *Symp*. 196c.

marital context and transforms it into chastity in marriage. The following table collects all the places where the Eph. refers to this virtue:

Table 2b.1: Σωφροσύνη and its cognates in the *Ephesiaca*

EPH.	VIRTUOUS CHARAC-TER	SPEAKER	σώφρων	σωφροσύνη	σωφρονέω	Episode
1.2. 6	Anthia	Narrator	✔			Ephesian procession
1.4. 4	Habrocomes	Habrocomes	✔			Prayer to Eros
1.9. 3	Anthia	Habrocomes	✔			Wedding night
2.1. 3	Habrocomes	Habrocomes	✔			Corymbus episode
2.1. 4	Habrocomes	Habrocomes		✔		Corymbus episode
2.1. 4	Habrocomes	Habrocomes	✔			Corymbus episode
2.5. 7	Habrocomes	Manto	✔			Manto episode
2.6. 4	Manto	Apsyrtus (focalisation)	✔			Manto episode
2.10. 3	Habrocomes	Habrocomes		✔		Manto episode
3.5. 6	Anthia	Anthia (focalisation)		✔		Perilaus episode
3.10. 1	Anthia	Habrocomes (focalisation)			* excep.: σωφρόνως	Perilaus episode
3.12. 4	Habrocomes	Habrocomes		✔		Cyno episode
4.3. 4	Anthia	Anthia			✔	prayer to Isis
5.4. 6	Anthia	Anthia	✔			Polydus episode
5.5. 5	Anthia	Anthia		✔		Brothel
5.5. 6	Anthia	Anthia			✔	Brothel
5.7. 2	Anthia	Anthia		✔		Brothel
5.8. 7	Anthia	Anthia		✔		After the dream
5.8. 9	Anthia	Anthia			✔	After the dream
5.14. 2	Anthia	Anthia		✔		Rhodian night
5.14. 3	Anthia	Anthia	✔			Rhodian night

As this table shows, σώφρων and its cognates σωφρονέω, σωφροσύνη and σωφρόνως occur twenty-one times in the novel, plus one case in which Anchialus is defined as μὴ σωφρονοῦντα by Anthia (5.9.10). First, it is significant that this virtue is always attributed to the protagonists and discussed by the protagonists: this makes σωφροσύνη the most important device used by Xen. to characterise Anthia and Habrocomes through focalisation.[316] Second, it is not surprising that most of its occurrences match the episodes of the novel in which the protagonists battle against the suitors.

This construction works perfectly with Habrocomes, who in his speeches mentions σωφροσύνη after or during his meeting with the suitors:

- 2.1.4: τὴν μέχρις ἄρτι σωφροσύνην ἐκ παιδός μοι σύντροφον: after Corymbus' proposal;
- 2.10.3: ἀλλὰ χάρις [...] σοι, δέσποτα, ὅτι καὶ τὸ ἀληθὲς ἔμαθες καὶ τῆς σωφροσύνης ἀμείβῃ με: at the end of Manto's episode;
- 3.12.4: τὴν πολλάκις αὐτὸν σωφροσύνην ἀδικήσασαν: after Cyno's murder of her husband.

The only exception concerns the first occurrence, since it precedes marriage and, thus, is part of his internal fight against Eros to defend his status as δυσάλωτος (1.4.4, n.: Ἁβροκόμου τοῦ σώφρονος). Conversely, Anthia's relationship with σωφροσύνη can be divided into two parts using focalisation as a criterion: while in the first two occurrences first the Ephesians (1.2.6, n.: ὀφθαλμοὶ [...] φοβεροὶ δὲ ὡς σώφρονος) and then Habrocomes call her "chaste" (1.9.3, n.: μεθ'οὗ ζῆν καὶ ἀποθανεῖν ὑπάρξαι γυναικὶ σώφρονι), from Perilaus' episode onwards Anthia starts to personally use σώφρων as part of her self-definition (3.5.6: λέγει [..] τὰς περὶ τῆς σωφροσύνης συνθήκας). This becomes even truer in her two prayers to Isis (4.3.4 and 5.4.6), in which she places her virtue under divine protection. Finally, two mentions of σωφροσύνη concern the brothel episode and one follows her nightmare (5.5.5, 5.5.6 and 5.7.2). This progressive increase in the importance of this virtue confirms that the danger of the uncivilised society makes Anthia grow: this definitely proves the nature of the novel as a *Bildungsroman*.

That being said, in Xen.'s use of this virtue there are two nuances which merit special consideration. First, after Anthia's *Scheintod* (3.10.1: καλῶς μὲν καὶ σωφρόνως ἀποθανοῦσαν Ἀνθίαν and nightmare σωφροσύνη) and nightmare (5.8.9: ἐμοὶ δὲ ἀποθανεῖν καλῶς ἔχει σωφρονούσῃ) σωφροσύνη is related to suicide. This connection is significant, because it includes suicide in the protagonists' display of fidelity: on this, see LI 4.3-4. Second, in the final dialogue of the novel there is a further hint of Anthia's special focus on this virtue: while she refers to herself as σώφρων (5.14.2) and stresses how much she has fought to defend this virtue, Habrocomes defines himself not as σώφρων but καθαρός (5.14.4). Although these adjectives belong to a similar semantic sphere, the omission of the latter appears intentional, because Xen. does not generally avoid repetitions and καθαρός is used only here by Xen. As a result, the narrator seems to confirm at the end of the novel that Anthia is more serious about σωφροσύνη than her husband. Further, it is interesting that in this passage the heroine adopts also the adjective ἁγνή, which has already appeared in the oath of the first book (1.11.4, n.: ἐμοὶ μενεῖς ἁγνὴ). Since this word is originally related to gods, while καθαρός means 'pure' in the literal meaning of 'clean' and often is associated with objects, Xen. might be

---

[316] See Schmeling 1980, 116: 'this theme is present whenever either protagonist is on the stage'.

here suggesting that Anthia's virtue, unlike that of her husband, is divine and higher. This would confirm the importance of her fidelity.

2c) Ἀνδρεῖα

Along with σωφροσύνη, a second classical virtue which concerns the protagonists is ἀνδρεῖα: as I will shortly show, in the Eph. ἀνδρεῖα mostly coincides with the ability to defend conjugal fidelity in the most difficult situations and supports the emphasis on the heroine's moral behaviour.

To begin with, the common translation of ἀνδρεῖα is 'courage' and 'manliness' in war and is generally opposed to δειλία, 'cowardice'. That said, it also appears in other contexts and the most significant is the moral one. As Plato's *Laches* (191d-e) and *Symposium* (194a) already show, ἀνδρεῖα designates 'the metaphorical battle to overcome desires and pleasures' (Jones 2007b, 95). Following this connotation, it is evident how this virtue is very close to σωφροσύνη and can constitute the active display of it.

At the same time, as De Temmerman 2007 argues, in erotic literature a virtue such as ἀνδρεῖα is subjected to a 'transfer of their normal connotations to the erotic sphere' (106). As a result, in the Greek novels ἀνδρεῖα can also designate the 'erotic courage' which characterises the members of the couple who play the active role in the relationship.

Overall, as the following table shows, in his text Xen. adopts both the moral and the erotic connotations of ἀνδρεῖα:

Table 2c.1: Ἀνδρικός and its cognates in the *Ephesiaca*

EPH.	CHARACTER DESCRIBED	SPEAKER	ἀνδρικός	ἄνανδρος	δεῖλος
1.4. 1	Habrocomes	Habrocomes	✔		
1.4. 2	Habrocomes	Habrocomes		✔	
1.9. 4	Habrocomes	Anthia		✔	✔
2.14. 2	Habrocomes	Hippothous	✔		
3.6. 3	Anthia	Anthia		✔	✔

Despite the lower number of occurrences, the fact that ἀνδρεῖα occurs as σωφροσύνη always in character's text suggests that it is part of the protagonists' characterisation.

This is certainly true for Habrocomes, who follows a path which leads him to display ἀνδρεῖα. At the beginning of the novel, his lack of this virtue involves both the moral and the erotic connotations. While in his first monologue ὁ μέχρι νῦν ἀνδρικός (1.4.1, n.) and ὦ πάντα ἄνανδρος (1.4.2) prove how his past control of emotions and refusal of sex have faded away, on the wedding

night Anthia accuses him of being ἀνανδρός (1.9.4, n.), which points out his lack of erotic initiative. Interestingly, this definition is not fictitious, but ironically reflects his passive attitude towards love during the first chapters of the book.

That said, the last attribution of ἀνδρεῖα to this protagonist reverses the pattern: Hippothous unexpectedly calls Habrocomes ἀνδρικόν (2.14.2: ὁρῶ γάρ σε, ὦ μειράκιον, [...] καὶ ὀφθῆναι καλὸν καὶ ἄλλως ἀνδρικόν) at their first meeting. This occurrence is quite difficult to interpret, because the brigand has not met Habrocomes before. On the one hand, the introduction of ὀφθῆναι καλὸν near ἀνδρικόν and after Hippothous' presentation as a soldier (2.14.1) suggests that the brigand is here referring to the military concept of ἀνδρεῖα. However, the previous occurrences in the novel make it plausible that the readers were associating this passage also with another kind of ἀνδρεῖα. In addition, there are two passages of the second book which suggest its erotic connotation: first, in his reaction to the pirates' proposal Habrocomes defines himself as ἀνήρ in opposition to πόρνη (2.1.3: πόρνη μὲν ἀντὶ ἀνδρὸς γενομένῳ), displaying his acquisition of the leadership role in the couple. Second, later in the book he decides to pursue Anthia and this confirms his new active role (2.12.2). That said, although Habrocomes has this growth in the novel, he does not achieve a "moral" manliness: this matches the suggestion given by the analysis of the plot that this protagonist is able to preserve his chastity but not to beat his enemies and display his virtue.

Conversely, from the third book onwards Anthia is often related to a moral ἀνδρεῖα. To begin with, when in Tarsus she decides to commit suicide, she states: οὐκ οὕτως ἄνανδρος ἐγὼ οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς κακοῖς δειλή (3.6.3). Further, when in the fourth book Anthia kills Anchialus who tries to rape her, she implicitly displays the same virtue (4.5.5). Since in both cases the aim of Anthia's action is to preserve her fidelity, we are dealing with an ἀνδρεῖα which coincides with the ability to preserve chastity in marriage. In addition, the second passage includes the military value, since Anthia fights as an epic hero: as nothing similar is ascribed to Habrocomes, through ἀνδρεῖα Xen. seems to place an unusual emphasis on his female protagonist.

Also the last two passages confirm this impression: after her terrible dream, Anthia describes her creation of different stratagems against the suitors by saying: τέχνας σωφροσύνης ὑπὲρ γυναῖκας εὑρίσκω (5.8.7). In my opinion, the expression ὑπὲρ γυναῖκας fits well into her status of ἀνδρεῖα. Moreover, in the same speech, Anthia shows that she is φιλόπονος by saying: ἐγὼ μὲν καὶ πόνους ὑπομένω πάντας [...] (5.8.7). Since in Aristotle's definition ἀνδρεῖα is also accompanied by φιλοπονία, this passage further marks her possession of the first virtue. In addition, it emphasises the difference between the protagonists, because, unlike Anthia, Habrocomes lacks φιλοπονία: in the fifth book, when he becomes so poor that he decides to work in the quarry, a lack of energy forces him to leave this job (5.10.1: οὐκέτι φέρων τοὺς πόνους διέγνω). Finally, since in Greek mentality the ideal context in which a virtue such as ἀνδρεῖα was exhibited was public, Anthia's successful performance in the brothel can be read as the most appropriate example introduced by Xen: this further confirms how her conjugal fidelity has a public visibility which does not concern Habrocomes.

3) Repeated themes in the protagonists' speeches throughout the novel: other nuances of their conjugal fidelity

The analysis of these virtues has demonstrated that they are commonly part of the protagonists' direct speeches. A more detailed analysis of these passages highlights the existence of some themes which the protagonists constantly explore, such as promises of fidelity, consolation and suicide. Before providing a list of these occurrences, I would like to state why these topics are important.

First, their repetition is a confirmation of the high number of suitors met by Anthia and Habrocomes, since their encounters with them are at the origin of these motifs. Second, Xen.'s exploitation of these motifs is not mechanical: the existence of a thematic variation, which reflects the oscillation of the protagonists' minds from hope to desperation, and the suggestion of a progression within each area make these themes part of the *Bildungsroman*. Finally, a great number of these τόποι come from the epic and tragic literary tradition: although Xen. seems not to refer to specific models, their presence supports the literary quality and the tragic tone of the laments of the Eph. (NA 3 and 4.1).

3a) Fidelity in life as well as in death

1.9.3: Habrocomes expresses this theme in his final invitation to Anthia: this is the only passage in which this topic is not focused on the speaker.

3.5.4, 3.6.5: Anthia in Perilaus' house.

3.10.3: Habrocomes after Anthia's *Scheintod*.

4.3.4: Anthia in her prayer to Isis in Alexandria.

4.5.3: Anthia in her lament before Anchialus' murder.

5.10.4-5: Habrocomes before going back to Ephesus.

3b) Consolation

1.11.1: the navigation for both protagonists.

2.8.1: Anthia's presence for Habrocomes;

3.10.2: Anthia's body for Habrocomes;

4.2.2: Anthia's supposed death for Habrocomes;

5.1.11: the sight of Thelxinoe's body for Aegialeus;

5.8.4: εὑρήσειν σε (Anthia) καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ συγκαταβιώσεσθαι for Habrocomes.

3c) Futility of life without the beloved

1.11.5: Anthia in her oath of fidelity.

1.14.5: Habrocomes' old tutor before his death.

4.6.7: Anthia in the ditch.

5.8.4: Habrocomes in the quarry.

3d) Proposed suicide in case of...

2.1.4: Habrocomes: Corymbus' love.

2.1.6: Anthia: Euxinus' love.

2.4.6: Anthia: Habrocomes' love with Manto.

2.5.7: Manto: Apsyrtus' refusal of taking revenge on Habrocomes.

3.10.3: Habrocomes' rescue of Anthia's body.

5.10.4-5: Habrocomes' burial of Anthia's body.

- Death as a display of virtue

2.1.4: Habrocomes in reaction to Corymbus' proposal.

5.8.8-9: Anthia in reaction to her dream and Habrocomes' possible betrayal.

3e) Death or Burial with the beloved[317]

2.1.6: Anthia, Corymbus episode.

2.4.6: Anthia, Manto episode.

2.7.5: Anthia, Manto episode.

2.11.5: Anthia, Lampo episode.

3.8.7: Anthia, after her *Scheintod*.

3.10.3: Habrocomes, after Anthia's *Scheintod*.

5.8.4: Habrocomes, episode in the quarry.

5.10.5: Habrocomes, before his return to Ephesus.

4) **Some interesting patterns at work throughout the novel**

While this framework already shows the repetitions and variations of these themes, I would like to add some comments on them, in order to show the role played by these themes in the *Bildungsroman*. I will also argue that their presence might suggest that Xen., after the three erotic traditions, is here referring to a fourth one, which is epic-tragic.

First, the introduction in the novel of "consolation" follows a descending and then ascending climax: apart from the first occurrence, which concerns both protagonists, the desire for relief is entirely focused on Habrocomes and the change of situation provokes a shift also in his object of consolation.[318] The result of this process is this sort of circular route, in which presence is the apex and death the nadir:

> Presence of the beloved >> possession of the beloved's corpse >> (exemplary) death of the beloved >> presence of the beloved's corpse >> presence of the beloved.

---

[317] As this theme is exclusively focused on the protagonists as a couple, I will here write the member of the couple who addresses this and the episode in which it appears.

[318] Along with these expressions, in the novel there are episodes in which consolation is materially brought to the protagonists, but because the agent of this is not the beloved, Anthia and Habrocomes' desire is never fulfilled until their reunion in Rhodes. To begin with, Eudoxus offers consolation to Anthia (3.5.6) and he is followed by Hippothous (3.10.3, 5.9.13), who does the same before with Habrocomes and then with Anthia. Finally, Amphinomus twice consoles Anthia (4.6.7 and 5.2.4), while Hippothous is cared of of by his ex-servants in Rhodes (5.10.12).

The existence of this pattern appears a persuasive example of how Xen. has carefully built the protagonists' approach to their difficult journey.

Similarly, "suicide" is the main thought of the protagonists when they react to the most difficult situations: this suggests that this topic also is part of the way in which Xen. structures his text. That being said, Xen.'s exploitation of this motif is combined with real attempts at suicide, in which Anthia is more involved than Habrocomes: while the latter tries to kill himself only once in prison (2.7.1), Anthia does it twice in Perilaus' house (3.5.6 and 3.8.2) and once in the fifth book after her nightmare (5.8.9). This confirms that in the Eph. ἀνδρεῖα is related to suicide (LI 4.2b). In addition, the same topic is closely related to the desire for a shared death. This leads to a focus on burial, which is important for two reasons. From a thematic point of view it appears to be a way in which the protagonists express their desire for an everlasting relationship. Further, it inevitably recalls the epic exploitation of this topic. While the model of Achilles and Patroclus might be echoed in some passages (APP 1.12), the general existence of an epic colour seems to be part of that heroisation of the protagonists' love which Xen. mostly achieves through his interplay with the *Odyssey* (LI 6.2).

Finally, also the motif 'the futility of life without the beloved' has a long literary history: a motif like this is already introduced by Andromache in her famous dialogue with Hector, when she states: οὐ γὰρ ἔτ᾽ἄλλη ἔσται θαλπωρή, ἐπεὶ ἂν σύ γε πότμον ἐπίσπῃς, ἀλλ᾽ἄχε᾽ (6.411-3). Since the *Iliad* is a model of the Eph. (LI 6.5), one might argue that in Xen.'s first oath, where this theme appears for the first time, Xen. was recalling the famous scene of Hector and Andromache. However, since no textual connection or motif shared with Homer emerge, this link is too loose to be accepted. On the other hand, Greek tragedy has more attestations of the same theme: cf. Sophocles' *Ajax* 393 (Tecmessa because of the absence of Ajax) and Sophocles' *Antigone* 566 (Ismene without Antigone) and Euripides' *Orestes* 1072 (Pylades without Orestes). Although none of these passages is Xen.'s hypotext, together they show how Greek tragedy has a focus on 'futility of life'. Since this general conclusion can be extended to the other repeated motifs of the Eph., our author seems here to have in mind a fourth literary tradition, which focuses on Iliadic and tragic motifs and is used to describe the protagonists' sufferings.

When compared to lovesickness, the distance between Xen. and his models is here greater: thus, there is no hint here of a sophisticated literary approach, but we are dealing with a simple choice which supports our author's interest in emotions and theatricality (NA 4).

5) <u>Three confirmations of Habrocomes' less visible but deep *Bildung*</u>

While the protagonists' reactions to the uncivilised love occur mostly in direct speeches, Xen. seems to develop this idea also through three subtler narratorial devices: a philosophical exploration of body and soul, the second dream (2.8.2) and the introduction of Hippothous. Interestingly, as I will shortly prove, each of these elements mostly focus on Habrocomes. This proves that, although Anthia's *Entwicklung*, *Bildung* and fidelity are more visible, as her actions and laments prove, Habrocomes also is part of this pattern and shares her virtue. In addition, since in relation to body

and soul the hero is clearly aware of his growth and he expresses it in philosophical language, he seems there to achieve that moral and philosophical παιδεῖα which he strangely lacks at the beginning of the novel (1.1.2, n.: παιδείαν, d).

As a result, Xen. is interested in the development of both protagonists. This is not surprising, since the novel starts as the revenge of Eros against Habrocomes (LI 2.1) and the exclusion of him from the progress of the text would have appeared very strange. However, what is unexpected is the more private dimension of his conversion, which seems to make it more profound and philosophical.

5a) Body and soul

This first device is introduced very early in the novel: it is part of the first presentation of Habrocomes in the novel (1.1.2, n.: παιδεῖαν) and consists of the relationship between body and soul.

In the Greek novels, as Cummings 2009, 147-163 shows, there are many occurrences of the word ψυχή: its status as 'the seat of πάθη or emotions' (149) gives it a key role in the recurrent descriptions of love. In addition, ψυχή is often connected with σῶμα. In Greek literature this combination is a cliché which has two possible kinds of exploitation:[319] some authors adopt it to describe the wholeness of human nature, of which body and soul are together part, or to mark an opposition between physicality and spirituality. However, as I will show, within the novelistic corpus only Xen. seems to exploit this combination in a consistent way: he twice introduces "body and soul" in the second chapter of this first book and then other three times later in the text. This suggests that this formula might be used by Xen. to enrich Habrocomes' characterisation.

Table 5a.1: combinations of body (σώμα) and soul (ψυχή) in the *Ephesiaca*

Eph.	Greek text	Owner of body / soul	Context	Meanings	Relation of body and soul
1.1. 2	συνήνθει δὲ αὐτῷ τοῖς τοῦ σώματος καλοῖς καὶ τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγαθά	Habr.	Habrocomes' presentation	beauty of the body and the soul	connection

[319] See Aesop 12.1 and 21.1 for the probably earliest use.

Eph.	Greek text	Owner of body / soul	Context	Meanings	Relation of body and soul
1.1. 4	ἠγάλλετο μὲν καὶ τοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς κατορθώμασι, πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον τῷ κάλλει τοῦ σώματος·	Habr.	Habrocomes' presentation	beauty of the body and the soul	dichotomy
1.5. 5	τὸ σῶμα πᾶν ἠφάνιστο καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καταπεπτώκει	Habr.	lovesickness	erotic suffering	connection
1.9. 1	ἐπάλλετο δὲ αὐτοῖς τὰ σώματα καὶ ἐκραδαίνοντο αὐτοῖς αἱ ψυχαί	Protag.	wedding night in Ephesus	emotional reaction	connection
2.4. 4	ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν μου τοῦ σώματος, τὴν ψυχὴν δὲ ἐλευθέραν ἔχω.	Habr.	Manto episode	slavery of the body versus freedom of the soul	dichotomy

Table 5a.2: other occurrences of body (σῶμα) in the *Ephesiaca*

Eph.	Greek text	Owner of the body	Context	Meanings
1.1. 6	κάλλει σώματος	Habr.	initial presentation	beauty of the body
1.2. 5	ἤνθει δὲ αὐτῆς τὸ σῶμα ἐπ'εὐμορφίᾳ	Anthia	initial presentation	beauty of the body
1.3. 2	μέρη τοῦ σώματος ἐγύμνωσεν	Anthia	protagonists' falling in love	lascivious beauty of the body
1.5. 2	τὰ σώματα [...] πεπονηκότα	Protag.	lovesickness	erotic suffering
2.4. 4	ἀπειλείτω νῦν [...] Μαντὼ ξίφη καὶ βρόχους καὶ πῦρ καὶ πάντα ὅσα δύναται σῶμα ἐνεγκεῖν οἰκέτου	Habr.	Manto episode	body and mistreatment
2.5. 4	χρῶ σώματι ὡς οἰκέτου	Habr.	Manto episode	body and mistreatment

Eph.	Greek text	Owner of the body	Context	Meanings
2.6.3	αἵ τε γὰρ πληγαὶ τὸ σῶμα πᾶν ἠφάνιζον βασάνων ἄηθες ὂν οἰκετικῶν	Habr.	Manto episode	body and mistreatment
2.7.5	οὐδὲ ὅστις σου τὸ σῶμα κοσμήσει	Habr.	Manto episode	corpse
3.2.13	ἐγὼ δὲ τοσοῦτον ἠδυνήθην τὸ σῶμα διασῶσαι [...]	Hyper.	Hippothous' story	corpse
3.7.2	ἐπιπεσὼν τῷ σώματι	Anthia	Anthia's *Scheintod*	corpse
3.8.4	φείσασθε δὲ τοῦ σώματος	Anthia	Anthia's *Scheintod*	life
3.9.1	μαθὼν τὴν [...] τοῦ σώματος ἀπώλειαν	Anthia	Anthia's *Scheintod*	corpse
3.9.7	ἴσως [...] τὸ σῶμα σῴζεται	Anthia	Anthia's *Scheintod*	corpse
3.9.8	δεῖξαι τὸ σῶμα	Anthia	Anthia's *Scheintod*	corpse
3.9.8	τὸ σῶμα ἀφανὲς ἐποίησαν	Anthia	Anthia's *Scheintod*	corpse
3.10.2	τὸ σῶμα ἀφέληται;	Anthia	Anthia's *Scheintod*	corpse
3.10.3	μέχρι που τὸ σῶμα εὕρω	Anthia	Anthia's *Scheintod*	corpse
3.11.1	Οἱ δὲ λησταὶ [...] τὸ σῶμα ἐθεράπευον, ζητοῦντες ἀεὶ τὸν ὠνησόμενον κατ'ἀξίαν.	Anthia	after Anthia's *Scheintod*	body and mistreatment (alluded)
4.2.5	μήτε τὸ Νείλου ρεῦμα μιανθείη ποτὲ αδίκως ἀπολομένου σώματι	Habr.	episode of the crucifixion	corpse and contamination
4.2.8	ἄρτι δὲ τῆς φλογὸς μελλούσης ἅπτεσθαι τοῦ σώματος	Habr.	episode of the pyre	body and mistreatment

Eph.	Greek text	Owner of the body	Context	Meanings
4.6. 1	ὁρῶσι τὸν Ἀγχίαλον ἀνηρημένον καὶ τὴν Ἀνθίαν παρὰ τῷ σώματι	Anchialus	Anchialus episode	corpse
4.6. 2	ὁ μὲν τις ἀποκτεῖναι κελεύων καὶ συνθάψαι τῷ Ἀγχιάλου σώματι	Anchialus	Anchialus episode	corpse
5.1. 9	τὸ σῶμα οὐ τέθαπται	Thelxinoe	Aegialeus episode	corpse
5 . 1 . 10	τὸ δὲ σῶμα αὐτῆς ἐτέθαπτο ταφῇ Αἰγυπτίᾳ	Thelxinoe	Aegialeus episode	corpse
5 . 1 . 12	Αἰγιαλεῖ [...] μεγάλη παραμυθία τὸ σῶμα τὸ Θελξινόης	Thelxinoe	Aegialeus episode	corpse
5.5. 2	αἰκίζεται τὸ σῶμα	Anthia	Rhenaea episode	body and mistreatment
5.7. 4	παρεῖται τὸ σῶμα	Anthia	episode of the brothel	body and the strategic simulation
5.8. 3	οὐ γὰρ συνείθιστο τὸ σῶμα οὐδ'ὀλίγον ὑποβάλλειν ἔργοις εὐτόνοις ἢ σκληροῖς	Habr.	episode of the quarry	body and mistreatment
5.8. 3	τὸ σῶμα ὑποτέθεικα δουλείᾳ	Habr.	episode of the quarry	body and mistreatment

Table 5a.3: other occurrences of soul (ψυχή) in the *Ephesiaca*

Eph.	Greek text	Owner of soul	Context	Meanings
1.5. 1	εἶχον δὲ πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν τὰς ὄψεις τὰς ἑαυτῶν, τὰς εἰκόνας ἐπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀλλήλων ἀναπλάττοντες	Protag.	lovesickness	Platonic combination of eyes and soul
1.9. 2	τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῆς [...] προπεμπούσης [...] τὰ δάκρυα	Anthia	wedding night	soul origin of tears

Eph.	Greek text	Owner of soul	Context	Meanings
1.9.6	ὅσα ἐνενόουν διὰ τῶν χειλέων ἐκ ψυχῆς εἰς τὴν θατέρου ψυχὴν διὰ τοῦ φιλήματος παρεπέμπετο	Protag.	w e d d i n g night	connection between kiss and soul
1.9.7	ὦ [...] τὸ πρῶτον ἐνθέντες τῇ ἐμῇ κέντρον ψυχῇ	Anthia	w e d d i n g night	Platonic combination of eyes and soul
1.9.7	τὸν ἔρωτα τὸν ἐμὸν καλῶς εἰς τὴν Ἁβροκόμου ψυχὴν ὡδηγήσατε.	Habr.	w e d d i n g night	Platonic combination of eyes and soul
1.9.8	ἔχετε ψυχάς ἃς αὐτοὶ ἐξεκαύσατε	Protag.	w e d d i n g night	Platonic combination of eyes and soul
1.11.3	τῆς ψυχῆς μοι ποθεινοτέρα	Habr.	visit to Samos	erotic epithet
1.13.6	φεῖσαι δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς	Habr.	C o r y m b u s episode	request for salvation (opposition with slavery, cf. 2.2.4)
1.16.2	αἵ τε ψυχαὶ ἐκραδαίνοντο	Protag.	C o r y m b u s episode	emotional reaction (cf. 1.9.1)
2.4.5	τῆς ψυχῆς [καὶ] τῆς ἐμῆς δέσποτα (I follow here Henderson's correction to O'Sullivan; otherwise, τῆς ἐμῆς has no meaning)	Anthia	M a n t o episode	erotic epithet
3.3.6	π ρ ὸ ς α ὐ τ ο ῦ σ ο ι <ποθεινοτέρου τῆς> ψυχῆς Ὑπεράνθους	Hyper.	after Hippothous' story	soul of the dead
3.5.4	ὦ φ ι λ τ ά τ η μ ο ι π α σ ῶ ν Ἁβροκόμου ψυχή	Habr.	A n t h i a ' s *Scheintod*	soul of the dead
3.6.5	ὦ φίλτατη Ἁβροκόμου ψυχή	Habr.	A n t h i a ' s *Scheintod*	soul of the dead
5.12.2	ὁ δὲ ἔπαθε μὲν τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπὶ τῷ παραδόξῳ τοῦ πράγματος	Habr.	Rhodes	emotional reaction

Eph.	Greek text	Owner of soul	Context	Meanings
5.13.3	τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐβούλοντο αἱ ψυχαί	Protag.	final recognition in Rhodes	echo of the Platonic *Symposium*
5.14.2	τῆς ἐμῆς ψυχῆς Ἀβροκόμη δέσποτα	Anthia	last night in Rhodes	erotic epithet

Table 5a.4: Recapitulation of body and soul in the *Ephesiaca*

	Body / soul	Body	Soul
Number of occurrences	5	29	16
Distribution in the novel	I book: 4 II: 1 > unequal: no after Manto's episode	I: 4 II: 4 III: 10 IV: 4 V: 7 > fair distributiom	I: 9 II: 1 III: 3 IV: 0 V: 3 > high concentration in the first book
Distribution of owners	Prot: 1 Habr: 4 Anthia: 0 Others: 0 > prominence of Habrocomes	Prot: 1 Habr: 9 Anth: 13 Others: 6 > fair distribution	Prot: 5 Habr: 6 Anth: 4 Others: 1 > prominence of protagonists
List of the main meanings	- Beauty of the body and the soul: 2.	- Corpse: 15; - Body and mistreatment: 8; - Beauty of the body: 3.	- Platonic combination of eyes and soul: 4; - Soul of the dead: 3; - Erotic epithet: 3; - Emotional reaction: 2.

1) Analysis of the tables

To begin with, the first, third and fourth occurrences of body and soul focus on the wholeness of the human being, while the other two emphasise its division into two parts. Interestingly, this second value is focused on Habrocomes and the initial prominence of the body is reversed in the Manto episode: this framework can be interpreted as a sign of a development of the protagonist towards a more spiritual conception of his self, in which soul constitutes the core of his personality (on this, 1.1.2 n.: παιδείαν). Similarly, the passages at 1.9.1 (n.: ἐπάλλετο) and at 5.13.3 are very interesting to compare, since they involve both protagonists and describe their reaction at the beginning and the end of the novel. Although these scenes play the same role in the text, it is significant that in the former case both body and soul are mentioned, while in the latter only the soul, which is connected

with the protagonists' will. Although emotions are there still expressed and, thus, the reality of the body is not really omitted, the exclusive presence of ψυχή appears to place further emphasis on spirituality.

On the other hand, the hypothesis of this progressive change might be supported by the analysis of the occurrences of the body: they seem to follow an evolutionary pattern in which the beauty of the σῶμα, which is introduced in the first book, is abandoned and substituted by many episodes where body is mistreated. This "corruption" has its nadir in the Manto episode with Habrocomes' imprisonment, where the protagonist's body is heavily tortured and the blood disfigures his beauty. The peculiarity of this passage is underlined by Xen.'s only use of αἷμα in the whole text (2.6.3) and by his formulaic repetition of ἀφανίζω and τὸ σῶμα πᾶν (2.6.3 and 1.5.5, n.: τὸ σῶμα).

Finally, it is not unthinkable that in this negative consideration of the body Xen. is including another very popular image of Greek thought: the association between σῶμα and σῆμα. This possibility might be supported by different devices:

a) the repeated use of δεσμά in the novel, which starts from the oracle and is a frequent obstacle in the protagonists' journey (1.6.2 n.: oracle, 3);

b) in Homer the love of Ares and Aphrodite, which is the model of the protagonists' love on the wedding night (LI 6.2), has a negative outcome, since Hephaestus entraps both gods with his chains as a punishment for their immoral act. Although Xen. does not introduce this episode in his representation, I wonder whether Habrocomes' real σῆμα might be interpreted as an allusion to Hephaestus' trap. This would make the prison not only the punishment inflicted by Manto, but also a possible criticism of the fact that his first love has been too physical. This association might be also suggested by Anthia's visit to Habrocomes in prison, when she embraces his chains as part of some gestures of affection (2.7.5 and, esp., 1.5.5, n.: τὸ σῶμα).

c) a philosophical consideration of σῆμα could also be part of Habrocomes' second dream (2.8.2), because his liberation from the prison is there represented as a metamorphosis from horse to man (see below, b).

Overall, the inclusion of σῆμα in Xen.'s exploitation of σῶμα is not unlikely.

Further, the same evolution of σῶμα seems also to concern Anthia: after the initial presentation of her beautiful body (1.2.5), from the third book onwards her σῶμα starts to be mistreated like that of Habrocomes, first by the brigands who sell her to Psammis (3.11.1) and then by Rhenaea and during the forced exposure in the brothel (cf. 5.7.4 and 5.8.3). In my opinion, this pattern seems to confirm what has emerged in the combinations of body and soul: the soul, unlike the beauty of the body, is the necessary component of the human being.

Having provided this framework, it is interesting to compare it with Xen.'s shift in the conception of love: the hypothesis of a more spiritual ideal of love clearly matches the progressive disappearance of σῶμα in the second part of the novel. This leads to the conclusion that Xen. might be deliberately using the traditional dichotomy between body and soul as part of the *Entwicklung* of the Eph.. Given this discovery, I would like to stress that it has an originality in the novelistic corpus.

2) Comparison with the novelistic genre: Xen.'s unusual focus on body and soul

In the novelistic corpus these are the occurrences of body and soul:

	Xen.	Char.	Longus	Ach.	Hld.
σῶμα / ψυχή	5	1	1	7	5

Above all, only Ach. and Hld. introduce it more than once: this makes Xen. the first author of the corpus to exploit it consistently. In addition, the other novelists frequently use this combination, but they do not seem to connect it to the development of the novel. This gives the impression that they are using it merely as a cliché or as a motif which can be varied.

This happens clearly in Hld. One the one hand, body and soul are associated to describe:

a) authentic courage in battle (1.29.6: τοῖς ἐχθίστοις ψυχήν τε ἅμα καὶ σῶμα τεθηγμένοι συμπίπτωμεν);

b) Thyamis' value when he is appointed new priest (7.8.7: ἱκανῶς γε ἔχειν ψυχῆς τε ἅμα καὶ σώματος πρὸς τὰς τῆς ἱεροσύνης λειτουργίας);

c) the sleeping of the protagonists (2.15.2: οὕτως ἄρα ποτὲ σώματος πάθει καὶ τὸ νοερὸν τῆς ψυχῆς συνομολογεῖν ἠνέσχετο).

On the other hand, Hld. introduces the dichotomy in two passages:

a) when the doctor Acesinus makes a distinction between diseases of the body and those of the soul (4.7.5: τέχνη σώματος πάθη θεραπεύειν ἐπαγγέλλεται ψυχῆς δὲ οὐ προηγουμένως);

b) in the Arsace episode Theagenes' condition in prison is described by the narrator with the following words: τὸ μὲν σῶμα καταπονούμενος τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν ἐπὶ σωφροσύνῃ ῥωννύμενος (8.6.4). The existence of a marked opposition and the association of σωφροσύνη and ψυχή which gives ῥώμη to Theagenes recalls Habrocomes' defence of his soul in his answer letter to Manto (2.4.4).

Along with these more habitual uses, the novelists also vary this combination. This technique emerges particularly in the only occurrences made by Char. and Longus. The former introduces the formula as part of an apostrophe made by Dionysius to Callirhoe (5.6.2: τὸ τιμιώτερον ἐμοὶ σώματός τε καὶ ψυχῆς), which can be compared with Xen.'s erotic epithets based on ψυχή (1.11.3). On the other hand, the latter introduces our image in Philetas' description of his lovesickness (2.7.5: Ἤλγουν τὴν ψυχήν, τὴν καρδίαν ἐπαλλόμην, τὸ σῶμα ἐψυχόμην). This appears to be an expansion of Xen.'s third occurrence, because of the introduction of ἡ καρδία. That said, Ach.'s creativity is even more elaborate, as the following list shows:

a) in Charicles' tragic end and in Leucippe's *Scheintod* this novelist introduces the motif of the double death which concerns not only the soul, but also the body (cf. 1.13.4: καί μοι τέθνηκας θάνατον διπλοῦν, ψυχῇ καὶ σώματι and 7.5.3: νῦν δὲ τέθνηκας θάνατον διπλοῦν, ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος);

b) Ach. exploits the combination to express emotions in a more articulate way: in 1.6.3 he explains the τόπος of the night as the apex of erotic sufferings by saying: ἂν δὲ ἡσυχία τὸ σῶμα πεδηθῇ,

καθ'αὑτὴν ἡ ψυχὴ γενομένη τῷ κακῷ κυμαίνεται. Then, like Longus, he introduces καρδία in the description of Clitophon's reaction to the false news of Leucippe's death, in a passage which again recalls that of Xen's lovesickness (7.4.1: τρόμος μὲν εὐθὺς περιεχύθη μου τῷ σώματι καὶ ἡ καρδία μου ἐλέλυτο, ὀλίγον δέ τι μοι τῆς ψυχῆς ὑπολέλειπτο).

c) the issue of body and soul is extended to the natural world, by ascribing it to the palm-tree (1.17.5 : ἀνέψυξε μὲν τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ φυτοῦ, τὸ δὲ σῶμα ἀποθνῇσκον πάλιν ἀνεζωπύρησε [...]).

d) As in the Eph., body and soul are mentioned in a Platonic passage about love, where the image of the body, captured by the eyes, goes inside the soul (1.9.4: ὀφθαλμοί [...] ἀπομάττουσιν [...] τῶν σωμάτων τὰ εἴδωλα· ἡ δὲ τοῦ κάλλους ἀπορροή, δι'αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν καταρρέουσα).

Overall, Ach.'s passages clearly show how Xen.'s use of body and soul is simple. However, the lack in the former of a coherent exploitation of this motif leaves a mark of uniqueness to the latter's "technique".

Finally, there is a final nuance of Xen.'s originality, because his focus on blood in the mistreatment of the body has few parallels in the novelistic corpus: only Ach. associates it with Clitophon and Hld. does the same with Theagenes. While the former character is wounded on his thigh by Leucippe's kidnappers (Ach. 5.7.2) and then heavily hit by Thersander (8.1.3 ff.), the latter enters the scene of the novel with his παρειὰ καταρρέοντι τῷ αἵματι φοινιττομένη (Hld. 1.2.3). In both cases, however, the aim of using blood is not to underline the devastation of the heroes' body, but to give them respectively an anti-epic and an epic portrait: only Xen. mentions αἷμα to address the dichotomy between body and soul. As a result, we are dealing with a deliberate exploration which supports the growth of a spiritual awareness in Habrocomes.

<u>5b) The second dream as the metaphorical description of Habrocomes' *Bildung* and of the whole novel</u>

The second device by which Habrocomes is related to a moral progress is his second dream (2.8.2), which occurs shortly after the dramatic greeting made by Anthia to him in prison. This passage can be divided into three parts: while the first has his father Lycomedes as the main protagonist, the second and the third concern Habrocomes and a mare, which can be easily identified with Anthia. As is typical of Xen.'s dreams and oracles (<u>NA</u> 1.2), this vision performs a simple "emotional" function, since it gives to Habrocomes a 'Zeichen der Hoffnung' (Liatsi 2004, 164 and 2.8.2). Similarly, it also plays a proleptic function, since Habrocomes dreams of his final reunion with Anthia, which constitutes the happy ending of the novel.

That said, however, the originality of this passage lies in its metaphorical nature (see Liatsi 2004, 164) and in its focus on Habrocomes' adventures. All his life is here considered, from his father to his double metamorphosis and his relationship with Anthia. As I will shortly show, Xen. here offers a synthesis of his life and a confirmation of his *Bildung*.

In order to prove the truth of this statement, there are some enigmatic parts which need to be discussed:

1) ἐν ἐσθῆτι μελαίνῃ: Lycomedes' black clothes;

2) role of the father in Habrocomes' liberation;

3) identification of the mare and protagonists' metamorphosis from human beings to horses;

4) Habrocomes' final metamorphosis into man.

1-2) Analepsis of the liberation from lovesickness

To begin with, Lycomedes' black clothes are analysed by Plastira-Valkanou 2001, who shows that in Artemidorus they are associated with death and mourning and suggests that this feature is another prolepsis of the negative destiny of the protagonists' parents (for another, 1.10.10, n.: ὁδὸν). However, on further examination, the whole passage of Artemidorus which she mentions is more articulated: on the one hand, Artemidorus argues that for sick men wearing a black cloth σωτηρίαν προσημαίνει· οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀποθανόντες ἀλλ' οἱ τοὺς ἀποθνήσκοντας πενθοῦντες τοιούτοις χρῶνται ἱματίοις (2.3). This last statement is significant, as it seems to imply that the death does not concern the dreamer and, following this interpretation, Xen. would refer to Habrocomes' and not to Lycomedes' death[320]. Furthermore, although shortly after Artemidorus declares that black clothes are usually negative (ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλως ἡ μέλαινα ἐσθὴς πᾶσι πονηρὰ πλὴν τῶν τὰ λαθραῖα ἐργαζομένων), Lycomedes might be included in the category which constitutes an exception, since his action in the dream is evidently positive. As a result, the use of oneirocriticism here is controversial.

This theory also seems to fail to explain Habrocomes' liberation. The most immediate interpretation of this action would be to see it as a prolepsis of Apsyrtus' liberation of Habrocomes (2.10.2), but the reason for the association between Lycomedes and Apsyrtus is not clear. Plastira-Valkanou 2001 argues that in Artemidorus there is an equation of fathers and masters (4.69: καὶ τὸ ὅλον δεσπόται γονεῖς διδάσκαλοι θεοὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἔχουσι λόγον). On the other hand, Liatsi 2004, 165 justifies the presence of the father as the most obvious for a young boy like Habrocomes: since he is facing a terrible situation, the memory of his father would be naturally the first to appear in his mind.

In my opinion, as with the first issue, none of these interpretations is definitely convincing. As with the other dreams (1.6.2, n.: oracle, 7 and 1.12.4, n.: dream), I believe that the focus of the analysis should be on the relation between this passage and Xen.'s analeptic and proleptic apparatus. In this respect, scholars are wrong to ignore the fact that Lycomedes' search for Habrocomes is described with an expression which has a clear epic colour and recalls the adventures of Odysseus: πλανώμενον κατὰ πᾶσαν γῆν καὶ θάλατταν (LI 6.5). Since, then, in the second part of the dream there is another journey, that of Habrocomes, in which the first part of the formula is recalled (ἐπὶ πολλὴν γῆν διώκοντα), I would conclude that this dream has a clear epic mark. A further proof of this might lie in the fact that Habrocomes is sleeping, since the sequence falling asleep - dream is already Homeric (see Regla Fernandez Garrido 2003, 362, with references in n. 56).

---

[320] See on this Liatsi 2004, 167: 'Es handelt sich in Habrokomes' Traum also nicht um eine Voraussage des Todes seines Vaters, der im Traum schwarz gekleidet erscheint'.

This discovery has an immediate consequence: being Habrocomes' father, Lycomedes might be compared with Laertes, and his black cloth, at this point, would become the way in which Xen. imitates how Homer introduces his character: in the *Odyssey* Laertes is suffering to much because of his son's absence that he is almost close to death (*Od*. 1.188-193, 16.142-145 and esp. 15.352-357, where he explicitly asks Zeus to let him die). Thus, he constantly cries (*Od*. 4.110-2) and his death is even mentioned by Penelope in her cunning speech to the suitors (*Od*. 2.96-102, 19.141-7 and 24.131-7).

The first reason why this Homeric interpretation is convincing is that it supports our "correction" to Artemidorus: Lycomedes, being a double of Laertes, would be mourning for Habrocomes' death and not for his own. This possibility is also supported by the comparison with Char., in which black clothes are worn by Dionysius and Chaereas to mourn their wives' death (1.12.6 and 3.4.4).

That said, it seems to be interesting that in the first book there is a moment when Lycomedes is explicitly afraid of Habrocomes' death, which is his lovesickness (1.5.5). Since, then, the father proposes to cure his son by consulting the oracle (1.5.9), I wonder whether it is not possible to read this part of the dream as an analepsis of that episode. This reading would imply that lovesickness is metaphorically compared to prison and, since it includes the suffering of the body and is the origin of the sex between the protagonists, this analogy might enrich the association between σῶμα and σῆμα which has already emerged in the novel (see below, a). Overall, this interpretation seems to work better than that of Plastira-Valkanou 2001, because it allows us to "avoid" the difficult parallel between Lycomedes and Apsyrtus and it offers a more precise explanation than that of Liatsi 2004, without excluding it.

Within this new framework, the only element which is still enigmatic is the mention of Lycomedes' wanderings. In my opinion, since an epic formula such as πλανώμενον κατὰ πᾶσαν γῆν καὶ θάλατταν in the Eph. works as sign of an Odyssean identity (LI 6.5), it seems to encourage the reader to see in Lycomedes an echo of Laertes. As a result, what has to be understood is why Xen. is comparing Laertes with the father of Odysseus. In my opinion, since the whole dream refers to Habrocomes' life, here Xen. is simply including Habrocomes' father in the Odyssean framework which characterises the whole novel. This increases the parallel between Habrocomes and Odysseus (LI 6.3) and that between the *Bildungsroman* and the *Odyssey*, on which see respectively LI 6.3 and 6.2.

3-4) Habrocomes' spiritual growth

Similarly with the first part of the dream, the second and the third part have also been subjected to different interpretations. There are two main issues discussed by scholars: the parallel between the protagonists and horses and the double metamorphosis of Habrocomes, which are evidently connected one with the other. To begin with, the presence of these animals might have a very simple explanation: the horses could be read as a prolepsis of what Habrocomes does when he travels on

horseback in search for Anthia (2.13.4). However, as Morgan 2007, 463 states, 'the dream seems to predict more than this' and I would agree with him, given the big picture offered by this passage. There are three main views about this association:

- horses are a habitual symbol for lovers; this is what Plastira-Valkanou 2001, 141 argues comparing Artemidorus (prol. 4, 4.46). This identification is confirmed by the mythological story of Poseidon chaser of Demetra, in which the former manages to have a relationship with the latter only after the transformation of both in horses (Paus. 8.25.5).

- horses are immoral animals, since they are symbols for instinctive people and instinctive lovers.[321] The correctness of this judgment is proved by Adamantius' *Book of Physiognomy*, in the part which focuses on this kind of animals: 'Equus animal erectum est atque exultans, in certando animosum, victoriae cupidum, non impatiens laboris. homines ergo qui ad huius animalis speciem referuntur, capillo erunt tenso rubeo, genas habebunt maiores, collum longius, nares magis patulas, labium inferius demissum, erunt calidi in venerem, iactantes sui, contentiosi nimium, sapientes minus' (Anonymus Latinus, 118).

- as Capra 2007/8, 9 argues, the identification of Habrocomes with a horse might work as a 'sovrapposizione funzionale con il "cavallo rapido" Ippotoo'. In other words, with this image Xen. might be suggesting an overlap between the two characters, which I will later discuss (see below, LI 4.6b).

On the other hand, Habrocomes' metamorphosis is studied by Konstan forth., who argues that 'although the account of the dream is quite brief, the symbolism seems clear and significant: just as in Apuleius, the metamorphosis of the protagonist into an animal and back into human form can be taken as an allegory of the hero's fall and subsequent deliverance' (1-2).

In my opinion, this view is certainly right, because the attribution of an inferior status to Habrocomes' identification with a horse is clear in the dream, where these animals are opposed to to human beings: for this reason, they are not merely used as a parallel with lovers. In addition, Habrocomes is a lover also when he again meets Anthia: as a result, the horse might more specifically refer to the instinctive side of *eros* which characterises the protagonists in the first development of their love in Ephesus (LI 2.4). Conversely, the final reunion in love (LI 5.3) would be considered as a deeper stage reached by the protagonists, since Habrocomes is there man and no longer horse.

As a result, I would conclude that the whole dream is a description of Habrocomes' *Bildung*: after the prison constituted by lovesickness, the first liberation would make the protagonist horse - thus a instinctive lover - and then his journey would lead him to maturity.[322] Although the emphasis is

---

[321] Cf. Liatsi 2004, 169: 'ein Großteil der antiken Tradition sieht im Bild des Pferdes den animalischen Aspekt der menschlichen Sexualität symbolisch ausgedrückt' (169) and Bierl 2006, 84: 'vor allem fungiert das Pferd als Symbol der Initiation des jungen Menschen auf dem Weg zur Reife').

[322] See Konstan forth. on this: the dream 'suggests that the travels, trials and triumph of the protagonists in Xenophon's novel may themselves be read as a narrative of spiritual progress'.

clearly on Habrocomes, the fact that also Anthia is described as a mare allows us to extend this development to her.

In Konstan's (forth.) view, there are further confirmations of this interpretation: the first comes from the presence of Isis, who appears both in Xen.'s and Apuleius' novel. Since the time of Herodotus this goddess was closely related to metamorphosis, because of her identification with Io. This heroine was transformed into a cow and after long travels and travails finally recovered her human form.[323] In addition, two early Christian texts, the story of Peter's incarceration in *Acts* 12 and Perpetua's account of her final days in her *Passio*, seem to 'belong to the same world of narrative and experience' as the Eph., since 'both cases involve a vision of deliverance from prison on the part of a superior figure'. The parallel with *Acts* is especially interesting, because in this passage, after the vision of the angel, Peter is welcomed in Mary's house by a servant called Rhoda (12.13-16), whose name recalls that of Xen.'s Rhodes. As Konstan forth. himself points out, it is difficult to assess what kind of connection there was between these texts, but since 'the story of Peter's imprisonment will have circulated at once in oral form' and in the first century AD 'there was a flourishing Christian community in Ephesus', the possibility of a reciprocal influence is not unlikely and also Perpetua's story might be part of this interaction, since 'she shares with the heroes and heroines of the novels a capacity for endurance'.

Finally, the interpretation of this dream as meaningful for the whole novel is also significant for another reason: Habrocomes' second dream results in being closely connected with Apollo's oracle, with which it shares the Odyssean background, the presence of an analepsis and a prolepsis and an allusion to the protagonists' final destiny (1.6.2, n.: oracle). More deeply, as the divine response, this vision appears as a summary of the whole novel. This increases the importance of this message and gives to it the same metaliterary image.

5c) Hippothous as an antagonist of Habrocomes and a supporter of his *Bildung*

As I have already stated, the unexpected use of animals in Xen.'s dream also suggests that the protagonist, becoming a horse, is associated by Xen. with Hippothous, an important character of the novel whose name clearly recalls the same animal.

This hypothesis leads us to explore the nature of this character: although in the description of the uncivilised society I briefly alluded to him (LI 3.2a), it is difficult to find a proper place for him in the world of the novel, since he belongs to both societies. His Perinthus and his love for Hyperanthes are clearly comparable to Ephesus and the protagonists' love (3.2.1 ff.) and, thus, his origin lies in the civilised society. Nevertheless, after his murder of Aristomachus (3.2.10) and Hyperanthes' death (3.2.12), he becomes a brigand and, thus, he enters the uncivilised society.

Without any doubt, this role of "bridge" between the different worlds of the novel performs a structural function: Hippothous is the 'Helfer' of the protagonists,[324] because in the third book he helps Habrocomes to look for his wife (3.3.6), while in the fifth he buys Anthia from the

---

[323] See Konstan 2010, 3 and Hdt. 2.41.3.

[324] Capra 2007/2008, 9.

brothelkeeper (5.9.5) and he leads her back to Ephesus (5.11.1-2). For this reason, Hippothous shares the travel pattern with the protagonists[325] and in this respect Habrocomes is associated with him.

While this function is accepted by every scholar, it is more difficult to assess whether Xen. is interested in exploring the morality of Hippothous and what is his final judgement about this. Interestingly, Alvares 1995 and Watanabe 2003 give both a positive answer to the first interrogative, while they offer two different answers to the second: the former scholar interprets the entire life of Hippothous as a *Bildungsroman* from a violent to a human behaviour and argues that the reason for this change lies in his friendship with Habrocomes. As a result, in this view Hippothous would follow the same path as the protagonist, moving from the status of a instinctive "horse" to a human one. Conversely, Watanabe 2003 attributes to Hippothous a consistent performance of masculinity, which contrasts with Habrocomes' passivity. In this case, Hippothous, paying a closer obedience to his name, would stay a horse for the whole novel, without becoming man as Habrocomes.

In my opinion, a careful analysis of the text of the Eph. shows that Xen. deliberately invites his readers to accept and work on the parallel between Habrocomes and Hippothous in relation to the dream. This is significant: the moral focus of that passage proves that Xen. is interested in a moral exploration of the figure of Hippothous and confirms the correctness of Alvares and Watanabe's approach to him. In addition, the negative nature of horses in the dream might also suggest that the author's key to interpret the brigand's behaviour is not positive.

In my opinion, this impression, which is similar to Watanabe's thesis 2003, has further proof in the novel: despite his initial genuine desire for love, Hippothous is a violent man, who behaves as a citizen of the uncivilised society. Conversely, Habrocomes is a pure man whose life is only moved by his devotion to Anthia. For this reason, it seems to me that Hippothous' immorality emphasises Habrocomes' morality by contrast and that the former does not undergo the same metamorphosis into man as the latter. Only in the final episode of the novel does the distance between the two seem to be minimised or eliminated, but the lack of progress suggested by Alvares 1995 makes this conclusion functional to the plot more than a real conversion: on this, see LI 5.5.

1) The confirmation of the parallel: the encounter of Habrocomes and Hippothous at the end of the second book

After the dream (2.8.2), Hippothous enters the scene of the novel when he captures Anthia and Cilician merchants (2.11.11) and, few chapter afterwards, he personally meets Habrocomes and starts a friendship with him.[326] This scene in itself very important, because the plot establishes a link between the brigand and Habrocomes and with this parallel Xen. seems to invite his readers to follow the development of their relationship throughout the whole novel. More importantly, this passage has some echoes of the second dream: this confirms that Hippothous is evoked in

---

[325] See Alvares 1995, 354: 'Hippothous is the unifying link between the separate story-lines of Anthia and Habrocomes'.

[326] I agree with Alvares 1995 that Schmeling's (1980, 56) interpretation, of a homosexual relationship here lacks proof.

Habrocomes' vision and allows us to consider Hippothous as an immoral character, as the horse is. This nature makes him an antagonist of the protagonist. These are the proofs of this connection:

a) During the meeting with the brigand Habrocomes behaves as the dream has asked him to do, as we read: ἤλπιζε δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἀβροκόμης ἐν τῇ πολλῇ πλάνῃ τὴν Ἀνθίαν εὑρήσειν (2.14.4), which describes why Habrocomes swears an oath of fidelity with Hippothous. First, Habrocomes' hope is the same feeling which the protagonist has after the dream (2.8.2: εὔελπις ἦν). Second, the formula τὴν Ἀνθίαν εὑρίσκειν (LI 2.5) appears a possible reminder of the dream, in which Habrocomes τέλος εὑρεῖν τὴν ἵππον (2.8.2). Third, ἐν τῇ πολλῇ πλάνῃ has the same Odyssean colour as the expression ἐπὶ πολλὴν γῆν διώκοντα (2.8.2), which also refers to Habrocomes' search for Anthia. As a result, this framework might recall that episode in the readers' mind.

b) When Hippothous and Habrocomes decide to rest together, Xen. strangely focuses his attention on horses and especially on the former's. In my opinion, this appears a further signal that the author wants his readers to connect Hippothous with these animals, as the dream suggests. Therefore, when the characters decide to leave together, we read τοὺς ἵππους ἀνελάμβανον (2.14.5). Immediately after, Xen. adds a parenthesis which seems to be superfluous: ἦν γὰρ τῷ Ἱπποθόῳ ἵππος ἐν τῇ ὕλῃ κρυπτόμενος (2.14.5). On closer examination, however, it can be interpreted as a deliberate pun on the brigand's name. Since in the Eph. the presence of horses is very rare and they only occur in two general descriptions, which concern the Ephesian procession and Psammis' load (1.2.4 and 4.3.2), I would accept the hypothesis of a subtle interplay with them.

Having established this original link, I will now explore how the immoral Hippothous behaves in the novel and how his parallel with Habrocomes is developed after the second book. Since the stages of this relationship are numerous, I will present them in sequence.

2) Hippothous' immorality throughout the whole novel

I) THE FIRST APPEARANCE IN THE NOVEL

Hippothous is introduced in the Eph. as an outlaw and warlike man, who captures Anthia and Cilician merchants (2.11.11) and decides to sacrifice the former to Ares (2.13.1-2). As Alvares 1995, 399 acutely notices, the presence of this god, to whom Hippothous is devoted, recalls his erotic "epiphany" on the Ephesian canopy (1.8.2), but here the narrator clearly emphasises his warlike nature. The same result is provided by his portrait in his first meeting with Habrocomes, where he appears ὡπλισμένῳ (2.14.1). As a result, as the dream seems to suggest, Hippothous is introduced as a violent man and this might constitute both a parallel and a first difference from Habrocomes. The former is admitted by Habrocomes' intemperate behaviour in Ephesus (LI 2.4), while the latter by the start of the new phase of his life which consists of his search for Anthia (LI 4.2a).

II) THE SHARING OF LOVE STORIES

The second step of this parallel lies in the sharing of their love stories (NA 3.4). Despite the similarities which characterise Hippothous' love for Hyperanthes, it is indisputable that

Hippothous' murder of Aristomachus (3.2.10) and his flight (3.2.11) again shows his intemperance. As a result, although Watanabe 2003 argues that Hippothous behaves properly,[327] I would instead highlight the persistence of a violence in his attitude, in continuity with his first introduction in the novel. This conclusion is also supported by Xen.'s conception of societies, according to which Hippothous' exile marks his passage to an uncivilised world (NA 3.2a).

III) THE FAILED COLLABORATION BETWEEN HIPPOTHOUS AND HABROCOMES

The third step of the relationship between Hippothous and Habrocomes happens shortly after, when the former offers to help Habrocomes in his search for Anthia (3.3.6). Although Alvares states that 'at this point Hippothous' heroic friendship for Habrocomes is fully developed',[328] this promise is not maintained in the course of the novel: in the following chapters Xen. describes the immorality of Hippothous' companions, who get drunk (3.10.4) and massacre entire villages (4.1.1). As the first event coincides with Habrocomes' flight, no real friendship is established between the two heroes. As a result, despite the initial attempt, also in this case Hippothous' intemperate behaviour marks a distinction from that of Habrocomes.

IV) HIPPOTHOUS' VIOLENT BEHAVIOUR IN THE FOURTH AND FIVE BOOKS

Interestingly, in the last two books of the novel this difference increases instead of fading away. To begin with, Hippothous' punishment of Anthia for her murder of Anchialus (4.6.3) suggests that the brigand has not lost his intemperant attitude, while Habrocomes keeps preserving his purity trying to find Anthia (4.4.2). Similarly, when in the fifth book Habrocomes is suffering for love and working in Syracuse with Aegialeus, the narrator underlines how Hippothous desires new activity and new devastation (5.2.1-2). These two paragraphs are significant, since the actions of the two heroes are described as very close one to the other. In addition, at the end of the same chapter the narrator describes Hippothous' terrible massacre of Areia, whose name recalls that of Ares (5.2.7): Hippothous' behaviour seems to coincide with that of his first presentation in the novel, without any positive evolution.

That said, however, a chapter later Hippothous casts away his weapons after the fight with Polyidus' band (5.3.3). As Alvares 1995 writes, the phrase ἀπορρίψας τὰ ὅπλα appears another deviation from Hippothous' first appearance in the novel (2.14.1) and, thus, the scholar interprets this act as Hippothous' renunciation of his violent way of life. In my opinion, this statement is only partially true: although Hippothous no longer attacks people, his subsequent actions in the novel are not moved by a deep aim like that of Habrocomes. In Sicily the brigand looks for supplies (cf. 5.3.3 and 5.6.1) and his adventure has its apex in his marriage of convenience with the old Sicilian woman (5.11.1). Interestingly, shortly after this event, the narrator emphasises Habrocomes' desire for wealth: διέγνω δὲ πλεῦσαι μὲν εἰς Ἰταλίαν, ὠνήσασθαι δὲ οἰκέτας ὡραίους καὶ θεραπαίνας καὶ

---

[327] See Watanabe 2003, 14: 'Hippothous emerges [...] as an elite urban Greek male who acts in ways appropriate to his station'.

[328] Alvares 1995, 401.

ἄλλην περιβολὴν ὅση γένοιτ᾽ ἂν ἀνδρὶ εὐδαίμονι (5.9.2). Thus, Hippothous' goal does not seem to be different from his aim expressed in his first meeting with Habrocomes, in which the brigand declared: ἴωμεν οὖν Κιλικίαν μὲν ἀφέντες ἐπὶ Καππαδοκίαν καὶ τὸν ἐκεῖ Πόντον· λέγονται γὰρ οἰκεῖν ἄνδρες εὐδαίμονες <ἐνταῦθα> (2.14.3).

Finally, when Hippothous buys Anthia from the brothel-keeper, his behaviour is not that of a "convert": the reason for this transaction has no deep justification (5.9.5) and, when he falls in love with her, his instinctive desire seems again to overcome him (5.9.11). Overall, in my opinion all these elements confirm the persistence of an intemperance in Hippothous' behaviour and makes Alvares' (1995) hypothesis of a moral progress of the brigand in the fifth book unacceptable.

If there is a change, it is only occasional: first, just before his encounter with Cleisthenes, we are told that Hippothous ἐμέμνητο δὲ ἀεὶ τοῦ Ἀβροκόμου καὶ τοῦτον ἀνευρεῖν ηὔχετο, περὶ πολλοῦ ποιούμενος κοινωνῆσαί τε αὐτῷ τοῦ βίου παντὸς καὶ τῶν κτημάτων (5.9.2). This desire to share τὰ κτήματα and the use of the verb κοινωνέω seem to suggest that Hippothous is here establishing a friendship with Habrocomes. As Konstan 1997, 77 argues, among the various features of φιλία listed by Aristotle there are 'wishing the other well, condoling with a friend, enjoying the time spent together'.[329] Second, the brigand quickly restrains his violence towards Anthia (5.9.13). Overall, in these two situations Hippothous shows an untypical moral behaviour, but it appears to be part of his structural role of making the protagonists' reunion happen. As a result, I would not see in it a profound conversion, but an anticipation of the end of the novel (LI 5.5).

CONCLUSION

On balance, I would confirm that the parallel established in the dream between Habrocomes and Hippothous works in the novel. While in the first case the characters partially share an intemperate behaviour, what follows is different: Habrocomes progressively becomes a deep lover and achieves his union, while Hippothous shows different features of his violent attitude. Only in the fifth book, and especially at the end, the latter's behaviour approaches more that of the former, but a certain amount of intemperance still characterises the brigand. As a result, Bierl 2006, 84 seems right, when he defines Hippothous as 'das triebhafte Alter ego' of Habrocomes, because 'sein Homosexualität wie auch die aggressive, erotische Neigung gegen die Heldin verkörpert'.

As a result, I would conclude that, unlike Habrocomes, Hippothous remains horse and in this way he helps the readers to recognise the progress of the protagonist.

---

[329] See also the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon of Athens 2.4.6, in which Socrates describes the qualities of a good friend by saying: ὁ γὰρ ἀγαθὸς φίλος ἑαυτὸν τάττει πρὸς πᾶν τὸ ἐλλεῖπον τῷ φίλῳ καὶ τῆς τῶν ἰδίων κατασκευῆς καὶ τῶν κοινῶν πράξεων […]. In addition, see Konstan 1997, 70 on κοινωνία as the technical Greek term for 'partnership'.

CHAPTER 5:
THE FINAL VICTORY OF A SOCIETY IN LOVE

1) What happens at the end of the novel? The victory of love in the protagonists' reunion

As is proper in fiction, the brothel episode, which constitutes the peak of the danger for the protagonists, results in the defeat of the uncivilised society.

That being said, in accordance to the circular pattern typical of the novels, our natural expectation would be to return to the society of the beginning of the novel. Nevertheless, this does not happen: the encounter between the protagonists happens in Rhodes and not in Ephesus and the former city is is not the Rhodes of the first book. As a result, Xen. does not locate the reunion of the protagonists in a clear social background. In my opinion, this suggests that in his view love takes priority over society: the division of the world which is typical of the Eph. seems to be here interrupted to create space for love.

2) The Rhodes of the fifth book as a pretext for the protagonists' love

This conclusion emerges more clearly if we look at the Rhodes of the fifth book. Unlike that of the first book (LI 1.1), in this city the action of the novel is set for a long narrative time: the most important place is the temple of Helios, which is visited by all the main characters, from the ex-servants to the protagonists, and creates opportunities for mutual meetings (5.10.6, 5.10.7, 5.10.9, 5.10.11, 5.11.4 and 5.12.3). This "religious" focus, which recalls that of the Ephesian temple of Artemis, becomes striking when the narrator mentions the public feast dedicated to Helios, the so-called "Halieia", 'which was celebrated every four years'[330] (5.11.2). Thus far, the parallel with the first Ephesus seems to be established and one might conclude that civilised society has already won out over the uncivilised one.

On further examination, however, this conclusion cannot be really accepted, because Xen. introduces a series of variations. Since in the novel no other ἑορτή with πομπή occurs apart from the initial one, the readers are clearly invited to make a close comparison between this event and Artemis' procession. Interestingly, the result of this emphasises their mutual differences: in Rhodes Xen. omits the description of the πομπή and he adds this detail: ἐνταῦθα παρῆσαν ὁ Λεύκων καὶ ἡ Ῥόδη, οὐ τοσοῦτον τῆς ἑορτῆς μεθέξοντες, ὅσον ἀναζητήσοντες εἴ τι περὶ Ἀνθίας πύθοιντο (5.11.13). This lack of interest in the procession is confirmed by Anthia, who enters the temple before the end of the ceremony (cf. 5.11.3 and 5.12.1), and by Habrocomes, who does not even take part in the procession (cf. 5.12.2 and 5.13.1). While the absence of the latter is part of the narrative strategy of delaying the protagonists' recognition, the former's behaviour is surprising, given her pious portrait at the beginning of the novel. In my opinion, these facts break the Ephesian pattern:

---

[330] Oikonomou 2010, 268. As Arnold 1936, 435 argues, the origin of this feast dates shortly after the foundation of the city (408 BC), but it is not attested by inscriptions until the close of the fourth century BC and next appears on an inscription of the second century BC.

while the ceremony there was serving the purpose of generating weddings, here it is only a pretext for the meetings which prepare the recognition between the protagonists.

Overall, this shift seems to suggest that in the new Rhodes, unlike the first Ephesus, maturation of love does not need the help of the society, but follows its own rules. This notion becomes clearer at the end of the episode, where the protagonists meet together and only afterwards the whole population gathers to celebrate the event and to thank Isis for this gift (5.13.3 and 4): this produces a contrast with the first Ephesus, where the divine oracle instead was the reason why the protagonists married. As a result, I would conclude that in the fifth book Xen. is deemphasising the importance of society to focus on the autonomy of the protagonists' love. For this reason, it becomes very important to analyse what kind of *eros* Xen. is here introducing.

3) <u>The core of the new erotic ideal of the society in love</u>

Without any doubt, the core of this search lies in the final Rhodian night, where the protagonists share their misadventures. As I have already suggested in <u>AIM</u>, this event must be read in relation to the Ephesian night, since they are both key elements of the plot, and for this reason, after an analysis of the second episode, I will compare it to the first one.

3a) An invincible fidelity

Without any doubt, the night in Rhodes focuses on Anthia and Habrocomes' confession of their personal achievement of fidelity. As a result, it appears to be the fulfilment of the oath of fidelity between the protagonists (<u>LI</u> 2.5). This leads me to the first conclusion: the new ideal of this society in love does not differ from the last step of the first society in nature, but in depth: as the protagonists here show, their whole journey has served the purpose of increasing their σωφροσύνη. In addition, since Anthia illustrates her whole story here, Xen. seems to offer another metaliterary image of his work, after that of the Ephesian canopy: his novel is comparable to the ἀπολογία made by Anthia and Habrocomes of their personal fight to preserve their fidelity (5.15.1: ταῦτα δι᾽ὅλης νυκτὸς ἀλλήλοις ἀπελογοῦντο). In this respect, this new ideal appears the result of their victory over the uncivilised society and, thus, it is presented as both the product and the achievement of their *Bildung*.

3b) Symmetry

Along with this first value, the protagonists' reunion in Rhodes also leads to the achievement of the symmetry launched on the wedding night (<u>LI</u> 2.4, e). Their recognition is quick and generates a common reaction, which involves the whole of their personality:
- soul (5.13.3: τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐβούλοντο αἱ ψυχαί);
- body (ibid., περιλάβοντες ἀλλήλους);
- emotions (ibid., κατεῖχε δὲ αὐτοὺς πολλὰ ἅμα πάθη, ἡδονή [...]).

In addition, the Rhodians celebrate their reunion with an exclamation which underlines their unity (5.13.3: πάλιν ὁρῶμεν Ἀβροκόμην καὶ Ἀνθίαν τοὺς καλούς). As a result, the development of the protagonists here finds its fulfilment.

4) <u>The more original nuances of the new erotic ideal of the society in love</u>

While fidelity and symmetry are the main values of Xen.'s new ideal of love, the comparison with the wedding night and the whole novel offers other minor nuances. As I have already shown in <u>LI</u> 2.4, the most significant ingredients of that event are:

- wealth;
- homeland;
- sex;
- marriage;
- proposal of symmetry made by Anthia.

At a quick glance, it is striking how none of these elements seems to be important in the final reunion of the protagonists:

- Habrocomes arrives poor in Rhodes and regains his wealth only when he meets his ex-servants (5.10.12);
- the reunion happens in Rhodes and not in Ephesus;
- neither sex nor marriage are explicitly mentioned;
- in the dialogue Habrocomes' brief answer to Anthia gives the impression of a lack of symmetry in the couple.

As I will argue shortly, the issue here is not that Xen. is excluding these element from his final ideal of love, but he is introducing a shift of emphasis: fidelity and symmetry are more important than any of these and this increases the originality of his new erotic ideal. The pieces of evidence which can be used are again suggested by the *Entwicklung* of the novel and one episode deserves a particular attention, which is Aegialeus' story. The reason for this importance lies in the fact that after the fisherman's account there is the only explicit comment made by Habrocomes about his *Bildungsroman*. Since the protagonist states: καὶ νῦν ἀληθῶς μεμάθηκα ὅτι ἔρως ἀληθινὸς ὅρον ἡλικίας οὐχ ἔχει (5.1.12), we are invited to consider Aegialeus' experience as a positive model.[331] The main reason for this is that Aegialeus offers the example of a love which outlasts death and, thus, it has already achieved what Habrocomes is trying to experience with Anthia. That said, this story offers also minor suggestions, which I will explore shortly.

<u>4a) The priority of true love over money</u>

As I have shown in <u>LI</u> 1.2, wealth is part of Xen.'s civilised society. Conversely, in the final Rhodes this element is no longer mentioned. Another proof of this shift is given by servants: while in the first book Anthia and Habrocomes leave Ephesus with a group of them (1.10.6 n.: πολλοὶ), after their death they are never replaced. This omission fits well into the attitude of the entire fifth book,

---

[331] On the role of Habrocomes as an audience of the novel, <u>NA</u> 4.4.

in which wealth seems progressively to lose importance. The first evidence about this is given by Aegialeus' story: despite his belonging to a rich family (5.1.14: τῶν τὰ πρῶτα ἐκεῖ δυναμένων), after his misadventures the fisherman states: ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐνταῦθα διήγομεν (ἐν) ἀπορίᾳ μὲν τῶν ἐπιτηδείων (5.1.9). However, this change does not mean the loss of happiness: ἡδόμενοι δὲ καὶ πάντων ἀπολαύειν δοκοῦντες (ibid.).

Then, Habrocomes himself, despite his high status, suffers from ἀπορίᾳ δὲ τῶν ἐπιτηδείων (5.8.1; cf. 5.10.3: ὁ μὲν ὀλίγα ἔχων τὰ ἐπιτήδεια) until the meeting with Leucon and Rhode (5.10.12). In addition, this episode does not give happiness to him, because τῷ δὲ ἦν οὐδὲν Ἀνθίας τιμιώτερον (ibid.). Finally, this progressive detachment of Habrocomes from wealth seems to be underlined by Xen. through the contrasting parallel with Hippothous: unlike the protagonist, the brigand manages to recover wealth as soon as he becomes poor (5.9.1) and this is evident when he marries the old Sicilian woman (ibid.; L4.5c). As a result, Xen. seems to suggest that true love does not need money.

4b) The priority of true love over homeland

While the wedding night is celebrated in Ephesus, the last night is set in Rhodes: this leads us to address the controversial issue of the shift of cities. In the history of the studies of the Eph., the key role played by Rhodes in the fifth book has always puzzled scholars and is at the origin of Merkelbach's interpretation of the novel (AIM), in which the Rhodian cult of Helios is the most important proof of the *Heliosredaktion*. Since, as I have already argued, this theory is not based on enough pieces of evidence, I would instead offer a narrative interpretation of this phenomenon, which again starts from Aegialeus' account. His love story is a story of opposition and contrast with his homeland and it is significant that the fisherman defines himself as οὐδὲ ἐπιχώριος (5.1.4): since this adjective is used repeatedly in the first chapter of the novel in relation to Habrocomes and his family, Xen. seems to be deliberately opposing Aegialeus to the protagonist. Since, however, the experience of the fisherman is positive, we can conclude that Xen. is deemphasising the importance of homeland and proposing the priority of love to it.

In addition, later in the book, the protagonists themselves seem to become aware of this motif, as in their last two monologues Ephesus no longer gives them comfort, as their desire is to meet one another.[332] This consideration of homeland appears a novelty in the protagonists' conception, since in Perilaus' episode, conversely, the memory of Ephesus was a source of joy for Anthia (3.4.3), although she was already suspecting her husband's death (3.5.3). As a result, Xen. seems also here to undermine the role of homeland to stress the importance of love and I would accept this hypothesis also to explain the substitution of Ephesus with Rhodes.

That said, as in the case of wealth, we are not dealing with a rejection of the value of homeland, because the protagonists eventually return to Ephesus: the value of this event will be shortly discussed (see below, 5).

---

[332] Cf. Habrocomes' statement in 5.10.4: φεῦ τῶν κακῶν· εἰς Ἔφεσον ἵξομαι μόνος καὶ πατράσιν ὀφθήσομαι τοῖς ἐμαυτοῦ χωρὶς Ἀνθίας and that of Anthia in 5.11.4: νυνὶ δὲ δούλη μὲν ἀντ᾽ἐλευθέρας, αἰχμάλωτος δὲ ἡ δυστυχὴς ἀντὶ τῆς μακαρίας. καὶ εἰς Ἔφεσον ἔρχομαι μόνη [...]).

4c) The priority of true love over sex

Unlike poverty, the role played by sex and marriage in the society in love appears to be more difficult to discover. To begin with, in his final night Xen. does not explicitly mention sex, because he only says that all the characters ἀνεπαύοντο (5.13.6) and, particularly, Ἀνθία ἀνεπαύετο μετὰ Ἀβροκόμου (ibid.). Since ἀναπαύομαι is commonly used in the novel to express the habitual action of sleeping (1.11.6, 3.2.11, 3.10.4, 5.11.2) and the only exception is on the wedding night where, however, the erotic meaning is given by the introduction of περιφύντες (1.9.9), one might argue that we are dealing with a deliberate omission.

In my opinion, however, Xen. leaves this act as implicit: the Odyssean night, which is the model of this event (Od. 23.296 and LI 6.3), as well as that introduced by Char. (8.1.17 and APP 2.2) includes sex and, thus, Xen. would have had to give a more explicit signal than silence to omit it. That said, I would rather interpret this omission as the proof that our author is here focusing on a different form of love, in which the conversation between the lovers is more important than the erotic consummation.

This novelty first emerges in the Rhodian final night, in which the protagonists talk together, both with the other characters (see 5.13.5: πολλὰ καὶ ποικίλα παρὰ πάντων τὰ διηγήματα [...] παρεξέτεινόν τε ἐπὶ πολὺ τὸ συμπόσιον) and alone (5.14). In addition, two other examples come from the fifth book. The first again belongs to Aegialeus' story: while in his life the fisherman often enjoyed having sex with Thelxinoe (5.1.5), after her death he states: ἔχω γὰρ μετ'ἐμαυτοῦ καὶ ἀεὶ φιλῶ καὶ σύνειμι (5.1.9). Then he adds: ἀεί τε ὡς ζώσῃ λαλῶ καὶ συγκατάκειμαι καὶ συνευωχοῦμαι and [...] αὕτη με παραμυθεῖται βλεπομένη (5.1.11). Although verbs like σύνειμι and συγκατάκειμαι can be used to describe sexual relationships, it seems to me implausible that Aegialeus is suggesting such a macabre thing. As a result, I would rather read in these actions the emergence of a kind of love which is "spiritual", as is based on two actions: speaking (λαλῶ) and looking (βλεπομένη) at the beloved. Interestingly, after this episode Polyidus, an erotic rival of Anthia, unexpectedly adopts a similar approach. After his presentation as a brigand (5.3.2) and his attempt at raping Anthia (5.4.5), moved by pity and by respect to Isis he restrains his erotic violence and swears an oath of chastity (5.4.7). That said, it is interesting that Polyidus' passion for Anthia does not disappear, but is transformed into a new form: αὔταρκες γὰρ αὐτῷ φιλοῦντι ἐδόκει κἂν βλέπειν μόνον καὶ λαλεῖν αὐτῇ (5.4.7). Since Xen. introduces the same verbs as in Aegialeus' episode, these two passages seem to have been conceived together. This supports the impression that a new ideal of love is here emerging. In conclusion, unlike love in the first Ephesus, Xen.'s new ideal has its focus on a spiritual form.

4d) The priority of true love over marriage

As with sex, Xen. introduces explicit references to the protagonists' marriage neither in the last scene of the novel nor in the entire final book, in which only Rhenaea alludes to her γάμος (5.5.1,

5.5.3).[333] Unlike the previous case, however, the omission is only apparent; since on the final night in Rhodes the protagonists are clearly compared to the most important married couple of the Greek tradition, namely Penelope and Odysseus (LI 6.3), marriage is clearly present there. In addition, in LI 2.4 I have argued that silence might be the consequence of the fact that Xen. focuses here on conjugal fidelity and he considers marriage simply as the ceremony which starts the relationship of the couple.

That said, since in the analysis of the fifth book subtler themes have emerged, I would add a second speculative hypothesis, which is again suggested by Aegialeus' story: his love for Thelxinoe is authentic but not marital, since it is born in opposition to the γάμος wanted by Thelxinoe's father for his daughter (5.1.6.7). As a result, Xen. might be here suggesting that a sincere and everlasting erotic passion is even more important than marriage. In my opinion, a statement like this also sheds new light on the protagonists' relationship: while the marriage in the first book is realised through the help of their parents, they are now pursuing love as their personal ideal. In addition, one might wonder whether Xen. aims to criticise the model of his first society. In my opinion, this is not the case, because since Aegialeus' story is heard by a mature Habrocomes, it has to be read in the context of this growth.

4e) Beyond fidelity: a speculative extension of true love beyond the closure of the novel

Having reached a better understanding of Xen.'s final and new ideal love, there is a last "strange" theme which must be explored: the impression that, unlike the wedding night, in the Rhodian one symmetry might be less stressed or even missing. Although with their recognition the protagonists achieve their union (LI 5.3b), in the final dialogue Anthia appears worried about Habrocomes' fidelity.

As I will show in the analysis of the oracle (1.6.2, n.: oracle, 5), this impression works well with the interpretation of the Eph. as a story which, as the *Odyssey*, might have a continuation after its closure. In our case, this would include another separation of the protagonists and a subsequent definite reunion, that τάφος θάλαμος prophesied by Apollo. In my opinion, Anthia's anxiety might be here the sign of this.

To begin with, unlike in Ephesus, Anthia speaks before her husband. Since this is the only dialogue of the novel in which this happens,[334] her primacy is here emphasised. In addition, this stress is confirmed by the protagonists' feelings and by the quality and content of their speeches. First, Habrocomes is completely unemotional in this scene, since his words are introduced by φησὶ (5.14.3) while those of Anthia by ἔκλαεν (5.14.1). Second, as I showed in NA 1.1b, in this passage Xen. displays an unusual rhetorical ability, but this concerns only Anthia's speech, which, unlike that of Habrocomes, includes a concrete list of her misadventures. Overall, these elements confirm that 'this pair of speeches appear to be [...] unbalanced' (Doulamis 2003, 96). If we combine this element with the beginning of the protagonists' reunion, it seems to me that the Rhodian night has

---

[333] I would not consider here the expression γάμων ἁγνὴν introduced by Xen. to designate Amphinomus' promise of not having sex with Anthia, because it is a formula in which γάμων does not explicitly refer to marriage.

[334] Cf. the other dialogues in 1.4.1-3 and 1.4.6-7, 1.9.2-3; 4-5; 2.1.2-4, 5-6, 7-8, 1.11.3-4, 5 and Doulamis 2003, 94.

an opposite direction to that of the Ephesian one, since it goes from symmetry to asymmetry. This trajectory appears a possible threat to the union of the couple.

Finally, the conclusion of Anthia's speech is significant: apparently, her questions to Habrocomes about fidelity are made simply to stimulate Habrocomes' positive answer and lead to the final confirmation of fidelity. On further examination, however, their form establishes two interesting parallels with other passages of the novel. In the first question Anthia adopts the words which describe her jealousy at the beginning of the novel (1.5.4 n.: δήλη), while the second question refers to the possibility of Habrocomes' betrayal of the oath. This theme has already been explored by the heroine after her second dream, which contains the only other allusion in the novel to an infraction made by her partner (5.8.9: Ἁβροκόμης μὲν γὰρ εἰ καὶ τοὺς ὅρκους παραβέβηκε [...]). Since this nightmare happens only six chapters before this, it is not unthinkable that Anthia is still shocked about that revelation. In conclusion, there seems to be a tension in the relationship which is focused on Anthia and in my opinion the final sentence καὶ ῥαδίως ἔπειθον ἀλλήλους, ἐπεὶ τοῦτο ἤθελον (5.15.1), which offers a final image of the couple in concord, is too short to release the tension.

As a result, I would speculate that Xen. is giving further depth to his final ideal of love, by establishing its truest fulfilment after the end of the text. Within this hypothesis, at the end these subtle worries would not be negative, but they would work as a prelude to the achievement of a more perfect union between the protagonists. For this reason, this apparent contrast can also be considered as part of the *Entwicklung* and of the *Bildung* of Anthia and Habrocomes.

5) The last scene in Ephesus: the final step of the *Bildungsroman*

After this analysis of the new ideal of love in Rhodes, there might be the expectation that the novel has reached its conclusion, as the *Bildung* of the protagonists achieves there the two deepest features of their love, fidelity and symmetry. That being said, in the last chapter of the novel Anthia and Habrocomes return to Ephesus. This fact requires our interpretation: one might simply argue that Xen. is here paying debt to the circularity of the text which is proper to the genre. In my opinion, however, there is more in this last scene and this is suggested by the way in which Ephesus is described.

Unlike the city of the first book, this new Ephesus is focused on the protagonists. Although the narrator writes that the whole population was informed of the return of Anthia and Habrocomes (5.15.2: προεπέπυστο δὲ τὴν σωτηρίαν αὐτῶν ἡ πόλις ἅπασα), the Ephesians do not perform any actions. Only the protagonists make prayers, sacrifices and offerings to Artemis (ibid.). Shortly after, we discover that they are joined by two other couples: the one composed of the old servants and that constituted by Hippothous and Cleisthenes (5.15.4). As these characters seem to share the new ideal which emerged in Rhodes and constitute three families, the new Ephesus appears a sort of "social realisation" of true love. This is significant: since in the Greek tradition heterosexual love has the social value of guaranteeing the continuity of the society (see on this Pl. *Lg.* 636a-d), we are not dealing with a mechanical closure, but with something that Xen. deliberately seems to place as the final step of his *Bildungsroman*.

That said, however, this new society includes a couple which is strange from a number of points. While the presence of the ex-servants is not surprising, since they are already compared with the protagonists in Tyre (LI 2.4), the presence of Hippothous is unexpected, since he is a brigand, he plays the role of immoral antagonist of Habrocomes (LI 4.5c) and his beloved is a boy and not a woman. While I will shortly focus on this last aspect (see below, 6), I would argue that the overall reason for his integration lies in the rules of fiction: before the end of the novel Xen. wants even his violent character to become positive and this certainly emphasises the power of Eros, which constitutes the only reason for this transformation. This priority of love to class makes the last Ephesus a very special society, which is different from both the first and the second ones of the Eph. and I would call "society in love".

6) The controversial presence of Hippothous and Cleisthenes: homosexuality enters the new "society in love"

While the transformation into οἶκος of the protagonists and the ex-servants' relationship is a natural consequence, the presence of Hippothous and Cleisthenes is less easy to fit, as they are both men and a few chapters before Xen. describes their relationship as pederastic.[335] This leads us to look carefully at the passage of the last chapter of the novel which concerns them. To begin with, since Xen. states that Hippothous will spend his whole life in Ephesus (5.15.4: διέγνω δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἱππόθοος ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τὸν λοιπὸν καταβιῶναι χρόνον), the subsequent repetition of ὁ Ἱππόθοος διῆγεν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ μετὰ Ἁβροκόμου καὶ Ἀνθίας (ibid.) implies that Hippothous and Cleisthenes' union is supposed to be permanent like that of the other two couples.[336] That said, it is more difficult to understand what kind of relationship the two are having: the expression παῖδα ποιησάμενος (ibid.) requires our interpretation.

As I will shortly show, the reference to adoption which is hidden in this expression and the parallel between heterosexuality and homosexuality which underlies the whole novel suggest that in Xen.'s mind true love goes beyond marriage and might involve homosexual people. That said, however, the way in which this extension is applied seems incomplete.

6a) Adoption as the interpretation of παῖδα ποιησάμενος

While ποιοῦμαι is typically used by Greek novelists with a predicative to express the establishment of a social relationship, especially marriage,[337] only Xen. introduces παῖδα ποιοῦμαι: this originality has to do with his interest in adoption, because the formula αὐτὸν παῖδα ποιοῦμαι commonly describes this social institution. This already emerges in the *Iliad*, when Phoenix remembers when

---

[335] Cf. 5.9.3: εἵπετο δὲ αὐτῷ μειράκιον τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ εὖ γεγονότων, Κλεισθένης τοὔνομα, καὶ πάντων μετεῖχε τῶν Ἱπποθόου κτημάτων and 5.13.6: Ἱππόθοος δὲ καὶ τὸ μειράκιον τὸ ἐκ Σικελίας τὸ ἀκολουθῆσαν εἰς Ἰταλίαν ἰόντι αὐτῷ, ὁ Κλεισθένης ὁ καλός.

[336] See Konstan 1994, 39, who speaks of 'an enduring domestic association, comparable to marriage'. See also Watanabe 2003, 36: 'as adoptive father and son, Hippothoos and Kleisthenes are now incorporated in an institutional grid that guarantees the permanence of their co-habitation, even though the erotic component may be gone'

[337] See, for instance, Ποιοῦμαι γυναῖκα in Char. 7.6.7, Ach. 5.14.2, 6.11.3 and Hld. 4.18.5, while Longus uses ποιοῦμαι ἄνδρα in 3.25.2.

he adopted Achilles (9.494-5: ἀλλὰ σὲ παῖδα, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ᾽ Ἀχιλλεῦ, ποιεύμην). Then, Herodotus relates the same expression to the Spartan institution (6.57.5: καὶ ἤν τις θετὸν παῖδα ποιέεσθαι ἐθέλη, βασιλέων ἐναντίον ποιέεσθαι) and Demosthenes does the same with an Athenian case of adoption. In his oration *Against Boetus*, the accuser Mantitheus attacks his adopted brother, because he has asked to have the same name as him. In his view this claim is illegitimate and creates confusion. Interestingly, the most common terms used here for the act of adoption are again ποιοῦμαι (4, 6, 31, 29 and 33 bis) and ποίησις (20).

While this framework is provided by the analysis of these technical words, Xen.'s relationship with adoption is also highlighted by intratextuality. Above all, παῖδα ποιοῦμαι also appears in Cyno's episode, when her husband ὁ μὲν δὴ Ἄραξος ἠγάπα τὸν Ἁβροκόμην καὶ παῖδα ἐποιεῖτο (3.12.4). This suggests that Araxus might have adopted Habrocomes, although this idea is not further developed. In addition, in Lycia Leucon and Rhode are sold πρεσβύτῃ τινί, ὃς αὐτοὺς εἶχε μετὰ πάσης ἐπιμελείας, παῖδας αὐτοῦ νομίζων (2.10.4), while in Syracuse Aegialeus ὑπεδέξατο δὲ τὸν Ἁβροκόμην ἄσμενος καὶ παῖδα ἐνόμιζεν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἠγάπα διαφερόντως (5.2.1). Although this second formula with νομίζειν is less technical than the previous one, in Greek vocabulary it can refer to the act of the adoption. Again in Demosthenes' *Against Boetus* the status of sons of the two contenders is described with the sentence παῖδας ἐποιήσατο τούτους ὁ πατήρ, ἀπὸ τούτου καὶ νομίζεσθαι (29), in which αὐτὸν παῖδα νομίζομαι shares with ποιοῦμαι a technical connotation.[338] Other similar occurrences are in Herodotus, when he describes the Libyan tradition of assignation of babies to parents[339] and in Philo Judaeus, who introduces παῖδα νομίζειν to express the possibility that human beings may not be adopted by God.[340] Finally, Dio Chrysostom defines Castor and Pollux as οἳ Διὸς παῖδες ἐνομίσθησαν (61.11). As a result, the Lycian master's and Aegialeus' acts might be compared with Araxus' and Hippothous'. That said, however, the text admits two possibilities: we might deal with a real action or only with an expression of a feeling.

On further examination, in both episodes Xen. seems to support the first interpretation. First, in the Lycian's case Xen. states that the reason why the master παῖδας αὐτοῦ νομίζων (2.10.4) is that καὶ γὰρ ἄτεκνος ἦν (ibid.). Then, in the fifth book, we discover that the same person has appointed Leucon and Rhode as his heirs: τεθνηκότος [...] δεσπότου καὶ τὸν κλῆρον (ἦν δὲ πολύς) ἐκείνοις καταλιπόντος (5.6.3). This framework confirms that we are dealing with a real adoption: in ancient society, this institution 'enabled a person of standing, but lacking descendants, to continue his line and to ensure that his own interests were protected in old age' (Lindsay 2009, 41). In addition, 'in the case of both Greece and Rome, adoption appears to be largely for the rich' (ibid.), as in the Lycian's case. Finally, the immediate acquisition by the Ephesian servants of an inheritance fits well into the most effective method of adoption, which happened when the adopting father was still alive: in fact, 'in an *inter vivos* adoption the adopted son had immediately uncontested rights to his

---

[338] See also ibid., 33 for another occurrence of the same verb.

[339] Hdt. 4.180.6: Ἐπεὰν δὲ γυναικὶ τὸ παιδίον ἁδρὸν γένηται, συμφοιτῶσι ἐς τὠυτὸ οἱ ἄνδρες τρίτου μηνός, καὶ τῷ ἂν οἴκῃ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τὸ παιδίον, τούτου παῖς νομίζεται.

[340] See *On confusion of tongues* 148: εἰ μήπω ἱκανοὶ θεοῦ παῖδες νομίζεσθαι γεγόναμεν.

inheritance' (Lindsay 2009, 44), without the need of a will required by the 'adoptions by will' (ibid.). Similarly, Aegialeus' act contains two other social hints of adoption: within this social bond, 'the adoptive son during the lifetime of the adopter was expected to engage in a relationship with his adoptive father replicating a biological father-son relationship' (ibid., 43). This fact might be echoed by Xen.'s attribution of ἀγαπάω to Aegialeus (5.1.2). Further, 'the adopted son makes much [...] of the fact that he had performed all due rights over his adoptive father after his death' (Lindsay 2009, 44). This element might be also recalled by Xen., as Habrocomes, on his way back to Ephesus, stops to offer libations at Aegialeus' grave (5.10.3). As a result, the Lycian master' and Aegialeus' decisions seem to be real acts of adoption and I would extend this conclusion also to Araxus' case. This possibility is facilitated by the presence of the more technical formula.

Overall, the emergence of this framework is very important, because it can be used to shed a new light on the final passage of the novel: I would consider Hippothous' relationship with Cleisthenes as the fourth adoption of the Eph.

This discovery allows us to express a final judgment on the last scene of the novel. To begin with, there is no doubt that adoption is a kind of relationship which fits well into the social dimension of the end of the Eph. Through this institution Hippothous does not only have Cleisthenes with him in the present, but he will also be able to leave all his goods to him when he dies. As a result, the brigand has found the way to create a new οἶκος and from this perspective Hippothous' family can be compared to that of the protagonists and of the ex-servants. In this respect, it is possible that Xen.'s silence about the protagonists' son, which constitutes an exception in the genre (LI 2.4c), might serve the same purpose of assimilating these relationships: the coexistence of natural and adopted sons might have shown a contrast between them.

That said, however, the construction of this parallel is not perfect. First, since adoption implies a father-son balance, the basic symmetry of the married couples does not concern Hippothous' love. Second, it is not clear whether in this kind of relationship homosexual love was still practiced. In my opinion, the second topic is less relevant, because Xen. is also deemphasising sex in the protagonists' relationship and, thus, he seems to be uninterested in this issue. In theory, the permanence of homosexual love is allowed by how adoption functioned in the Roman world. As Lindsay 2009, 71 argues, 'there was no requirement to be married in order to adopt, and it might be suspected that many of the Roman adoptions occurred in bachelor establishments where there was no longer a female partner, or perhaps never had been. It was in fact a possible alternative to marriage' . As a result, since Xen. could be influenced by this institution, I would not exclude that in his mind adoption could include a sexual connotation.[341] However, Xen.'s silence makes this assumption a mere speculation.

---

[341] Further, the use of παῖς might support this conclusion, since in Greek language this word was the common definition of the passive partner of a homosexual relationship (see on this Dover 1978, 16: 'In many contexts, and almost invariably in poetry, the passive partner is called παῖς'). Although Xen. uses mostly this noun to indicate 'son' or a generic 'boy' (for 'son' see 1.1.1, 1.10.5, 1.10.7, 1.10.9, 1.10.10, 2.10.4, 2.13.6, 2.13.7, 3.4.4, 3.12.4, 5.1.2, for 'boy' 1.1.5, 1.7.2, 1.12.1, 3.2.10, 5.4.9, 5.4.11, 5.5.8 and 5.7.7), in Hippothous' story the most technical use appears (3.2.10: εὑρίσκω συγκατακείμενον τῷ παιδὶ) and this does not exclude that the readers could here recall this connotation.

Conversely, the lack of symmetry is more significant, because the novelist is more explicit about the balance in the relationship and this final comparison seems to be a way in which he addresses the wider issue of a comparison between heterosexuality and homosexuality. This discovery is significant and invites us to check whether he explores this topic throughout the whole novel. Since the answer is positive, in the next section I will focus on it.

6b) The parallel between heterosexuality and homosexuality in the *Ephesiaca*

In the Greek novel as a genre the introduction of homosexual relationships is not a recurrent ingredient, given its 'strikte heteroerotische Orientierung des griechischen Liebesromans' (Effe 1987, 96). Against this general attitude Xen. introduces a good number of homosexual loves, as the following list proves:

- 1.14.7: Corymbus' love for Habrocomes;
- 3.2.2: Hippothous' love for Hyperanthes;
- 3.2.6: Aristomachus' love for Hyperanthes;
- 5.9.3, 5.13.6: Hippothous' love for Cleisthenes.

The existence of these four relationships seems to suggest that our author is interested in this topic and this hypothesis is further stressed by the fact that Char. instead completely ignores homosexuality (see again Effe 1987, 97: 'Homoerotisch-Päderastisches wird ganz ausgespart').

Given this originality, I would like to show how Xen. explores homosexuality through these examples. To begin with, as I will further discuss in the commentary (1.16.2, n.: λέγει, esp. e), Corymbus' love is described in parallel with both Euxinus' and Manto's heterosexual passions.[342] This particularly emerges in Euxinus' proposal, where, in Konstan's view 1994, 39, 'the model of marriage draws to itself and subtly informs the pederastic pattern'. Thus, in Xen.'s first presentation of homosexuality there is a sort of overlap with heterosexuality: Corymbus' love is uncivilised as that of every rival's love because of the performance of an active role: gender shift does not play a role here (LI 3.2a).

The second episode in which homosexuality is explored concerns Hippothous' account in the third book. In this case also Xen. addresses this topic in relationship to heterosexuality: his love story recalls that of the protagonists and this is confirmed by the fact that Habrocomes is close in age to Hippothous and that Hyperanthes' name recalls that of Anthia.[343] Given this starting comparison, I would argue that, at a deeper level, Hippothous' love-story shares a conception of love very similar to that of the protagonists.[344] This conclusion is suggested by the analysis of Xen.'s text: the brigand's love for Hyperanthes is genuine, as well as his desire to spend his whole life together with

---

[342] Se, on this, Konstan 1994, 37: 'this episode presents a homoerotic and heteroerotic passion in strictly parallel terms, emphasized by the fact that each lover pleads the case of the other'.

[343] See NA 3.4 on the didactic role played by this story and Morgan 1996, 175 on the issue of names. For more on the parallel between Habrocomes and Hippothous, NA 7.4b.

[344] I here take issue with Morgan 1997, 175 and Wanatabe 2003, 7, who, instead, argue that Hippothous' relationship with Hyperanthes is pederastic as that established by Aristomachus. In my opinion, intra-textuality within the story offers the best criterion for the interpretation of this problematic passage.

Hyperanthes. In addition, both lovers share the same feelings: φιλήματα καὶ ψαύσματα come from each of them (3.2.4) and also the former's plan to kill Aristomachus is something that the latter is aware of (3.2.10). Finally, Xen. clearly produces a contrast between this story and the pederastic courtship of Aristomachus, which appears to be a particular version of uncivilised love (LI 3).[345] The emphasis here is on the immorality of Aristomachus, who corrupts Hyperanthes' father to fulfill his erotic desire (3.2.7).

Overall, this framework suggests that Xen. is here doing something more than in Corymbus' case: he does not only ignore the gender differentiation, but he is also trying to include homosexuality in the ideal love which concerns the protagonists and, thus, in their search for symmetry. That said, the only reason why this attempt fails is the tragic outcome of Hippothous' story (3.3.2 and NA 1.2): thus far, homosexuality appears to differ in length from heterosexuality.

The reason why this sequence of passages is significant is that they confirm that Xen.'s exploration of homosexuality at the end of the novel belongs to a bigger picture and, thus, we might expect that Xen. will offer there his final assessment about this topic. If we again look at the relationship between Hippothous and Cleisthenes, this assumption becomes true. On the one hand, although Hippothous has lost Hyperanthes, the fact that he finds another boy, Cleisthenes, and starts a new relationship appears the first sign that homosexual love can also last, despite the change of the beloved (5.9.3). Then, the transformation of this love into adoption makes this relationship stable: this seems to suggest that Xen. has reconciled the main difference between heterosexuality and homosexuality. At the same time, however, the lack in Hippothous' relationship of that symmetry achieved by the protagonists marks a distinction, which goes in the opposite direction to Xen.'s previous attempt with Hippothous and Hyperanthes. In my opinion, with this issue the identification of heterosexuality and homosexuality shows its failure.

In conclusion, I would argue that our writer does his best to make his ideal of love universal and to open his society to all those who are interested in *eros,* included homosexuals. He might also eliminate real children and omits explicit references to marriage to facilitate this aim. Nevertheless, at the end, Xen. seems to conclude that the purest form of love, which focuses on fidelity and symmetry, can only be achieved by heterosexual couples: this is the final message of the novel.

6c) Xenophon's position on homosexuality in his literary contemporary context: a brave and original attempt

That said, within the Imperial literary context Xen.'s attempt at establishing a parallel between homosexuality and heterosexuality appears to be original and "brave". As I have already suggested, Xen.'s novelty already emerges in the novelistic corpus, in which only Ach. and Longus introduce homosexuality and neither of them makes a homosexual relationship last as a heterosexual one. As no other example comes from Imperial literature, I would conclude that Xen.'s final inclusion in Ephesus of the couple composed of Hippothous and Hyperanthes is really original.

---

[345] For this reason, Hunter 1997, 197 defines Aristomachus' love for Hyperanthes as 'a perverted form of classical pederasty'.

To begin with, in *Leucippe* there are two homosexual stories 'die eine ähnliche Funktion wie die Hippothoos-Erzählung bei Xenophon haben' (Effe 1987, 99): both Clinias' love for Charicles (1.7-1.14) and that of Menelaus (2.35) constitute parallel narratives to Clitophon's love story. This is evident in the first one:

a) Cleinias and Clitophon are affected by the same δουλεῖα (1.7.2).

b) Charicles is almost the same age as Cleinias, since there are only two years of difference (1.7.1); similarly, Clitophon is nineteen years old (1.3.3) and, thus, he should not be much older than Leucippe, whose age is unknown;

c) Charicles has to deal with a dangerous second love wanted by his father for an economic reason (1.7.4). Similarly, Clitophon's father wants to marry him Calligone, his step-sister (1.3.2).

Given these parallels, the only difference between these two stories lies in Charicles' unexpected death (1.12.2). This is interesting: Ach. manages to create a reciprocity between the homosexual lovers, but not to ascribe to them an identical duration. This makes Charicles' story even closer to Hippothous' one, opening the possibility of an influence of Xen. on Ach., which, however, is difficult to prove. That said, however, no evolution concerns the former in the progress of the novel: in its simplicity the second story of Menelaus confirms the sad destiny which is typical of the novelistic homosexual lovers and duration is the reason why heterosexuality is better than homosexuality. In addition, since Ach.'s initial proposal of symmetry in Charicles' story is no longer discussed, it lacks importance: Xen.'s consistent approach is missing in *Leucippe*.

This difference becomes greater in *Daphnis and Chloe*, where Longus adopts an ironical approach to homosexuality: his only homosexual lover Gnathon is 'a man of low station' (Konstan 1994, 29), whose immorality and lustfulness impedes any virtuous comparison with the protagonists' love. As a result, Longus does not use homosexuality to explore heterosexuality.

Finally, the Imperial literary context beyond the novels shows how Xen.'s discussion about gender and love was widespread in his contemporary world. Three sources are particularly interesting for that topic: the epigrams of the *Greek Anthology*, Plutarch's *Amatorius* and pseudo-Lucianus. Overall, short duration and asymmetry appear to be the main features of homosexuality.

To begin with, some Greek authors of epigrams, such as the Byzantine Eratosthenes Scholastichus and Agathias in AP. 5.277 and AP 5.278, focus on asymmetry as the difference between heterosexuality and homosexuality. Plutarch does the same in his *Amatorius* (770c: ἐκδέχεται μόνον ... οὐδὲν † πολιῶσα ἀκμάζων καὶ ῥυτίσιν, ἀλλ᾽ἄχρι τάφων καὶ μνημάτων παραμένει) and then he points out reciprocity as the difference between the two. Finally, in Pseudo-Lucian's *Amores*, although homosexuality wins the "battle" against heterosexuality, Charicles' defense of latter is based on the same topics. First, while the homosexual lovers are condemned to wither (21: τ δ' ἐν νεότητι παραμεῖναν ἄνθος εἰς γῆρας αὐτοὺς μαραίνειν πρόωρον), the pleasure of heterosexual love lasts longer (25: καὶ τό γε πρῶτον ἐγὼ πᾶσαν ἀπόλαυσιν ἡγοῦμαι τερπνοτέραν εἶναι τὴν χρονιωτέραν·). The second point again concerns reciprocity: Charicles makes this invitation to his rival: τί δ' οὐχὶ τῶν ἡδονῶν καὶ τὰς ἀντιπαθεῖς μεταδιωκτέον, ἐπειδὰν ἐξ ἴσου τοῖς διατιθεῖσιν οἱ πάσχοντες εὐφραίνωνται; (27).

In conclusion, it seems to me that Xen. was aware of the contemporary debate about love and gender and it is possible to read his valorisation of homosexuality as a personal contribution to this discussion.

7) Comparison with the other Greek novelists: Xenophon's ideal society of love

This final focus on an ideal of love, which includes Xen.'s attempt at universalising it, leads me to compare again his treatment of societies with the other novels. As in the first division, also this final model focuses on the protagonists and on love. At this stage, however, the parallel with Longus becomes more significant: Xen.'s proposal of a society of love, which constitutes a different kind of civilised society, is comparable to the former's choice to make the protagonists return to the countryside after the discovery of the life of the city (4.37). In Longus' case there is an utopia - the bucolic one - which takes priority over the ordinary world.[346] In our case, it is love which takes priority and an utopian feature can be ascribed also to Xen.'s construction.

At the same time, the comparison with Char., Ach. and Hld. confirms or strengthens the differences already apparent in the first part. This is particularly true with the first author: since the author of *Callirhoe* builds his novel 'as a journey from the centre to the periphery and back' (Morgan 2007d, 43), the Syracuse of the beginning of the novel is not different from that of the end, as the repetition of marriage has already shown (LI 2.4, b). In addition, at the end of the novel Chariton does not fail to address the political issue and to display Chaereas' military glory (8.6.10[347]) and that of his companions, who are officially granted citizenship as a reward (8.8.13). Finally, Chaereas tells the whole population his story (8.7.9-8.8.11), while in Xen. the protagonists' dedication to Artemis limits the knowledge of their adventures to the readers of the novel.

These differences show how Xen. is radical in his focus on love.

A different emphasis concerns also Hld., who at the end of the *Aethiopica* makes the protagonists' marriage a collective celebration which includes a public procession to Meroe (10.40.3). Further, the Ethiopian society plays the role of legitimising Theagenes' and Chariclea's love: this is more than what the Rhodians do with Anthia and Habrocomes (5.13.3). Only Ach. does not mention the whole population at the end of his text, as Clitophon briefly mentions his wedding (8.19.2) and that of his sister (8.19.3). However, this silence is part of general lack of interest of the narrator in depicting the social environment of Tyre and Byzantium and, thus, it lacks the shift which happens between the introduction and the end of the Eph..

As a result of this comparison, I would conclude that Xen.'s "society in love" in Ephesus has a deliberate focus on love which makes him more original than is usually thought.

---

[346] On the difficult interplay between the two worlds in Longus, see Morgan 2004, 15-16.

[347] This happens where the arrival of the ships in the harbour is described.

CHAPTER 6: XENOPHON AND HOMER

1) Introduction

Thus far, the intratextual analysis has demonstrated the two main threads of the Eph.: the uncontrollable power of Eros and the journey which is undertaken by the protagonists and makes them become mature lovers.

In this chapter I will demonstrate that both topics are introduced by Xen. with the help of the Homeric model: the *Odyssey* is the foundation of the second thread, while both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are used by Xen. to portray Eros as the only enemy of the protagonists. Overall, the way in which Xen. refers to Homer is twofold: he draws from him epic scenes and motifs and, at the same time, he makes his own style Homeric by creating expressions which resemble in the form and in the content those of his model.[348] The influence of the *Odyssey* on the Eph. is evidently greater than that of the *Iliad*: the former poem affects every level of Xen.'s narration, from the plot to the construction of scenes, characters and single expressions. For this reason, I would conclude that, rather than defining the *Odyssey* as the main intertext of this novel, it is more appropriate to see the Eph. as a paraphrasis in prose of the *Odyssey*. This conclusion leads us to revisit the traditional way in which novelistic intertextuality is conceived: Xen.'s lack of interest in direct allusions to Homer, which usually appears to be the sign of his scant literary knowledge, can be rather interpreted as the fruit of his different approach to the model: our author does not want to quote from the *Odyssey*, but to write his novel as an *Odyssey*. Since the same "technique" seems to concern Xen.'s exploitation of the *Symposium* (LI 7.3e), we are dealing with a new kind of intertextuality, which, in my opinion, constitutes an originality in the Greek novels (APP 2.1).

Finally, since the message of the Eph. is focused on love and not on war, this paraphrasis of the *Odyssey* is not literal, but has a peculiar erotic and moral focus, which seems to owe a partial debt to Imperial moral interpretations of Homer.

2) Xenophon and the *Odyssey*: structure and scenes

The presence of the *Odyssey* in Xen's mind is not surprising, since, as Graverini argues, the novelistic genre is an 'epica borghese',[349] in which three Homeric τόποι always occur:

1) the combination of love and adventure;

2) the reunion of the couple at the end;[350]

3) the importance of secondary narrators.

While each of these elements is part of the Eph., in this novel there is something more: the *Odyssey* lies at the core of the text. As I argued in the introduction (AIM), Apollo's oracle and the two nights

---

[348] This argument can be related to O'Sullivan's (1994) analysis of the style of the Eph., in which he demonstrates how Xen. uses many formulae and some repeated scenes. However, I will identify a smaller number of expressions, in which also the content is epic. See below, LI 6.4.

[349] Graverini 2006, 36.

[350] On this, see also Ruiz Montero 2003b, 347.

of love of the protagonists are the pillars of the structure of the novel and the Odyssean model underlies both.

2a) Apollo's oracle and Tiresias' prophecy

Apollo's oracle intertexts with the prophecy of Tiresias (1.6.2, n.: oracle, 4). This parallel, which is subtly introduced by Xen., helps him to reveal the strong proleptic value of the oracle: as the Odyssean adventures are foreshadowed by the Tiresias, Apollo's words foretell the main events of the plot of the Eph. Thus, Xen. seem to learn from Homer how to structure his text. In addition, the existence of this model opens two interesting possibilities.

The first is the identification between Poseidon and Eros: as the former's wrath, caused by Odysseus' murder of his son Polyphemus, is at the origin of Odysseus' misadventures, Eros' anger appears to be the responsible for all the trials that are listed in Xen.'s oracle. The discovery of this parallel clearly proves that our author is proposing an erotic reading of the *Odyssey*, in which love play the role of sea. At the same time, it offers a key to interpret the first passages of the Eph. in which Eros' anger is mentioned (cf. Xen. 1.2.1 and 1.4.5). The phrase used at the beginning of the second chapter - μῆνιᾶ [...] ὁ Ἔρως - , which immediately recalls the first line of the *Iliad* (see below, LI 6.5 and 1.2.1, n.), might subtly allude to the beginning of the Odyssean story: θεοὶ ἐλέαιρον ἅπαντες νόσφι Ποσειδάωνος· ὁ δ'ἀσπερχὲς μενέαινεν ἀντιθέῳ Ὀδυσῆϊ πάρος ἧν γαῖαν ἰκέσθαι (*Od*. 1.19-21). Given this initial link, I would speculate that Xen. might be using the parallel between Poseidon and Eros throughout the novel and this might shed further light on the debated issue of the "disappearance" of the latter in the novel, which occurs after the destruction of the protagonists' boat (LI 2.1). Since in the *Odyssey* Poseidon's anger is after not mentioned again after the destruction of the Phaeacian ship (*Od*. 13.164-5) and in the Eph. the boat, being Ephesian, is Phaeacian (LI 6.2c), this coincidence might be not casual, but the fruit of a subtle imitation produced by our author.[351]

Second, this Odyssean intertext might suggest that both Xen.'s divine response and the whole of the Eph. allude to an untold conclusion of the story in Egypt (1.6.2, n.: oracle, 6). As a result, through Homer our author would be testing the borders of the novelistic genre and giving an original metaliterary definition of his text: as the *Odyssey* consists of an endless repetition of journeys, the Eph. would be seen as a never-ending sequence of erotic adventures.

2b) The two Odyssean nights of Anthia and Habrocomes

The Odyssean colour of the two erotic nights of the novel is created in different ways. In the first episode Xen. uses the only *ekphrasis* of the novel, that of a Babylonian canopy, to portray the Odyssean love of Ares and Aphrodite as a double of the protagonists' passion (1.8.2-3, n.: the only *ekphrasis*). As I will demonstrate in the commentary, the introduction of this model creates a second metaliterary image of the Eph. as a Phaeacian tale, in which Xen. identifies himself with Homer.

---

[351] For similar re-elaboration of Poseidon's anger in Petronius, see Morgan 2009, who focuses on the Homeric origin of Priapus' wrath.

This definition also reflects the aim of the whole novel: the Phaeacian tales were intended to entertain their audience[352] and this function is certainly performed the Eph., being a novel.

Conversely, in the second night the epic model directly inspires the actions of Anthia and Habrocomes, who share their misadventures like Odysseus and Penelope in Ithaca (APP. 1.6). The reason why this Odyssean passage is significant is that it focuses on conjugal fidelity and, thus, it provides a contrast with Ares and Aphrodite's love, which was strongly used by Greek writers as a symbol for lustful and uncontrolled love. Since Xen. exploits this contrast in this text,[353] the Homeric nights support the *Entwicklung* of his erotic ideal. In addition, in both events the protagonists are the only characters of the novel who are aware of the Odyssean model: in the wedding night only Anthia and Habrocomes see the canopy and, thus, the moral teaching of the representation is addressed to them. Similarly, in the Rhodian night, they literally become Odysseus and Penelope. As a result, the *Odyssey* seems to be used also to support the nature of the Eph. as a *Bildungsroman*. This is not surprising, since in the Imperial Era this poem was a common source of παιδεῖα. That said, however, it is more unusual that the teachings of this text are transferred to the erotic sphere.

Further evidence for this identification between the *Bildung* of the Eph. and the *Odyssey* comes from Habrocomes' reaction to Aegialeus' story: in this passage, where the process of education is overtly revealed by Xen. (LI 5.4), Habrocomes defines himself as Odysseus (5.1.13: ἐγὼ δὲ πλανῶμαι μὲν κατὰ πᾶσαν γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν; LI 6.5). This suggests that he is aware of his Odyssean status and that his growth is an Odyssean journey. The same conclusion can be extended to Anthia because of some of her monologues in the fifth book (APP. 1.5).

2c) The Odyssean nature of the societies of the *Ephesiaca*

Along with the oracle and the two erotic nights, the *Odyssey* supports also Xen.'s establishment of the civilised and uncivilised societies and of the final one: the first is compared with Scheria, the second with the imaginary world of the Phaeacian tales and the third with Ithaca.

The link between Ephesus and Scheria is clearly established by the parallel between Anthia and Nausicaa (1.2., n.: intr.) and by presence of the canopy (1.8.2-3, n.: the only *ekphrasis*, 1-2). Then, this pattern affects the Rhodes of the first book, which is an Ephesus in miniature: the motif of the protagonists' divine visit echoes Alcinous' interpretation of Odysseus' arrival at Scheria (1.12.1, n.: ἐπιδημίαν). Overall, this comparison suggests an interesting feature of the civilised society, which is its ideal nature. Since Scheria does not know human tensions and wars (Od. 6.270), it constitutes a happy and utopian society and this fits well the atemporal frame of the beginning of the Eph. (1.1.1, n.: ἦν). A second feature suggested by Scheria is wealth and prosperity, as the splendour of Alcinous' palace proves (see Od. 7.84-97) and this trait is part of the representation of the first Ephesus, as Habrocomes' origin and canopy show (1.1.1, n.: ἀνὴρ).

---

[352] See Plut. *Mor.* 1093c on this: τίς δ' ἂν φάγοι πεινῶν καὶ πίοι διψῶν τὰ Φαιάκων ἥδιον ἢ διέλθοι τὸν Ὀδυσσέως ἀπόλογον τῆς πλάνης;.

[353] For his awareness of the interpretation of Ares and Aphrodite's love, see LI 6.6 and 1.8.2-3, n.: the only *ekphrasis*, 3b.

Conversely, the Rhodes and Ephesus of the fifth book are associated with Ithaca. The former becomes Ithaca because it houses the final dialogue of the poem, while the latter is already identified with Odysseus' homeland in Eudoxus' episode (APP 1.2). Since in the *Odyssey* Ithaca, unlike Scheria, is considered as a real πόλις, which is dominated by tensions between its inhabitants, Xen. seems to emphasise Homer to stress the realism of his final society in love. This becomes particularly true in Ephesus, where the Odyssean model becomes stronger: as Odysseus, after his reunion with Anthia, goes to visit Laertes in order to re-establish his οἶκος, Anthia and Habrocomes do exactly the same in the last chapter of the novel (LI 5.7), as they make sacrifices to Artemis, build graves for their parents and invite two other couples to build two new families. As a result, the entire novel appears to be a journey from Scheria to Ithaca: this pattern is is another confirmation that Homer is used by Xen. to construct the *Entwicklung* of his novel. That said, Xen. seems here to deviate from the *Odyssey*: although his final Rhodes and Ephesus appear more realistic than the first ones, their focus on love maintain an idealistic and utopian hint. As a result, here Xen.'s approach to Homer appears to be subtle.

Finally, the uncivilised society contains episodes which resemble those of the Odyssean νόστος. As in Hld., 'the reader's recognition of the Homeric hypotext activates a whole series of meaningful resonances':[354]

Table 2.1: The correspondences between scenes of the *Ephesiaca* and Odyssean episodes

Episodes of the *Ephesiaca*	**Episodes of the *Odyssey***	**Link for the demonstration**
first part of the Corymbus episode	episode of the Oxen of the Sun	1.12.3-1.14.1, n.: an Odyssean interpretation
second part of the Corymbus episode	Calypso's meeting with Odysseus	1.16.4-5, n.: εὐδαιμοσύνην
Manto episode	corrupted version of the Nausicaa episode	APP 1.1
Perilaus episode	corrupted version of the Nausicaa episode	APP 1.2
Cyno episode	- Circe episode - Clytemnestra's murder of Agamemnon	- APP 1.7 - APP 1.8

---

[354] Morgan 2009, 35.

Episodes of the *Ephesiaca*	Episodes of the *Odyssey*	Link for the demonstration
Anthia in the ditch with Amphinomus	- Odysseus' visit to Hades through the indirect allusion to Cerberus; - meeting between Odysseus and Amphinomous, the good suitor of the Odyssey.	- APP 1.9 - APP. 1.9
Habrocomes in the quarry	Polyphemus in the quarry	APP 1.10
Anthia in the brothel	Circe episode.	APP 1.11

To begin with, this high number of correspondences gives a strong support to my interpretation of the Eph. as a paraphrasis in prose of the *Odyssey*: almost every single episode of the protagonists' journey appears to be a rewriting of the poem. More precisely, the uncivilised society of the novel seems to follow a pattern of foreignness which is similar to that of the *Odyssey*: Xen.'s focus on brigands (LI 1.3) seems to recall the kind of enemies whom Odysseus encounters, which are not part of his world because of their violence (*Od.* 9.141). That said, there is an interesting difference which requires interpretation: some characters of the Odyssey, unlike those of the novels, belong to an imaginary world.

On further inspection, this deviation appears to be very interesting, because Xen. transforms his models following a consistent pattern, according to which the Odyssean supernatural figures or places become human beings or spaces:

- the sin against the Oxen of the Sun >> the drunkenness of the protagonists' sailors;
- the monster Scylla and the Nymph Calypso >> the pirate Corymbus;
- Circe >> Cyno;
- the Underworld >> ditch;
- Polyphemus' cave >> quarry;
- Circe's palace >> brothel.

Overall, this "operation" made by Xen. seems to follow two criteria. The first depends on the genre: since the novel must avoid the imaginary world, Xen. creates realistic representation. The second is a moral and erotic concern, which transforms all the Odyssean suitors, who are not always erotic characters in the poem, into immoderate rivals in love in the Eph. This fact is very important, because it confirms the definition of the protagonists' journey as an erotic *Odyssey*. In addition, the appearance of Polyphemus and Circe towards the end of the novel is significant too, since these episodes are the most dangerous for Odysseus and his companions. Thus, the progression itself of the trials of the Eph. has a Homeric debt.

Finally, this kind of transformation is not original of our author, but it was typical of a particular kind of Homeric interpretation, the rationalistic one, where Homeric figures such as Scylla, Calypso and Circe were no longer considered as supernatural creatures, but were compared to courtesans. As

a result, our author seems to show here his interest in contemporary interpretations of Homer (for more, see below, LI 6.6). Finally, this human presentation of supernatural epic characters inevitably generates an ironical effect, which seems to provide that amusement which confirms the definition of the novel as a Phaecian tale.

2d) Two subtler exploitations of the *Odyssey* in the first book of the *Ephesiaca*: a "touristic" interpretation and a "comic" interpretation

While the influence of the *Odyssey* on the structure is so strong that affects the entire novel, in the first book our author seems to introduce two minor different reading of the Homeric poem. Interestingly, in both cases the aim of the author appears the same as before: supporting the nature of the novel as a *Bildungsroman*.

1) The "touristic" reading of the Odyssey
The coincidence between the protagonists' journey and the *Odyssey* is not immediately apparent: as I will later argue, the protagonists' parents seem to interpret their children's journey as a touristic *Odyssey* (1.10.3, n.: ὡς οἷόν τε), in which the νοῦς which is typical of Odysseus is not involved (cf., by contrast, *Od*. 1.3: πολλῶν δ᾽ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω).
Interestingly, when Anthia and Habrocomes visit Rhodes, their behaviour seems to indicate that they have taken seriously their parents' view: the city is introduced as a νῆσος μεγάλη καὶ καλή (1.11.6, n.) and the protagonists ἐξιστόρησαν the city (1.12.2, n.) and then leave it without being affected in their character and reactions.

2) The comic reading of the Odyssey
Although these two passages create the expectation that Anthia and Habrocomes might have a pleasant and easy journey, the pirates' attack eliminates this possibility, as real misadventures and hardships enter the protagonists' life. The plot itself, with its focus on the cruelty of Corymbus' and Euxinus' action, introduces this shift and leads us to think that a different kind of *Odyssey* has begun.
On further examination, Xen. also seems to suggest this with a new approach to his model. Shortly after the protagonists' departure from Ephesus, we find a number of details which come from Homeric descriptions of navigation. This pattern begins in the departure scene, in which there is an echo of Telemachus leaving Ithaca, and continues in the description of the ship and of its different manoeuvres (1.10.8, n.: καὶ ἐλύετο). A case in point is the depiction of the Phoenician pirates, which is quite close to those made by Odysseus in his false tales (1.13, n.: intr.). Since in the first part of the book only the imaginary *Odyssey* is echoed, I would conclude that in the second part Xen. deliberately focuses on the realistic *Odyssey* to portray the beginning of the journey. As a result, Homer is also used to underline that the hardship of the protagonists has begun.

3) **Xenophon and the _Odyssey_: interplay with the protagonists**

3a) Xenophon's interplay with Homeric characters

Along with this structural role, Xen. exploits the _Odyssey_ also for the construction of his protagonists: he introduces the generic connection of Anthia and Habrocomes with Penelope and Odysseus and, more subtly, he associates Anthia with other Homeric characters. This web of associations enriches the _Bildung_ of the protagonists, with a special focus on the heroine.

To begin with, Anthia plays three different Homeric roles in the novel: at the beginning she is associated with Nausicaa, then in the Perilaus episode she is compared to both Arete and Penelope and the parallel with Penelope continues until the end of the novel. This pattern is not invented by Xen., because he follows a progression which is already present in the _Odyssey_, according to which 'each new protagonist [...] becomes an alter ego or "mirror" of the main protagonist'.[355] Conversely, Habrocomes is compared only to Odysseus: no trace of Telemachus, who is his natural alter ego in the Homeric poem, is detectable in the novel.

While in APP I will further explore the individual comparisons (see APP 1.3-5), I would like to emphasise here that this interplay with Homeric characters follows the moral development of the Eph. This is particularly true with Anthia, whose personality is completely identified with Homeric figures. First, in Ephesus her status as a young virgin in love makes her a Nausicaa who tries to hide and controls her unchaste desires. Then, in Tarsus, she becomes Arete and Penelope when she begins to know the importance of fidelity and this gives her the possibility of defending this virtue from the attack of her enemies. As I argued in LI 4.2c, this attitude becomes evident in the fifth book, when Anthia's association with both Penelope and Odysseus becomes evident. Part of this construction is also the introduction of Cyno as a double of Clytemnestra (APP 1.8), since in the _Odyssey_ this heroine is symbol of infidelity in marriage and, thus, an anti-Penelope.

Similarly, the parallel between Habrocomes and Odysseus is important, because the latter's νόστος is the model of the former's pursuit of Anthia and, thus, the Odyssean hero supports the _Bildung_ of Habrocomes. The nature of this association focuses on love: Habrocomes is essentially Odysseus the lover. That said, this parallel seems to lose importance in the fifth book, where Habrocomes lacks Odysseus' courage (APP 1.4): this leaves the space to Anthia to become another Odysseus (APP 1.5) and this transformation places further emphasis on her role of Penelope. As a result, this framework proves that the _Odyssey_ lies at the core of the erotic ideal of the novel: both Anthia and Habrocomes' σωφροσύνη is compared to that of Odysseus and Penelope and Anthia's ἀνδρεῖα is a mix of the abilities of the two Homeric characters.

Finally, the importance of the Odyssean fidelity in the Eph. seems to be suggested also by Apollo's oracle, in which ἀνήνυτα ἔργα establishes an identification between the entire journey of the novel and Penelope's toils, rather than with Odysseus' misadventures (1.6.2, n.: oracle, 4). Similarly, in the final dialogue in Rhodes, Xen. places a clear emphasis on Anthia as the ideal wife: this means that Penelope's fight for chastity lies at the origin of the Eph. more than the glorious and varied

---

[355] Svenden 1983, 24; on Nausicaa as a 'paradigm for Penelope', see Van Nortwich 1979, 270.

adventure of Odysseus (APP 1.6). This leads us to a significant conclusion: this focus on Penelope appears to lie at the heart of Xen.'s erotic reading of the *Odyssey*. The ancient epic heroism is substituted by a new heroism, which is exclusively based on love and fidelity. For this reason, the Eph. assumes the status of an epic novel.

3b) The "traditional" origin of this interplay with Homeric characters

Given this rich framework, it becomes interesting to investigate whether Xen.'s approach to Penelope has a particular origin. Overall, her exploitation as a symbol of conjugal fidelity was so widespread in the Greek world that every reader of Homer would have recognised it. Evidence for this is given by Plutarch, who in his *Moralia* states: Φιλόπλουτος ἡ Ἑλένη, φιλήδονος ὁ Πάρις· φρόνιμος ὁ Ὀδυσσεύς, σώφρων ἡ Πηνελόπη (*Mor.* 140f; for more, see APP 3.2). As a result, the only avenue for finding a more specific answer lies in Xen.'s knowledge of the Ephesian statue of Penelope, which is possible but not certain (GI 3.6). The same impression of dealing with a universal reading is suggested by Xen.'s introduction of Arete and Odysseus the lover: while the former's link with marriage is also attested by late epigrams (APP 3.1), the erotic characterisation of Odysseus is evident in erotic literature (APP 2) and in the common interpretations of Homer.[356]

Conversely, the presence of Nausicaa deserves special attention: Xen.'s interplay between Anthia's chastity and her desire for wantonness in Ephesus seems to go beyond the Homeric construction of the heroine and to follow the moral interpreters of Homer (1.2, n.: intr., 3).

4) Xenophon and the *Odyssey*: style

A last feature in which our author seems to imitate Homer is language. Along with the important intertext which is constituted by παραπομπή (3.5.8, APP. 1.2), Xen. employs a series of expressions whose style and content appear to be epic.

The presence of "epic formulae" in the Eph. was first discussed by Hunter 2008, 690: when Xen. describes the final dedication of the inscription to Artemis and uses the words ἀνέθεσαν πάντων ὅσα τε ἔπαθον καὶ ὅσα ἔδρασαν, the scholar adds this comment: 'it is tempting to believe that when Xenophon of Ephesus' characters set up at the end of the *Ephesiaka* a *graphe* πάντων ὅσα τε ἔπαθον καὶ ὅσα ἔδρασαν ("of all they had suffered and done"), the epic heritage of the novel resonates strongly'.

On further inspection, I believe that there are more examples like this in the novel:

- 1.6.2: δεινὰ πάθη (oracle, 4, n.); this expression seems to be an echo of the prologue of the *Odyssey*, where Odysseus is the man who πολλὰ δ' ὅ γ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα (*Od.* 1.4);

- 1.10.3: ἤμελλόν τε γὰρ ἄλλην ὄψεσθαι γῆν καὶ ἄλλας πόλεις (the second interpretation of the oracle given by protagonists' parents, 1.10.3: ὡς οἷόν τε, n.); this long sentence appears to be related to the previous verse of the same prologue: πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα (*Od.* 1.3);

- 1.10.10: ὁδὸν δυστυχῆ μὲν ἀλλ' ἀναγκαίαν (Megamedes' definition of the protagonists' journey, n.);

---

[356] See e.g. Pseudo-Plutarch, 185, who states that Homer ἀνδρὸς δὲ πόθον τῆς αὐτοῦ γυναικὸς ἐν τῷ Ὀδυσσεῖ παρίστησιν). For more on the Homeric interpretations, see below LI 6.6.

- 2.8.2 : πλανώμενον κατὰ πᾶσαν γῆν καὶ θάλατταν (Lycomedes' arrival to free Habrocomes from prison in his second dream, LI 4.5b);
- 2.8.2: ἐπὶ πολλὴν φέρεσθαι γῆν (Habrocomes' search for a mare in the last part of the dream, LI 4.5b);
- 4.3.6: ἥτις τε εἴη καὶ πόθεν (questions about Anthia's identity; cf. also 5.4.4, where the same formula is adopted when Polyidus is involved in the same task);
- 5.1.13: ἐγὼ δὲ πλανῶμαι μὲν κατὰ πᾶσαν γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν (Habrocomes' self-definition in his reaction to Aegialeus' story);
- 5.9.7: πέπονθα μέν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ πολλά [....] καὶ δεινά [...]. 5.9.8: διαβόητα μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἔνδοξα πεπόνθαμεν [...] (Anthia's self-presentation to Hippothous);
- 5.14.1: ἀπείληφα σε πολλὴν γῆν πλανηθεῖσα καὶ θάλασσαν (Anthia's self-definition at the beginning of the final dialogue of the novel).

Since most of these expressions belong to direct speeches and, more precisely, three are self-definitions of the protagonists, they seem to be emphasised by Xen. In addition, they occur at both the beginning and at the end of the novel. As a result, I would suggest that Xen. is aiming to create a sort of Odyssean vocabulary in his text to increase his debt to his poem. In this respect, the fact that in the first two formulae the connection with the *Odyssey* is closer than in the following ones might be the sign that Xen. is giving a foundation to this pattern.

5) Xenophon and the *Iliad*: a less articulated relationship
Unlike that of the *Odyssey*, the presence of the *Iliad* in the novel is less consistent: it seems to begin at the beginning of the second chapter, where Eros's anger may be compared to that of Achilles (1.2.1, n.: μηνιᾷ), and then is recalled in the expression πῦρ αἴδηλον of the oracle (1.6.2, n.: oracle, 3) and during Corymbus' attack (1.14.1, n.: ἐνέπρησε). In this episode, the formula ἐνέπρησε τὴν ναῦν is an Iliadic allusion and the whole action of the pirates is presented as an epic enterprise.
Overall, since Corymbus' action is not only warlike but also erotic, the *Iliad* appears to be subjected like the *Odyssey* to an erotic interpretation: like Achilles' anger, also Corymbus' fire can also be a symbol of the dangerous action of Eros and this idea is supported by the identification between Corymbus and the god which is made by Euxinus in his speech (1.16.2, n.: λέγει). As a result, the typical motif of Eros as a warrior has an Iliadic colour in the Eph.
That being said, it is more difficult to find further uses of this model. Certainly, in the episode of the pirates the inclusion of epic motifs makes the scene more serious and this interacts with the twofold use of the *Odyssey*: it supports the moral side by making this fight more challenging for the protagonists, as well as the comic and entertaining side, since pirates do not deserve the status as heroes.
On the other hand, it is less clear how far Xen. wants to interplay with the Iliadic characters. In my opinion, unlike the Odyssean characters, Iliadic figures neither are consistent models of those of the Eph. nor enrich the personality of the protagonists. Only brief parallels seem to appear in the second part of the first book and we cannot be sure whether all the readers were able to detect them.

First, the comparison between Corymbus and Hector when the Ephesian ship burns in fire might emphasise the barbaric and hostile nature of the former. Shortly after, Euxinus' invitation to Corymbus to search for an erotic γέρας suggests an identification between the latter and Achilles, which would fit well into the initial comparison between Corymbus and Eros (1.16.2, n.: λέγει). That being said, the first association does not seem to be taken further, since Habrocomes is not Achilles. This uncertainty confirms that the main purpose of using the *Iliad* is to support the traditional motif of the *militia amoris*.

This conclusion is significant: since Eros the warrior in the Eph. is compared in the oracle with the Odyssean Poseidon, it seems to me that the *Iliad* is used by Xen. to support the interplay with the *Odyssey* and not as an independent intertext.

6) <u>**The moral interpretations of Homer: allegories and rationalisation**</u>

Throughout the analysis of Xen.'s approach to the *Odyssey* I have been showing how his moral reading of this poem seems to share elements with traditional interpretations of Homer. This possibility has emerged particularly in relation to Ares and Aphrodite's love, the transformation of supernatural characters into humans and the parallel between Anthia and Nausicaa. While in the commentary and in <u>APP</u> 1 I will explore the individual connections further, I would like to provide a little background to these interpretations, in order to demonstrate the likelihood that Xen. was aware of them and the difficulty in establishing this with certainty, because of their popularity.

Overall, two different approaches to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* share a moral concern: while the allegorical interpreters argue that 'alle origini del mito c'è una verità di tipo etico espressa simbolicamente',[357] for the historic-rationalistic interpreters 'a monte del mito c'è una storia che poi ha assunto connotati fantastici'.[358] As a result, while the first ancient scholars focus on the existence of moral values which are incarnated in the *Odyssey*, the second humanise the divine creatures and identify human events at the origin of the mythical accounts.

Although we are dealing here with two different theories, in the Imperial Era it was common to find overlaps between the two: as I will shortly show, only at their origin were they separated, but then they progressively intermingled with each other. On the one hand, the allegorical interpretation, with a focus on ethics, probably begun in the sixth century BC with Theagenes from Rhegium and then had an important diffusion in Sophistic Athens, where the first scholars defended Homer from Xenophanes' criticism. Within this context, a positive evaluation of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* is ascribed to the sophist Antisthenes, who was probably followed by Alcidamas. Afterwards, every important philosophical school dedicated part of its doctrine to Homer. Since this study always had an interaction with the world of the schools and with the reflection of other writers, it progressively gave birth to a sort of collective moral interpretation of the epic poems, which is clearly established in the Imperial Era.

---

[357] Ramelli 2004, 205.

[358] Ibid.

Great evidence for this is given by several writers, who offer many insights into this tradition: the most famous are Heraclitus with his *Homeric Allegories*, Plutarch with *How a young man should read poetry* and Pseudo-Plutarch with *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer*. In addition, Maximus Tyrius in some of his orations and Athenaeus in his *Deipnosophistae* often discuss passages from the Homeric poems, as scholiasts. While the destination of Heraclitus' work is unclear, all the others belong to the world of the Greek school of rhetoric: Pseudo-Plutarch's treatise 'had its origins in the classrooms'[359] and Plutarch's dialogue targeted students of a slightly higher level of education.[360] In addition, this second work offers the significant image of how active and critical the readers of the Homeric poems were supposed to be: Plutarch argues that δεῖ δὲ μὴ δειλῶς μηδ' ὥσπερ ὑπὸ δεισιδαιμονίας ἐν ἱερῷ φρίττειν ἅπαντα καὶ προσκυνεῖν, ἀλλὰ θαρραλέως ἐθιζόμενον ἐπιφωνεῖν μηδὲν ἧττον τοῦ "ὀρθῶς" καὶ "πρεπόντως" τὸ "οὐκ ὀρθῶς" καὶ "οὐ προσηκόντως".[361] In addition, Plutarch reveals how common it was for ancient readers to adopt a moral approach. Finally, both Maximus Tyrius' and Athenaeus' text contain material of popular knowledge: thus, their connection with the world of rhetoric is very plausible.

Overall, this framework makes it very possible that Xen. was aware of these interpretations, although no definite proof is available.

On the other hand, the rationalistic approach, which might be inspired by Aristotle, concerns Palaephatus, Heraclitus, an anonymous writer of *On incredible things* and Conon. Although these authors are not famous, in the Imperial Era this kind of interpretation is widespread in different kinds of texts: a case in point is Heraclitus' *Homeric Allegories*, who introduces hints of this theory. In addition, Palaephatus lived in the second century BC, but his work was quite widely known in the Imperial literary context. As a result, the hypothesis of Xen.'s acquaintance with this second tradition is also plausible. In addition, since his reference to it involves more than one episode of the Eph., his knowledge of the rationalistic theory seems to be more explicit than that of the allegorical one.

---

[359] Lamberton 2002, 187.

[360] Hunter 2009, 169: 'Plutarch's concern is no less than *paideia*'.

[361] *Mor*. 26b.

CHAPTER 7: XENOPHON AND PLATO

After Homer, the most important model of the Eph., Xen. introduces some intertextual allusions to Plato and, specifically, to his *Phaedrus*, *Symposium* and *Lysis*. Although some of them have already been mentioned in the discussion of the first steps of the protagonists' love (LI 2.3-4), I will here discuss them further to demonstrate the breadth of Xen.'s approach to Plato. Overall, the connections between these two authors make it plausible that the latter is not only used by the former to support the construction of lovesickness and the wedding night, but his influence also concerns some topics which have emerged as part of the *Bildung* and the *Entwicklung* of the Eph.

In order to achieve this aim, I will also address an issue of readership: unlike the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the inclusion of Xen. in Plato's readership is less evident and must be proved.

1) <u>Intertextual connections with Plato: review</u>

- 1.1.3: προσεῖχον δὲ ὡς θεῷ: "worship of the beloved as a god": cf. θύοι ἂν ὡς ἀγάλματι καὶ θεῷ τοῖς παιδικοῖς **(***Phdr.* 251a).

- 1.1.4: ἐφρόνει: "the proud lover": cf. ἅμα οἱ καλοί, ἐπειδάν τις αὐτοὺς ἐπαινῇ καὶ αὔχῃ φρονήματος ἐμπίπλανται καὶ μεγαλαυχίας· (*Ly.* 206a).

- 1.1.6: ὅπου γὰρ Ἀβροκόμης ὀφθείη, οὔτε ἄγαλμα κατεφαίνετο οὔτε εἰκὼν ἐπῇνεῖτο "comparison of the beloved with a statue: cf. θύοι ἂν ὡς ἀγάλματι καὶ θεῷ τοῖς παιδικοῖς (*Phdr.* 251a).

- 1.2.1: δυσάλωτος: "the impregnable lover": cf. Οὐκοῦν ὅσῳ ἂν μεγαλαυχότεροι ὦσιν, δυσαλωτότεροι γίγνονται (*Ly.* 206a).

- 1.2.6: pun on φαιδροὶ;

- 1.2.8: πάντες ἰδόντες Ἀβροκόμην ἐκείνων ἐπελάθοντο [....], ἔτρεψαν δὲ τὰς ὄψεις ἐπ᾽αὐτὸν βοῶντες ἀπὸ τῆς θέας ἐκπεπληγμένοι [...]: "the priority of Habrocomes' beauty over that of the others": cf. οὕτως ἐκπεπληγμένοι τε καὶ τεθορυβημένοι ἦσαν, ἡνίκ᾽εἰσήει [...] οὐδεὶς ἄλλοσ᾽ἔβλεπεν αὐτῶν, οὐδ᾽ὅστις σμικρότατος ἦν (*Chrm.* 154c).

- 1.3.2: τὸ Ἀβροκόμου κάλλος εἰσρέον δεχομένη: "the flow of beauty": cf. δεξάμενος γὰρ τοῦ κάλλους τὴν ἀπορροὴν διὰ τῶν ὀμμάτων (*Phdr.* 251b and ἔρως δὲ [ἐκαλεῖτο], ὅτι ἐσρεῖ ἔξωθεν καὶ οὐκ οἰκεία ἐστὶν ἡ ῥοὴ αὕτη τῷ ἔχοντι, αλλ᾽ἐπείσκτος διὰ τῶν ὀμμάτων (*Cra.* 420b).

- 1.4.4: ὠδύνα and 1.4.6: ὀδυνῶμαι: "love as a disease": cf. ὅταν δὲ χωρὶς γένηται καὶ αὐχμήσῃ [...], ἡ ψυχὴ οἰστρᾷ καὶ ὀδυνᾶται (*Phdr.* 251d).

- 1.4.6: ἐφ᾽ Ἁβροκόμῃ μαίνομαι: "the lover's madness": ταύτης μετέχων τῆς μανίας ὁ ἐρῶν τῶν καλῶν ἐραστὴς καλεῖται (*Phdr.* 249e).

- 1.4.7: τί τὸ πέρας τοῦ κακοῦ;: "love as evil": cf. ὅταν μηδὲν ᾖ πέρας κακοῦ (*Phdr.* 254b2).

- 1.5.1: Τὰς εἰκόνας ἐπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀλλήλων ἀναπλάττοντες: "obsessive presence of the beloved's image": εἰκόνα πλάσαντες τῆς ψυχῆς λόγῳ (*R.* 588b10) and Περίπλασον δὴ αὐτοῖς ἔξωθεν ἑνὸς εἰκόνα (ibid., 588d10). Pun on ἀναπλάττω.

- 1.8.3: Ἔρως αὐτὸν ὡδήγει: οὐ γὰρ ἔχει Ἔρωτα Ἄρης, ἀλλ᾽ Ἔρως Ἄρη - Ἀφροδίτης, ὡς λόγος [...] (*Symp.* 196d).

- 1.9.5: συμφύντες ἀλλήλοις ἀναμιγῶμεν: "union of love": cf. περιβάλλοντες τὰς χεῖρας καὶ συμπλεκόμενοι ἀλλήλοις, ἐπιθυμοῦντες συμφῦναι (*Symp.* 191a).

- 1.9.7: ἐνθέντες τῇ ἐμῇ κέντρον ψυχῇ: "the goad of love": see πόθου κέντρων ὑποπλησθῇ (*Phdr.* 253e6-254a1).

- 5.13.3: τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐβούλοντο αἱ ψυχαί: "the real desire of the souls": cf. ἄλλο τι βουλομένη ἑκατέρου ἡ ψυχὴ δήλη ἐστίν (*Symp.* 192c-d)

- 5.13.5: παρεξέτεινόν τε ἐπὶ πολὺ τὸ συμπόσιον: pun on *Symposium*.

2) Xenophon, Platonic intertexts and readership

To begin with, this web of passages suggests that Xen. was intertexting with the *Phaedrus*: this is not surprising since this dialogue was commonly read in Imperial schools and by Imperial literati.[362] In addition, the discovered allusions focus on the same three chapters of the *Phaedrus* which are dedicated to the erotic μανία and to the lover's welcome of the beauty of the beloved. This concentration makes it more plausible that Xen. was reading this part of the Platonic text. This hypothesis is also supported by the fact that one of the puns of the novel concerns the title of this dialogue (1.2.6 n.: ὀφθαλμοί, e).[363]

A similar conclusion can be extended to Xen.'s relationship with the *Symposium*: although the number of references to this dialogue in the Eph. is smaller, the *Symposium* had the same popularity

---

[362] On the *Phaedrus* as 'the most widely read Platonic dialogue' in the Imperial Era, see e.g. Herrmann 2007, 209.

[363] See ibid. also for the value of puns on Plato.

as the *Phaedrus* in the Imperial era.[364] In addition, Xen.'s final introduction of a pun on τὸ συμπόσιον (5.13.5) appears a possible reminder of this dialogue. As a result, Xen. seems to refer to both Plato's erotic dialogues and it is significant that these allusions are well distributed in the whole text: they start at the beginning with the setting of the novel and then are concentrated at crucial junctures in the plot, such as the presentation of both characters, the religious procession, the falling in love, the development of the erotic passion, the consummation of love, and the final recognition: this supports the idea that Xen. is deliberately exploiting these models and I will shortly explore this topic.

On the other hand, Xen.'s debt to the *Lysis*, the *Charmides,* the *Cratylus* and the *Republic* is more problematic, because these dialogues were not commonly read by erotic writers. As I will show in the commentary (1.3.2, n.: ἀναπεπταμένοι and 1.5.1, n.: τὰς εἰκόνας), it is not unlikely that the passages from the last two dialogues were circulating independently from the original texts in the Imperial Era and this makes it plausible that Xen. was using them as an indirect source. Conversely, the cases of the *Lysis* and of the *Charmides* need to be explored, since these dialogues were not part of a common background. Overall, their reception in the Imperial Era is more difficult to assess: first, 'their aporetic structure and the lack in them of any clear doctrinal statements in general was a considerable impediment to them being studied seriously by later Platonists - and hence a ticket to relative obscurity' (Tarrant 2000, 102[365]). The Platonic handbook, however, which is attributed to the Middle Platonist philosopher Alcinous, contains an echo of the *Lysis*: in the chapter about 'friendship and love' (33.4), we find that the person who tries to gain the object of his love is not going to reach it by θρύπτων οὐδ'ἐπαινῶν τὰ παιδικά. In his edition of this text Dillon 1993, 204 adds the following comment: 'certainly the point about not spoiling the beloved [...] seems to owe much to *Lysis* 205b-206b, where Socrates is instructing Hippothales in how not to approach his beloved'. In the same text, scholars suggest two other possible references to our works: the expression ὀξύτης διανοίας, which states the purpose of mathematics as 'the sharpening of the intellect' (7.2), although is plainly based on *Republic* 525d, might be borrowed from *Charmides* 160a, where ἡ ἀγχίνοια is described as ὀξύτης [...] τῆς ψυχῆς (see Dillon 1993, 86). Finally, the thesis that there is a neutral mean between the states of virtue and vice (30.2) 'can appeal to the authority of Plato in *Phaedo* 90a and *Lysis* 216d' (ibid., 184). In addition, *Charmides* is recalled by Hermogenes in his work *On forms of Style* (2.6), where 175a is considered as an example of ἐπιείκεια, as οὐκ ὀλίγα παρὰ τῷ Πλάτωνι, ἔνθα ἂν ὁ Σωκράτης ἔχῃ τι λέγειν περὶ αὐτοῦ.[366] Finally, in the late *Prolegomena philosophiae Platonica*, which dates to the sixth century AD, *Lysis*, *Euthydemus* and *Charmides* are mentioned together as Platonic dialogues which, in the sceptic view of the Platonic Academy, 'contain many examinations of both sides of an issue' (Tarrant 2000, 11).

---

[364] See Tarrant 2000, 201, who underlines how both dialogues 'were extremely popular, having a wide appeal among the literate classes.

[365] For these reasons, Dillon 1996² does not mention them in his index to *The Middle Platonists*.

[366] Cf. on this De Lacy 1974, 8, and Rutherford 1997, 49, n. 43.

Overall, this catalogue of passages does not provide strong evidence that *Charmides* and *Lysis* were read in the Imperial Era. In addition, the people who read this kind of Platonic manuals were mostly philosophers and, thus, these witnesses could be unknown to Xen. That said, however, the most significant link in the Eph. concerns a passage from the beginning of the *Lysis* and the hypothesis that at least this section of the dialogue was known by our author is more plausible. As Plutarch argues,[367] the openings of Platonic dramatic dialogues were orally performed in the Imperial Era and, thus, they were known by enlarged audiences. Since the *incipit* of the *Lysis* does not contain philosophical issues, but it simply describes an erotic and theatrical scene, it might fit into this group.

For this reason, I would accept the possibility that Xen. knew this Platonic piece and, therefore, his motifs of "the proud lover", "the impregnable lover" and "the priority of Habrocomes' beauty" might be borrowed from this work. Conversely, I am more sceptical about Xen.'s relationship with the *Charmides*, also because the word which our author would be drawing from this dialogue is very common in Greek literature.

3) The Platonic foundation of the symmetry achieved by Anthia and Habrocomes

3a) Initial asymmetry

Having established a connection between Xen. and Plato, I would like to demonstrate that the latter lies at the core of the relationship of the former's protagonists. As I argued in LI 2.1, Habrocomes' presentation as an ἐρώμενος is shaped through the exploitation of Platonic models. This is especially proved by the plausible comparison with the *Lysis*, which is established by δυσάλωτος (1.2.1, n.), but other signs of Xen.'s debt to Plato are Habrocomes' definition of καλόσκαὶαγαθός (1.1.2, n.: οὗτος), his being worshipped as a god (1.1.3, n.: προσεῖχον) and as a statue (1.1.6: οὔτε ἄγαλμα) and his arrogance because of the praise he receives from the Ephesians (1.1.4: ἐφρόνει, n.). In addition, the Platonic model underlies Anthia's active reaction to love. Among the motifs focused on her in the falling in love scene, a key role is certainly played by the themes of the reception of the flow of beauty (1.3.2, n.: ἀναπεπταμένοις) and by the Platonic words used in her first monologue, such as μαίνομαι (1.4.6, n.) and τί τὸ πέρας τοῦ κακοῦ (1.4.7, n.). Further, since the adoption of Platonic language does not concern Habrocomes, this rhetorical pattern again increases her leadership in the couple, since she is paradoxically more educated than Habrocomes.

In conclusion, in the beginning of the Eph. the construction of the couple seems to have a deliberate Platonic foundation.

3b) The proposal of symmetry

When in the wedding night Xen. ascribes to Anthia the proposal of a union with Habrocomes (LI 2.4c), Plato is again very important. In the middle of her speech Anthia introduces the verb

---

[367] See Plut. *Mor.* 711c: the Platonic dialogues which can be classified as τῶν δραματικῶν, τοὺς ἐλαφροτάτους ἐκδιδάσκονται παῖδες ὥστ'ἀπὸ στόματος λέγειν.

συμφύντες (1.9.5, n.). As this word is a plausible intertext with Aristophanes' speech in the *Symposium*, Xen. seems to identify the couple's new ideal with the Platonic ideal of symmetry, which coincides with the union between the halves that had been separated.

3c) A more traditional asymmetry

In the subsequent establishment of a more traditional asymmetry between Habrocomes and Anthia, in which the former is the pursuer of the latter (LI 4.2a), Xen. does not introduce direct allusions to Plato. However, the contrasting comparison between Habrocomes and Hippothous, which runs parallel to his search for Anthia, appears to be a possible Platonic echo (below, 4b).

3d) The fulfillment of a symmetry

When at the end of the novel the protagonists are re-united in Rhodes, the model of the *Symposium* is again echoed in Xen.'s comment: τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐβούλοντο αἱ ψυχαί (5.13.3). Following Laplace 1994, 445's suggestion, this phrase could be a Platonic allusion. When in Aristophanes' myth the meeting between halves happens, their mutual embrace does not satisfy them, because ἄλλο τι βουλομένη ἑκατέρου ἡ ψυχὴ δήλη ἐστίν (192c-d), which coincides with an everlasting love. Since a sentence where ἡ ψυχὴ is the subject, βούλομαι the verb and the object a pronoun occurs again only in the Eph., this passage from the *Symposium* here inspires our novelist. Thus we find that Xen. seems to introduce a frame to his text, according to which both the first allusion to symmetry and its achievement come from the same Platonic model.

3e) The *Ephesiaca* as a new *Symposium*

Overall, this discovery of a progression of Platonic intertexts in the Eph. is significant, because it suggests that this model affects the core of the message of the novel and this is particularly true in relation to the final erotic ideal. While invincible infidelity (LI 5.3a) has a clear Homeric foundation, the other main value, symmetry (LI 5.3b), is also revealed as having a Platonic origin. This discovery is significant: it shows that Homer and Plato are used together by Xen. and it proves that the latter also has a great influence on our author. As a result, I would speculate that the more spiritual *eros* of the final part of the Eph. might be part of his relationship with Plato.

To begin with, in the aforementioned passage from Aristophanes' speech the proposal of an everlasting love coincides with a sharing of life and death between the lovers (*Symp.* 192e: ἕως τ'ἂν ζῆτε, ὡς ἓν ὄντα, κοινῇ ἀμφοτέρους ζῆν, καὶ ἐπειδὰν ἀποθάνητε, ἐκεῖ αὖ ἐν Ἅιδου ἀντὶ δυοῖν ἕνα εἶναι κοινῇ τεθνεῶτε·). Since Xen. clearly introduces the fulfilment of the first ideal in the last chapter of the novel[368] and alludes to the other with τάφος θάλαμος in the oracle (1.6.2, n., 3) and in Aegialeus' story,[369] the topic of fidelity might also have a Platonic colour. Second, since the Platonic model refers to both hetero- and homosexual love[370] and is not focused on marriage, the

---

[368] 5.15.3: αὐτοὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ διῆγον ἑορτὴν ἄγοντες τὸν μετ'ἀλλήλων βίον.

[369] 5.1.6: ὠμόσαμεν ἀλλήλοις πολλάκις ἕξειν καὶ μέχρι θανάτου.

[370] See on this Hunter 1997, 193: 'Aristophanes, in fact, offers an explanation for both hetero- and homosexual eros'.

impression that Xen. is proposing an ideal of love which goes beyond this social institution and gender might find its confirmation in Plato (LI 5.4d and 5.6). Finally, it is not impossible that Xen.'s original focus on a "society in love" (LI 5.5) has a Platonic foundation too. In the *Symposium* Phaedrus includes in his praise of Eros his key role of conductor of human life. This god, in fact, shows his power over kinship, social position and wealth: ὃ γὰρ χρὴ ἀνθρώποις ἡγεῖσθαι παντὸς τοῦ βίου τοῖς μέλλουσι καλῶς βιώσεσθαι, τοῦτο οὔτε συγγένεια οἵα τε ἐμποιεῖν οὕτω καλῶς οὔτε τιμαὶ οὔτε πλοῦτος οὔτ' ἄλλο οὐδὲν ὡς ἔρως (*Symp*. 178c5- d1). Then, shortly after, Phaedrus expresses his famous desire for a society of lovers: εἰ οὖν μηχανή τις γένοιτο ὥστε πόλιν γενέσθαι ἢ στρατόπεδον ἐραστῶν τε καὶ παιδικῶν, οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως ἂν ἄμεινον οἰκήσειαν τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἢ ἀπεχόμενοι πάντων τῶν αἰσχρῶν καὶ φιλοτιμούμενοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους, καὶ μαχόμενοί γ' ἂν μετ' ἀλλήλων οἱ τοιοῦτοι νικῷεν ἂν ὀλίγοι ὄντες ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν πάντας ἀνθρώπους (ibid., 178e3-179a2). Xen.'s new society in love could be a revisitation of this ideal.

As a result, the involvement of Plato in the last chapter of the Eph. seems to be significant and this leads me to a final speculation. Since the protagonists' final dialogue is τὸ συμπόσιον (5.13.5), Xen. might be here suggesting that his whole novel is a new Platonic *Symposium*. As with the *Odyssey*, our author would write his text trying to emulate his model and not focusing on allusions.[371]

As is commonly known, in the *Symposium* Plato expresses his ideal of love through Diotima's proposal, which consists of a promotion of spiritual love that implies a rejection of the physical.[372] Since Xen. does not exclude sex and physicality from his final ideal love (LI 5.4a-c), his *Symposium* would appear a less radical version of the Platonic one. In this respect, one could argue that Xen. is more following Hephaestus' words in Aristophanes' speech than Diotima herself.

4) Platonic themes in the *Ephesiaca*

While the Platonic mark of Xen.'s symmetry has its origins in Platonic allusions and then Xen. freely expands on it, I would like to show that there are two topics of the Eph. which are important for the *Bildung* of the novel (LI 5a, c) and might have a Platonic inspiration: body and soul and the comparison between Habrocomes, Hippothous and horses. This discovery is significant: since both themes concern Habrocomes' *Bildung*, the influence of Plato on the male protagonist here becomes stronger and fills the gap that the Platonic construction of Anthia had created. That said, since these two topics lack intertexts with Plato, the connection between Xen. and his model is looser here than in the case of symmetry.

---

[371] On the originality of this technique, see LI 6.1.

[372] Cf. *Symp*. 210 b6-7: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τὸ ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς κάλλος τιμιώτερον ἡγήσασθαι τοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι and *Symp*. 210c5-6: the final aim is to understand that τὸ περὶ τὸ σῶμα καλὸν σμικρόν τι ἡγήσεται εἶναι.

4a) <u>The Platonic origin of the "body and soul" theme</u>

Although the ambivalent link between body and soul is exploited by some authors of Greek literature, Plato is certainly one of those who place a special emphasis on it.[373] A focus on their dichotomy already occurs in Socrates' *Apology*, where Socrates states that the aim of every human life should be the cultivation of the soul and not of the body (29d7-e2). The reason for this is that σῶμα is an obstacle in the path which leads to the knowledge of the truth. This notion emerges clearly also in the *Phaedo*: ἕως ἂν τὸ σῶμα ἔχωμεν καὶ συμπεφυρμένη ᾖ ἡμῶν ἡ ψυχὴ μετὰ τοιούτου κακοῦ, οὐ μὴ ποτε κτησώμεθα ἱκανῶς οὗ ἐπιθυμοῦμεν· φάμὲν δὲ τοῦτο εἶναι τὸ ἀληθές (66b5-b7). Finally, Plato enriches this topic by adopting the image of the σῶμα as a σῆμα (*Phdr.* 250c5-6), εἰργμός (*Phd.* 82e3) or δεσμά (*Phd.* 67d1-2), from which the soul has to be freed.

Given this framework, since Xen. is keen on Plato, it is not unlikely that he was considering these topics as Platonic. A confirmation of this comes from the text: the phrase ἡ ψυχὴ καταπεπτώκει (1.5.5, n.) appears a possible allusion to the Platonic fall of the soul.

4b) <u>The Platonic origin of the two horses, Habrocomes and Hippothous</u>

For a similar reason, Xen.'s introduction of the metamorphosis of men into horses and, especially, the parallel established between Habrocomes and Hippothous might recall another Platonic theme: the *Phaedrus'* myth of the chariot with the contrast between the impudent and the virtuous horse. This idea, which is already suggested by Bierl 2006, 84, works very well with Hippothous and his status as intemperate horse, which can be easily compared with the ὕβρεως καὶ ἀλαζονείας ἑταῖρος (*Phdr.* 253e). Conversely, since Habrocomes' morality is opposed to Hippothous' behaviour, the protagonist might be identified with the horse who is τιμῆς ἐραστὴς μετὰ σωφροσύνης τε καὶ αἰδοῦς (253d).

In my opinion, because of the considerable fame of this Platonic myth, the association of these characters with this model was very easy to make and this hypothesis is also supported by the fact that Ach. also plays with this idea giving the name Leucippe, the "white horse", to his protagonist. Thus, I would accept this association's existence and I would add a final speculation. In the Platonic dialogue the charioteer plays the role of guiding and controlling the horses and his task especially targets the intemperate one. For instance, when he sees the real nature of beauty and chastity, ἔδεισέ τε καὶ σεφθεῖσα ἀνέπεσεν ὑπτία, καὶ ἅμα ἠναγκάσθη εἰ τοὐπίσω ἑλκύσαι τὰς ἡνίας οὕτω σφόδρα, ὥστ'ἐπὶ τὰ ἰσχία ἄμφω καθίσαι τὼ ἵππω (Phdr. 254 b7-c1). Since at the end of the novel Hippothous renounces his violence, Xen. might be implying that he is the charioteer and, thus, he is playing a role comparable to that of Plato, taming not only Habrocomes, but also Hippothous. This speculation would fit well into the Platonic foundation of Xen.'s final ideal of love. In addition, as with Homer, our author would be subtly identifying himself with his model (<u>LI</u> 6.2).

---

[373] See, e.g., the definition of human being in the *Phdr.* 246c5-6: ζῷον τὸ σύμπαν ἐκλήθη, ψυχὴ καὶ σῶμα παγέν, θνητόν τ'ἔσχεν ἐπωνυμίαν. For later philosophical uses, see Dobbin 1998, 100, who states that the opposition between the slavery of the body and the freedom of the self 'was common also in Cynic popular philosophy and adopted by the early Fathers as Christian doctrine'.

In conclusion, all these hints seem to confirm that the *Bildungsroman* of the Eph. has a Platonic, as well as a Homeric colour (LI 6.2).

4c) The interesting example of the novel written by Chion of Heraclea

A possible confirmation of the existence of these two Platonic themes in the Eph. can be given by the study of a text which seems to owe a similar debt to Plato. I am referring to the epistolary novel written under the name of Chion of Heraclea, which has been recently dated to the second half of the first century AD[374] and which is chronologically close to the Eph.

My purpose in mentioning this work is neither its unusual genre - we are dealing with 'the only example of a novel in letters' (Düring 1951, 18) - nor its content, which is the story of Chion, a disciple of Plato who left Athens to go to kill Clearchus, the tyrant of his city Heraclea. My interest lies in the fact that, although 'adventure, not instruction or protreptic, seems the object of the text' (Konstan 1990, 272), the novel presents some topics, which 'recommend philosophy [...] as a means of mastering the fear and pain associated with the body' (ibid., 273). More precisely, one of these topics concerns precisely body and soul. It is Chion who claims that the slavery imposed by Clearchus' tyranny is not able to affect his soul: ἡ μὲν οὖν πατρὶς ἐν τοιούτοις κακοῖς καὶ κινδύνοις ἐστίν, ἐγὼ δέ, εἰ μὲν αὐτὸ ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ βούλοιο τοὐμὸν σκέπτεσθαι, καὶ πάνυ ἀσφαλής εἰμι. δουλείαν γὰρ ταύτην ἔγωγε νομίζω, ἢ μετὰ τῶν σωμάτων καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ὑφ' ἑαυτὴν ἔχει· ἡ δὲ τῆς μὲν ψυχῆς οὐδ'ὁτιοῦν ἁπτομένη, τὸ δὲ σῶμα μόνον ἔχουσα οὐδὲ δουλεία τυγχάνειν ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ (14.3). This clear exposition of the well-known dichotomy, which also occurs in other parts of the letter, recalls the same pattern found in Xen. In addition, Chion's remark about the limits of slavery echoes those expressed by Habrocomes to Manto, as he explicitly refers to freedom: Clearchus οὐδέποτε γάρ μου τὴν ψυχὴν χειρώσεται, ἐν ᾗ τὸ δοῦλον ἢ τὸ ἐλεύθερον. Finally, along with these motifs, both the author of Chion's letters and Xen. adopt a 'simple and straightforward style' (Düring 1951, 19) in the presentation of these themes.

Overall, the reason why this parallel might help our interpretation of the Eph. is that in the epistolary novel the debt to Plato is certain. Although 'the anonymous author of Chion's letter was certainly not a philosopher, nor was he an original thinker with a philosophy of his own' (Düring 1951, 21), 'every idea of any philosophical importance can be explained as a reminiscence of his browsing in Plato's writings' (ibid.). As a result, the fruit of this presentation is 'une vision également romanesque et mythique de l'enseignement de Platon' (Billault 1977, 33). In my opinion, Xen, might be doing the same as Chion giving a Platonic colour to his exploitation of body and soul and of the "two horses"- myth.

---

[374] See Düring 1951, 9-16 on the issue of the date.

CHAPTER 8:
CRITICISM OF DOULAMIS' "STOIC" THEORY

While in the previous chapter Plato has emerged as the philosophical model of the Eph., Doulamis argues that Stoicism has an influence on the Eph., which is difficult to establish, and he is open to the possibility that 'Xen is consciously allusive to this philosophical school'.[375] This thesis must be discussed, because the presence of a Stoic framework might challenge or affect our interpretation. In my opinion, however, the elements which the scholar identifies as Stoic in the Eph. do not allow us to accept his theory. For this reason, I would argue that the Eph. lacks a Stoic background and this further proves the plausibility of my reading.

In a passage from his article, Doulamis 2007 argues that the link between the Eph. and the Stoics is 'possible and attractive' (159) In addition, he introduces as a proof of this connection the sharing of an ἀφελής style in Xen. and Epictetus' works. While the main point of his theory, which is developed through some passages of the novel, needs to be examined, I would immediately dismiss the second, because ἀφέλεια is such a wide stylistic principle that it cannot prove a closer link between these two authors.[376]

To begin with, the following table list the passages analysed by Doulamis 2007:

Table 0.1: Analysis of the passages listed by Doulamis as Stoic

Eph	Context	Stoic concepts according to Doulamis	Stoic words according to Doulamis	Intratextuality and / or intertextuality
1.4. 3	Habrocomes' resistance to Eros	Distinction between the true nature of things and perception of them, *proairesis*, vulnerability of the body and mental willpower.	- τοῖς σοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, οὐχὶ σοι. - ἐὰν θέλῇς.	Xen. *Cyr.* 1.23.4, 5.1.11.

---

[375] Doulamis 2007, 172.

[376] On ἀφέλεια in literature, see e.g. Ruiz Montero 2003.

Eph	Context	Stoic concepts according to Doulamis	Stoic words according to Doulamis	Intratextuality and / or intertextuality
1.4. 7	Anthia's question about the limits of her passion	Control of emotions.	- ὁ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ὅρος. - τὸ πέρας τοῦ κακοῦ.	- Arist. *Top.* 140b 28, Gal. *De placitis Hippocratis et Platonis* 4.2.3, 4.4.2, Favorin. fr. 96, 19. - see 'the limit to love' in table 1, 2 and 3 in LI 2.3.
1.16. 3	Euxinus' proposal to Habrocomes	Acceptance of the overwhelming destiny, refusal to blame others for their misfortunes.	- εἰκὸς μὲν ἐπὶ τῇ συμφορᾷ φέρειν χαλεπῶς. - δεῖ δέ σε τῇ τύχῃ πάντα λογίσασθαι.	
2.1. 4	Habrocomes' refusal to Euxinus	Choice of death to avoid immoral behaviour.	τεθνήξομαι δὲ πρότερον καὶ φανοῦμαι νεκρός σώφρων.	Philostr. *Ep.* 1.64.
2.4. 4	Habrocomes' answer to Leucon	Soul as the foundation of true freedom, distinction between the body and deliberate choice. Slavery and mistreatment of the body.	- δοῦλος μέν εἰμι [...].ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν μου τοῦ σώματος, τὴν ψυχὴν δὲ ἐλευθέραν ἔχω. - πάντα ὅσα δύναται σῶμα ἐνεγκεῖν οἰκέτου. - ἑκὼν ἀδικῆσαι.	δοῦλος/ἐλευθερός: Xen. 1.16.3, 2.10.2, 5.11.4. σῶμα οἰκέτου: Eph. 2.5.4, 5.8.3 (τὸ σῶμα ὑποτέθεικα δουλείᾳ). Periander 2, Pl. *Apol.* 37a5, Ps-Phoc. *Sententiae* 51, Eph. 2.10.2, 3.3.6 and 3.5.4.
2.5. 4	Habrocomes' letter to Manto	Freedom from slavery, death a resolutive option.	εἴτε ἀποκτείνειν θέλεις, ἕτοιμος.	

To begin with, none of these passages is intertexting with Stoic texts; moreover, two have other models, such as the *Cyropaedia* of Xenophon from Athens (1.4.3, n.: τοῖς σοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς) and Plato's *Phaedrus* (1.4.7, n.: τὸ πέρας τοῦ κακοῦ). As a result, the only way to discover a Stoic

presence is through identifying some shared themes. Although this possibility fits into Xen.'s general approach to intertextuality, it is significant that our author does not introduce textual links between the "Stoic" passages of the first and the second book and other parts of the novel: this suggests that the "Stoic" presence does not affect the whole novel.

This makes it crucial to analyse the individual passages mentioned by Doulamis 2007. As I will shortly prove, the Stoic topics described by the scholar are not really explored by Xen. As a result, I would consider the listed passages not as Stoic, but as a reflection of the more general philosophical patina with which our author is familiar or part of the Platonic exploration.

a) The first passage is part of Habrocomes' first speech and will be analysed in the commentary (1.4.3, n.: τοῖς σοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς). The discovery of a plausible debt to Xenophon of Athens weakens the possibility of a Stoic influence.

b) A negative conclusion can be also ascribed to the second passage. Along with the Platonic intertextuality of τὸ πέρας τοῦ κακοῦ (1.4.7, n.), a wider issue arises here: in the Eph. the control of emotions, which is 'a central tenet of Stoicism',[377] evidently does not concern the protagonists, since they often express their sentimental reactions to events. The only sphere in which this feature might be accepted is the erotic one, where both Anthia and Habrocomes display their σωφροσύνη, but this virtue is Classical and not Stoic (LI 4.2a).

c) In Euxinus' proposal Doulamis identifies as Stoic tenets the invitations to accept destiny and not to blame others for one's misfortunes. However, both topics are too generic to be considered as derived from this philosophical school.

d) Habrocomes' expression of his desire to commit suicide is one of the many epic-tragic themes of the novel and we would need more precise language to consider it a philosophical exception to this pattern (LI 4.3-4).

e, f) In the last two passages the Stoic presence appear more promising, since Habrocomes twice addresses the concept of "true freedom" which is central to Epictetus' teaching. In addition, as the second occurrence is part of the "body and soul" topic, it deserves further consideration.

At a first glance, this positive impression is supported by the unusual presence of intratextuality, which concerns the opposition between ἐλευθερός and δοῦλος and the formulae ἑκὼν ἀδικῆσαι and σῶμα οἰκέτου. In addition, the third passage refers to the mistreatment of the body, another topic related to "body and soul". On further examination, however, we find that these shared expressions are not Stoic. First, the formula ἑκὼν ἀδικῆσαι was part of the common vocabulary of the Imperial Era, as attested in Pseudo-Phocylides' *Sententia* 51: Ὅστις ἑκὼν ἀδικεῖ, κακὸς ἀνήρ. Further, Xen. also adopts it in protagonists' monologues which belong to a completely different context (cf. 3.3.6 and 3.5.4): thus, this formula cannot be defined as Stoic. Second, the opposition between ἐλευθερία and δουλεία is so recurrent in the Greek literature that it appears to be a common τόπος. This conclusion can be easily drawn by looking at the following sententia of Aesop: Ἐλεύθερον ἀδύνατον εἶναι τὸν πάθεσι δουλεύοντα (40). Within this cliché, ἐλευθερία is associated with the

---

[377] Perkins 1995, 79.

spiritual aspect of humanity, while δουλεῖα with the physical one, as Sophocles witnesses: εἰ σῶμα δοῦλον, ἀλλ' ὁ νοῦς ἐλεύθερος (fr. 940 Radt). In addition, if we want to find a plausible model, freedom of the soul is part of Platonic and Cynic vocabulary. Plato uses it in the *Theaetetus* 172d when he establishes a connection between freedom and philosophy: Κινδυνεύουσιν οἱ ἐν δικαστηρίοις καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις ἐκ νέων κυλινδούμενοι πρὸς τοὺς ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ καὶ τῇ τοιᾷδε διατριβῇ τεθραμμένους ὡς οἰκέται πρὸς ἐλευθέρους τεθράφθαι. More broadly, as Dobbin shows, 'other Platonic sources affirm the freedom of the mind relative to the body, starting from *Timaeus*, where freedom of the mind is stronger than the bound of the body'.[378] On the other hand, 'ἐλευθερία was a watchword of the Cynic school' (Dobbin 1998, 202). As a result, the opposition between ἐλευθερία and δουλεία is not an exclusively philosophical topic and, among philosophers, the Stoics do not appear to be particularly focused on it.

This conclusion can be extended to the "slavery of the body", although with a different demonstration. Unlike the previous one, this theme is often explored by Epictetus, as the following passage proves, in which human life is described by a suppositious pupil: ἄφες ἡμᾶς ἀπελθεῖν ὅθεν ἐληλύθαμεν, ἄφες λυθῆναί ποτε τῶν δεσμῶν τούτων τῶν ἐξηρτημένων καὶ βαρούντων. ἐνταῦθα λησταὶ καὶ κλέπται καὶ δικαστήρια καὶ οἱ καλούμενοι τύραννοι δοκοῦντες ἔχειν τινὰ ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἐξουσίαν διὰ τὸ σωμάτιον καὶ τὰ τούτου κτήματα. ἄφες δείξωμεν αὐτοῖς, ὅτι οὐδενὸς ἐξουσίαν' (1.9.14-15). As Dobbin 1998 argues, however, the context of this passage is clearly Platonic, since the ban on suicide addressed by Epicurus was a key argument of the *Phaedo* (see, e.g., 61b-62e). This is not surprising, since, as Long 2002, 158 shows, 'Epictetus' recollection of the *Phaedo* is certain' and, overall, he 'has a deep and ubiquitous affinity for the Socrates of Plato's dialogues' (ibid., 16).

Overall, this framework makes me conclude that Doulamis' (2007) Stoic interpretation of the Eph. is not acceptable and that, conversely, the attribution of a Platonic origin to some of his listed passage is more plausible: this supports our interpretation. That said, there is still something interesting in Doulamis' theory. Since his passages are numerous and all belong to direct speeches, they seem to confirm the more general trend that emerged in the analysis of Plato: philosophy is part of the growth of the protagonists.

---

[378] Dobbin 1998, 70. See *Timaeus* 41b2/6: δι' ἃ καὶ ἐπείπερ γεγένησθε, ἀθάνατοι μὲν οὐκ ἐστὲ οὐδ' ἄλυτοι τὸ πάμπαν, [...], τῆς ἐμῆς βουλήσεως μείζονος ἔτι δεσμοῦ καὶ κυριωτέρου λαχόντες ἐκείνων οἷς ὅτ'ἐγίγνεσθε συνεδεῖσθε Cf. also Pl. *Leg.* 875c-d, Plut. *Parsne an facultas* 5, [Plut] *De Fato* 574A, Calcidius 180b-181, Plot. 3.1.8.

COMMENTARY ON THE FIRST BOOK

CHAPTER 1

Introduction: the presentation of Habrocomes

The first chapter of the novel focuses on the introduction of the male protagonist. Since the story of the novel starts only at the beginning of the second chapter (1.2.1, n.: μηνιᾷ), the first chapter appears to be the prologue of the Eph.

Three are its distinctive features:

- a focus on Habrocomes: his priority over Anthia (LI 2.1), his idealised characterisation, which is composed of different elements, from his wealth to his παιδεῖα and his status as Platonic ἐρώμενος (LI 7.1), makes this passage rich in themes which will be explored later in the novel;

- the lack of 'direct characterisation': as De Temmerman forth. argues, this choice might stem from Xen.'s interest in ἀφέλεια and is an element typical of the entire novel, in which Habrocomes and other characters often reveal their thoughts through their actions and their speeches (NA 3).

- the use of verbs which set the action in an indefinite past and underline the repetitiveness of Habrocomes' life. This stylistic issue confirm that the story of the Eph. has not yet started.

1.1.1: ἦν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἀνὴρ: the best way to understand the beginning of the Eph. is to compare it with that of Char., who introduces his novel with an authorial statement in which he reveals his name, his social role and the nature of the work (1.1.1: πάθος ἐρωτικὸν). In addition, he mentions Hermocrates as ὁ Συρακοσίων στρατηγός, οὗτος ὁ νικήσας Ἀθηναίους (1.1.2): this 'locates his story at a fairly precise date in the past and links it to historical figures' (Morgan 2004b, 453). Overall, the two passages show that Char. is an 'obtrusive primary narrator' (Morgan 2004b, 479), who wants to presents his work as a Classical historian. In addition, since 'on several occasions in the novel he uses the present tense of institutions of the Persian Empire' (ibid. and see, e.g., 6.8.6-7), this narrator is also 'fictitiously configured as more or less contemporary with the events he relates' (Morgan 2007c, 480). Finally, apart from the first sentence which constitutes a prologue, the narrator of *Callirhoe* is 'omniscient' and 'external'.

Interestingly, only the last two features occur in the Eph., in which time is instead set in a generic past (GI 2.2) and the readers are introduced neither to the name of the author nor to the title of the work. In addition, 'since the narrator at the very end of the novel refers to the protagonists' lives after the end of the story (5.15.3), he is not configured as a contemporary of the events he narrates; but there is no indication by how much the story antedates the act of narration' (Morgan 2007c, 489). This lack of references is so marked that it must be the way that Xen. intended to present his work.

Two possible perceptions seem to be created: as Hägg 1971, 120 argues, on the one hand the very beginning of the text 'is not far from the traditional opening of the folk-tale: 'Once upon a time there was…''. This interpretation is further developed by Ruiz Montero 1981 and 1988, who shows how the link between the Eph. and the same genre is also suggested by their sharing of narrative motifs and situations. Finally, Scobie 1979, after having compared this beginning with that of the fable of *Amor and Psyche* in Apuleius (*Met.* 4.27: 'Erant in quadam ciuitate rex et regina'), uses the connection with folk-tales to develop the theory of an oral fruition of the text (for a judgment on this, see <u>AIM</u>).

On the other hand, the presence of an omniscient and not intrusive narrator might suggest a link with Homer, who is very familiar to Xen. (<u>LI</u> 6). Although the first perception is clearly more significant, it can coexist with this second one, since the first part of the first book is shaped with the parallel with a particular land of the *Odyssey*, Scheria, which has an aura of fairy-tale (<u>LI</u> 6.2c).

Finally, if we accept the hypothesis that Xen. wrote after Char., we could add that the readers of the Eph. who were aware of *Callirhoe* might have felt lost after this introduction. As a result, they might have asked themselves a question about the origin of the author and the parallel with Homer might have come in their mind.

1.1.1: ἀνὴρ τῶν τὰ πρῶτα ἐκεῖ δυναμένων: this expression is the first "formula" of the Eph., as it occurs also in 2.13.3, 3.2.1, 3.2.5, 3.9.5 and 5.1.4. The existence of many repetitions like this is the foundation of the different theories about the Eph., from the oral approach to the rhetorical one (AIM). Interestingly, this first example already plays an intra-textual role: the third and last occurrences of this formula refer to Hippothous and Aegialeus, whose love-stories work as a double of the main one (<u>NA</u> 3.4). As this exploitation starts from the beginning, I would argue that Xen. is suggesting the readers to consider consistently this possibility in the entire text.

In addition, Xen. mentions here the wealth of Habrocomes' family, which reflects a novelistic τόπος (see Letoublon 1993, 20-25 and 61-64 and <u>LI</u> 1.2) and corroborates the novel's introduction as a folk-tale, since it has an idealistic origin. Interestingly, as I have already noted (LI 5.4a), this element will be progressively detached from Habrocomes: this suggests that wealth is not a necessary component of Xen.'s final society in love.

On the other hand, unlike the narrator, homeland acts in parallel in Xen. and Char.: Habrocomes shares some similarities with Dionysius, who is introduced by Char. as πλούτῳ καὶ γένει καὶ παιδείᾳ τῶν ἄλλων Ἰώνων ὑπερέχοντα (1.12.6). Then, his house is characterised by τὸ μέγεθος καὶ τὴν πολυτέλειαν (1.13.1) and Callirhoe is invited to rest ἐν τῷ καλλίστῳ τῶν οἰκημάτων (1.14.3). Finally, this connection might be supported by the common resistance to Eros (1.4.1-3 n.) and by the belonging of both their cities to Ionia: since in the Eph. there is no parallel for Syracuse, it is not impossible that Xen. decided to make Dionysius his protagonist and this hypothesis would explain why in our text the political and public dimension are missing (<u>LI</u> 1.6c).

Finally, on a lexical point of view, τῶν τὰ πρῶτα ἐκεῖ δυναμένων is rightly considered by Zanetto 1990, 235 as an example of Xen.'s 'ricerca di una dizione netta, precisa, quasi asettica', which does not generally belong to a sophisticated style.

1.1.1: Λυκομήδης: Lycomedes is the first of the thirty-three out of forty-four characters of the *Eph.* that receive a name from Xen.: this high number is already discussed by Dalmeyda 1926, who in his introduction to the edition of the text states: 'L'auteur ne met jamais en scène un personnage […] sans lui donner un nom'. In Hägg's (2004) view, the reason for this abundance lies in the intricate plot of the *Eph.*, in which the protagonists meet many secondary characters. Since Xen. does not have time to describe each one in detail, their names 'function as a substitute for characterization […]: they are in some cases the only really individual trait which the author bestows upon a character' (201). For this reason, in the whole commentary I will pay a special attention to names. A first attempt to classify them is made by Hägg 2004, who divides names into three categories:

a) 'significant', whose etymology is meaningful;

b) 'literary', which occur in previous texts;

c) 'realistic', which are attested by papyri.

Overall, the existence of these three categories is not rigid: there are cases where more than a feature is acceptable.

In addition, Ruiz Montero 1994, 1108, divides further the 'significant' names in other three groups according to the following criteria:

a) 'Funktion des Person innerhalb des Handlungsgefüges;

b) Tätigkleit;

c) Physischen Eigenschaften und moralischen Qualität'.

The most significant examples for each of these classes are:

a) Hippothous and Manto;

b) Aegialeus, Perilaos

c) the protagonists and Cyno.

In the present case, Lycomedes potentially belongs to each of Hägg's (2004) categories: the etymology of this name is clear, since it is composed of λύκος and μήδομαι, but it also belongs to the literary tradition (in the *Iliad* Lycomedes is a son of Creon, see *Il.* 9.84, 12.366, 17.345.346, 19.240) and is attested in the Imperial world (Hägg 2004, 220; see also other occurrences in Strab. 12.58.560, Paus. 8.27.6, Arr. An. 2.1.5). That being said, however, since Lycomede's role in the novel does not have any connection with both the meaning of the name and the Homeric hero, the hypothesis of a 'realistic' name appears the most plausible (see on this also Borgogno 2005, 383).

Along with the issue of the name, it is also significant that Habrocomes' father enters so quickly the novel and this is the first sign of the importance of the protagonists' parents, which is a novelistic τόπος. As Billault 1996, 119 argues, in the Greek literature their appearance constitutes a novelty: while in Greek and Latin comedy, the genre in which parents are mostly introduced, they tend to create obstacle to their sons, in the Greek novel 'all mothers and fathers of heroes [...] behave in exactly the same way towards their children. They do not oppose their children's love affairs'. This is particularly true for the *Eph.*, where the parents play a decisive role in the happening of the protagonists' marriage (LI 2.3b1) and Lycomedes appears also in Habrocomes' second dream, where an echo of Laertes reinforces his protective role (LI 4.5b).

Within the novelistic corpus the only exception is constituted by Ach.'s novel, where Clitophon's father wants to force his child to marry Calligone (2.11.2-8, 2.15.1-2).

1.1.1: Τούτῳ τῷ Λυκομήδει: this close repetition of Lycomedes' name and the emphasis placed by the demonstrative are considered by Ruiz Montero 2003 as two features typical of the popular Greek narrative and, more specifically, of the 'chained' style, the λέξις εἰρομένη. Since this *polyptoton* of the name appears at the very beginning of the text, I would suggest that Xen. might be here suggesting to his readers that his entire novel must be read as a simple text.

1.1.1: γυναικὸς ἐπιχωρίας: the local origin is the second element which characterises Habrocomes' family: along with wealth, it certainly contributes to the ideal presentation of the male protagonist. Unlike the previous, this element is attributed to Anthia's family: the belonging of her family to Ephesus is the only piece of information that the narrator tells us about her social position in the first book (1.2.5, n.: ἐγχωρίων), along with her frequentation of the temple. Only later, in the second book, the heroine will reveal her noble origin to persuade Lampo not to commit violence against her (2.9.4 and NA 2.1a2). Finally, since the same adjective ἐπιχώριος is also related to Artemis' ἑορτή (2.2.1), this suggests that Xen. is emphasising the role played by homeland in this first scene of the novel and this statement is confirmed by the attribution of ἐπιχώριος to Hyperanthes (3.2.2) in his parallel love-story (on the function of this story, NA 3.4).
That said, as in the case of wealth, homeland is another theme which will progressively lose importance in the novel (LI 5.4b).

1.1.1: γίνεται: as Mann 1896, 26 argues in his detailed analysis of the verbal tenses of the Eph., 'ungemein häufig findet sich das Praesens historicum', so that 'fast zwei Drittel aller Indikative des Präsens sind von dieser Art' (1.2.1, n.: μηνιᾷ). Ruiz Montero 2003 considers this abundance as another trait typical of the style of the popular Greek narrative. In my opinion, a verb like this contributes to the atemporal framework of the story.

1.1.1: παῖς: in Letoublon's (1993, 23) view the inclusion of an only child in Habrocomes' family might reflect a historical attitude, since in ancient Greece after the Archaic era the birth of children decreased. At the same time, I would argue that this element might also play a literary role: it seems to emphasise the uniqueness of Habrocomes and, thus, it might be part of his idealised portrait.

1.1.1: Θεμιστοῦς: unlike from the first name of the novel, this is 'literary': in the Greek mythological tradition Themisto refers to different characters, such as Ipseus' daughter and Athamanthes' wife or Nereus and Doris' daughter or Arcas' mother. While these characters do not have any connection with our story, it is interesting that in the "Antheia-fragment" (GI 1) the same name is borne by a woman who appears in a scene " dominated" by the Amazons. In my opinion, this link might be significant: since these mythological warriors were at the origin of Artemis' dance

194

in Ephesus, also Themisto might have been linked with Ephesus. As a result, the appearance in the Eph. of this character might constitute a local Ephesian trait.

1.1.1: οὗτος ὁ Ἁβροκόμης ἀεὶ μὲν καὶ καθ'ἡμέραν εἰς κάλλος ηὔξετο: this sentence, which describes the progressive nature of Habrocomes' beauty, starts a longer description of the protagonist, which is composed of habitual attitudes. From a stylistic perspective, it is interesting how most of these actions share the imperfect with the beginning of the novel. More specifically, the idea of repetitiveness is expressed by the two hypothetical periods which Xen. here adopts (cf. 1.1.5 and 7), which describe the routine of Habrocomes' life. Further, the *protasis* of the former contains an iterative optative (1.1.5: ἀκοῦσαι). Finally, repetitiveness is also suggested at the end of the section by the relative clause introduced by ὅπου, 'wherever'.
This discovery is significant: since Xen. usually introduces hypothetical periods only in direct speeches (esp. 1.11.3-5, n: oath of fidelity, b), the inclusion of an example also in this chapter seems a device deliberately chosen (for its function, 1.1: introd.).

1.1.1: Ἁβροκόμης: Habrocomes is certainly a 'significant' name', being it is composed of ἁβρός and κόμη: its meaning is 'with delicate hair' (LSJ) and, thus, it belongs to Ruiz Montero's (1994) third category, in which both a physical and moral connotation are conveyed. In addition, it is also a 'literary' name: in Herodotus' *Stories* Ἁβροκόμης is a son of Dareius killed at the Thermopilis and his brother is Hyperanthes: ἐν δὲ δὴ καὶ Δαρείου δύο παῖδες, Ἁβροκόμης τε καὶ Ὑπεράνθης (7.224). In my opinion, the existence in this passage of two Xenophontic names makes it more plausible that Xen. was drawing from Herodotus.
While this twofold origin of the protagonist's name does not appear controversial, the graphic form of Ἁβροκόμης is strongly discussed by scholars, because in the manuscripts there is an oscillation in the spirit (see Papanikolau 1973: 'cum spiritu leni legitur nomen Ἀβροκόμης in codice, raro cum aspero'). As a result, editors of Xen. come to different conclusions: Dalmeyda 1926 and O'Sullivan 2005 adopt in the whole text the rough spirit, while Papanikolau 1973 prefers the smooth. While the former justify their decision through the parallel between Ἁβροκόμης and ἁβρός, the latter uses as a criterion the higher frequency in F of the smooth spirit. That said, Ruiz Montero adopts an original approach, as she proposes to 'respetar la lectura habitual del códice, y no realizar corrección alguna con respecto a este nombre' (1981, 88). This decision is based on the fact that 'por la progresiva debilitación del espírito áspero en la época imperial, la pronunciación del ἁβρο- no se diferenciaría de la de ἀβρο-, por lo que el nombre resultaría para los griegos del II s. d.C. dotado del medesimo significado concreto en cualquiera de los dos casos' (Ruiz Montero 1981, 87; see for similar ideas also Lejeune 1872, 282 and Dalmeyda 1926). In my opinion, this hypothesis is the most valuable one, because it provides a plausible explanation of the oscillation which occurs in F. In this respect, it might be also interesting that the lack of rough spirit is a common mistake of F in the first book (see GI 1).

Finally, Herodotus' possible intertext does not help to solve this issue, since his choice of the smooth spirit might depend on his adoption of the Ionic dialect, in which the rough spirit is not usually used.

1.1.1: μέγα δή τι χρῆμα: this expression includes two difficult textual points, the lack of the genitive which usually follows the apposition μέγα χρῆμα and the presence of the genitive γενομένου, which agrees with κάλλους but not with the meaning of the previous sentence.

The existence of these problems induce Hirschig 1855, Dalmeyda 1926 and Papanikolau 1973 to accept Tresling's (1792) old expunction of ὡραιότητι σώματος ὑπερβαλλούσῃ, in order to make κάλλους close to μέγα δή τι χρῆμα. This choice, however, does not seem convincing, because μέγα δή τι χρῆμα is an emphatic expression which suits well the beginning of the novel and leaves the presence of γενομένου unclear (see O' Sullivan 1982, 54: 'their deletion does not give an entirely satisfactory text anyway'). In addition, as Borgogno 2003b, 31 adds, μέγα δή τι χρῆμα seems to find its completion in the mention of the beauty of the body. Finally, μέγα τι χρῆμα occurs frequently in texts previous to the Eph. without the genitive (e.g. Emp. 113, Timaeus J 124b, Xen. *Cyr.* 1.4.8, Plb. 8.7.7; 12.6; 9.22.6, *Vitae Aesopi, Vita Pl. vel Accursiana*, p. 248) and its elimination would also contrast with Char., who uses this expression at the beginning of his novel, although with the genitive (1.1.1: θαυμαστόν τι χρῆμα παρθένου). As a result, I would keep the second part of the sentence, interpreting, as O'Sullivan 1982, 54 does, ὡραιότητι as a 'dative of respect or of cause'.

That said, Palairet 1765 places καὶ οὔτε with <τοι>ούτου before κάλλους, creating a genitive absolute where τοιούτου establishes a link with the previous sentence. Then, O' Sullivan 2005 slightly changes this reading introducing τοσούτου. In this way, both authors give a sense to this second part of the sentence. In my opinion, Palairet's (1765) reading is more correct that O'Sullivan's (2005) one: τοιοῦτος κάλλος is an expression more common than τοσοῦτος κάλλος to designate an extraordinary beauty. The former is introduced by Char. 2.4.7, where Dionysius is praising Callirhoe, by Longus 4.17.7 and 4.18.1 with reference to Chloe and in *Joseph and Asenath* to the male protagonist (6.7 and 13.11). The latter, conversely, occurs only once in Hld., when Cybele comments on the beauty of her master Arsace (7.9.5). As a result, I would consider τοιοῦτου as more plausible. A possible objection to this conclusion might be that when the Tyrians are struck by the protagonists' beauty, we read τοσαύτην ἰδόντες εὐμορφίαν (2.2.4). However, the presence here of another noun does not allow us to use this as a real parallel for the present passage. In addition, τοιοῦτος is referred to beauty later in the Eph., when the brothel-keeper welcomes Anthia in Taras (5.5.8: ὁ δὲ ἰδὼν κάλλος οἷον οὔπω πρότερον ἐτεθέατο). Thus, I would definitely keep τοιοῦτου: this means that Xen would be the only novelist who relates τοιοῦτον κάλλος to the male protagonist. This confirms that his focus on Habrocomes is special.

1.1.1: ὡραιότητι σώματος ὑπερβαλλούσῃ: beauty is the first feature attributed to Habrocomes and it will be shortly extended to Anthia (1.2.5, n.: τὸ κάλλος). Unlike wealth and homeland, this theme is an etiquette which characterises the protagonists throughout the whole novel. The reason for this does not only lie in the fact that the protagonists of the novel must be beautiful, but seems to reflect

a narrative role: Anthia and Habrocomes' beauty is the device used by Xen. to make some characters interact and some "attack" the protagonists.

Interaction concerns the different crowds of the novel, namely the Ephesians (1.2.7 and 1.2.8), the Rhodians (see below 1.12.1) the Tyrians (1.14.4) and the Rhodians again at the end of the novel (5.15.3). Conversely, attack concerns the numerous rivals of the protagonists (LI 3) and in this case beauty is not mentioned by them, but by the protagonists themselves, who blame it for the harm that brings to them (2.1.3, 2.11.4, 5.5.5 and 5.7.2).

Finally, the special connection between the protagonists and beauty is confirmed by the fact that in the novel it is difficult to find other characters who are beautiful: the only exceptions are Hyperanthes and Telxinoe, who are double of the protagonists, and Cleisthenes, whose beauty is functional to his role of Hippothous' ἐρώμενος. On the other hand, Manto's and Moeris' beauty does not really have to be taken into account: Xen. explicitly states that Manto is less beautiful than Anthia (2.3.1: ἦν δὲ καλὴ καὶ ὡραία γάμων ἤδη, πολὺ δὲ τοῦ Ἀνθίας κάλλους ὑπελείπετο), while Moeris' beauty is only briefly alluded to by Manto (2.12.1: ὁ καλὸς Μοῖρις).

As a result of this framework, it is possible to conclude that Xen. considers beauty as a distinctive feature of his protagonists. That said, unlike Char., our author does not explicitly introduced the link between κάλλος and εὐγένεια (1.1.6 and 2.1.5), apart from the brief reference in the Lampo episode (2.9.4 and NA 2). This omission suggests that Baslez's (1990, 115) statement that that 'le monde des héros romanesques est le monde des 'bien-nés' (εὐγενεῖς)' appears to be less significant for our novel.

1.1.1: σώματος: although Xen. insists on Habrocomes' beauty, he does not describe it. This omission is common in the archaic Greek literature and iconography, where 'la bellezza degli eroi e delle donne non è mai descritta, è sempre semplicemente enunciata, o tutt'al più rilevata con un confronto' (Pasquali 1942, 141) and the beautiful is considered as 'tipico' (ibid. 140). A case in point is Agido's description made by Alcmane in *Parth*. 39-49, where the young girl is compared to the sun with the expression ὁρῶ ὥτ'ἄλιον.

The reason for this silence might reflect a religion attitude: as Zeitlin 2003, 78 argues, 'from the earliest times, the Greeks saw something divine in beauty' and, thus, they did not describe human beauty, but they attribute to it a supernatural nature (cf. Bianchi Bandinelli 1960). A result of this approach is the strong association between human and divine beauty which is typical of the Greek world and, thus, the idealisation of the former.

That said, however, the presence of this pattern in the Greek novel is surprising, because in the Hellenistic Era portrait became popular in art due to the promotion made by Alexander the Great. Then, shortly after, this technique an interest in physical description of human beings also entered many literary genres such as 'die Biographie und Geschichtschreibung, Sophistik, Physiognomik und Epistolographie' (Jax 1936, 151) and also poetry (cf. Theoc. 10.24-37 e Verg. *Buc*. 7.37-38). In Dubel's (2001, 56) view, the reason why this novelty did not affect the novel is 'l'effet d'un choix poétique autant que d'une stratégie esthétique', which aims at including the protagonists in 'un univers topique'. In addition, the French scholar argues that, in relation to secondary characters, the

novelists adopt a 'principe général d'économie', according to which 'seuls les détails fonctionnels sont retenus par le romancier' (Dubel 2001, 30).

Overall, this general argumentation suits our novel, where Anthia is described as a goddess, because of her comparison with Artemis (1.2.6, n.: χίτων), while the secondary characters do not merit a particular characterisation: only a few details are given about Manto (2.3.1) and Cyno (3.12.3). In addition, unlike Longus and Hld., who introduce a brief description of their male protagonist (cf. Longus 1.28.2 and 2.20.3 and Hld. 2.35.1, 7.10.3-4), our author omits that of Habrocomes, as does Char. As a result, Xen.'s approach to human beauty conforms to the generic attitude.

That said, on further examination, Anthia's description might constitute a partial exception: the description of her eyes seems to show the influence of phyisiognomic treatises (1.2.6, n.: ὀφθαλμοί): for this reason, this passage requires attentive analysis.

1.1.2: οὗτος ὁ Ἀβροκόμης [...] τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγαθά: the second section of the first chapter introduces the two sides of Habrocomes' beauty, which concerns his body and his soul. The narrator emphasises his exploitation of this classical dichotomy by writing a sentence which has a chiastic arrangement: in the first part Habrocomes' beauty is twice underlined, while τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγαθά constitutes a proleptic reference to the hero's spiritual virtues, which are analysed in the following sentence starting with παιδείαν. Overall, this twofold portrait makes him a model of the καλόκἀγαθία, the famous Greek ideal of 'nobleness' (see, on this, Bourriot 1996, 129 and Jaeger 1939, 273): this suggests that Xen. is interested in the aristocratic ideal, although he does not stress the link between nobility and birth.

As is commonly known, it is Plato who gave to the *kalokagathia* a philosophical foundation and his dialogues are often populated by young καλοικἄγαθοί (see Capra 2004, 189: 'in Platone i dialoghi sono popolati da fanciulli che - come Liside - sono o almeno dovrebbero essere non solo e non tanto belli, ma "belli e buoni"'). Two famous examples are Charmides and Lysis, who are both defined in their homonymous dialogues as πάνυ καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός (cf. *Char*. 154e and *Lys*. 207a).

The existence of this pattern is significant, because it gives a first clue that Xen.'s aristocratic ideal might have a Classical and, possibly, a Platonic foundation.

Having said that, it is significant that in the fourth section Xen. introduces again the same dichotomy, but giving priority to the body: ἠγάλλετο μὲν καὶ τοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς κατορθώμασι, πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον τῷ κάλλει τοῦ σώματος: see 1.1.2 n.: παιδείαν (for a more detailed discussion of "body and soul", LI 4.5a and LI 7.4a).

1.1.2: συνήνθει: this is the first pun made by Xen. on the name of Anthia, as it is comes from ἄνθος, 'flower', which is a cognate word of this verb. With the origin of this name and the current game Xen. is certainly anticipating the beauty of the heroine (for more, 1.2.5, n.: Ἀνθία). This confirms our author's interest in names and, interestingly, other puns on the protagonists' names occur later in the text: see 1.2.5, n.: ἤνθει, 1.8.2-3, n.: the only ekphrasis, 2a7: τὰ ἄνθη φέροντες for Anthia and 1.9.5, n.: ἡ καλή σου κόμη for Habrocomes.

Within this framework, also the name of Ὑπεράνθης can be included, as it appears to be a variation of Ἀνθία and this link is supported by the definition of Hyperanthes as ἄνθος κλυτὸν (2.3.13), which appears on his epitaph.

Finally, at the end of Hippothous' story, the brigand confesses his desperation to Habrocomes by saying: ἐγὼ δ᾽Ὑπεράνθην ἰδεῖν οὐκέτι δυνήσομαι (3.2.3). Immediately after, Hippothous ἐδείκνυέ τε τὴν κόμην καὶ ἐπεδάκρυεν αὐτῇ (3.3.3): in my opinion, the presence of κόμη few words after Ὑπεράνθης appears to be a possible pun on the name of both protagonists, which would subtly confirms Xen.'s interest in this kind of games.

1.1.2: παιδείαν … γυμνάσματα: this period, which seems to be the list of Habrocomes' τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγαθά, is divided into three clauses: the first two share a parallel structure, while the third is a nominal sentence. Since the whole meaning is not straightforward, I will carefully analyse the most important words, starting from the first clauses.

a) Παιδεῖα and μουσική

Παιδεῖα and μουσική are certainly the key words of this sentence: while the first is the word traditionally used by Greeks to describe the 'education which "makes men"' (Goldhill 2001, 17), the second 'encompasses those skills over which the Muses presided', such as 'singing and dance, memorizing and reciting (or singing) of the traditional poets, and competence in playing musical instruments, notably the lyre' (Robb 1994, 192). Since Xen. is relating to both these terms a verb which expresses the action of training, namely μελετάω and ἀσκέω, Habrocomes is here introduced as a man who is committed to a comprehensive education of himself.

Given this general idea, more precise points must be made. To begin with, the construction of both sentences appears slightly odd. Πᾶσα παιδεῖα occurs frequently in Greek literature to designate 'the totality of the education' one can receive: a case in point is Plato's passage from the *Republic*, where Socrates includes this formula in his recapitulative idea of state: Εἶεν· ταῦτα μὲν δὴ ὡμολόγηται, ὦ Γλαύκων, τῇ μελλούσῃ ἄκρως οἰκεῖν πόλει κοινὰς μὲν γυναῖκας, κοινοὺς δὲ παῖδας εἶναι καὶ πᾶσαν παιδείαν, ὡσαύτως δὲ τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα κοινὰ ἐν πολέμῳ τε καὶ εἰρήνῃ, [...] (543a). Also Flavius Josephus uses πᾶσα παιδεῖα to express the whole of the Hebrew education (AJ 10.194: πᾶσαν ἑτοίμως ἐξέμαθον παιδείαν ἥτις ἦν παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις καὶ τοῖς Χαλδαίοις). That said, the presence in the Eph. of a verb like μελετάω does not immediately accord with a comprehensive term like παιδεία: as a result, I would translate here this noun with a more specific and concrete term 'discipline': 'he practised every discipline'. This interpretation works well with the second clause, where μουσική has instead a specific meaning, since it refers to 'art over which the Muses presided'. Thus, this second phrase can be translated as 'he trained himself in any musical art', where 'musical' unfortunately deemphasise the importance of the correspondent Greek word.

Overall, the study of these two clauses leads us to a first important conclusion: Habrocomes' education is part of the cultural phenomenon of the Greek παιδεῖα. Through this term, Xen is alluding to the Greek attitude 'of defining their particular place in their world through claims to superior culture since (at least) the fifth century BC' (Whitmarsh, 2005, 13). As is commonly

known, this strong appreciation of Greek culture had its origin in the Classical Era and then in the Imperial Era there was a revival of it. Although both phenomena shared the word παιδεία, they have a different focus: the first was essentially promoted by the Athenians πεπαιδευμένοι of the fifth and fourth century BC (see Robb, 1994, 183-213), who were attentive readers of Plato and Xenophon of Athens. Conversely, the second was led by the members of the Second Sophistic movement (see Whitmarsh 2005, esp. 3-22, and Chew and Morgan forth.).

Although the Greek novel as a genre shares some features with the second kind of παιδεῖα (Whitmarsh 2005, 86-9), Xen. seems here to allude to the first one and the first hint at this lies in the mention of μουσική. This word, in fact, includes a wide range of activities which lose importance where the oral culture was overcome by the literary one: for this reason, Aristophanes calls μουσική ἀρχαῖα παιδεία (*Clouds* 961 ff.). This discovery is quite significant, because it might shed new light on the social world of the Eph.

b) θήρα, ἱππασία and ὁπλομαχία

The focus on training which has thus far emerged also concerns the following activities, which are called συνήθη γυμνάσματα. The introduction of θήρα, ἱππασία and ὁπλομαχία appears to be another allusion to the first kind of παιδεία, since these disciplines are typical of Classical Greece. Proof of this is the *Cyropaedia* of Xenophon of Athens, in which hunting is defined as the best preparation for war (1.3.3) and Cyrus learns to ride a horse (1.2.10). In the following analysis, I will enrich this argumentation.

1) θήρα: the 'educational value' of hunting is addressed by Xenophon of Athens in his *Cynegeticus*, in which he argues that this activity 'called for self-denial, endurance, and hard physical effort' (Anderson 1985, 107). More precisely, at the end of his first chapter, where he gives a list of the mythical heroes who loved hunting and thereby acquired virtue, he declares: ἐκ τούτων [κυνηγεσίων] γὰρ γίγνονται τὰ εἰς τὸν πόλεμον ἀγαθοὶ εἴς τε τὰ ἄλλα ἐξ ὧν ἀνάγκη καλῶς νοεῖν καὶ λέγειν καὶ πράττειν (1.18). Conversely, for his emulator Arrianus 'hunting meant a good morning's gallop, and he very honestly does not claim too much for the hunting field as a school of character' (ibid.). This difference suggests that the ideal exploitation of hunting was proper of Classical and not of Imperial παιδεία.

2) ἱππασία: as Spence argues, in Athens 'the idea that equestrianism was a suitable medium for educating royalty and the upper elechons of society frequently surfaces during the Classical period' (1993, 93). In this Era, in fact, cavalry played an important role in the numerous battles fought by Greeks. In addition, as care of horses was expensive, this activity was prerogative of aristocratic people: as a result, 'the Athenians basically perceived their cavalry and cavalry class as a group of wealthy aristocratic youths' (202). This framework suggests that ἱππασία suits well Habrocomes' aristocratic and wealth nature. Finally, it is interesting that the theme of 'riding' and 'horse-exercise' is the subject of two other treatises written by Xenophon of Athens, the *Hipparchikos* and the *Peri Hippikes*. The existence of these sources, as well as the decline of Athenian cavalry in the Hellenistic Era, gives further proof of the Classical nature of Habrocomes' παιδεῖα.

3) ὁπλομαχία: this word refers to 'fighting with heavy arms' (LSJ), which is the distinctive sign of hoplite warfare: interestingly, 'the hoplite was the most important offensive land arm of the *polis* and, despite some changes in the way war was waged, this remained so in most of Greece until the late fourth century' (Spence 1993, 165). This activity was ascribed to young aristocratic Athenians during the Classical Era and Plato includes it in the education of young people (*Laws* 813d-e). As a result, Xen. seems here to pay tribute to this ancient valorisation of hoplite fighting. This conclusion is confirmed by the story of the term ὁπλομαχία, which is mostly related to Classical Greece. This link emerges in the following occurrences:

- Xenophon of Athens refers ὁπλομαχία to Phalinus, a Greek experts on military tactics (*An.* 2.1.7: καὶ γὰρ προσεποιεῖτο ἐπιστήμων εἶναι τῶν ἀμφὶ τάξεις τε καὶ ὁπλομαχίαν);

- with the same term Ephorus describes the Athenians who fought in Mantineia (fr. 54J: πρὸς δὲ τούτοις καὶ ὁπλομαχίας μαθήσεις ἐν Μαντινείαι πρῶτον εὑρέθησαν Δημέου τὸ τέχνημα καταδείξαντος);

- the same focus on Classical Athens occurs in Theophilus' fable (fr. 17: ὁ μὲν Φάλαγξ ἔμαθε παρὰ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τὰ περὶ τὴν ὁπλομαχίαν).

Finally, in the Imperial era only four authors use ὁπλομαχία:

- Philo does this in his description of a man who lacks military experience: οὐδὲ γὰρ ἕτερόν τινα κτεινόμενον εἶδεν οὐδὲ ἤσκητό πω ταῖς ὁπλομαχίαις, αἳ μελέται καὶ προγυμνάσματα παίδων ἐφ' ἡγεμονίᾳ τρεφομένων εἰσὶ διὰ τοὺς ἐνισταμένους πολέμους (*Leg. ad Gaium*, 30);

- two medicine writers refers ὁπλομαχία as a cause of diseases (see Diosc. Ped. *De mat. med.* 5.46.1: ἁρμόζει δὲ στομαχικοῖς, κεκοπωμένοις δι' ὁπλομαχίαν ἢ ἱππασίαν πολλήν and Galen *De Ippocratis liber epidemiarum,* Kuhn 17a, 838 on therapies and 17b, 8)

- Dion Cassius uses ὁπλομαχία with the Roman meaning of 'gladiatorial combat' (e.g., HR 37.46.4, 43.22.3, 51.23.1, 69.6.1).

In my opinion, this second group of passages proves that in a Greek context the Imperial exploitation of ὁπλομαχία was rare. As a result, I would speculate that also this term might have been introduced by Xen. having a Classical activity in mind.

This leads me to conclude that Habrocomes is keen on the first kind of παιδεία and this discovery also pushes the 'dramatic date' of the text back (GI 2.2): Habrocomes is training to become a Classic πεπαιδευμένος. In addition, it is not impossible that our author owes here a debt to Xenophon of Athens, who was particularly interested in hunting and cavalry. Finally, further confirmation of this Classical portrait might come by Xen.'s omission of athletics, which were instead part of the Imperial concept of παιδεῖα (see Jones 2007b, 113: 'The number of Imperial inscriptions commemorating athletic victors, together with treatises and other texts on athletics, suggest a contemporary concern with the display of masculinity through physical endeavour in the gymnasium').

c) Further suggestions: possible references to rhetoric

Since Xen.'s portrait of Habrocomes places an emphasis on practical activities, I would also speculate that ἐμελέτα might subtly recall μελέται, the rhetorical declamations which were part of

Greek education (see Whitmarsh 2005, 20: 'The μελέτη was a speech given in the persona of, or addressed to, a famous figure from myth or ancient history from the classical period'). Similarly, in ancient Greek also γύμνασμα, which generally means 'exercise', sometimes designates rhetorical training or even 'text-books' (LSJ and Theo *Prog.* 1): as a result, it it is not impossible to read this term as another reference to rhetoric.

d) Conclusion

Overall, this rich description of Habrocomes' παιδεῖα seems to emphasise his ideal characterization. That said, the fact that Xen. calls these activities τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγαθά (1.1.2) appears strange. In Jones' (2007b, 84) view this suggests a lack of 'moral dimension' in Habrocomes. In my opinion, this assessment is correct: the protagonist seems to consider the activities of this body as activities of this soul and this suggests that he has not yet discovered what his ψυχή is (LI 4.5a). Further, his lack of spiritual virtue can also be confirmed by his arrogance towards Eros.

This discovery works well in the interpretation of the novel as a *Bildung*: since in the Greek perception παιδεία 'is a process, not an overnight acquisition, suggesting that it cannot be possessed by the young' (Jones 2007b, 45), this behaviour of Habrocomes can be interpreted as a consequence of his young age, which will be soon revealed (1.2.2, n.: ἐξκαίδεκα). As a result, I would suggest that from now onward the readers of Xen. could expect a moral evolution of the hero.

A confirmation of this interpretation is provided by Char., who constructs similarly Chaereas' figure: at the beginning of the novel his starting παιδεία, which is suggested by his noble origin (1.1.3) and his frequentation of the gymnasium (1.1.5), is contrasted by his jealous anger, which 'marks him out clearly on as a hot-headed youth' (Jones 2007b, 46). Then, throughout the novel Chaereas manages to acquire a mature παιδεία through his personal experience.

1.1.3: προσεῖχον δὲ ὡς θεῷ:

a) The famous τόπος about divine beauty

As Di Benedetto 1987 states, we are here dealing with an old τόπος: 'l'essere simile ad un dio era un modulo espressivo tipico del linguaggio omerico quando si voleva mettere in evidenza l'eccezionalità di un uomo nel suo manifestarsi e nel suo agire e in Saffo stessa lo troviamo più volte in contesto epitalamico' (31). Two famous examples are Odysseus' praise of Nausicaa as a possible goddess (see *Od.* 6.149-152) and Sappho's definition of Hector and Andromache as θεο<ε>ικέλο[ις (fr. 44.23; for secondary bibliography, cf. also Pattoni 2005, 86 n. 128 and Schmeling 2005, 45).

The fortune of this commonplace in the Imperial Era is proved by Lucian: in his *Essays in portraiture defended*, Panthea makes a critic to her portrait made by Lycinus and Polystratus: ἐγὼ δέ σε οὐδ᾽ἐκεῖνα ἠξίουν, ταῖς ἡρωίναις παραθεωρεῖν με Πηνελόπῃ καὶ Ἀρήτῃ καὶ θεανοῖ, οὐχ ὅπως θεῶν ταῖς ἀρίσταις (7). In the reply given to her Lycinus proves to be aware of the literary motif which he is using: Εἰ δὲ καὶ ὅτι μάλιστά σε αὐταῖς ἐκείναις εἴκασα, οὐκ ἐμὸν τοῦτο, οὐδὲ ἐγὼ

πρῶτος ταύτην ἐτεμόμην τὴν ὁδὸν, ἀλλὰ πολλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοὶ ποιηταί, καὶ μάλιστα ὁ πολίτης ὁ σὸς Ὅμηρος [...] (24).

In addition, this motif is also popular among the Greek novelists. In Char. Callirhoe's ἐπιφάνειαι like a goddess are 'noch mehr als diejenigen des Habrokomes, der Antheia und der Charickleia' (Kerényi, 1971, 97), she is identified with Artemis (1.1.16, 4.7.5), a Nymph or a Nereid (2.4.8, 3.2.15, 6.3.4, where she is like Thetis) and Aphrodite (3.2.14, 4.7.5, 5.9.1, 8.6.11). Furthermore, the heroine is also compared to goddesses, namely again Aphrodite (1.1.2, 2.2.6), Artemis (6.4.6) and to a generic one in 3.9.1. In Xen., the same motif is attributed to Anthia, who will be shortly compared to Artemis (1.2.7 n.: ἀνεβόησε) and both protagonists are considered as gods by the Tyrian population (2.2.4). Finally, Hld. uses this τόπος for Charicleia: in 1.2.6 the heroine is compared to Artemis or Isis, while in 1.2.1 more generically to a goddess. Conversely, neither Ach. nor Longus are interested in this theme: their 'sehr sparsam angewandten Floskeln' (Kerényi, 1971, 97) occur in the first description of Leucippe, where the heroine is compared with Selene (1.4.3), and in the comparison made by Longus between Daphnis and Apollo (4.14.2).

Despite this traditional background, this passage of Xen. maintains an originality, because our author refers this τόπος to a male character. Since only Plato in the Greek tradition makes the same exception, where the ἐραστής in front of his beloved θύοι ἂν ὡς ἀγάλματι καὶ θεῷ τοῖς παιδικοῖς (*Phaedrus* 251a), this passage might be part of the Platonic presentation of Habrocomes: see LI 7.3a.

Finally, it is interesting to note that Xen. does not follow Char. and Hld. in introducing also the comparison between a character and a hero of the Greek tradition (cf. Char. 1.1.3, where Chaereas is likened to Achilles, Nireus, Hippolytus and Alcibiades, and Hld. 1.10.2, where Cnemon is a new Hippolitus and Hld. 1.10.2, 2.35.1 and 4.3.1, where Theagenes is a new Achilles): the reason for this difference seems to be both his lack of sophistication and his different approach to intertextuality, according to which he does not directly mention his literary models (GI 2.1).

b) The role of the crowd

Along with the presence of this famous τόπος, it is also significant that Xen. introduces it focused on the Ephesian population. The involvement of the crowd in the life of the protagonists is another typical novelistic theme, which plays a double role: it is a crucial element of Xen.'s civilised society (LI 1.2) and it also performs the function of being 'a channel through which information passes to the reader' (Morgan 1991, 91). For this second value, see NA 4.4.

1.1.3: προσεκύνησαν ἰδόντες καὶ προσηύξαντο: this pair of verbs, which occurs also in 1.2.7 and in 1.12.1, strengthens the crowds' consideration of the characters as gods, as their attitude towards them becomes real worship. Traditionally, these verbs are used by Greeks in cultic contexts and Xen. himself uses them in relation to real gods: in 3.11.5 Psammis falls down in front of Isis (τὴν θεὸν προσεκύνει), in 5.4.11 Anthia prays to the gods after Apis' response (προσεύχεται τοῖς θεοῖς),

in 5.10.7 Habrocomes does the same with Helios in Rhodes (προσεύξασθαι τῷ θεῷ) and shortly after Anthia reminds the same god of her past sacrifice (5.11.4: σε προσεκύνουν).

That being said, the appearance of προσκύνεω suggests a further observation. As is commonly known, in ancient Greece prostration was typical of the worship of gods, while it was not accepted towards kings and superiors, because this was considered an Eastern and impious behaviour. For this reason, when Alexander the Great started to ask people to kneel in front of him, he found many opponents among the Greeks. Given this framework, one might wonder whether also Xen.'s worship of the protagonists was considered immoral by Greeks. In my opinion, since our author relates προσκύνεω to Habrocomes and Anthia when he overtly considers them as gods, the answer seems to be negative. In short, προσκήνησις follows and does not create a divine comparison.

Even the other novels confirm this conclusion: as I show in the following table, in each of the authors προσκύνησις concerns gods and characters considered as gods. In addition, Char. and Hld. introduce προσκύνησις in an Eastern context and the second author defines it as a not Greek and immoral attitude: when Theagenes refuses to worship Arsace, the queen comments: 'Σύγγνωτε - εἶπεν - ὡς ἀπείρῳ καὶ ξένῳ καὶ τὸ ὅλον Ἕλληνι καὶ τὴν ἐκεῖθεν ὑπεροψίαν καθ' ἡμῶν νοσοῦντι' (7.19.2). Since this pattern is clearly different from the worship of the protagonists, I would use it to exclude an impious connotation from Xen.'s occurrences.

Finally, Char.'s exploitation of this motif is significant for two reasons: first, Callirhoe, who is often worshipped as Aphrodite, and, at the same time, is devoted to the goddess, appears a very plausible model for Anthia, who worships Artemis and is worshipped as Artemis. Second, Char.'s exclusive focus on Callirhoe gives another proof that Xen.'s extension of this τόπος to Habrocomes is original.

Table ad 1.1.3: Use of προσκύνεω and προσκύνησις in the traditional corpus of the Greek novels

Nov	To worship a god	To worship characters as gods	To worship a superior (Eastern προσκύνησις)
Char.	1.1.5, 2.3.5, 3.6.3, 8.4.10 (Aphrodite), 3.8.6 (Nemesis).	1.1.16, 2.3.9, 3.9.1, 3.9.5, 3.12.4, 4.1.9, 5.3.9 (Callirhoe).	5.2.3, 5.3.3, 5.3.11, 5.4.8, 5.8.9, 5.9.1, 6.7.3, 6.7.5 (bis), 6.7.6, 7.5.15, 8.5.5, 8.5.12 (Persian King).
Longus	2.2.4, 2.2.5, 2.24.1, 3.28.1 (Nymphs), 2.24.2 (Pan).	3.9.2 (Daphnis' admirers)	
Ach.		3.23.1 (Menelaus), 8.8.8 (Ephesian priest)	

Nov	To worship a god	To worship characters as gods	To worship a superior (Eastern προσκύνησις)
Hld.	2.26.5 (Delphian Pythia), 10.6.2 (Egyptian gods)	3.17.2 (Calasiris)	7.17.3, 7.19.1.2.3, 7.25.1 (Arsace), 9.12.3, 9.27.1-2, 10.25.1, (Hydaspes).

1.1.4: ἐφρόνει: after the description of Habrocomes focused on the Ephesians, we are here introduced to another trait of his personality: due to his fame and beauty, he is proud and haughty. The apex of this behaviour is showed by his contempt for Eros. Because of this attitude Habrocomes has often been compared by scholars with the Euripidean *Hippolytus*, but also other models have been mentioned, namely Theocritus' *Daphnis* (see Ruiz Montero 1994, 1098: 'die Verachtung des Eros erinnert an den 'Hippolytos' des Euripides und den Daphnis' des Theokrit') and *Narcissus* (see Schmeling 1980, 23).

As I suggested in LI 2.1, Xen. is not directly engaging with Euripides (APP 4.4): Habrocomes' arrogance is more simply part of the Hellenistic τόπος of "Eros' revenge against the arrogant lovers" (table 3 in LI 2.3). In this respect, I completely agree with Crismani 1997, who argues: 'l'accenno alla giovanile refrattarietà all'amore da parte di Abrocome e alla vendetta di Eros […] è solo un omaggio alla tradizione: nell'elegia, nei drammi di Euripide, ma non diversamente nella Nea, Eros si abbatte improvviso sulle sue vittime, trionfando facilmente dei loro animi' (56). In addition, Theocritus' *Daphnis* and Plato's *Lysis* appear to be two possible intertexts (see below a and b). Finally, following Harrison's (2007b) view, Xen.'s focus on arrogance and punishment might be the source of Apuleius' story of Cupid and Psyche (on this, GI 5.2).

a) Habrocomes like Daphnis

The version of Daphnis' story which might interest us comes from Theocritus, who introduces the motifs of arrogance and divine punishment in this character's life are involved. This is different from the more common version of the myth, which explores the shepherd's infidelity to a Naiad, which leads the latter to blind him or turn him to a stone (cf. Ael. *ibid.* and Parth. 39, *Schol. ad Theoc.* 1.65, 7.73, Serv. ad Virg. *Eclog.* 8.68, Phylarg. ad Virg. *Eclog.* 20).

In the first *Idyll*, which focuses on Daphnis' suicide (64-145), Aphrodite retells the life of the shepherd, who is punished by Eros because of his arrogance: (97-8: τύ θην τὸν Ἔρωτα κατεύχεο, Δάφνι, λυγιξεῖν· ἦ ῥ'οὐκ αὐτὸς Ἔρωτος ὑπ'ἀργαλέω ἐλυγίχθης;). Interestingly, this pattern coincides with Habrocomes' story. Since Theocritus, as Longus proves, is one of the authors read by Greek novelists, I would suggest that Xen. might be playing with Daphnis' story. However, since no textual allusions are introduced, his knowledge seems to be limited to the outline of the myth.

Finally, Daphnis' story is similar to that of Narcissus: when this boy is sixteen years old, the nymph Echo falls in love with him. Like Daphnis, Narcissus refuses her love and Nemesis takes revenge on him, making him fall in love with his reflection in a pool. Since Narcissus is not able to obtain the

object of his love, he dies of sorrow by the same pool. That being said, the possibility that Xen. was referring to this story is more difficult to accept, because Eros is here not mentioned and this myth was not clearly attested in Greece. Its first literary occurrence is in Ovid *Met.* 3.339, while in the iconography 'the myth of Narcissus was widely illustrated in the Roman world from the first cent. A.D. onwards' (LIMC VI, 709).

In short, I would conclude that Habrocomes is probably Daphnis in Xen.'s mind but not Narcissus.

<u>b) Habrocomes like Lysis</u>

Since the parallel between Habrocomes and Lysis is clearly introduced at the end of the second chapter (2.1.2, n: δυσάλωτος), it might also involve the issue of pride (<u>LI</u> 7.1), confirming the identification of Habrocomes with an ἐρώμενος.

1.1.4: Κατορθώμασι: in the Greek tradition κατόρθωμα generally means 'success' and becomes 'virtuous action' (LSJ) in a philosophical context. In my opinion, Xen. is here using the first meaning, because he wants to highlight that Habrocomes is practising and performing παιδεῖα through hunting, cavalry and hoplite warfare (1.1.2, n.: παιδείαν). In this respect, κατορθώματα adds a new feature to the previous definition of these activities as τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγαθά (ibid., d).

Despite this shift, Habrocomes' lack of distinction between body and soul seems here to continue (<u>LI</u> 6.2): this term, like τὰ ἀγαθά, does not refer to authentic spiritual actions. In addition, this contrast might be here strengthened if we accept the existence of a philosophical colour in κατόρθωμα: in Stoic language the plural of this term is used to denote the control of passions which is typical of them (see, esp., Phil. *Leg. Alleg.* 1.97), and this attitude is clearly not part of Habrocomes' behaviour, as his arrogance proves.

1.1.5: ὅτι εἷς καλὸς αὐτὸς: in this sentence the text is unclear, since F has ἔνι, while Cocchi's *editio princeps* εἷς, which is here accepted by O' Sullivan 2005. This numeral, however, when it means 'the only', is usually followed by a superlative of the adjective or by οἷος and μόνος: as a result, Cocchi's (1726) reading is disputable. In addition, Dawe 2001, 304 adds further criticism: first, he suggests that in the context of this passage the whole expression with εἷς 'is an unlikely claim to be made even by someone as vain as Habrocomes': his pride would have certainly led him to use the superlative κάλλιστος after εἷς. In addition, there is no palaeographic reason to transform ἔνι into εἷς. As a result, he develops a new idea, according to which 'there has been a false word division and the original was ὅτι ἐνίκα κάλλει αὐτός' (ibid.). This reading is supported by Homeric parallels: in *Il.* 9.130 and 272 the imperfect of νικάω is referred to the beauty of Agamemnon's Lesbian slaves, while in *Il.* 23.742 to the silver crater offered by Achilles to the athletes during Patroclus' games.

Following Capra's (2008b, 14) view, I would propose to accept Dawe's reading, as it emphasises Habrocomes' beauty and is based on a common palaeographic mistake like diplography. O'Sullivan 2005, who is attracted by this proposal, at the end does not accept it, because in his opinion the *usus* of the novelist would suggest the existence of a present instead of a imperfect. However, this

statement appears to be weak: the same construction (λέγω with a declarative clause introduced by ὡς or ὅτι) again occurs in two other passages of the novel with a past tense (2.3.1 and 5.5.7). Having said that, this discussed phrase is also worth analysing for the motif which it introduces: the prominence of an extraordinary beauty in a group of beautiful young people. As it often appears in the beginning of the Platonic dialogues, it seems to be part of the peculiar presentation of Habrocomes (LI 7.3a).

1.1.5: Ἔρωτα: Eros is the first of the divine presences of the Eph.. Unlike Artemis and most of the gods of the Greek novels (see Calderini 1987), Eros has no connection with local cults: this suggests that its role in the novel is essentially narrative: as I have already said, Eros is the real actor of the plot (LI 1.1) and, in addition, he is used by Xen. to 'feature a power struggle between the persons and emotion' (Cummings 2009, 95): see 1.2.1-2, n: ὁ θεὸς for more.

1.1.5: μὴ θέλων: this participle introduces the motif of the 'attempt to resisting love', which is a common erotic τόπος (see table 3 in LI 2.3). For a more intense and personal expression of the same motif in Habrocomes' first monologue, 1.4.1-3, n.

1.1.5: ἐξέβαλεν: as Capra 2008b argues, this is a strange aorist, which does not accord with the near verbs, which are all imperfects. The hypothesis of an aplography, already suggested by Hemsterhuys, seems adequate, because the same anomaly occurs in 1.2.5, where F has ὑπερεβάλετο and συνεβάλετο, which are interpreted as imperfects by Locella 1796 and Cocchi 1726. Since in that case the context discourages us from accepting the existence of immediate actions, I would follow the two Italian scholars and change also the present one, trying to build on the *usus* of the author.

1.1.6: ἀπέφαινέ τε ἑαυτὸν Ἔρωτος παντὸς κρείττονα καὶ κάλλει σώματος καὶ δυνάμει: also this passage is uncertain, because in F there is the close repetition of καλλίονα and κάλλει. While Papanikolau does not change this reading, O'Sullivan 1982, 5 argues that 'καλλίονα κάλλει is completely inept and καλλίονα δυνάμει is nonsense'. In fact, 'it seems very likely that an original κρείττονα became κάλλιονα by assimilation to κάλλει'. Borgogno 2003, 32 reveals that the paternity of this reading has to be attributed to Dalmeyda 1926, who proposes κρείττονα in his apparatus as an alternative to Hercher's expunction of καὶ κάλλει σώματος καὶ δυνάμει ('καὶ κάλλει σώματος καὶ δυνάμει del. Hercher. Quae si non deleas reponere possis κρείττονα pro κάλλιονα'.

1.1.6: ὅπου γὰρ Ἀβροκόμης ὀφθείη, οὔτε ἄγαλμα κατεφαίνετο οὔτε εἰκὼν ἐπῇνεῖτο: with this sentence Xen. makes a comparison between the beauty of Habrocomes and Eros' statues. The comparison between human beauty and a statue is a famous τόπος of the erotic literature, in which usually the statue portraits a god (see Lier 1914's words: 'in alia etiam sententiarum ratione puella cum dea comparata in poesi amatoria occurrit; digna enim existimatur, quam, cum sit pulcherrima, artifices exemplar sibi sumant, si quanto iis Venus vel alia dea sit effigenda', 9). As a result, this

theme is really similar to that of the divine comparison (1.1.3, n.: προσεῖχον) and also in this case a significant occurrence comes from Lucian. In his *Essays in portraiture*, which precedes the aforementioned *Essays in portraiture defended*, Lycinus decides to build the first part of his portrait by using many famous sculptures and paintings: in this way, he makes our τόπος the key feature of his work and, as most of his models depicted are goddesses, also the previous τόπος is included (6-8).

Also the novelists are keen on the parallel between human beauty and statues: in Char., when Callirhoe carries her son among her arms, the author adds this comment: ὤφθη θέαμα κάλλιστον, οἷον οὔτε ζωγράφος ἔγραψεν οὔτε πλάστης ἔπλασεν οὔτε ποιητὴς ἱστόρησε μέχρι νῦν· (3.8.6). This formulation of the motif is very close to the aforementioned passage of Lucian. In Hld., on the other hand, as soon as the brigands see Charicleia in the initial scene, μετῆχθαι τὸ ἄγαλμα διὰ τῆς κόρης ὑπ᾽ἀγροικίας εἴκαζον (1.7.2). Similarly, when Charicles meets her for the first time, for her beauty πᾶς ὀφθαλμὸς [...] ἐπ᾽αὐτὴν φέρεται καὶ ὅπου δὴ χαινομένη ναῶν ἢ δρόμων ἢ ἀγορῶν καθάπερ ἀρχέτυπον ἄγαλμα πᾶσαν ὄψιν καὶ διάνοιαν ἐφ᾽ἑαυτὴν ἐπιστρέφει (2.33.3). Then, in the last book, when the same heroine is ready to sacrifice herself, she has the same effect on the audience: περίοπτος ἐφ᾽ὑψηλοῦ πᾶσι γεγενημένη, καὶ πρὸς τοῦ σχήματος τῆς στολῆς ἀγάλματι θεοῦ πλέον ἢ θνητῇ γυναικὶ προσεικαζομένη (10.9.3).

Having proved the popularity of this τόπος, as in the case of the previous τόπος, Xen. constitutes an exception, because he attributes it to a male character (see 1.2.8, n.: οἷος for a second "male" occurrence of this motif). This anomaly again recalls the Platonic *Phaedrus* (LI 7.3a). Also Meleager dedicates includes this τόπος in his epigram dedicated to the boy Praxiteles (AP 12.56, 1-4):

Εἰκόνα μὲν Παρίην ζωογλύφος ἄνυσ᾽Ἔρωτος
  Πραξιτέλης, Κύπριδος παῖδα τυπωσάμενος·
νῦν δ᾽ ὁ θεῶν κάλλιστος Ἔρως ἔμψυχον ἄγαλμα
  αὐτὸν ἀπεικονίσας ἔπλασε Πραξιτέλην.

This testimony is interesting, because Meleager designates the statues with the same two words used by Xen. and by Lucian: εἰκόνα and ἄγαλμα. This proves that these terms were popular in the Augustean and Imperial Era. However, since the *Phaedrus* was a well-known text, it is not unlikely that Meleager like our author was drawing this motif from Plato too: this would confirm the Platonic colour of Xen's occurrence.

Finally, in the second chapter Xen. introduces a portrait of his female protagonist which can be compared with a famous statue of Artemis (1.2.6, n.: χίτων). As he does not mention this model, he seems to vary this motif: instead of expressing the comparison between the heroine and the statue, he subtly describes the former as the latter. In this literary operation, our author might be again compared with Char. and with Hld. In Hunter's (1994, 1074) view, the former would be inspired by the Aphrodite of Cnidus in his Callirhoe's description of the second book (2.2.2), while the latter's first portrait of Charicleia has been compared with statues of Artemis at rest (1.2; see on this Colonna 1987, 56, n. 2: 'in questa prima descrizione di Cariclea alcuni studiosi hanno colto la reminiscenza di una qualche statua di "Artemide in riposo"; in effetti non è improbabile che

Eliodoro abbia avuto in mente qualcosa del genere e si sia abbandonato al gusto dell'ἔκφρασις'). Since, however, in his passage Char. describes merely the skin of the heroine, only Hld. is comparable with Xen. Since both authors portray Artemis and Hld. repeatedly shows his dependence on Xen (GI 5.1), it is not unlikely that he owes him a debt also in this case. As a result, Xen.'s subtle variation of this τόπος seems to be original in the novelistic corpus and this increases the importance of studying each of its elements (1.2.6, n: χίτων).

1.1.6: οὔτε ἄγαλμα κατεφαίνετο: this sentence is not clear, because the verb means 'become visible, appear' (cfr. *LSJ*, s.v., 918.) and there seems to be something missing. For this reason, some new readings have been proposed:
- Peerlkamp 1818 simplifies κατεφαίνετο into ἐφαίνετο;
- Dalmeyda 1926 introduces <καλὸν> before the verb and this conjecture is accepted by both Papanikolau 1971 and Borgogno 2005;
- Bianchi 2003, 172 replaces κατεφαίνετο with διεφαίνετο, because this other compound verb means 'stand out' and occurs with this meaning in AP 2.1.285-6 with reference to a statue of Apollo. In this case, the copyist would have been induced to a mistake by the presence in the same chapter of other compound verbs with κατα-, like καταγελάω (1.1.5, 1.1.6);
- Zanetto, as Capra 2007/2008, 14 reports, proposes κατεφιλεῖτο: Xen. would be here referring to the Greek custom of kissing the statues of the gods, which happened in ancient ceremonies.
Overall, this variety of readings proves that this passage is controversial and, in my opinion, none of them is convincing:
- Dalmeyda's (1926) proposal 1926 because it eliminates the parallelism with the second part of the sentence;
- Zanetto's (in Capra 2007/8) idea because καταφιλέομαι never occurs in the passive form in Greek literature.
- Bianchi's (2003) proposal because διαφαίνομαι does not have other occurrences in the Eph.
Given this framework, I would speculate that the manuscript reading is the most likely reading. Since in its absolute use καταφαίνομαι also appears in the eleventh chapter of the first book to describe the appearance of Rhodes to the protagonists (1.11.6: κατεφαίνετο δὲ ἡ Ῥοδίων νῆσος), I would suggest that Xen. might be here introducing a poetic fight between the visibility of Habrocomes and that of the statues.

CHAPTER 2

Beginning of the action: the presentation of Anthia in Artemis' Ephesian procession

With this chapter the action of the novel begins, because Eros starts to take revenge against the arrogant Habrocomes. The god's success is immediate: he prepares the falling in love of the protagonists by introducing Anthia on the scene and making her encounter with Habrocomes possible. For this reason, the introduction in the novel of the female protagonist appears to be functional to the broader theme of Eros' initiative (LI 2.1).

In addition, this chapter introduces us to the reality of Ephesus, which is focused on a religious event of the city, a procession to Artemis' temple: its existence opens the possibility that our author might show his closeness to Ephesus, but no positive answers are given (GI 4.1).

Finally, Xen. also uses this passage to introduce more personal and deeper features of Anthia, such as her identification with Nausicaa (LI 6.3.1), which I will explore in this introduction: this suggests that Xen. is also interested in the development of his female protagonist and not only in that of Habrocomes.

INTRODUCTION: ANTHIA LIKE NAUSICAA

In the description of the Ephesian procession Xen. seems to have a Homeric model in mind: Anthia is introduced as the Odyssean Nausicaa and the Ephesians are associated with the Phaeacians. This double parallel, which is here started, is then continued in the fourth chapter with a special focus on Anthia.

While the model of Scheria seems to be part of the ideal connotation of the first Ephesus of the novel (LI 6.2c), the parallel between Anthia and Nausicaa introduces the sequence of Homeric heroines to whom the female protagonist is compared (LI 6.3a). Within this parallel, Xen. seems to make Anthia more lascivious than Nausicaa: as I will shortly show, this deviation from the model might have been inspired by the moral interpretations of the *Odyssey* (LI 6.6).

1) Anthia like Nausicaa: a chaste virgin, shameful and full of respect for her parents

To begin with, I would like to show how the parallel with Nausicaa is constructed by Xen. Five parallels of motifs occur in the second chapter:

a) Anthia enters the scene of the novel as the leader of a group of virgins (1.2.5: ἦρχε δὲ τῆς τῶν παρθένων τάξεως Ἀνθία, θυγάτηρ Μεγαμήδους καὶ Εὐίππης) and Xen. adds that her beauty surpasses that of the others (ibid.: πολὺ τὰς ἄλλας ὑπερεβάλετο παρθένους). In the *Odyssey*, when Nausicaa has washed the clothes in the river, she is ἀμφιπόλοισι μετέπρεπε παρθένος ἀδμής (*Od.* 6.109; on this parallel, see Dowden 1999, 233: 'The motif of the girl like Artemis of course originates in the *Odyssey*, where Homer [...] colours Nausicaa [...] as the leader of the dance group.

[...] Thus this "myth" [...] is adopted in an entirely appropriate context, almost 800 years later, by Xenophon of Ephesus').

b) Anthia is indirectly compared to Artemis through her portrait, which recalls that of the huntress goddess because of the χίτων (1.2.6, n.), the νέβρις, the τόξα and ἄκοντες, Similarly, Nausicaa is compared to Artemis who goes hunting with her nymphs (*Od.* 6.102-108).

c) Shortly after Anthia's appearance, Xen. tells that the Ephesians προσεκύνησαν her ὡς Ἄρτεμιν (1.2.7, n.: ἐπὶ τοῦ τεμένους). This recalls how Odysseus starts his famous apostrophe to Nausicaa: Γουνοῦμαί σε, ἄνασσα· θεός νύ τις ἢ βροτός ἐσσι; εἰ μέν τις θεός ἐσσι, τοὶ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσιν, Ἀρτέμιδί σε ἐγὼ γε, Διὸς κούρῃ μεγάλοιο [...] (*Od.* 6.149-151).

d) In front of Anthia some Ephesians τοὺς γονεῖς αὐτῆς ἐμακάριζον (1.2.7, n.): the verb μακαρίζω belongs to the literary τόπος of the μακαρισμός, which has its first model in Odysseus' approach to Nausicaa, when the hero says: εἰ δὲ τίς ἐσσι βροτῶν, τοὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ ναιετάουσι, τρισμάκαρες μὲν σοί γε πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ [...] (*Od.* 6.153-4).

e) The falling in love between the protagonists is preceded by the birth of the fame of their beauty, which makes both Anthia and Habrocomes desire to meet each other. This special use of fame might have its origin in Nausicaa's worry that the Phaeacians could create a φῆμις about her relationship with Odysseus: τίς δ᾽ὅδε Ναυσικάᾳ ἕπεται καλός τηε μέγας τε ξεῖνος; ποῦ δέ μιν εὗρε; πόσις νύ οἱ ἔσσεται αὐτῇ (*Od.* 6.276-277). The same idea is repeated shortly after: βέλτερον, εἰ καὐτή περ ἐποιχομένη πόσιν εὗρεν ἄλλοθεν· (*Od.* 6.282-283).

In addition, Anthia's monologue in the fourth chapter includes another parallel:

f) Anthia is worried about her love because she is παρθένος ἐγὼ φρουρουμένη (1.4.7). Similarly, Nausicaa admits to be afraid of her parents' judgement, when she makes this general statement: καὶ δ᾽ἄλλῃ νεμεσῶ, ἥ τις τοιαῦτα γε ῥέζοι, ἤ τ᾽ἀέκητι φίλων πατρὸς καὶ μητρὸς ἐόντων, ἀνδράσι μίσγηται, πρίν γ᾽ἀμφάδιον γάμον ἐλθεῖν (*Od.* 6.286-288).

In conclusion, Anthia is clearly compared to Nausicaa by Xen. and the focus on this parallel is on the first part of the Odyssean scene, where Alcinous' daughter is introduced and then meets Odysseus. This is important, because most Homeric scholars agree that the nuptial theme is central in this Homeric episode (see Ingalls 2000, 12: 'Nausicaa's role is to sound the marriage theme, and marriage is a central focus of the Nausicaa episode'). This is proved by Athena's apostrophe to Nausicaa (*Od.* 6.27: σοὶ δὲ γάμος σχεδόν ἐστιν) and that of Nausicaa to her servants, where she calls Odysseus her πόσις (*Od.* 6.244). The importance of marriage is also underlined by Odysseus who praises familial harmony with the following words: οὐ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ γε κρεῖσσον καὶ ἄρειον, ἢ ὅθ᾽ὁμοφρονέοντε νοήμασιν οἶκον ἔχητον, ἀνὴρ ἠδὲ *γυνή· (Od.* 6.183-185). As a result, since Anthia is a Nausicaa in front of Odysseus, this literary parallel legitimates her status of a girl yearning and ready to marry Habrocomes.

In addition, as Alcinous' daughter is concerned about her love and does not want to act without the consent of her parents, Anthia lives the same dilemma, since she is restrained by her shame and her obedience to her parents. Both these values are quite significant, because they are part of Xen.'s civilised love: as a result, the epic model seems to be also at the origin of Anthia's view of lovesickness.

2) Xenophon's variations on the Homeric model: Anthia is a potential ἐραστής

Within this framework, some differences between Homer and Xen. can be noticed. Two are less significant: the Ephesian crowd twice plays the role of Odysseus (points c-d) and the fame generated by them is not negative, as the Homeric φῆμιν ἀδευκέα (*Od.* 6.273). Both changes appear the simple consequence of Xen.'s adoption of the novelistic motif of the crowd's adoration (1.1.3, n.: προσεῖχον, b). Further, the positive consideration of the Ephesian crowd might be also influenced by the echo of the Platonic young population of the gymnasia (LI 7.3a): our novelist seems to exploit two models here.

On the other hand, Anthia's worries about her love are more explicit than those of Nausicaa and this establishes an interesting difference from the model. Although some scholars, such as Anderson 2009, suggest that in Homer Nausicaa behaves in an ambiguous way towards her parents and that she appears more sexy than she was supposed to be (see 24: 'though acquainted with shame and the customary restrictions governing a maiden's tongue, she cleverly circumnavigates these restrictions'), in my opinion this is not true, since Nausicaa preserves her status as a virgin. Her silence about her marriage in the meeting with her father should not be interpreted as a trick, because it is caused by shame (*Od.* 6.66-7: αἴδετο γὰρ θαλερὸν γάμον ἐξονομῆναι παπρὶ φίλῳ). In addition, her decision to go to wash the clothes is inspired by Athena (*Od.* 6.25-40) and not by her lustful desire. Finally, in the encounter with Odysseus she never loses her modesty: her bravest act is her decision not to flee from Odysseus, as servants do (*Od.* 6.139-140), but this is required by the plot, which demands the introduction of the hero in the action. As a result, I would consider the Homeric Nausicaa as a heroine who, despite her love, is able to preserve her fidelity and control. This clarification is important for the following points of my argumentation: unlike her, with her passion Anthia sometimes shows a hint of wantonness.

To begin with, when in her first monologue Anthia says: παρθένος παρ'ἡλικίαν ἐρῶ καὶ ὀδυνῶμαι καινὰ καὶ κόρη μὴ πρέποντα (1.4.6), she focuses on love as a incontrollable passion, which is not a Homeric theme. This suggests that the parallel between the two is not perfect: Anthia is more active in her erotic initiative than Nausicaa. This difference is first introduced by her acceptance of Habrocomes' beauty as an ἐραστής (LI 2.3c), which makes her feel she has overstepped the boundaries of a virgin (1.3.2, n: διέκειτο). In addition, Anthia's thought of speaking aloud to attract Habrocomes' attention (1.3.2, n: ἐλάλησεν) and showing him parts of the body (1.3.2, n: μέρη) has no parallel in Homer.

While, as with the Ephesians, one reason for this deviation lies in Xen.'s exploitation of the Platonic model (LI 2.3c and 7.3a), the key to understand this new approach lies in the moral interpretations of Homer, whom Xen. seems here to acknowledge. Conversely, the influence on him of the Hellenistic and novelistic consideration of Nausicaa appears to be less relevant.

3) A possible influence on Xen. of the moral interpretation of Nausicaa

In Plutarch's *How a young man should read poetry* there is a passage which is quite significant: the author includes Nausicaa's behaviour towards Odysseus in the group of Homeric passages in which more than one interpretation is acceptable, because of the ambiguity of the text (see *Mor.* 27a: ὅπου δ'ἀσαφῆ τὰ τῆς γνώμης, διοριστέον οὕτω πως ἐφιστάντας τὸν νέον). Plutarch offers two different explanations: εἰ μὲν ἡ Ναυσικάα ξένον ἄνδρα τὸν Ὀδυσσέα θεασαμένη καὶ παθοῦσα τὸ τῆς Καλυψοῦς πάθος πρὸς αὐτόν, ἅτε δὴ τρυφῶσα καὶ γάμων ὥραν ἔχουσα, τοιαῦτα μωραίνει πρὸς τὰς θεραπαινίδα

[*Od.* 6.244-5]

ψεκτέον τὸ θράσος αὐτῆς καὶ τὴν ἀκολασίαν· εἰ δὲ τοῖς λόγοις τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τὸ ἦθος ἐνιδοῦσα καὶ θαυμάσασα τὴν ἔντευξιν αὐτοῦ πολὺν νοῦν ἔχουσαν εὔχεται τοιούτῳ συνοικεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ πλωτικῷ τινι καὶ ὀρχηστικῷ τῶν πολιτῶν, ἄξιον ἄγασθαι (*Mor.* 27 A-B).

This double interpretation suggests that the Imperial readers of the *Odyssey* considered Nausicaa not only as a chaste woman moved by Odysseus' virtues, as the second interpretation states, but also as an incontinent and impudent lover, as the words τὸ θράσος and τὴν ἀκολασίαν prove. The same alternative is witnessed by the scholiast Q.T., who makes this comment on Nausicaa's desire of marrying Odysseus: δοκοῦσιν οἱ λόγοι ἀπρεπεῖς παρθένῳ εἶναι καὶ ἀκόλαστοι (Schol. on *Od.* 6.244-6). At the same time, the same scholiast adds a reference to the opposite and positive judgement, which, being attributed to the historian Ephorus of the IV century BC, was probably available at Xen.'s time: Ἔφορος μέντοι τοὔμπαλιν ἐπαινεῖ τὸν λόγον ὡς ἐξ εὐφυοῦς πρὸς ἀρετὴν ψυχῆς.

In my opinion, the first interpretation of Nausicaa as a licentious heroine is closer to the Anthia of the first book of the *Eph.* than the authentic Homeric Nausicaa. As a result, I would speculate that the difference between the two might be not the fruit of Xen.'s personal deviation from the model, but the consequence of his adoption of this moral reading of the *Odyssey*. In this respect, it is interesting that the scholiast' expression ἀπρεπεῖς παρθένῳ conveys the same message as our novelist' phrases τῶν παρθένοις πρεπόντων καταφρονοῦσα (1.3.2) and παρθένος [...] ἐρῶ [...] καὶ κόρη μὴ πρέποντα (1.4.6), which both concern Anthia.

Possible confirmation of this hypothesis is offered by the introduction of Manto in the second book, who is clearly introduced as a double of Anthia. Intratextuality provides a parallel between the two young girls: their suffering is expressed with the same formula (cf. 1.3.2 and 2.3.3: διέκειτο πονήρως). Then, in her letter Manto declares: μηκέτι φέρειν δυναμένη ἀπρεπὲς μὲν ἴσως παρθένῳ, ἀναγκαῖον δὲ φιλούσῃ δέομαι (2.5.1). This recalls Anthia's statement in her first monologue: ἤδη δε καὶ τῶν παρθένοις πρεπόντων καταφρονοῦσα (1.4.2). That said, there is a difference between the two: Manto is more ἐραστής than Anthia, since she oversteps the boundaries of a virgin. She loses her temper (2.5.5) and generates a similar reaction in Apsyrtus (2.6.1). This outcome is related by Xen. to their barbaric origin (2.3.7 and 2.4.2). As I will show in APP 1.1, also Manto is compared to Nausicaa by Xen. Although her behaviour appears immoral, it fits well into Plutarch's first interpretation of the Homeric heroine, in which θράσος and ἀκολασία define her behaviour towards Odysseus. Further, the parallel between Manto and Calypso (APP 1.1) makes the link closer, since it is included in Plutarch's interpretation of Nausicaa.

As a result, I would use Manto to confirm that Xen. was aware of the immoral interpretation of Nausicaa: our author would be exploiting it for both Anthia and Manto, with a difference in emphasis.

4) A possible influence on Xen. of the novelistic interpretation of Nausicaa

On the other hand, the influence of the literary and iconographic tradition on Xen. seems to be weaker. In the Classical Era Nausicaa does not undergo any particular change: she 'est essentiellement un personnage homérique' and 'de la littérature ultérieure, il ne reste au sujet de N. que des bribes' (LIMC, 712), such as fragments of Sophocles' play *Nausicaa or the Washerwomen* (cf. TrGF IV Radt. F. 437-439) and fragments of two comedies (cf. *The Washerwomen or Nausicaa* of Philyllius, PCG VII F 8 and *Nausicaa* of Eubulus, PCG V F 68). Although their unstable textual status does not allow us to draw any definitive conclusion, these works do not suggest the existence of an evolution of Nausicaa's legend: they only attest that her bath was the most important scene and this topic was also probably depicted on the Polygnotus' painting described by Pausanias (1.22.6), the only preserved artifact of Nausicaa's iconography.

The only exception to this framework is constituted by another tradition which 'mentionne un mariage de N. avec Télémaque dont elle aurait eu un fils' (LIMC, 712), which is first attested in Hellanicus and Aristotle (*Ath.pol* fr. 506), as Schol. Eust. Hom. *Od.* 16.118 (FGrH4F156) proves: Ἀριστοτέλης δ᾽ἐν Ἰθακησίων Πολιτείαι καὶ Ἑλλάνικος δὲ Τηλέμαχον μέν φασι Ναυσικαάν γῆμαι τὴν Ἀλκινόου. Unfortunately, nothing more is known about it and, thus, it is difficult to assess whether in this version of Nausicaa's life the heroine was behaving as a more active lover. A positive answer might be suggested by the same scholiast who, after the sentence just quoted, refers to the weddings between Telemachus and Nausicaa and between Penelope and Telegonus and then adds this comment: περιττὰ ταῦτα καὶ κενὴ μοχθηρία. However, it is not clear whether this judgment also concerns the former couple.

That being said, in the Hellenistic and Imperial Era there is a revival of the tradition of Nausicaa. Latin literature offers us the first model: Virgil exploits Nausicaa's figure in the *Aeneid*, where 'the dominant model for the books 1-4 is Odysseus' soujourn among the Phaeacians' (Oliensis 1997, 305). Here 'the Homeric role of Nausicaa is shared out between Dido and Venus' (ibid., 306). The parallel between Dido and Nausicaa is evident, since it characterises the whole episode and depends on the regal role shared by them; further, as Dido is the queen of Carthage, she might be also compared with Arete. On the other hand, Venus' link with Nausicaa is subtler and is confined to the first book, where she is the first to welcome Aeneas on the new land and is described as like Artemis (Verg. *Aen*. 1.314-320).

This double comparison is quite significant: both Dido and Venus suggest that Nausicaa is transformed from virgin into an active woman who tries to achieve her love. The existence of this antecedent of the novel is important: although Xen. does not seem to have read Virgil, Char. did this (on this, see Tilg 2010, 261-297) and, therefore, the novelistic treatment of Nausicaa might have been influenced by the Latin poet.

Given this hypothesis, in our genre the introduction of the heroine does not follow an unique pattern: while in Char. Callirhoe is a Nausicaa who arouses fantasy, in Longus she is identified with the unconscious lover Chloe. Finally, Hld. introduces a clear double of the Homeric heroine, Nausiclea, who is given by her father as a wife to Cnemon. However, on further investigation, only Longus goes beyond a brief mention, introducing Nausicaa as an ἐραστής who is more active than in the *Odyssey*. That said, unlike Anthia and Manto, Chloe lacks any moral concern. As a result, the influence on our author of the novelistic treatment of Nausicaa is limited to the common emphasis placed on her erotic desire. Thus, it is appears to be less relevant than that of the moral readings of the *Odyssey*.

a) Chariton

When in 6.4.6 Artaxerses imagines Callirhoe, he explicitly compares her to Nausicaa by quoting her Homeric simile with Artemis. Although this parallel is not further explored, it is surprising that '*Odyssey* 6.102-4 [...] is quoted, unfairly recalling an episode not without sexual tension, but altogether more chaste' (Morales 2005, 122). Since Nausicaa's image here answers the King's 'mounting lust' (ibid.), the portrait of the heroine does not coincide with the Homeric one.

Another passage in which Nausicaa appears is in the second book, where Char. alludes to Odysseus' arrival at the Phaeacian island through Plangon's invitation to Callirhoe to remove her salt (2.2.1-4). Here, however, Char.'s focus is not on Plangon as Nausicaa, but on Callirhoe as Odysseus: both share the salt (cf. 2.2.2: ἐκ μακρᾶς θαλάσσης [...] τὴν ἅσιν and *Od*. 6.137: κεκακωμένος ἅλμῃ). The only hint at Nausicaa is the definition of Plangon as a ζῷον οὐκ ἄπρακτον (2.2.1): this emphasis on her active character might echo the role attributed to Nausicaa by Virgil.

At the same time, from a broader perspective it is interesting that Char. identifies Miletus with Scheria: this creates a parallel with Xen.'s Ephesus and strengthens the similarity between Dionysius and Habrocomes (1.1.1, n: ἀνήρ). Since both cities are described by novelists as rich centres, the association between Scheria and prosperity finds here its confirmation (LI 6.2b).

b) Longus

After Char., Longus compares his protagonist Chloe with Nausicaa at the beginning of his novel: when the former falls in love with Daphnis who is having a bath (1.13.1-5), 'Longo riprende una scena tipica dell'eros omerico, quella del bagno dell'eroe, [...] e su di essa innesta il motivo dell'innamoramento, desunto dalla letteratura amorosa. [...] Nello specifico, lo spunto per questa operazione sembra provenire dal celebre episodio del bagno di Odisseo dopo l'incontro con Nausicaa in *Od*. 6.223 ss.' (Pattoni 2005, 78). The correctness of this conclusion is proven by the numerous analogies between Longus and the Odyssean passage (see Pattoni 2005, 78-84 for a list). That said, the novelist places an erotic emphasis on the scene: he makes Chloe directly wash Daphnis and then he describes Chloe's falling in love with Hellenistic motifs (see Pattoni 2005, 95-97) and a Platonic sentence (cf. Longus 1.13.5: ὅ τι μὲν οὖν ἔπασχεν οὐκ ᾔδει and Plato *Phaedr*. 255d, following Morgan 2004's suggestion). Although Chloe is not conscious of what she is doing, her behaviour is definitely braver and more active than that of Anthia. Thus, Longus, clearly takes a

step further than Xen. and his lack of interest in a moral concern makes him even more distant from our author.

c) Heliodorus

Finally, in the *Aethiopica* the comparison with Scheria is introduced from the second book onwards, when Cnemon, Calasiris and Charicleia are hosted by Nausicles in Chemmis. Before this event happens, Calasiris appears to Cnemon near a river as does Odysseus in Scheria (cf. 2.21.3: ἐναλύων ταῖς ὄχθαις καὶ δόλιχόν τινα τῷ ῥείθρῳ πολλάκις ἄνω καὶ κάτω παραθέων and *Od.* 6.85: Αἱ δ᾽ὅτε δὴ ποταμοῖο ῥόον περικαλλέ᾽ ἵκοντο). Shortly after, both men are hosted in a house of an old man, Nausicles, who is hunting, and they are welcomed by his daughter Nausiclea (2.22.1). This new scene, her name and the fact that she is described as ἤδη γάμου ὡραία (ibid.) makes this girl clearly Nausicaa and her father Alcinous (see, on this, Anderson 1997's synthesis, 306: this scene is a 'loose modernization of Odysseus' tale to the Phaeacians').

After the beginning of this comparison, Hld. introduces other parallels:

a) In 5.16 a big banquet is held in Nausicles' house, which recalls the Homeric one (see, e.g., *Od.* 7.182-184; on this see Dowden 2007, 147: 'The link to the *Odyssey* is fairly clear'), and the master repeatedly asks Calasiris to tell his story (5.16.1), revealing again his association with Odysseus. The same role of storyteller is then played by Cnemon in 6.2.

b) At the end of Calasiris' story, Nausicles encourages Calasiris to find Theagenes: Ὦ πάτερ [...] σὺ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἐξῆς γοῦν εὔθυμος εἶναι [...] (5.33.4). This seems to echo Alcinous' promise to Odysseus.

c) In 6.6.2 Nausicles extends the same invitation to all his guests (for a subtler consideration of this figure in relation to Alcinous, see Dowden 2007, 147).

d) In the whole episode Charicleia is Penelope and this emerges clearly in 6.8-9, when Cnemon's marriage with Nausiclea makes her feel desperate about her union with the dead Theagenes.

Overall, this framework confirms the existence of the *Odyssey* as the hypotext of this long scene. At the end of this, the Homeric model is varied: before the protagonists leave Nausicles' house, Chariclea understands that Cnemon has fallen in love with Nausiclea (6.7.8: Ἡ δὲ Χαρίκλεια τόν τε Κνήμωνα ἐκ πολλῶν ἤδη συμβάλλουσα τοῦ Ναυσικλέους ἐπὶ τὸ θυγάτριον ἐπτοημένον). When also Nausicles acknowledges this, he offers to his daughter Cnemon, one of the alter egos of Odysseus in the novel (6.8.1 and APP 2.4b4) and, unlike Homer, the wedding is quickly celebrated. As a result, "Nausicaa" here becomes a wife. However, since this does not depend on her initiative, in this portrait the heroine lacks the activity introduced by Longus and, thus, is not close to Anthia.

d) Petronius

Petronius compares Nausicaa to Trimalchio in accordance with his comic and ironical approach to Homer (APP 2.6): in 27.1 the latter 'is playing ball when first seen by Encolpius' (Harrison 1998, 583, n. 10; see *Sat.* 27.1). The contrast with the Homeric model is here remarkable: although Trimalchio, like Nausicaa, is 'inter pueros capillatos ludentem pila' (cf. *Od.* 6.99-100), he is a

'senem calvum', who treats his servants badly and asks one of them to carry a chamber-pot for him. For this reason, Encolpius ironically describes Trimalchio's actions as 'lautitias'. Part of this parallel is also the bath scene, into which Trimalchio, Encolpius, Ascilitus and Giton take part.

Given this framework, the comic nature of this allusion is indisputable (see on this Walsh 1970, 43) and, thus, this passage does not have any connection with Xen.'s Nausicaa.

e) Apuleius

In Apuleius Nausicaa enters the scene of the novel once and, then, the Phaeacian episode is evoked another time without the young girl. In the second book Nausicaa is Photis, who welcomes Lucius (2.7). However, as Harrison 1990, 197 argues, 'the stupefaction of the hero at the sight of her attractions, and his rhetorical congratulations to the one who is to enjoy them, recall and invert Odysseus' and Nausicaa's meeting on the beach': as in Petronius, a comic reading is also here dominant. As a result, the parallel with Xen. is not significant.

The Phaeacian episode is then recalled in the story of *Amor and Psyche*: Psyche is compared to Odysseus when in the divine palace she finds the attractions which Odysseus experienced in Scheria, such as bath, food and songs (5.2.3-3.5). However, unlike Odysseus, Psyche is trapped by these seductions (see on this Morwood 2010, 109: 'opposite to Odysseus' immovable decision of going home, Psyche's commitment to the delights of her life in the palace is trapping her in a space that her emotional health demands that she should leave'). Although this parallel places an emphasis on the prosperity of the Phaeacians, the absence of Nausicaa does not allow us to use it to shed light on Xen.'s Anthia.

5) The implausible hypothesis of a parallel with Phaedra

Laplace 1994, 451 offers another interpretation of Anthia the ἐραστής, by suggesting a comparison with the tragic Phaedra. In Laplace's view, this connection would be especially proposed by the following monologue delivered by Phaedra:

δύστηνος ἐγώ, τί ποτ'εἰργασάμην;
ποῖ παρεπλάγχθην γνώμης ἀγαθῆς;
ἐμάνην, ἔπεσον δαίμονος ἄτῃ.
φεῦ φεῦ τλήμων.
μαῖα, πάλιν μου κρύψον κεφαλήν,
αἰδούμεθα γὰρ τὰ λελεγμένα μοι.
κρύπτε· κατ'ὄσσων δάκρυ μοι βαίνει
καὶ ἐπ'αἰσχύνην ὄμμα τέτραπται.
τὸ γὰρ ὀρθοῦσθαι γνώμην ὀδυνᾷ,
τὸ δὲ μαινόμενον κακόν· ἀλλὰ κρατεῖ
μὴ γιγνώσκοντ'ἀπολέσθαι (Eur. *Hipp.* 239-249).

Overall, in this passage two themes are similar with those of the Eph.:

- ἐμάνην (v. 241) and τὸ δὲ μαινόμενον κακόν (v. 248), which both designate Phaedra's madness of love, are echoed by Anthia's expression: ἐφ'Ἀβροκόμῃ μαίνομαι (1.4.6);

- αἰδούμεθα (v. 244) and ἐπ'αἰσχύνην ὄμμα τέτραπται (v. 246) express erotic shame, which is similar to Anthia's reaction to love.

That said, however, these parallels are not really close, because the situation of the heroine is different from that of Anthia. To begin with, the debt of both authors to the Platonic model is enough to justify the sharing of the first theme. Then, on closer examination, the second motif is not identical: while Anthia is a young girl like Nausicaa, Phaedra is an experienced woman, who is already married and falls in love with her stepson: thus, her love is immoral from the beginning. This feature was clear in the perception of the Greek novelists, since Hld. compares both Demaenete and Arsace to her (see Rocca 1976).

At the same time, the topic of lovesickness does not establish a valid connection either, because there are many other occurrences of it in erotic literature (LI 2.3c) and, in addition, Char. deliberately makes Callirhoe lie on her bed like Phaedra (cf. Char. 1.14: ἐπὶ τῆς κοίτης ἐγκεκαλυμμένη, κλαίουσα καὶ σιωπῶσα and Eur. *Hipp.* 131-4). Since Xen. omits this motif, his description of love does not betray any intention to follow Euripides. As a result, in the description of Anthia Xen. exclusively focuses on a slightly immoral version of Nausicaa.

ANALYSIS OF THE LEMMATA

1.2.1: μηνιᾷ: the first sentence of the second chapter, which is the first narratorial prolepsis of the Eph. (NA 1.2), describes the first action that happens on the scene of the novel: Eros' anger against Habrocomes. As this present tense follows a sequence of imperfects and of repetitive actions (1.1: introd.) and moves the plot, I would interpret it as a historical present instead of a real present which has a gnomic value. Having said that, it is striking how μηνιᾷ in its position at the beginning of a sentence seems to recall μῆνις, the first word of the *Iliad*: this appears to be a way found by Xen. to emphasise the anger of Eros (LI 6.5). This interpretation seems to have two further confirmations: to begin with, this sentence is one of the rare narratorial statements in the Eph. about the intentions of the gods and this fact gives relevance to its content (for the most significant parallel, 1.4.5, n.: Ἔρως). Second, in the novel Xen. introduces other associations between this god and the *Iliad* (LI 6.5): thus, this present passage appears the foundation of Xen.'s connection with the *Iliad*. Having said that, this wrath might also echo another divine anger, that of Poseidon in the *Odyssey* against Odysseus (LI 6.2a).

Finally, from this point onwards 'narration is subsequent' (Hägg 1971, 62). That said, surprisingly the first indication of relative chronology of the Eph. appears only in 1.2.8 with ὡς δὲ παρῆλθε τὸ τῶν παρθένων πλῆθος. This means that the introduction of Anthia in the procession is not described as a new event but follows the flow of the description of the ceremony. The rare occurrence of these temporal indicators supports the existence of an atemporal framework at the beginning of the novel NA 2.2).

1.2.1-2: ὁ θεὸς [...] ἐξοπλίσας [...] ἐστράτευεν:

a) The military image of Eros in the *Ephesiaca*
The 'irresistible (not necessarily benevolent) power of god' (see LI 2.1) enters here the scene of the Eph. and assumes two traditional images: Eros is both a warrior and a fire. The former appears for the first time and is more emphasised than the latter, which starts at the end of the third chapter (see 1.3.4 n., ὁ ἔρως).

The military image of Eros is a τόπος typical of both the erotic and the novelistic literature (see table 2 and 3 in LI 2.3). Xen. uses it consistently in the first chapter to feature the struggle between love and Habrocomes. Following Cummings 2009'study on 'Eros as an Opponent' (95-113), I would like to offer here a synthetic scheme of how this metaphor is developed by Xen. To begin with, in erotic literature the scenario of the conflict introduced by Eros is basic and is composed of 'the cause and initiation of hostilities, the duration of conflict with any sub-events, and the outcome of the conflict' (96). In the Eph., however, the second part is only briefly introduced by Habrocomes in his monologue (1.4.1-3, n.: H.'s first monologue): the largest emphasis in Xenophon is upon the end point of the process' (99). In fact, as soon as Habrocomes falls in love, the emotion personified as Eros starts to hold Habrocomes (1.3.1, n.: κατεῖχε δὲ αὐτὸν ἐγκείμενος ὁ θεός), introducing the first occurrence of another image: the emotion holding the lover.

Second, it is also significant that, unlike other metaphors and motifs of the Eph., Eros as a warrior has his exclusive target in Habrocomes. Anthia is linked with the god only at the end of the third chapter, but just briefly: the origin of her passion is directly Habrocomes. This difference seems to lie in Xen.'s choice of making Anthia a Platonic lover: thus, her relationship with love is conceived as her welcome of the beloved's beauty. Despite this difference, both protagonists share love as a fire (1.3.4, n.: ὁ ἔρως and 1.5.9, n.: ἔτι μᾶλλον ὁ ἔρως) and a concern about the morality of their passion.

In the following scheme I list the different stages of Xen.'s metaphor:

1) Cause and initiation of the conflict (1.2.1).
- Cause: ὁ θεὸς [...] ὑπερηφάνοις ἀπαραίτητος.
- Initiation: ἐζήτει δὲ τέχνην κατὰ τοῦ μειρακίου.
- Victim: Habrocomes (δυσάλωτος).

2) Duration of the conflict (1.4.2-3)
Since this part comes after the defeat, is not real, but virtual: it happens only in Habrocomes' mind.
- 1.4.2-3: Resistance: οὐ καρτερήσω νῦν;

3) Outcome of the conflict (1.3.1-1.4.1; 1.4.4-5)
- 1.3.1: Defeat: ἡττῆται ὑπὸ Ἔρωτος Ἀβροκόμης. 'A person affected by an emotion can be defeated by an emotion' (Cummings 2009, 97).
- 1.3.1: Emotion's hold of the lover: κατεῖχε δὲ αὐτὸν ἐγκείμενος ὁ θεός.
- 1.3.2: Capture: ἦν αἰχμάλωτος τοῦ θεοῦ.
- 1.3.4: Emotion's hold of the lover: ὁ ἔρως ἐν ἑκατέροις ἦν ἀκατάσχετος: the emotion is not only inside, but prevents the victim from doing any action.
- 1.4.1: Capture: ὁ τῷ θεῷ λοιδορούμενος ἑάλωκα;
- 1.4.1: Defeat: νενίκημαι;
- 1.4.1: Slavery: παρθένῳ δουλεύειν ἀναγκάζομαι;
- 1.4.4: Tyranny: ῥίψας ἑαυτὸν εἰς γῆν.
- 1.4.4: Defeat: νενίκηκας;
- 1.4.4: Slavery: τὸν πάντων δεσπότην.

Victims:
- Habrocomes for the entire period.
- Anthia: only 1.3.4.

Overall, this list confirms that Xen.'s focus is on the irremediable action of Eros, which repeatedly defeats Habrocomes and makes him his slave. In the single lemmata I will look more in depth at some of the listed expressions.

b) Comparison with the other Greek novelists: "militia Amoris"

In addition, if we look at the other novelists, Xen.'s reflection on the cause and conflict of love emerges as a possible element of originality: although all the other authors of the corpus exploits the same metaphor, Xen. is the only one who is really interested in its entire progress. On the one hand, Longus and Ach. introduce neither the origin nor the interior fight started by Eros; in the former love is a positive presence which progressively wins, while in the latter the military image starts from Clitophon's defeat from love and focuses on the "outcome of the conflict". On the other hand, Char. and Hld. are closer to Xen.: the former introduces the conflict, but mostly in relation to Dionysius and Mithridates (1.4.2), while the latter' presentation of Charicleia seems to be inspired by Xen. Charicles' announcement that Charicleia is in love seems to intertext with the Eph.: ἑάλωκεν ἡ δυσάλωτος καὶ νενίκηται ἡ δυσκαταμάχητος (4.7.1). The connection lies in the Platonic adjective ἡ δυσάλωτος (1.2.1, n.), which has its other novelistic occurrence in Xen. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that Hld.'s occurrence belongs to a part of the text where Hld. seems to own a greater In addition, this passage is set in a part of the text where Hld. seems to owe a greater debt to our author (1.2.2-5, n.: τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος). As a result, Xen.'s attribution to Habrocomes of the origin and the conflict of love is an original exploitation of "militia amoris" in the novelistic corpus. That being said, the way in which the other authors of the genre explore the third phase of this metaphor is more sophisticated than that of Xen. This emerges particularly in the extension of this image to interpersonal relationships: in the other novels the war is not only that between Eros and the protagonists, but also the battle played by the rivals one against the other. In my opinion, the lack in the Eph. of this level of exploration might be interpreted as a sign of his simplicity.

Finally, it is also important to remember that there is also another way in which in erotic literature this metaphor is introduced, in which the lover plays the role of Eros and tries to win his beloved. This is a common motif of Roman Elegy, as Ovid witnesses with her famous sentence: 'Militat omnis amans, et habet sua castra Cupido' (Ovid. *Am*. 1.9.1). While this variant is echoed by Xen. only in the wedding night, where Anthia and Habrocomes ἐφιλονείκουν δὲ δι᾽ὅλης νυκτὸς πρὸς ἀλλήλους (1.9.9), is more exploited by the other novelists, as the occurrences of φιλονεῖκος and φιλονεικία prove (1.2.1, n.: φιλονεῖκος).

c) Comparison with the other Greek novelists: Xen.'s poor exploitation of the images of Eros

Another field in which Xen. reveals to be less sophisticated than the other novelists is the characterisation of Eros: to begin with, he omits the traditional Hellenistic representation of this god as a playing child, whose 'most obvious attributes are the wings and the bow and the arrow' (Morgan 2004, 179). The reason why this image was popular lies in the fact in that Era Eros definitely gained the status as Aphrodite's son. While his features as a child appear in Char. (4.7.6), Longus (1.7.2, 2.6.1, 2.7.1, 4.34.1), Ach. (1.1.13, 2.4.5, 2.5.2, 4.7.4, 8.12.5) and in Hld. (only wings in 4.2.3), Xen. alludes to them only in the canopy, where there are Erotes players (1.8.2-3, n.: the only *ekphrasis*), but no more detail is given about them.

More deeply, Xen. does not exploit the Hesiodic idea (*Theog.* 120 ff.) of 'Eros as a cosm(ogon)ic power)' (Morgan 2004, 179), which also belongs to Orphic cosmogonies and appears in all the other novels: in Char. it is introduced by Artaxates in his dialogue with his king, in Longus by Phileta, in Ach. by Clitophon in his speech to Satyrus and in Hld. by Calasiris in a dialogue with Chariclea (see in "Eros' power on gods and nature" in table 2 in <u>LI</u> 2.3). The only hint at this portrait in the Eph. might be the epithet τὸν πάντων δεσπότην used by Habrocomes (1.4.5, n.), but it is too generic to suggest that Xen. is alluding to this tradition. Further, our author is not interested in Eros as the 'principle of natural growth and continuity' (Morgan 2004, 179). This is less surprising, since this association only appears in Longus (2.7.3).

Overall, since these different approaches to Eros are synthesised in Plato's *Symposium*, our author seems to ignore or to omit this text in relation to this topic. Similarly, Xen.'s is also poor in his selection of Eros' attributes: apart from φιλονεῖκος (1.2.2, n.) and σφοδρότερος (1.4.4, n.), which are typical of novels, and πικρός, which is proper of the entire erotic tradition (1.4.5, n.), he prefers generic terms such as ἀπαραίτητος (1.2.1 n.) and τὸν πάντων δεσπότην (1.4.5 n.). Conversely, the other novelists' list of epithets is richer and enlarges the sphere of competence of the god:

- Char. 1.1.12 δημαγωγός;
- 2.6.4 εὔελπις;
- 3.2.5: νυμφαγωγός;
- 3.9.4: περίεργος;
- 4.4.5: ἀπάταις χαίρει καὶ δόλοις;
- 4.7.6: φιλόκαινος;
- 6.1.9: ἐρῶντος σύμβουλος;
- 6.4.3: ἔστι γὰρ ἴδιον Ἔρωτος <τὸ> φιλόκοσμον;
- 8.5.14: κοῦφον;
- Longus 4.18.1: ὁ Ἔρως ποιεῖ σοφιστὰς;
- Ach. 5.25.6: mention of Eros' μυστήρια (on the fortune of this τόπος, see 'Eros / Aphrodite mystery cult' in table 4 in <u>LI</u> 2.3);
- 5.27.4: αὐτουργὸς καὶ αὐτοσχέδιος σοφιστής.
- 5.20.4: Eros the teacher of words: cf. ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτός σοι ὁ Ἔρως ὑπαγορεύσει and 5.27.1: διδάσκει γὰρ ὁ Ἔρως καὶ λόγους. The same idea is at the origin of Longus' consideration of Eros as the writer of his work (2.27.2: ἀπεσπάσατε δὲ βωμῶν παρθένον, ἐξ ἧς Ἔρως μῦθον ποιῆσαι θέλει). In this case, 'Sappho's description of Eros as μυθοπλόκος, "weaver of stories", is the model' (Morgan 2004, 193 and Sapph. 188 LP). A first hint at this role appears in Longus 1.11.1, where Eros is the moulder of an episode of the story (τοιάνδε σπουδὴν Ἔρως ἀνέπλασε).
- Hld. 4.1.1: Eros the narrative force: ἀγωνοθετοῦντος, οἶμαι, καὶ βραβεύοντος Ἔρωτος καὶ δι' ἀθλητῶν δύο τούτων καὶ μόνων οὓς ἐζεύξατο μέγιστον ἀγώνων τὸν ἴδιον ἀποφῆναι φιλονεικήσαντος.

In conclusion, Xen.'s representation of Eros can be defined as simple: our author is more interested in his function in the plot than in his characterisation.

1.2.1: φιλόνεικος: the first problem raised by this adjective is that in the Greek tradition φιλόνεικος is usually interpreted as a variant of φιλόνικος: the origin of this identification would lie in the Alexandrians' consideration of ει as an allophone of ῑ, which became then common in late antiquity. The reason why this association is problematic is that the two adjectives do not have the exact meaning, because they have two different etymologies: while φιλόνικος means 'fond of victory' (νίκη), φιλόνεικος 'quarrelsome' (νεῖκος). Since Hld.'s manuscripts contain both variants of the same word, this suggests that in Imperial Greek the existence of two distinctive terms was still admitted: as a result, Ἔρως φιλόνεικος might also here indicate either Eros who likes to cause quarrels or, following the late development of the term, Eros who is fond of victory. In my opinion, the original connection with νεῖκος is more plausible. To begin with, the previous mention of μηνιᾷ and the following introduction of ὑπερηφάνοις ἀπαραίτητος (1.2.1) suggests that Eros is starting a fight against Habrocomes. In addition, the prologue of the *Iliad* includes the idea of contention between Agamemnon and Achilles (*Il.* 1.6: διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε), which would suit the other reference to the latter's anger (1.2.1, n.: μηνιᾷ). Finally, the same meaning also characterises φιλονεικέω (1.9.9), the cognate word which is used by Xen. to express the sexual fight between the protagonists in their wedding night. The stress on strife there is suggested by the following participle φιλοτιμούμενοι τίς φανεῖται μᾶλλον ἐρῶν (1.9.9). That being said, as I noted earlier, in this second passage this metaphor has a different meaning, since there is a translation from 'the relationship between the emotion and the person affected' to that 'between the two people affected' (Cummings 2009, 109).

Clarified this textual difficulty and shown this final shift which occurs in Xen., I will now look more carefully at the occurrences of erotic φιλονεῖκια in the novels: since this adjective is referred to Eros at the beginning of Char., its position in the narration suggests that it might play an important role in *Callirhoe*. Since also Xen. uses this adjective for his first definition of Eros, φιλονεῖκος appears to be a key expression to understand how both novelists are approaching the metaphor of love as a warrior. In addition, this parallel opens the possibility to interpret the other novelists' occurrences as an answer to these models: this increases the importance of this word and its dissimilar uses confirm the different approach to love as a warrior which has been before outlined.

To begin with, Ἔρως φιλονεῖκος enters Char.'s novel in the fourth section of the first chapter (1.1.4): we find here the only military action of Eros which concerns the protagonists, since the god wants to create a marriage between the most rival families of Syracuse. This context clearly leads us to accept here the meaning of φιλονεῖκος as "quarrelsome". After this mention, Eros' action is focused on Chaereas' rivals: the god is φιλόνεικος towards Dionysius and the Persian king (cf. Ἔρως in 2.4.5 and 6.4.5). These two occurrences are significant, because they suggest that the god enjoys fighting: this is the same pattern that we find in the Eph. That said, at the same time Char. introduces a variant: not only Eros is φιλονεῖκος against the rivals, but the rivals themselves become φιλόνεικοι one against the other: after an anticipation of this in 1.2.2, in which the erotic battle in Syracuse is compared with gymnastic competitions, a clearer example of this new motif appears in 4.4.1, where Callirhoe is defined as the contended ἆθλον. Then, in 5.8.4 all the rivals are described

as erotic warriors (Συνήθης μὲν οὖν καὶ πρόχειρος πᾶσι τοῖς ἀντερασταῖς πόλεμος) and, finally, this pattern is extended to the temporary rivalry which Statira has toward Callirhoe (5.9.2, where the former πᾶσαν ἀφεῖσα γυναικείαν φιλονεικίαν εὐνουστέρα τῇ Καλλιρόῃ διὰ τὴν τιμὴν ἐγένετο). As a result, in *Callirhoe* Eros is also φιλονεῖκος in another sense: he enjoys causing troubles from distance. While in the first case Char. links Eros to secondary characters as does Xen. with Habrocomes, Char.'s second approach is completely missing in the Eph. As a result, φιλονεῖκος confirms the results of the previous analysis of the image of love as a warrior (1.2.1-2, n: ὁ θεὸς, b). In addition, in this case the parallel between Char. and Xen. is particularly close, because the only other author before them who associates ἔρως and φιλονεῖκος is Gorgias in his *Helen's Encomy* (see 4: ὑπ'ἐρωτός τε φιλονίκου), where the "modern" variant of the adjective appears. However, the absence of a god and the complete different context make the connection between this passage and the novelistic ones implausible (on this I take issue with Laplace 1994, 455). As a result, the hypothesis that one of the two novelists is drawing φιλονεῖκος from the other is very likely and, since Xen. introduces only two occurrences and gives to them a different meaning, his dependence on Char. is more probable than the other way around.

Finally, in the other novelists this theme does not occur frequently: an erotic use of φιλόνεικος and φιλονεικῖα appears only once in both Ach. and Hld, who seem to introduce these words only to acknowledge a novelistic motif: the former describes the erotic battle fought by Thersander against Leucippe as a φιλονεικῖα [...] ἐρωτική (6.18.5), while the latter stresses Eros' role in the life of men by saying: βραβεύοντος Ἔρωτος καὶ δι'ἀθλητῶν δύο τούτων καὶ μόνων οὓς ἐζεύξατο μέγιστον ἀγώνων τὸν ἴδιον ἀποφῆναι φιλονεικήσαντος (4.4.1; in the novelistic corpus there are a few more occurrences of this cluster of words, but they are unrelated with love: cf. Longus 1.27.3, where the contest concerns music, and Ach. 4.12.3 and 5.1.6, where it concerns elements of the earth). In my opinion, since Char. and Xen. use φιλονεῖκος and φιλονεῖκια in relation to the whole novel, I would speculate that Ach. and Hld. might be subtly doing the same. Since the former focuses the first part of the novel on Clitophon's battle to conquer Leucippe and the second on that played by Melite with Clitophon and by Thersander with Leucippe, the hypothesis that φιλονεικῖα is also here a leading principle of his text is acceptable. Hld.'s case is even clearer, because his passage can be read as a synthesis of the whole novel. In addition, this author attributes twice the same verb to the destiny's action towards men (4.19.8: Ὦ τῆς ἀμειλίκτου καθ'ἡμῶν τοῦ δαίμονος φιλονεικίας and 7.14.5: τοῦ δαίμονος πανταχόθεν μοι τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς προσηγορίαν περικόψαι φιλονεικήσαντος): this appears to be a possible extension of this motif to who really leads human life.

In conclusion, I am suggesting that φιλονεῖκος and φιλονεικῖα have a sort of metaliterary value in the entire novelistic corpus.

1.2.1: ὑπερηφάνοις: this word, which is the definition of Habrocomes' hostility to love (LI 2.1), is here introduced for the first time in the novel: as De Temmerman 2007, 99 notices, apart from this case, where the reference is generic, all the other occurrences of this adjective and of its cognates ὑπερηφανία and ὑπερηφανέω 'apply to the male protagonist Habrocomes' and are focused on different speakers: Habrocomes relates ὑπερήφανία to himself in two of his monologues (1.4.5 and

2.1.2), while Anthia, Euxinus and Manto refer to him the same appellative (1.4.6, 1.16.5, 2.5.2 and 2.5.5): thus, ὑπερήφανος is an element typical of Habrocomes' characterisation.

Further, this sequence of passages suggests that this cluster of words might be part of the *Entwicklung* of the novel. First, the existence of a gap between the narrator's current definition of Habrocomes' arrogance and the future awareness of the character is a sign of the importance of direct speeches, which reveal how the protagonists develop their personality (NA 3). Second, the fact that two rivals accuse Habrocomes of being ὑπερήφανος suggests that the initial arrogance of the protagonist, which is his personal sin, is transformed into a proof of his refusal of rivals' erotic proposals and, thus, of his chastity. which is no longer a personal "sin".

Finally, Xen.'s focus on this issue invites us to study its possible origin. As De Temmerman 2007, 100 again notes, ὁ ὑπερήφανος is a type of Theophrastus' *Characters*, in which this kind of man is described as 'someone who refuses to comply with the requests of others and does not want to come into contact with others'. That being said, the novelty of our Xen.'s approach, which is typical of his whole genre, would be to accomodate this model in an erotic context (see De Temmerman 2007, 106 for the description of this phenomenon: 'Most of the character-types [...] transfer their normal connotations, exemplified in Aristotle and Theophrastus, to the erotic sphere, with the result that characteristics traditionally associated with a certain character become erotically coloured').

Since in Habrocomes' first monologue there is also a connection between ἀνδρεῖα and warfare, which was typical in Greek ethical discourse (on this, see Jones 2007, 113) and especially in Aristotle's moral treatises, it is not unthinkable that our author was aware of part of these works and that he was drawing from them some types like the present one.

This hypothesis might be supported by the lack of ὑπερήφανος and cognates in Char. and also Longus does not introduce them with reference to an erotic arrogance (3.30.5 and 4.19.5). This lack of literary parallels makes the relationship with ethical treatises plausible. Conversely, both Ach. and Hld. have two occurrences each of these terms, which are both in character's text and recall the second exploitation made by Xen. of this concept. Hld. shares the same purpose as our author, since he makes Achaemenes and Cybele address Theagenes with the epithet ὑπερήφανος (7.25.1 and 7.25.2). On the other hand, Ach. plays with his usual irony, since Clitophon's chastity is not maintained throughout the novel: in the first occurrence it is Satyrus who refers to this (5.11.6: ὁ δὲ οὐκ οἶδα τί παθὼν ὑπερηφανεῖ), while in the second Melite calls directly the protagonist τὸν ὑπερήφανον in her prayer to Leucippe (5.22.6).

That said, in my opinion the existence of these four occurrences is not enough to consider ὑπερηφανία a novelistic τόπος. In addition, both novelists might be deliberately echo the Eph., especially Hld., whose Arsace is a double of Manto. For this reason, I would still consider Theophrastus as a possible model of Xen. and the same possibility might concern the motif of the "cowardice of love" introduced on the wedding night (1.9.4, n.: ἄνανδρε καὶ δειλέ).

Finally, there is another term which ascribes arrogance to Habrocomes, which is σοβαρός (1.4.7, n: σοβαρός). Since this adjective, unlike ὑπερήφανος, is popular in the novelistic corpus, it might confirm that the novelistic word for arrogance was not the one so frequently used by Xen.

1.2.1: ἀπαραίτητος: since this adjective, which means 'inexorable', is linked by Greek authors to other gods, we are not here dealing with a specific epithet of Eros (1.2.1-2, n.: ὁ θεὸς c). Its attribution to divine figures occurs in Plato's *Laws* (see 907b: θεοί [...] εἰσίν [...] παρὰ τὸ δίκαιον ὡς παντάπασιν ἀπαραίτητοι), in Demosthenes, where ἀπαραίτητος is the epithet of Justice (see *In Aristog.* 1.11: τὴν ἀπαραίτητον καὶ σεμνὴν Δίκην), and in Pausanias where Nemesis (see 1.33.2: θεῶν μάλιστα ἀνθρώποις ὑβρισταῖς ἐστιν ἀπαραίτητος) and Zeus (see 7.25.1: τὸ δὲ Ἱκεσίου μήνιμα [...] ἔστιν ἀπαραίτητον) are addressed. Finally Maximus Tyrius offers us some passages where ἀπαραίτητος is related to a generic divinity (see esp. 5.3a: ἄστρεπτον τὸ θεῖον καὶ ἀτενὲς καὶ ἀπαραίτητον).

That being said, if we look at the etymology of this adjective, we might interpret it as a prolepsis of Eros' refusal to accept Habrocomes' prayer in the fourth chapter. This would make its presence here more sophisticated than what appears.

1.2.1: δυσάλωτος: in the Platonic *Lysis* Socrates, after the allusions to the pride which characterises beautiful men, makes this comment: Οὐκοῦν ὅσῳ ἂν μεγαλαυχότεροι ὦσιν, δυσαλωτότεροι γίγνονται (206a). While the sharing of the theme makes the connection between this passage and the Eph. not impossible, the analysis of δυσάλωτος in Greek literature shows that we might be dealing with an intertextual connection between Plato and Xen.

Overall, most of the occurrences of δυσάλωτος in Greek literature concern hunting or war and it is impossible to quote here all these references, given their high number (see, e.g., for the former, *Lysis* 206a and Philo, *De post. Caini* 18, while for the latter DH 1.66.2 and Plut. *Mor.* 181c). In addition, in Soph. *OC* 1723 δυσάλωτος is describes the power of evil, while in Pl. *Ti.* 51a the adjective has the different meaning of 'hard to comprehend'.

Given this framework, only Plato and Xen. use δυσάλωτος in erotic contexts. This originality is confirmed by the novelistic corpus, where both Char. and Hld. once adopt this adjective in a military context (cf. Char. 8.8.9 about the impregnable Tyrus and Hld. 2.24.1 on dangerous brigands). The latter, then, uses δυσάλωτος in relation to sleeping (Hld. 4.4.2). Only another passage has an erotic meaning: when, always in the *Aethiopica*, Charicles tells Calasiris about Charicleia's falling in love, he exclaims: ἑάλωκεν ἡ δυσάλωτος (Hld. 4.7.1). Although the adjective has here become a noun, this expression seems to reinforce our argument: as Charicleia shares with Habrocomes the same resistance to Eros and Hld. surely wrote his text after our novelist (GI 5.1), we might be dealing with the first intertextual connection between the two or Hld. might draw this adjective from Plato, as he is keen on this author. While the first hypothesis would not affect our interpretation of Xen.'s adjective, the second would strengthen it, because it would increase the plausibility of its Platonic origin.

As a result of this framework, I would conclude that Xen. might be deliberately intertexting with the *Lysis* and this hypothesis would strongly support the interpretation of Habrocomes as a Platonic ἐρώμενος (LI 7.3a).

Finally, two interesting parallels of δυσάλωτος appears in *Daphnis and Chloe*, where Philetas describes Eros as ἀθήρατος (2.4.3) and then the god defines himself δυσθήρατος (2.5.2). Since, as

Pattoni 2005, 305, n. 22 argues, these two epithets 'alludono a una prerogativa meno frequente di Eros, che più spesso nelle metafore é assalitore e non preda', it is not unthinkable that Longus was here looking at Xen. or at Plato, but no definite proof is available.

1.2.1: ἐρωτικῶν φαρμάκων: this definition of the expedients adopted by Eros against Habrocomes is an expression created by Xen. While in Greek literature φάρμακον has two main meanings, namely 'medicine' and 'philtre' (LSJ), in the novels only the second is introduced in its literal way. The first example comes from our novel, where φάρμακον is the poison that Anthia asks repeatedly in Tarsus (3.6.1), while in Ach. there are two cases: while an Egyptian soldier prepares a filter to conquer Leucippe (4.15.4: φάρμακον ἔρωτος), Melite asks Leucippe to offer her a φάρμακον to conquer Clitophon (5.22.3: πάρασχε φάρμακον).

That said, in the novels there is a subtle connotation: as Cummings 2009, 68 argues, 'both aspect of the dual nature of φάρμακα appear as metaphors in the novels' in relation to love. Within this erotic connotation, the first meaning - 'cure' - is attested and is more frequent than the second: it has many occurrences in Longus, where Philetas establishes this as a τόπος by stating: Ἔρωτος γὰρ οὐδὲν φάρμακον and then proposes his three famous remedies (2.7.7). Then, later in the novel φάρμακον occurs other five times with the same meaning (1.22.3, 2.8.5, 2.9.2, 2.10.3, 3.14.1). On the other hand, Char. uses once φάρμακον and Ach. twice (see "love is the only remedy for love" in table 2 and 3 in LI 2.3). Conversely, only three passages offer the second meaning of "philtre": Longus connects the image of poison with kisses (1.18.2) and with Daphnis' reaction to Chloe's nudity (1.32.4), while Char. introduces a 'visceral variant' of the poisoned kiss (2.8.1).

Given this framework, I would argue that Xen. is here exploiting the second metaphorical value: Eros might be using his philtres in his action against Habrocomes (for famous parallels of this motif, see Theoc. 2.15, Ov. *Ars Am.* 2.105-6 and Prop. 2.1.51). That said, since on the wedding night our author introduces also the other meaning of φάρμακον as an erotic "cure" (1.9.3, n: παντὸς): I would speculate that in the present passage Xen. might be subtly anticipating that Eros' revenge is not only a punishment against Habrocomes, but also the start of a process which will lead him to discover how love is great. This suggestion would ideally work as a parallel of the second verse of the oracle (see above, "love is the only remedy for love").

A similar ambivalence is introduced by Longus in the conclusion of Phileta's speech, in which, although in the opposite order, the first meaning of φάρμακον is 'medicine', but, as Morgan 2004, 184 argues, the reader could also interpret it as a 'love philtre, a way to promote and achieve love' (for more on this whole topic, see Cummings 2009, 66-69).

1.2.2: ἤγετο δὲ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἐπιχώριος: this sentence opens the first big "scene" of the novel. For the importance of scenes in the first book of the Eph., see NA 2.1.

1.2.2-5: τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἐπιχώριος ἑορτή … ἐγχωρίων: Artemis' feast is the first Ephesian element of the Eph.: thus, it requires a thorough analysis.

a) <u>The peculiar story of the Ephesian Artemis</u>

Artemis is the second divine presence of the novel after Eros. Her presence in a literary text is not surprising, since this goddess 'not only enjoys one of the most widespread cults, but is also one of the most individual and manifestly one of the oldest deities' (Burkert 1985, 149) and her mentions 'sont naturellement très nombreuses dans la littérature grecque et latine' (LIMC 2, s.v. Artemis, 618). That said, since Artemis is introduced within the Ephesian context, we must investigate the possible influence of her local cult on Xen.'s portrait.

Overall, in Archaic Greece there are two Artemis: the first is the Eastern Artemis, whose name 'appears among the gods of the Lydians and of the Lycians (Burkert 1985, 149) and it is identified with either the Asian Grandmother, or with Cibele or Anahita. The celebrity of this goddess is associated with her particular multibreasted image. The second is the Greek Artemis, who at her origin had two different identities: 'zwei Seiten ihres Wesens ragen über die anderen hervor: sie ist teils (besonders auf dem Peloponnes aber auch anderswo) die in der freien Natur waltende Göttin, teils die πότνια θηρῶν und große Jägerin' (Nilsson 1957, 179). That said, however, they very quickly mingled together, as it is proved by the Odyssean description of the goddess in the simile with Nausicaa, where Artemis is both goddess of the nature and huntress (*Od.* 6.102-109).

Within this cultic story Ephesus plays a significant role, since in this city the tradition of the Eastern Artemis met the Western one. Originally, the first to be worshipped there was the former, who was considered not as a Greek divinity but as 'eine Verkörperung von Asie' (Burkert 1999, 60; see Tim. *Pers.* fr. 791 Page 140 and 160, where this Asian epithet occurs). Then, when the Greeks colonised the city, they introduced their cult of the goddess which prevailed over the previous one. The most evident sign of this novelty was their choice of a small place near Ephesus as a new place for the birth of the goddess, whose name Ortygia was in deliberate competition with the Ortygia of the Island of Delos (*h. Hom. Ap.* 14-18). Along with this innovation, however, the Greeks did not completely abolish the Eastern cult, as they maintained three elements: the eunuch priests called 'Megabyzoi' or 'Megabyxoi' (see Hdt. 1.92.1 and Str. 14.641), the multi-breasted statue of the goddess and the Ἐφέσια γράμματα, painted table that 'seem to have been written indistinctly on the feet, girdle and crown of Artemis' (Arnold 1989, 15; see for more 1.5.6-7, n: εἰς τέλος).

This gave birth to a sort of syncretic cult, which lasted a very long time: it was still strong in the Imperial Era (Knibbe in Koester 1995, 142) and it faded only in the late 431 AD, when Ephesus housed the Third Ecumenical Council, an event which is considered as the proof of the abolition of Pagan cults in this city (Scherrer in Koester 1995, 2).

In conclusion, Artemis is a goddess very important in Ephesus. However, as I will shortly demonstrate, Xen. does not seem to acknowledge this tradition in his portrait of the goddess throughout the whole novel.

b) <u>The possible connections with the Ephesian reality</u>

At first glance, Xen.'s description seems to lack references to Ephesian details: above all, the combination of a temple, a ceremony and a goddess is a typical sequence of every πόλις in the Classic as well as in the Imperial Era (cf. on this Burkert 1985, 225: 'the living religious practice of

the Greeks is concentrated on festivals' and Van Nijf 1999, 176: 'Greek festivals play a central part in civic life under Roman rule'). Second, Anthia's portrait recalls that of a Greek Classical Artemis different and not of the Ephesian one (1.2.6, n: χίτων).

As a result, in the *Eph.* the only "realistic" trait of the goddess lies in her presence: Xen. seems to lack originality, as he adopts here a technique which is typical of the entire novel: the mention of the god of the place which is touched by the protagonists.

c) The mention of the Artemision

A similar lack of local colour concerns Xen.'s mention of Artemision (τὸ ἱερόν): our author does not describe any detail of this temple, which was still a very active religious center in the Imperial Era, despite its early foundation in the eight century BC (on its importance in the Imperial Era, see Pliny 36.95: 'Graecae magnificentiae vera admiratio exstat templum Ephesiae Dianae CXX annis factum a tota Asia'; for few historical details, see GI 3.1). The importance of this shrine depended only on its religious activity, but also on the social function performed in the life of Ephesus and of Asia Minor: it was the place where an 'international Kapitalzufluß' was available (Burkert 1999, 65 and cf. Xen. *An.* 5.3.7 and DC 31.54) and it had also the privilege of being an 'Asyl' (ibidem, 66; see also Pd. fr. 174), whose mythical founders were the Amazons (see Call. *Dian.* 237 and Etym. M. 402, 8 ff.). As a result, Xen.'s silence on this temple is not surprising, since its importance was certainly clear in his readers' mind. That said, our author also reveals to be disinterested in the "touristic" approach which occurs in the eleventh chapter of the first book and, especially, in other novelists (1.11.6, n: μεγάλη).

d) The most complicated issue: the study of Xenophon's ceremony

Unlike the Artemision, Xen.'s mention of Artemis' procession is rich. To begin with, a religious procession as the place where the protagonists fall in love is a τόπος of erotic literature and in LI 2.3a I speculated about the connection between this event and the oracle in Xen.'s ideal love. My purpose now is to focus on the ceremony itself, since Xen. informs us about the development of the whole procession and assings a role in the ritual to his protagonists. As a result, their erotic encounter happens only at the end of the event when the sacrifice in the temple begins (1.3.1: Ὡς οὖν ἐτετέλεστο μὲν ἡ πομπή [...]) and their forced separation coincides with the end of the ritual (1.3.3: τότε μὲν θύσαντες ἀπηλλάττοντο). This pattern draws a difference from the traditional role of ceremonies in erotic literature, which are usually only the pretext which makes two young people leave their house and meet on the road, as it happens in both Theocritus (see Theoc. *Id.* 2.70-72; 82-83) and Char. (see 1.1.5). As a result, Xen.'s exploration of this motif appears to be more extensive than usual. This originality makes the comparison between this ceremony and the Ephesian ones very important, since this emphasis might have a local origin. On further inspection, however, this does not seem to happen.

To begin with, three main ceremonies were dedicated to Artemis in Ephesus (cf. Portefaix 1999, 613, Rogers 1999, 241 and Knibbe 1995, 153): the older Ephesia and Artemisia and the feast for the birth of the goddess at Ortygia (see Str. 14.1.20). The former was part of a pan-Ionian festival,

which was celebrated every four years in the Panionion until the fourth century BC, when it was moved for safety reasons to a place out of the city (see Thuc. 3.104 and D.H. 4.25). The existence of the Artemisia, instead, is only attested by some inscriptions and literary texts (see Arnold 1972, 17, n. 4). Overall, these three Ephesian events do not match Xen.'s description: as the aforementioned sources report, they in fact involved the whole population (families attended the first and probably also the second ceremony, while in the third only boys vied for honour) and were led by male priests. As a result, what Ruiz Montero 2007, 268 argues appears the most reasonable conclusion: 'since many years we are no more sure that the description of Xen.'s initial procession is realistic'[379]. Thus, even without accepting Nilsson's and Gärtner's great scepticism (cf. Nilsson 1957[3], 243 and Gärtner 1969), Xen.'s ceremony might be better interpreted as a literary representation of any of the adolescent rituals dedicated to Artemis in Classical Greece, such as those attested in Brauron, (see Dowden 1989, 20-24), Athens (see Plut. *Arist.* 20, who describes the cult of Artemis Eukleia) and Patrai (see Paus. 8.18.11). Therefore, the introduction of this event does not seem to depend on the local cult of Artemis.

Interestingly, however, there are two sources which might suggest the existence of another Ephesian ritual. Since this other ceremony appears closer to that of Xen. than the previous ones, I wil now focus on both.

1) Calame and the Etymologicum Magnum
The first source is a lemma from the *Etymologicum Magnum*, which speaks of the Artemis Daitis' cult in Ephesus (on this feast, cf. Heberdey 1904): in his study of choruses of young women in Ancient Greece Calame discusses this passage and connects it with the Eph.

Δαίτις· τόπος ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. Εἴρηται ἀπὸ τοιαύτης αἰτίας. Κλυμένη θυγάτηρ βασιλέως μετὰ κορῶν τε καὶ ἐφήβ ων εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον παραγενομένη, ἔχουσα δὲ καὶ ἄγαλμα Ἀρτέμιδος, μετὰ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ λειμῶνος παιδιὰν καὶ τέρψιν, ἔφη δεῖν τὴν θεὸν εὐωχεῖσθαι. Καὶ αἱ μὲν σέλινα καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ συνάγουσαι, ἀνέκλιναν· οἱ δὲ ἔφηβοι, ἐκ τῶν πλησίον ἁλοπηγίων ἅλας λαβόντες, παρέθηκαν τῇ θεῷ ἀντὶ δαιτός. Τῷ δ' ἑξῆς ἐνιαυτῷ μὴ τούτου γενομένου, μῆνις τῆς θεοῦ καὶ λοιμὸς κατέλαβε, καὶ κόραι καὶ νέοι διεφθείροντο· χρησμὸς οὖν ἐδόθη, δι' οὗ ἐξηυμενίσαντο τὴν θεὸν, καὶ δαῖτας αὐτῇ ἐπετέλεσαν, κατὰ τὸν τῶν κορῶν καὶ τῶν ἐφήβων τρόπον. Καὶ ἐκ τοῦ συμβάντος παυσαμένου τοῦ λοιμοῦ, ἥ τε θεὸς καὶ ὁ τόπος ἀπὸ τῆς δαιτὸς Δαιτὶς προσηγορεύθη. Ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ Λυδόν τινα κάπηλον αὐτόθι κατοικήσαντα παρέχειν τὰ πρὸς τὴν δαῖτα τοῖς ἐπιξενουμένοις. Ἦν δὲ τὸ κύριον αὐτοῦ ὄνομα Ἔφεσος· ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ἡ πόλις (252.11 ff.).

---

[379] Scholars also discuss whether the lack of music in Xen.'s procession might be also considered as another proof of the anti-realism of the description: as Bowie 1990, 83 argues, in the Imperial Era 'in worshipping traditional gods traditional texts will still have been sung' and, in particular, we know that 'hymnodoi were attached to the cult of Artemis at Ephesus'. Having said that, however, Bowie 2006, 78 suggests that 'perhaps these ὑμνῳδοί sang only inside the temple precinct, and it does indeed seem that the elaborate procession set up by C.Vibius Salutaris in AD 104 involved the carrying of statues without any accompanying singing. Perhaps Ephesian readers would think Xenophon was getting it right'. As a consequence, this issue is still controversial and, thus, it cannot be used as part of the demonstration.

'Daitis: a place in Ephesus, as is explained by the following *aition*. Clymena, daughter of the king of the city, went to a place outside of the city accompanied by boys and young girls and carrying a statue of Artemis. After having played and enjoyed themselves in a field, Clymena told them to prepare a banquet for the goddess. The girls found celery and then they reclined on the grass. The boys instead, after having picked up salt from the near salt-pits, offered it to the goddess in place of a meal. The following year, however, this ritual was not repeated and the young people suffered a visitation of cosmic anger and an epidemic sent by Artemis: they were all killed. Then an oracular response was pronounced: people started again to propitiate the goddess and to offer her a meal, following the fashion used by the young boys and girls. After this fact, the epidemic stopped and the goddess and the place were called from this meal Daitis. Then, a Lydian tavern-keeper who was living there offered food to the guests. His chief's name was Ephesus, from whom the city's name derives.' (Calame 1997's translation, slightly changed).

As Calame 1997 notes, 'this passage, in explaining the epiclesis "Daitis" [...], describes both the ritual and the founding legend of this cult, [...] which consists of a meal offered to the goddess by the Ephesians' (94) and he argues that Xenophon's description shows a 'certain verisimilitude' with this passage: both texts, in fact, share the presence of boys and girls in a ceremony for Artemis, a female and noble leadership of the ritual and the location of the ritual in a place out of Ephesus. Overall, these connections leads him to suggest that the present passage of the Eph. is the 'final important source' (95) of the Daitis ceremony. As a result, in his view Xen. is describing this specific Ephesian event.

That said, although some of the listed similarities are true, there are differences between Calame's passage and that of Xen. which do not allow us to accept his conclusion. To begin with, this description is not the αἴτιον of the ceremony, but of the place Daitis in Ephesus, where the meal to Artemis was offered: since Xen. does not allude to this place, the issue of location cannot be used as an element of comparison. In addition, this ritual is a described as a very early ceremony, which then did not continue throughout the Ephesian story: this makes its existence at Xen.'s time implausible and, therefore, it is more difficult to understand from where his knowledge of this event might have come. While these two points complicates Calame's theory, the following two make it unlikely: in the Eph. the transport of Artemis' statue and the meal are missing. While Xen. might have decided to subtly hide Artemis' statue in Anthia's portrait, in my opinion his silence on the meal, which is the main ingredient of Calame's source, constitutes an objection which cannot be overcome. The only possible allusion in the Eph. to this event might lie in the list of the objects carried by the participants of the procession, where κανᾶ - 'basket of reed' or 'bread-basket' are included (1.2.4, n: τὰ ἱερὰ). However, these are the 'characteristic three-handled baskets which contained the vital prerequisites, practical and symbolic, for the sacrifice' (Parker 2005, 224) and they traditionally carried sacred barley: they were not used to bring food for banquets and, thus, they cannot be considered a hint at the Ephesian feast. As I result, I would not accept Calame's hypothesis.

2) Menander and an Ephesian δειπνοφόρια

In a fragment of Menander's comedy *The Cithara Player* the Athenian Moschion tells his father about his love affair abroad with an Ephesian woman. In this account, the romantic story has its origin in an Ephesian procession (a reference to a possible connection between Xen. and this passage is already made by Alperowitz 1992, 18):

μολὼν

εἰς τὴν Ἔφεσον ἔπεσον............

τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἦν τῆς Ἐφεσίας γὰρ τότε

δειπνοφορία τις παρθένων ἐλευθέρων·

εἶδων κόρην ἐνταῦθα Φανίου γε τοῦ

Εὐωνυμέως (92-97).

'Arrived at Ephesus I fell (in with) ...

For then there was a solemn procession where food was offered by free-born virgins to Artemis the the Ephesian. I saw there a maiden, daughter of Phanias of the Euonymeus clan'.

The reason why this source is curious is that Menander places like Xen. a falling in love in an Ephesian procession. That said, the preserved fragments of this comedy do not lead us to argue that there is a connection between Xen.'s and this text. In addition, despite the appearance, there is no proof that this fragment hints at the Daitis procession. As a result, we are dealing with a suggestive source which, however, at the end simply shares with our novel the literary exploitation of the procession as the place of the falling in love.

To begin with, what prevents the connection between Menander's description and ours is again the issue of food, which only occurs in the former. Second, the connection between Menander and the Etymologicum Magnum is not discouraged by what Gomme and Sandbach 1973, 416 argue. These scholars do not believe that Menander's δειπνοφορία is a local event, since 'it is not possible that a participant in the procession was Attic, as Phanias' daughter is'. In addition, δειπνοφορίαι were famous events in Athens, where they were part of the Oschophoria (on this feast, see Parker 2005, 211-217, with references to Greek sources) and probably of a ritual attributed to the Cecropids (see Philoc. 328 FGrH F 183: δειπνοφορία γάρ ἐστι τὸ φέρειν δεῖπνα ταῖς Κέκροπος θυγατράσιν Ἔρσηι καὶ Πανδρόσωι καὶ Ἀγραύλωι· [...] and Parker 2005, 216, n. 110 on this). Thus, it is more likely that Menander was creating this "Ephesian" event from his own Athenian perspective.

That said, one might object that two Imperial epigraphs from Ephesus attest the existence of a δειπνοφορία like this: the first inscription dates to the reign of Antoninus Pius (see I. *Eph*. 221, 5-6: τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος δειπνοφόρια τῆς θεοῦ) and the second was written in the third century AD (see I. *Eph*. 1577, a, 9-10: τῆς δειπνοφοριακῆς πομπῆς b, δειπν[οφόροι). However, the chronological distance between Menander and these two processions is great and, thus, it is not likely that these epigraphs were referring to the event mentioned by the comedian. Finally, on closer examination, in Daitis procession food is not carried as in Menander and the word δειπνοφορία is missing.

As a result, this source cannot be use to shed more light on Xen.'s procession. For this reason, I would conclude that Xen.'s emphasis on the procession does not depend on his will to establish a

particular connection with Ephesus. Conversely, it is simply a marked sign of the importance that religious life has in his civilised society (LI 1.2 and 2.3a). In addition, this focus on Artemis, which is connected with Anthia, places an emphasis on the heroine's chastity, which will be kept by her after the marriage with Habrocomes.

That said, I am aware that other scholars offer interpretations of Xen.'s feast which underline its universal character (see Nilsson 1906, 244, who compares this procession with the art of looking for a wife in a ceremony which was typical of 'viele nördliche ländliche Feste') and its social function: as Fusillo 1989, 197, 'le feste sono il momento più favorevole allo scambio fra i sessi in società caratterizzate dalla segregazione femminile'. In fact, as Hägg 1983, 123 adds, 'the only opportunity for young people of both sexes to be together without their parents supervising them'. In my opinion, these observations are true, but I believe that Xen.'s social and moral interest is here more important for the ideology of the novel. Thus, I consider these last views too generic.

e) <u>Heliodorus' dependance on Xenophon's procession</u>

Finally, Xen.'s procession is the passage which clearly proves that Hld. read the Eph. (GI 5.1). In addition the peculiar nature of this parallel, which lies in the combination of marital love and ì religion, confirm how these two novelists are similarly keen on these two topics.

In the *Aethiopica*, like in our novel, the protagonists' fall in love occurs during a long procession which is set in Delphi. The structure of this event is well summarised by Pouilloux 1984, 699, n. 25: 'au 2.34.3 les Enianes envoient une délégation (θεωρία) pour faire un sacrifice (θυσία) sous la conduite de Théagénès (ἀρχιθέωρος), car il y a une τετραετηρίς concomitante aux Pythia; mais on note (2.34.7) qu'on procède à un ἐναγισμός en l'honneur de Néoptolème. La procession est décrite dans ses diverse parties (3.1 and 2) et on cite l'hymne en l'honneur de Thétis et de Néoptolème (3.2.4), la triple lustration autour du tombeau de Néoptolème (3.5.2), le sacrifice (3.5.2), le banquet (3.10.1), avec la danse de la pyrrhique (3.10.3)'. Overall, Hld. himself stresses the exceptionality of this event by defining it as ὀνομαστὴν ἐν ὀλίγαις γενομένην (3.1.2).

Interestingly, the erotic encounter between his protagonists happens only in the fifth chapter of the third book (3.5.3-4), when the procession is finished and the participants have just entered the sanctuary to make sacrifices (3.5.1-2). Afterwards, their separation coincides with the end of the ceremony (3.6.1: ἐλέλυτο μὲν ἡ πομπὴ). Since the same situation occurs in the Eph., Hld. might depend on our author for this combination. This hypothesis is supported by more connections, which, following Schnepf's (1887, 11-14) analysis, suggest that Hld might be intertexting with Xen. a) The protagonists of both rituals play similar roles: Charicleia is like Anthia associated with Artemis (2.33.4), as the inclusion of bow and quiver in both their presentations immediately suggests (cf. Xen. 1.2.6 and Hld. 3.4.6), while the male leader of the procession is Theagenes (2.34.1), who is accompanied, like Habrocomes, by a group of ephebes (3.3.2).

b) Hld. introduces like Xen. the motif of the competition of beauty (Eph. 1.2.8, n: πάντες): above all, his Charicleia and Theagenes are introduced in sequence like Habrocomes and Anthia (Hld. 2.33.3-4 and 2.34.1). Then, Hld. twice offers a physical description of Theagenes (cf. 2.35.1 and 3.3.5) and this spectacle persuades the whole population to consider him the most attractive (Hld.

3.3.8). However, despite this success, when Charicleia appears her beauty wins the competition (3.4.1). Finally, this rivalry does not eliminate Delphians' admiration of the whole couple, which leads them to think that their union is divine (3.4.8: τὴν γὰρ πρὸς θάτερον αὐτῶν συζυγίαν ἴσα καὶ ἀθανασίαν ἦγον).

Overall, only two variations emerge in this comparison between Xen. and Hld.: an inversion of gender, in which Charicleia plays the same role as Habrocomes, and the definition of her as τὴν ζάκορον τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος (2.35.3). These differences suggest that Hld. is placing an emphasis on Charicleia's divine heroine, making her a heroine an even chaster version of Anthia (for more, see below, e2).

c) In both Xen. and Hld. the protagonists, after their falling in love, stare at each other and have a late separation (cf. Xen. 1.3.1 and 1.3.3 and Hld. 3.5.5 and 3.6.1).

d) Hld. seems to introduce two precise textual links with Xen.'s procession: at the beginning of the third book, when Calasiris would like to get quickly to the conclusion of his description, he states: Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ πομπὴ καὶ ὁ σύμπας ἐναγισμὸς ἐτελέσθη (3.1.1). Interestingly, Xen. describes the same moment of the ceremony with: Ὡς οὖν ἐτετέλεστο μὲν ἡ πομπή (1.3.1). Since the combination of τελέω with πομπή in the meaning of 'procession' occurs elsewhere only in a passage of Flavius Josephus (see *BJ* 1.228: λαμπρὰν δὲ πομπὴν [...] ἐτέλησεν) and in one from Plutarch (*Mor.* 242a: Ἄλλη πομπὴν τελοῦσα πάνδημον ἤκουσεν ἐπὶ τῆς παρατάξεως νικᾶν τὸν υἱόν), where, however, the verb is active, the textual link between the two novelists is here likely.

e) Charicleia's tunic is defined as χιτῶνα δὲ ἁλουργὸν ποδήρη (3.4.2): this recalls Anthia's χιτὼν ἁλουργής (1.2.6, n: ἁλουργής), with which there is only a difference in length. Interestingly, the union of χιτὼν and ἁλουργής has no other occurrences in Greek literature, apart from a passage of Plutarch's *Romulus* (see 26.2: ἁλουργῆ μὲν γὰρ ἐνεδύετο χιτῶν) and of Pollux's *Onomasticon* (see 4.120: ἐνίαις δὲ γυναιξὶ καὶ παράπηχυ καὶ συμμετρία, ὅπερ ἐστι χιτὼν ποδήρης, ἁλουργὴς κύκλῳ). Since, however, the first belongs to a Roman context, as Romulus is wearing a toga together with this tunic, and the second is a list of actors' dresses, I would again accept the textual connection between the two novelists.

As a conclusion, I would argue that in the description of the main procession of his novel Hld. is intertexting with Xen.

2) A particular bond between Anthia and Charicleia

Having reached this final statement, I would like to suggest an interesting consequence of this intertextual parallel. While Xen.'s influence on Hld. concerns erotic motifs, such as physical beauty and falling in love, and the structure of the whole episode, the inclusion of the religious event into this parallel is less evident. On further inspection, however, also this issue finds its place in the comparison: although in his description Hld. is keen on Delphian traditions, Charicleia's role as a priestess lacks any source and this suggests that Hld. might here has in mind Anthia. This conclusion is quite interesting: since this parallel would focus on the religious role played by both

heroines, the sharing between the two novelists of a similar religious and moral concern would be strengthened.

Without any doubt, Hld.'s description suits well the Delphic environment, since Neoptolemus' cult was locally promoted by Thessalians (see Pouilloux 1984, 693: 'L'adaptation du récit au cas de Néoptomème révèle sinon d'abord un savoir exact des rites delphiques, du moins une grande familiarité avec les divers aspects de ce culte héroique'). Further, although the novelist's introduction of the Aenians as leaders of the procession is 'une nouveauté que le reste de la tradition ignore' (694), the Imperial Aenian coinage and the belonging of this group to the Thessalians make a procession like a plausible historical event (Pouilloux, 1984, 694-5). As a result, Theagenes' role in the procession seems to reflect a realistic element and Hld.'s knowledge of Delphi appears accurate and possibly based on a direct knowledge of local traditions.

At the same time, it is evident that this author is also drawing information from literary sources. A case in point is his description of Neoptolemus' sacrifice, which is influenced by Pindar's *Seventh Nemean* (43-47) and Philostratus' *On Heroes* (52.3-54.1). The former author mentions the location of Neoptolemus' tomb and the existence of processions and sacrifices around it: thus, there is a loose connection with Hld.'s text, where the same elements occur. On the other hand, the parallel with Philostratus is more significant, not only because this author is generally in Hld.'s mind (see Colonna 1987, 13: 'da Filostrato, autore dell'*Eroico*, della *Vita di Apollonio*, delle *Immagini*, Eliodoro ha preso qualcosa in ogni pagina del romanzo'), but also because he precisely tells us that the Thessalians, as in Hld.'s description, dedicate a hymn to Thetis from their ship (cf. 53.10 and Hld. 3.2.4), cry as soon as they have reached the tomb (cf. 35.11 and Hld. 3.5.2) and use baskets to carry the victims (cf. 35.13 and Hld. 3.2.1). This suggests that Hld.'s procession is the fruit of a collection of both realistic and literary elements. In addition, in this passage Philostratus is not referring to the Delphian heroic cult, but to that of Achilles in Troy: thus, Hld.'s source of inspiration is not only local.

At first glance, this conclusion appears linear and supports our hypothesis that Hld. is only drawing from Xen. erotic motifs. However, Charicleia's cultic role does not seem to fit into this framework. First, her status as Artemis' priestess in Delphi lacks local attestation, since in this sanctuary the only woman who played this role was the Pythia, who is a person different from our heroine (see e.g. 2.35.4 and Dillon, 2002, 98: 'Women priests mainly, but not exclusively, served goddesses, and the main exceptions were women priests in Apollo's cults. Here the main focus of attention is the women priests at Delphi, responsible for giving oracles [...]'). For this reason, when Charicleia gives a prize to Theagenes for his victory in the race, Pouilloux 1983,268 comments: 'Cette mention est en effet la seule à attester la présence de la prêtress d'Artémis'.

Second, Hld. seems to be worried about Charicleia's role, because he justifies three times Charicleia's presence with a reference to a local tradition: this happens at the beginning of the procession (2.35.3: ὄψει [...] καὶ τὴν Χαρίκλειαν τήμερον, εἰ μὴ πρότερον εἶδες, συμπαρεῖναι γὰρ καὶ τὴν ζάκορον τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῇ πομπῇ καὶ τοῖς ἐναγισμοῖς τοῦ Νεοπτολέμου πάτριον), at the end (3.5.4: τοῦτο γὰρ ἔθος ὁ πάτριος διαγινώσκει νόμος) and during Theagenes' race (4.1.2: ἀφιγμένη καὶ ἄκουσα διὰ τὸ πάτριον). Since the first two statements are attributed to Charicles, in Hld.'s

mind the πάτριος νόμος is clearly the Delphian one: this evidence leads me to the conclusion that the novelist here is lying. Although this is not surprising, as Hld. might be simply following the novelistic attempt at 'making the reader believe' (cf. Morgan 1993), I would speculate that this strange confession might suggest that the "Ephesian" ceremony described by Xen. might be the subtle model of Hld.'s local tradition. This speculative hypothesis, if true, would further prove that Hld. owes a debt to Xen. that is not only narrative, but also thematic, as it shares with him the ideology about love and religion.

1.2.2: (στάδιοι δέ εἰσιν ἑπτά): this is the first parenthesis of the novel. As I argued in GI 1, this passage seems to be part of the "functional" parentheses, because it has a parallel in the sixth chapter, where Xen. includes another numeric distance from a holy place in the normal corpus of his text (1.6.1, n.: σταδίων). This suggests that our author's interest in this topic is authentic.

That being said, in Lavagnini's (1950) view, this measure does not correspond to the reality of the Hellenistic Ephesus, because the distance between the Door of Magnesia - 'l'unica porta adatta alla comunicazione col santuario' (201) – and the sanctuary 'é di almeno 1600 metri, mentre 'i sette stadii di Senofonte, calcolati come stadii tolemaico-romani di 185 metri, non danno più di 1295 metri'. (ibid., 202-203). As a result, 'il dato del romanzo sarebbe attinto dalla tradizione letteraria' and in particularly by Hdt. 1.26, who in his account of Croesus' life states: μεταξὺ τῆς τε παλαιῆς πόλιος, ἣ τότε ἐπολιορκεῖτο, καὶ τοῦ νηοῦ ἑπτὰ στάδιοι. This implies that Xen. would have in mind the Classical and not to the Hellenistic Ephesus.

In my opinion, although this interpretation is based on precise details, is too scientific, because Ancient Greeks measured distances differently from us, following the route which was leading them from one place to another. In addition, Xen. does not seem to be interested in a realism of correspondence: thus, I would rather suggest that he is introducing a plausible indication and that the readership of the novel could easily accept this as "realistic", while it is difficult that they could see it as deliberately imprecise. That being said, Lavagnini's (1950) suggestion might fit well into the hypothesis of a Classical dramatic date of the novel (GI 2.2), but this is certainly a very little contribution to this hypothesis.

1.2.2: τῶν ἐφήβων: the ephebes share the role of active participants at the ceremony with Anthia's maidens. As Borgogno 2005, 386 n. 24 states, the hephebate 'era il sistema di formazione civile e militare del soldato cittadino, praticato in numerose città della Grecia'. From the Hellenistic Era onwards it 'perse il carattere militare per accentuare quello educativo e culturale'. In this portrait Xen. does not suggest whether he is referring to any particular time. What here is important is that Habrocomes is introduced as an ephebe, because this confirms that he is still young and he has not completed yet his education. This social mark will appear again in the novel, with a special focus on Habrocomes, as his tutor's death (1.14.4-5 n.: ὁ τροφεύς) and the appearance of this father in a dream (1.12.4 n: τῷ δὲ Ἀβροκόμῃ) will confirm. As a result, this pattern is functional to the *Entwicklung* and *Roman* of the novel.

1.2.2: ἑξκαίδεκα: we discover here Habrocomes' age, while shortly later that of Anthia will be revealed (1.2.5). As Scarcella in Furiani – Scarcella 2006, 167 argues, 'la sorprendente novità introdotta dai romanzieri è la giovanissima età dei partners maschili, lontanissimi dai trentenni, età tipica della coppia coniugale greca'. Conversely, 'che le donne fossero giovani e vergini, tali da garantire la purezza del casato, era un dato assodato'. This younger status of male protagonists is a τόπος in the novelistic corpus: Daphnis and Chloe are fifteen and thirteen years old at the beginning of the novel (Longus 1.7.1), Chariclea is seventeen at the end (Hld. 10.14.4), like Ninus in the homonymous novel. The only expection is Clitophon, but is a partial one, since he is only nineteenth years old (Ach. 1.3.3).

1.2.3: πολὺ δὲ ξενικόν: the numerous presence of foreign people at the procession is a fact which is attested in Ephesus (see Thomas 1995, 100: 'a respectable number of political figures – Roman, Greek, Egyptian and others – turns to Ephesos when their careers become enviable and their continued existence threatens'), but at the same time was typical also of other Greek cities: the general nature of the procession is thus confirmed.

1.2.4: τὰ ἱερὰ καὶ … εἰρηνικά: also the objects carried in the procession are a traditional element of Greek processions, but with a distinction: from τὰ ἱερὰ to θυμιάματα we are dealing with objects which appear in every sort of ritual, while the following ones are peculiar to Artemis. The first conclusion is suggested by Burkert 1985, 93, who argues that in any Greek ceremony: 'one group of *anathemata* can be understood as giving permanence to the sacrificial act: vessels of all kinds, roasting spits, sacrificial axes, and above all tripods'. In addition, the presence of torches suggests that the procession was nocturnal: this is another common trait of Greek processions. On the other hand, horses, dogs and object for hunting are typical of Artemis, given her original interest in this activity (1.2.2-5 n.: τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος, a). Finally, the mention of objects connected with war and peace can be interpreted as a symbol of the entire life of the πόλις, which was based on the alternance of periods of war and moments of peace. This is not surprising, since in the Greek culture 'festivals interrupt and articulate everyday life' (Burkert 1985, 225). This further proves that this celebration is set by Xen. at the core of the civic life.

1.2.4: **ἑκάστη: the text is here problematic, because 'con rapido trapasso il romanziere descrive in prima posizione il gruppo di vergini' (Bianchi 2003, 173): for this reason, O' Sullivan 2005 introduces a lacuna in the text, following an early tradition started by Peerlkamp 1818 and supported by many other scholars.
In addition, Bianchi 2003 points out that the virgins are already mentioned twice before this passage and proposes to introduce again this term: ἑκάστη δὲ αὐτῶν <παρθένων> οὕτως. This reading might be correct, but no definite proof is available. Conversely, I would take issue with Jackson 1935, who inverts this sentence with the following, because in this way he violently interrupts the description of Anthia.

1.2.5: Ἀνθία:

a) <u>The choice of the name: the etymological meaning</u>

As I have already suggested (1.1.2 n.: συνήνθει), this name is 'significant'. This conclusion is also supported by the scant appearance of this name in literature: Ἀνθεία is only a name of city (cfr. *Il.* 9.151 and 293, Paus. 2.30.8 and 9, 4.3.1, 7.18.3, 5, 6 and 19.1) or an epithet of goddesses, namely of Aphrodite, Hera and the Hours (cf. *WGEN*, s.v.). The only exceptions concern characters who are not famous, such as Thespia's daughter (Apollod. 2.7.8), a sister of Priam (Polyaen. 7.47) and a courtesan (Athen. 13.592), but in none of these cases a parallel with Xen.'s protagonist emerges. Finally, from a papyrological point of view, there is only an occurrence of Ἀνθία (see Michigan Papyri in Garrett Winter 1936, 223-225): her name is definitely "significant".

b) <u>The choice of the name: the literary interpretation</u>

As I explained in the introduction, on further inspection the protagonists' names appears also to be 'literary'.

c) <u>The discussed graphic form</u>

As for Habrocomes (1.1.1, n.: Ἀβροκόμης), Anthia's name has also an unclear philological tradition: as Borgogno 2005, 387 n. 20 and O'Sullivan 2005 state, F always introduces the name Ἀνθία, apart from the present passage, where the proparoxytone form ἄνθια appears.

The reason for this variation, which is usually neglected by scholars, seems to be a consequence of the oscillation that this name was having in the Imperial Era: both Imperial inscriptions and the "Antheia-fragment" (<u>GI</u> 1) attest the existence of an alternative form Ἄνθεια (see e.g. IG 5.1, 1482, Messene), which was common in ancient epic (see *Il.* 9.151, 293 and *Scutum* 381) but which at Xen.'s time was less popular.

Following Capra's (2008b, 14) view, Xen. might be here acknowledging this rarer tradition: the appearance of ἄνθια appears to be a plausible correction made by a copyist to assimilate this form to Ἄνθεια, since in late antiquity both names were pronounced in the same way. As a result, while I would keep Ἀνθία throughout the whole text of the Eph., like Dalmeyda 1926, Papanikolau 1973, O'Sullivan 2005 and Borgogno 2005 do, I would here correct F introducing Ἄνθεια.

1.2.5: Μεγαμήδους: although this name in F has a -δ- only here, while -τ- in the other four occurrences, I would choose like Borgogno 2005, 387, n. 17 the present form also in the other occurrences, because Μεγαμήδης is a 'literary name' (see *h. Merc.* 100).

1.2.5: Εὐίππης: unlike that of her husband, this name is both 'literary' (cf. e.g. Danaus' daugher in Apoll. 2.1.5, Pierus' wife in Ant. Lib. 9 and Ov. *Met.* 303) and 'realistic' (see IG V: 2, Ma 335). The first aspect seems more important than the second, since Xen. is keen on names provided by mythographic authors.

1.2.5: ἐγχωρίων: Anthia's family is from Ephesus like that of Habrocomes: the importance of homeland in Xen.'s civilised society is confirmed (1.1.1, n: γυναικὸς).

1.2.5: τὸ κάλλος … οἷον θαυμάσαι: this section includes the description of Anthia's beauty: on its originality in the Eph., see 1.1.2. As the following notes will show, this portrait is divided into three parts, as the narrator focuses on different parts of the heroine:
  - description of hair (1.2.6 n.: κόμη);
  - description of eyes (1.2.6 n.: ὀφθαλμοὶ);
  - description of dress (1.2.6 n.: χίτων).
The most innovative part seems to be the second: unlike the other two, it includes original expressions and has a resonance in the rest of the novel.

1.2.5: ἔτη μὲν ὡς τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα: O'Sullivan 2005 has the merit of having reintroduced ὡς, which appears only in Cocchi 1726. As Borgogno 2003, 32 argues, this adverb 'va benissimo per il senso', because constitutes a parallel with περὶ, which is introduced in the indication of Habrocomes' age (1.2.2, n: ἐξκαίδεκα).

1.2.5: ἤνθει: this is the second pun made by Xen. on the name of this heroine. The parallel with the previous pun (1.1.2, n.: συνήνθει) is clearly established by the mention of beauty, which occurs in both passages.

 1.2.6: κόμη ξανθή, […] ὀλίγη πεπλεγμένη: from the Greek perception, both these traits are typical signs of beauty and the first lacks a gender distinction. For this reason, the first part of Anthia's portrait simply suggests that Anthia is typically beautiful.
On the one hand, blond hair characterises the Homeric Achilles (*Il.* 1.197) and Odysseus (cf. *Od.* 13.399 and 431) and also appears in Sapphus (fr. 98.6-7). For this reason, Misener 1924, 104 defines ξανθός as an 'idealistic descriptive epithet' which 'is not distinctive enough to individualize the heroes'. A confirmation of this generic nature is given by the occurrence of blond hair in other novelists (Ach. 1.4.3 uses it for Leucippe, Longus 1.17.3 for Chloe; see also *Iambl.* 15.13 and 39.19). On the other hand, intermingled hair is a reminder of the 'antica moda ionico-attica', as Beschi-Musti 1992, 329 argue commenting on Theseus' appearance as a woman in Pausanias (1.19.1).

1.2.6: ὀφθαλμοὶ γοργοί, φαιδροί μὲν ὡς καλῆς, φοβεροὶ δὲ ὡς σώφρονος: Anthia's physical description has its climax in the description of her eyes. Xen.'s focus on this organ is not casual, since eyes play a key role in the falling in love, lovesickness and marriage of the protagonists (1.3.1 n.). As a result, this passage appears to be an anticipation of what follows and especially of the less frequent use of eyes as projectors of beauty and this point is also marked by the presence of a Platonic pun.

At the same time, Xen.'s stress on the fearful aspect of the heroine and of her chastity introduces a difference from the following chapters of the novel, where Anthia is progressively introduced to love: as a result, I would speculate that in her first appearance in the novel Anthia is closer to Habrocomes than is usually thought: she shares with him a hostility to love.

That being said, this passage presents some textual and lexical difficulties: a detailed analysis is required to reach these unexpected conclusions.

a) The new reading καλῆς

The first step is philological and concern the manuscript reading κόρης: O'Sullivan's 2005 correction of καλῆς is certainly good, because it is suggested by a passage from Aristaenetus' epistle about Acontius and Cydippe: τὸν δὲ νέον ἐκόσμουν ὀφθαλμοὶ φαιδροὶ μὲν ὡς καλοῦ, φοβεροὶ δὲ ὡς σώφρονος (1.10.7-8). Since it is demonstrable that Aristaenetus was drawing from Xen. (GI 5.4), this correction can be accepted and there also internal confirmations: as I will demonstrate shortly, κόρης is not a good reading, because not only κοραί have φαιδροί eyes. Conversely, the presence of καλῆς seems to fit into the context of Xen's passage: first, since from the beginning of the novel this adjective is repeated often to describe the protagonists' beauty, its appearance here is not unlikely. Second, the presence of σώφρονος suggests that in the second part of the sentence the author is focusing on the spiritual aspect of Anthia's eyes (LI 4.3b).

This makes it plausible that the first part of this sentence concerns the physical aspect of the heroine and this conclusion is supported by the fact that Xen. might be aiming at establishing a parallel between Anthia and Habrocomes, who is praised for both his physical and intellectual qualities and his body is twice connected with κάλλει (1.1.4 and 1.1.6), it is plausible that, in which the cognate word καλῆς would fit very well. Having said that, the text presents two other lexical difficulties.

b) Γοργοί, eyes which have the effect of a Gorgon

First, the meaning of γοργοί is unclear: since it comes from Γοργώ, the terrible monster who transforms men into stones, it usually means 'fierce' and 'terrible' and sometimes refers to eyes. This translation, however, might be seen here as contradictory with Anthia's following description as a beautiful and virtuous woman. For this reason, some scholars propose the softer translations 'quick' (see Annibaldis 1987 and Anderson 1989) and 'scintillanti' (LRG). In my opinion, all these interpretations are not satisfactory, because they do not start from the mythological parallel with the Gorgon. Two aspects of this character are relevant: the monstrous nature and the horrifying gaze that turned those who beheld it to stone: these two elements are perfectly synthesised by Homer in the description of Athena's αἰγίς: ἐν δὲ τε Γοργείη κεφαλὴ δεινοῖο πελώρου, δεινή τε σμερδνή τε, Διὸς τέρας αἰγιόχοιο (Il. 5.741-2).

In my opinion, the use that Xen. and other erotic contemporary writers make of γοργός suggests that in this tradition this adjective lost the first connotation to focus merely on the second connotation, and, thus, on the effect of the gaze on the onlookers: we are dealing with an erotic exploitation of this motif. As a result, I would suggest that Anthia's ὀφθαλμοί would be defined as γοργοί to illustrate their shocking effect, as it will happen shortly in Ephesus. For this reason, I

would preserve the mythological parallel by translating γοργοί as 'eyes that have the effect of a Gorgon', rephrasing what Cummings 2009, 132 proposes. Having offered this interpretation, I will offer some evidence of this and I would also show how it might shed new light on the rest of the sentence.

A first proof comes from the novelistic occurrences of γοργός: both Ach. and Hld. introduce γοργὸς in the description of their heroines: the former, in fact, speaks of Leucippe's ὄμμα γοργὸν ἐν ἡδονῇ (1.4.3), while in the latter the child Charicleia γοργόν τε καὶ ἐπαγωγὸν ἐνεῖδε (2.31.1). In the first passage the association between γοργός and ἡδονῇ suggests that Leucippe has not a monstrous glance, but one which shocks and induces love. Hld.'s passage is even more helpful: the other adjective ἐπαγωγός means 'attraction' with a reference to incantation: its emphasis is again on the effect of the eyes on those who are touched by them, but none could ever think that Charicleia is ugly. The same conclusion can be drawn by looking at the passage where Charicleia dazzles Thyamis with her eyes. Hld. attributes the reason for this action to the protagonist's beauty (1.21.2: καὶ δή ποτε πρὸς τὸν Θύαμιν ἀντωπήσασα καὶ πλέον ἢ πρότερον αὐτὸν τῷ κάλλει καταστράψασα) and then adds this further explanation: καὶ τὸ βλέμμα κεκίνητο πρὸς τὸ γοργότερον (ibid.). This means that Charicleia's eyes with their beauty have definitely captured Thyamis. The final confirmation of this approach to the Gorgon comes from Lucian's *Imagines*, where Lycinus begins the dialogue by comparing the effect of the mythological figure on human beings to that provoked in him by a beautiful woman. In my opinion, this passage can be considered as an explicit description of the erotic interpretation of this motif:

Ἀλλ' ἦ τοιοῦτόν τι ἔπασχον οἱ τὴν Γοργὼ ἰδόντες οἷον ἐγὼ ἔναγχος ἔπαθον, ὦ Πολύστρατε, παγκάλην τινὰ γυναῖκα ἰδών· αὐτὸ γὰρ τὸ τοῦ μύθου ἐκεῖνο, μικροῦ δέω λίθος ἐξ ἀνθρώπου σοι γεγονέναι πεπηγὼς ὑπὸ τοῦ θαύματος (1).

That being said, there are other passages from Greek literature which offer another interpretation of γοργοί, since they concern men characterised by a distinctive heroism: in this case their strength more than their beauty generates fear in the onlookers. The first example is particularly striking: a γόργον ὄμμα characterises Hector in the *Iliad*, where it is compared to that of Ares (*Il.* 8.349), because of his destructive power in war. Similarly, in his *Heroicos* Philostratus describes a statue of the same hero: Hector φρομηματῶδες δοκεῖ καὶ γοργὸν καὶ φαιδρόν (19.3) and the qualities related to this features are both strength and beauty: καὶ γὰρ φρονηματῶδες δοκεῖ καὶ γοργὸν καὶ φαιδρὸν καὶ ξὺν ἁβρότητι σφριγῶν καὶ ἡ ὥρα μετ' οὐδεμιᾶς κόμης (ibid.; see also Flav. Phil. *Vit. Soph.* 2.27.5 for another male description with both adjectives, which refers to Hippodrome from Thessaly). Then, in his initial portrait of Alexander the Great Lucian offers another interesting occurrence which includes only γοργός. After having defined Alexander as μέγας τε ἦν καὶ καλὸς ἰδεῖν καὶ θεοπρεπὴς ὡς ἀληθῶς, he adds this feature: ὀφθαλμοὶ πολὺ τὸ γοργὸν καὶ ἔνθεον διεμφαίνοντες (3). The reason for γοργός here is not Alexander's beauty, which is expressed before, but this adjective is used to express his status as hero. Finally, Charicleia's reaction to Alcaemene seems to be worth mentioning too, since she reacts to him as to a Gorgon, in which only the terrible side of the monster is evoked (Hld. ἡ δὲ ὥσπερ τὴν Γοργοῦς θεασαμένη κεφαλὴν ἤ τι ἀτοπωτέρων, ὀξύ τι καὶ μέγα ἀνέκραγε [...]).

Interestingly, this twofold approach to γοργός is also attested in some descriptions of physiognomics treatises, which confirm that the difference lies in gender: in Adamantius' view, a βλέμμα ὑγρὸν γοργόν is one of the distinctive signs of the man ἀνδρεῖος, εὔψυχος and ἰσχυρός (B32). A more detailed description is given in another passage merely focused on the eyes of valiant warriors: ὀφθαλμοὶ γοργὸν βλέποντες δεινοί· οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὑγρὸν βλέποντες θυμοειδεῖς, ἄλκιμοι, ἀρειμανέες [...] (A 16). Finally, in a passage where the ideal appearance of μεγάλοι ἄνδρες is featured, Adamantius includes ὀφθαλμοὺς γοργοὺς φῶς πολὺ ἔχοντας ἐν ἑαυτοῖς (B32).

As a result, there seems to be a literary Greek tradition where ὀφθαλμοὶ γοργοί are typical of beautiful men, who are ἀνδρεῖοι because of their courage and readiness to fight. Although at first glance this nuance might appear extraneous to Xen., since he is describing a woman, I would speculate that our author might be also alluding to this second tradition. The aim of this operation would be to emphasise the warlike appearance of Anthia and to acknowledge the masculine nature of the god to whom she is compared, Artemis. A good confirmation of this is Aristaenetus' passage, where the description of Xen. is surprisingly attributed to Acontius and not to Cydippe.

This discovery is quite significant, because it suggests that Anthia, who will shortly behave as an ἐραστής, does not start the novel keen on love, but as a paragon of asexuality. As a result, her behaviour is comparable to that of Habrocomes.

c) The interpretation of the second part of the sentence: φαιδροί μὲν ὡς καλῆς, φοβεροὶ δὲ ὡς σώφρονος

This initial interpretation helps to analyse the second part of Xen.'s description. The position of γοργοί at the beginning of the sentence gives to it the role of synthesising the following words, which are then divided into two groups by word order and μὲν and δὲ. As a result, φαιδροί and φοβεροὶ should be interpreted as an expansion of γοργοί. That said, this link is not clear, since φοβεροὶ appears to be a repetition of γοργοί: also here a detailed analysis must be conducted.

To begin with, since γοργοί denotes the effect of Anthia's glance on others but does not describe her eyes, I would suggest that the following adjectives might fill this gap. Given this hypothesis, φαιδροί, which occurs only here in the novel, is the easiest adjective to interpret between the two: it means 'bright', 'appealing' and for this reason it can easily fit into the portrait of a καλή woman: beauty is the first reason for Anthia's parallel with the Gorgon. However, φαιδρός cannot be taken as a 'female' adjective, because it denotes also eyes of men (see the son of Zeus in Ap. Rhod. 2.44) and children (Eur. *Med.* 1043).

Conversely, the presence of φοβεροὶ, 'terrible' (LSJ), appears more obscure, since its connection with σώφρονος, 'chaste', is not clear. In my opinion, the solution could lie in the aforementioned parallel with Artemis the "masculine" huntress: Xen. might be suggesting that our heroine is committed to chastity and inaccessible like the goddess and, for this reason, her eyes, though beautiful, are 'intimidating'. In this respect, the opposition between μὲν and δὲ seems to work very well: φαιδροί would emphasise the physical reason why Anthia's eyes create a Gorgon effect, while φοβεροὶ the spiritual one. As a result, I would translate this second part with 'eyes appealing like those of a beautiful woman, but intimidating as those of a chaste'.

d) Anthia anti-lover like Habrocomes?

While Anthia's chastity is strongly stressed in this passage through her eyes, it is interesting how in the next passage where the same organ is mentioned Anthia is welcomes Habrocomes' beauty with her wide open eyes (1.3.2 n.) and she is suffering (διέκειτο δὲ καὶ Ἀνθία πονήρως). This new scene clearly provides a contrast with her first description. First, Anthia's eyes have lost their ability to affect the others and have become passive receivers. In addition, they appear to be merely connected with beauty, while her chastity is omitted. Finally, the phrase of διέκειτο δὲ καὶ Ἀνθία πονήρως (1.3.2) might have an immoral connotation, for which see 1.3.2, n., which suggests that the heroine is interpreting her falling in love as a break of her previous chastity. As a result, Anthia seems to undergo the same evolution as her future husband from hostility to love to acceptance of him and part of this path would be the contrast between the chastity of this passage and her following thought that loving is not ethically correct.

Finally, the connection between these two passages is strengthened by the presence of a Platonic pun in the first and of a Platonic intertext in the second: this confirms the impression that Xen. is inviting his readers to compare these two passages. In this respect, I would also speculate that φαιδροί might work as a proleptic hint at Anthia's transformation from an immaculate virgin into a passionate lover.

e) The demonstration of the Platonic pun

In his study about Plato in Longus Repath 2011 argues that when the author describes Chloe being suckled by a sheep, his use of φαιδρόν to denote her mouth is a 'pun [...] recalling the *Phaedrus*' and in the corresponding footnote he gives other examples from other texts, such as Plutarch's *Amatorius* (762d), where a man becomes through love φαιδρότερον and Pseudo Lucian's *Amores* (52), where Callicratidas is ἱλαρῷ τῷ προσώπῳ φαιδρὸς.

Furthermore, a similar pun occurs in Ach.: in Repath forth.'s view, two close chapters of the eighth book contain the expression φαιδρῷ τῷ προσώπῳ (8.13.1 and 8.14.3): in the former this designates Thersander's face, who is waiting for Leucippe's virginity test, while in the latter that of Melite, who is entering the Styge for a similar "exam". Repath forth. argues that Ach.'s reason for alluding to the *Phaedrus* is that Melite, unlike Leucippe, has not maintained a sexual abstinence. As a consequence, she 'has not adhered to the philosophical ideal espoused in the *Phaedrus*'. Therefore, in this case, 'the punning nature and context of these two identical phrases [...] encapsulate the author's use and abuse of Platonic love'.

As the Eph. contains other allusions to Plato and this is the only occurrence in the text of φαιδροί, I would argue that we might be dealing with a Platonic pun also in this passage. This possibility might be strengthened by a further consideration: the fact that φαιδροὶ is linked with καλῆς might work as a reminder of the main topic of this Platonic dialogue, which is beauty.

This conclusion leads me to take a further step in my interpretation, which is even more speculative: part of the Platonic pun might be also γοργοί. In the *Symposium*, as Savino 1991 states, 154, n. 29, there is 'un gioco di parole fra Gorgia e Gorgone': καὶ γάρ με Γοργίου ὁ λόγος ἀνεμίμνῃσκεν, ὥστε

ἀτεχνῶς τὸ τοῦ Ὁμήρου ἐπεπόνθη· ἐφοβούμην μή μοι τελευτῶν ὁ Ἀγάθων Γοργίου κεφαλὴν δεινοῦ λέγειν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἐπὶ τὸν ἐμὸν λόγον πέμψας αὐτόν με λίθον τῇ ἀφωνίᾳ ποιήσειεν (198c1-5). Although in Xen. the absence of both proper names Gorgias and Gorgon makes the hypothesis of this pun less likely than the previous one, the presence of the latter is indisputable, because the effect of the monster's eyes is clearly conveyed by γοργοί. This opens the possibility that the readers could be here reminded of Gorgias.

Having said that, both these puns or at least the first invites our interpretation: since the portrait of Anthia does not immediately recall Plato, the aim of this operation would be less specific: it is likely that Xen. is doing what Longus does, when through puns 'he makes a signal to the reader' (Repath 2010, 13) of the models he is following. At the same time, a more precise exploitation is not unthinkable: since Xen. exploits in the novel the eyes as projectors of beauty, I wonder whether our author is here suggesting the Platonic origin of this very common motif of Greek literature (see 1.3.1 n. for more). In fact, in the *Phaedrus,* during the description of the birth of love, the charioteer becomes burnt by love ἰδὼν τὸ ἐρωτικὸν ὄμμα of the beloved (253e) and then, when close to him, εἶδον τὴν ὄψιν τὴν τῶν παιδικῶν ἀστράπτουσαν (254b). In both cases, however, it is not clear whether Plato is referring to eyes or respectively to the beloved's face and appearance. As a result, this link is not as strong as others which will emerge in the novel.

f) An unexpected confirmation of the development of Anthia

Finally, it is interesting how in the course of the Eph. there is another passage where Anthia is physically described: after Hippothous' tragic love-story, the brigand tells Habrocomes about another episode, where he met for the first time the unknown heroine: ἦν δὲ καλὴ πάνυ, Ἁβροκόμη, καὶ ἐσταλμένη λιτῶς· κόμη ξανθή, χαρίεντες ὀφθαλμοί (3.3.5). This description shares elements with that of the beginning of the novel: together with the obvious reference to her beauty, κόμη ξανθή intertext with the second chapter of the first book. In this similarity the simplicity of Anthia's clothes can be included too: during the procession, she wears the traditional χιτὼν and νεβρὶς, with no special ornaments. Finally, χαρίεντες, 'graceful' and 'beautiful', which was used since Homer to denote parts of human body (see. e.g *Il.* 16.798, where κάρη χαρίεν τε μέτωπον of Achilles is mentioned), conveys a nuance similar to that of φαιδροί.

Overall, these parallels seem to suggest that through this passage Xen. wants to recall the beginning of this novel. Into this framework, however, one detail does not fit: the lack of reference to Anthia's ὀφθαλμοί φοβεροί. In theory, this omission might reflect Hippothous' impious status as a brigand, which does not allow him to see the spiritual side of the protagonist. However, since Hippothous has a soul sensible to love and his mention is a sort of appendix to his tragic story, I would rather offer a different interpretation: Xen. might be using Hippothous to subtly express that the initial chastity of Artemis has faded away. This would fit into our hypothesis that Anthia is moving from a masculine chastity to a feminine predisposition to love. In my opinion, this hypothesis might also

strengthen the association between our heroine and Charicleia, because of the definition of the latter as ἡ δυσάλωτος who is ἑάλωκεν (4.7.1).

1.2.6: σώφρονος: see LI 4.3b.

1.2.6: χίτων [...] κύνες ἑπόμενοι: this dress introduces the third part of Artemis' description, as the following comment made by the Ephesians will soon reveal (1.2.7, n: προσεκύνησαν). In fact, the χίτων. νεβρίς, γωρυτός and κύνες recall Artemis the huntress as she is attested everywhere in Greece in iconographical sources since the fifth century BC (while in the Severe art the goddess wears a long χίτων, but 'dès le milieu du V elle peut porter le vêtement court [LIMC Artemis, vol. 2.1,   747]). As a consequence, Xen's portrait of the goddess coincides with her Classical representation, which then became the most popular in the Hellenistic Era, as the famous Artemis Laphria (LIMC Artemis, vol. 2.1, n. 191-249) and Artemis from Versailles (ibid., n. 250-265) witness. Within this general Greek framework, no particular model can be identified: we are dealing with an "abstract" representation of Artemis, which every educated Greek was able to produce. The same conclusion can be extended to literary sources: in ancient text the most complete portrait is given by Callimachus in his *Hymn* to the goddess, who adopts the same pattern as Xen.: in fact, he writes that τῇ τόξα λαγωβολίαι τε μέλονται καὶ χορὸς ἀμφιλαφὴς (vv. 2-3). Shortly after, Artemis asks her father to have ἰοὺς καὶ τόξα (8) and the possibility of ἐς γόνυ μέχρι χιτῶνα ζώννυσθαι λεγνωτόν (11-12); finally, she also refers to her θοοὺς κύνας (17). In conclusion, our novelist seems to be interested neither in a local portrait of the goddess nor in the imitation of a specific model:
With this statement I personally take issue with Shea 1998, 68, who instead argues that 'Xenophon is following fairly closely Vergil's introduction of Venus in *Aeneid* 1.314-320'. Although in the Latin poem the goddess has Artemis' features and the last three verses of her description resemble that of Xen. (see 318-320: Namque umeris de more habilem suspenderat arcum venatrix, dederatque comam diffundere ventis, nuda genu, nodoque sinus collecta fluenti'), some elements are omitted by Virgil, like the quiver, arrows and the deer's skin. In addition, there is no other evidence in the Eph. that Xen. read Virgil and was assuming that his readers would recognise him. As a result, I would interpret these similarities as a sign that the both authors are referring to a traditional portrait of the goddess. Finally, I would also exclude a late influence of the Ephesian environment: although Oster 1990, 1726 rightly argues that 'even prior to the Roman period it is clear that Ephesian coins presented the Ephesian Artemis as the Huntress with stag', Xen.'s text does not have any hint at this production: no other evidences are provided by the novelist than his 'suppression' (Thomas 1995, 92) of the Anatolian representation.

1.2.6: ἁλουργής: the attribution of this adjective, 'sea-purple' (LSJ), to Anthia's χίτων is significant, because it is the only indication given by Xen. in this third part which seems extraneous to the association with Artemis. Its originality is confirmed by this meaning, since the appearance of this colour constitutes a subtle indication of Anthia's status.

In the ancient world this colour has always been particular, as it 'was common, therefore, for great statesmen, actors, courtesans and wealthy citizens to wear it as a rather blatant show of power and status' (EAG, 615). Purple, in fact, come from Tyre and was considered as a very precious kind of material.

As a result, this small word ascribes wealth to Anthia and, thus, makes her closer to Habrocomes. In addition, it might subtly anticipate the criticism about this issue which will occur later in the text.

This conclusion seems to be further strengthened by the use of the word ἀλουργής, which in Greek literature seems to be considered a feature typical of exaggerated costly objects, which shed an immoral light on the possessors. Two passages especially prove this: the first is from Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, where the hero is welcomed by Clytemnestra with purple vestments put on the floor and the hero expresses his fear of provoking the gods' jealousy because of that: καὶ τοῖσδέ μ' ἐμβαίνονθ' ἀλουργέσιν θεῶν μή τις πρόσωθεν ὄμματος βάλοι φθόνος (946-7). In addition, Agamemnon explicitly speaks about the shame toward this waste of wealth (948-9: πολλὴ γὰρ αἰδὼς δωματοφθορεῖν ποσὶν φθείροντα πλοῦτον ἀργυρωνήτους θ' ὑφάς). The second passage is chronologically closer to Xen.: in *Lycurgus' life* Plutarch, when describing the laws of this ancient statesman, refers to his intervention against the presence of τρυφή and πολυτέλεια in the Athenian houses (13.3). Since the tone of his attack is quite strong, this symbolic use of ἀλουργῆς   seems to be confirmed and, given the temporal closeness between Plutarch and Xen., it is possible to extend it to our novelist (13.4: οὐδ' ἔστιν οὐδεὶς οὕτως ἀπειρόκαλος καὶ ἀνόητος ὥστε εἰς οἰκίαν ἀφελῆ καὶ δημοτικὴν εἰσφέρειν κλίνας ἀργυρόποδας καὶ στρωμνὰς ἀλουργεῖς καὶ χρυσᾶς κύλικας καὶ τὴν τούτοις ἑπομένην πολυτέλειαν).

1.2.6: ὅπλα γωρυτὸς ἀνημμένος, τόξα, ἄκοντες φερόμενοι: the presence of ὅπλα in F is controversial, because its position between τόξα and ἄκοντες 'non soddisfa' (Borgogno 2003, 57), since ὅπλα includes in its meaning τόξα. For this reason, Dalmeyda 1926 and Borgogno 2005 follow Hercher 1876's expunction of the noun. In addition, Borgogno introduces a καὶ between τόξα e ἄκοντες, since 'l'aggiunta di ὅπλα ha fatto pensare ad una successione asindetica' (Borgogno 2003, 58).

On the other hand, O'Sullivan 2005 follows Peerlkamp 1818 placing ὅπλα before γωρυτὸς: although in this hypothesis the location of this noun in F would be more wrong, it is interesting how ὅπλα would play the same role of introductory apposition to the sentence as ἐσθής: in obedience to Xen.'s habitual use of parallel structures, I would accept this possibility as likely as the previous one.

1.2.7: ἐπὶ τοῦ τεμένους ἰδόντες Ἐφεσίοι προσεκύνησαν ὡς Ἄρτεμιν: this sentence, which attributes to Anthia the same motif προσκύνησις as Habrocomes (1.1.3 n.: προσεκύνησαν), is also interesting because it sets Anthia in the holy space of the τέμενος: this location, along with Anthia's leadership in the procession, suggest a special involvement in the cult of Artemis, which is then confirmed in the fifth chapter by her θρησκεία τῆς θεοῦ (1.5.1). In addition, in Connelly 2007, 85's view, 'the costumed Anthia is typical of sacred dress-up practiced within the context of festivals, particularly

those in which priests and priestesses may have reenacted foundation myths'. As a result, I would agree with Connelly's conclusion that 'Xen. does not claim priestly status for Anthia, yet she surely had special agency within the ritual as leader of the procession' (ibid.). This confirms Anthia's closeness to Charicleia.

In addition, this plausible attribution of a cultic role to Anthia should have been easier to understand for the ancient readers than for us, because it seems to reflect a typical Greek custom: as Holderman 1913, 299 argues, 'secondo l'uso greco le divinità maschili vengono di solito servite da sacerdoti, mentre quelle femminili da sacerdotesse'. Further, when Greek priestesses guided the ceremonies, they became 'la personificazione della divinità medesima' (ibid., 321), allowing the divine presence to enter the procession (Back 1883, 8 ff.). This phenomenon certainly concerned Artemis, whose cult was often led by young girls (see Paus. 3.18.4 for Sparta, 7.26.5 for Aegeira, and 8.5.11 for Orcomeno) and sometimes without the help of male priests (e.g. in Magnesia, see Holderman 1913, 310). Given this framework, it is more difficult to establish whether this cultic framework might suit the Ephesian setting. While the presence of female priestesses is attested by local inscriptions of the Roman period, in which this minister 'appears to be an unmarried woman' and has as her main tasks 'adorning the temple and performing public sacrifice' (Holderman 1913, 47), in the Classical and Hellenistic Era there were certainly the famous priests megabyzoi. Since there is no certainty about the date of their disappearance and Xen. does not seem to refer in the whole scene to a contemporary context, I would conclude that this cultic role played by Anthia reflects again a common trait of Greek society more than a local feature.

1.2.7: ἀνεβόησε τὸ πλῆθος [...] πεποιημένην: this is the first live reaction of the crowd in the novel, since its interaction with Habrocomes was set in the past. For the important role played here by the Ephesians, see 1.1.3 n.: προσεῖχον, b.

1.2.7: ὑπὸ τῆς θεοῦ πεποιημένην: since F includes the form περιποιημένην, 'kept safe' (*LSJ*), which does not fit into the context of this passage, scholars offer new readings: Giangrande 1964 the participle πεποιημένην, using πεποιημένος of 1.8.2 as a model. However, this solution does not seem convincing, because the concept of creation is not familiar to the Greeks (I agree with Borgogno 2003, 33's criticism: 'si può dire che gli abitanti di Efeso, nel vedere Anzia, pensino ad una creatura fatta dalla dea?') and the second passage is uncertain too (see O' Sullivan 1982, 55: 'It is not good critical practice to emend one passage on the model of another that is, to say the least, intensely suspect').

For this reason in 1982 O'Sullivan 1982 proposed πεπεμμένην, perfect participle of πέμπω. However, as Capra 2008b, 14, states, 'questa forma va bene per il senso ma non per l'*usus*: πεπεμμένος è anche participio di πέπτω ("digerire") e la forma ha quasi sempre questo significato'. Since O' Sullivan 2005 has more recently agreed on this point, in his apparatus criticus there is now a lacuna. In my opinion, although it is impossible to come to a definite conclusion, O' Sullivan's choice of πέμπω seems appropriate: since the participle implies the aforementioned ambiguity, I

wonder whether Castiglioni 1935's reading πεμπομένην might be the right one, as O' Sullivan 2005 introduces as a possibility.

1.2.7: τοὺς γονεῖς αὐτῆς ἐμακάριζον: the verb μακαρίζω recalls the literary τόπος of the μακαρισμός, which has its first appearance in Greek literature in Nausicaa's episode and then becomes an element typical of nuptial poetry and ritual. A proof of this is given by Xen. himself, who introduces it also in the description of the wedding (1.7.3 and LI 2.4).
The reason why this passage slightly more original than the Homeric one is that Anthia's parents and not Anthia herself is praised: this makes this passage another possible echo of Homer, since also Odysseus refers his praise to Nausicaa's family and not to herself (*Od.* 6.154-5: τρισμάκαρες μὲν σοί γε πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ, τρισμάκαρες δὲ κασίγνητοι·).

1.2.7: διαβόητος: Xen. introduces here the motif of the rumour, which in ancient literature has played a key role since Homer, where it is usually subjected to personification (for its first use, see *Il.* 2.93, where Ὄσσα, […] Διὸς ἄγγελος invites the Achaeans to convene an assembly). Furthermore, it has often been connected with love, because the notoriety of Helen's beauty is at the origin of the Trojan war (see on this Austin 1994 and Bettini 2002). In the erotic narrative, then, fame is traditionally associated with a τόπος, in which 'the unsurpassed beauty of the heroine draws throngs of spectators and also leads to likening her to a goddess' (Zimmerman 2004, ?): this is proved not only by novelists, but also by authors such as Parthenius (6.1) and Antoninus Liberalis (30.3 and 34.1), who collected the most traditional love-stories of the antiquity. Within this nuance, good parallels are available also in the Latin literature, as Psyche's beauty in Apuleius' tale (4.28.3) shows.

That being said, in the *Eph.* rumour has a small number of occurrences in which different subjects are involved:
a) 1.2.9: the fame of marriage (with the only occurrence in the novel of δόξα ἡ περὶ ἀλλήλων ἦλθε δόξα);
b) 1.7.3: the oncoming marriage (διαβόητος ὁ μέλλων γάμος)
c) 1.12.1: the name of the protagonists in Rhodes (ταχὺ δὲ δι' ὅλης τῆς πόλεως διεπεφοιτήκει τὸ ὄνομα Ἀβροκόμου καὶ Ἀνθίας);
d) 5.9.8: Anthia's story (διαβόητα μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἔνδοξα πεπόνθαμεν).
Although no other passages about rumour are available, it is interesting that, apart from the third, the other three concern important parts of the novel, such as marriage and Anthia's lament in front of Hippothous, which, contains the heroine's self-definition of her status as a new Odysseus. For this reason, these passages deserve further attention.
An interesting view to address this issue is offered by Tilg 2010 in his analysis of Char., who is the author who evidently focuses more on rumour and especially attributes it to Callirhoe's beauty. This is proved by the adjective περιβόητος, which is exclusively used by Char.: seven times in the novel it underlines this theme (1.14.8, 2.2.3, 2.7.1, 4.6.4, 5.2.7, 6.5.3), while twice it refers to her name

(4.7.5, 6.5.3) and once to her wedding (2.9.4). For this reason, Schmeling 2005, 39 defines Callirhoe as a 'celebrity' (39). Also other characters are involved by Char. in this pattern, but with a reference each: Dionysius' σωφροσύνη deserves this adjective, as well as Rodogune's beauty (5.3.4) and the Syracusan people (3.4.9). In addition, the word φήμη occurs even more, fifteen times (see Tilg 2010, 251-4). Although Char.'s rumour has many other nuances, our brief framework is enough to provide a possible model for the present passage.

In addition, it is interesting how in *Callirhoe* rumour assumes a metaliterary value, as it focuses on the same person as the author, Callirhoe (Tilg 2010, 242-3). This value emerges even more clearly when Char. stresses the importance of her name: in this case, the memory of the title of the novel seems to be recalled too (ibid. 242-3).

In my opinion, it is possible that also Xen. was using rumour in the same metaliterary perspective: this is clear in the last passage, where Anthia, referring to the story, mentions the *Eph*. In my opinion, here there is no distinction from Char.'s passage at the beginning when the author declares of Callirhoe: Φήμη δὲ τοῦ παραδόξου θεάματος πανταχοῦ διέτρεχε [...] (1.1.4). Then, in a subtler way, I wonder whether the double reference to the fame of marriage might be a way in which Xen. underlines how this issue is the key element of his topic, as Callirhoe's beauty is for Char. In this respect, the Homeric model may support this interpretation: since this fame originated with the inhabitants of a new Scheria, Ephesus, the status of the novel as a Phaeacian tale allows us to see in their creation the hand of the novelist. Finally, in the Rhodian passage, the rapidity with which Anthia and Habrocomes' name become popular might recall the title of the novel: this would make this theme an image of the success of the work which Xen. wishes to have. A possible objection, which is partially raised by Tilg 2010, 245, is that in this passage 'the names go around a city rather than the world or a continent', but, since also Rhodes is a new Scheria, we might interpret also this environment as ideal for giving a definition of the work. In addition, it is interesting that when Xen. names the protagonists in the part of the text where they are still together, he often write both their names (see 1.11.1, <1.16.1>, 2.1.1): this seems to support their fame. That being said, the limit of this to Rhodes in the twelfth chapter fits also well into the more intimate dimension of his novel (see NA 2).

As a result, while, following Tilg 2010, 258, 'Chariton's use of Rumour is unique among the novelists' (and this makes him argue a dependence on Virgil, see 261-270), I would suggest that here Xen.'s dependence on him is very plausible, because of our author' more limited approach to this theme. In addition, our author seems to be aware of Char.'s motif and to explore it in a brief but also subtle way: thus, we might be dealing with another proof of the existence of a sophistication in the *Eph*.

1.2.8: Ἀνθία ἡ καλή: as Capra 2008, 278 argues, 'le esclamazioni rivolte alla bellezza di un efebo sono un elemento ben noto della cultura greca, a partire dalle celebri iscrizioni vascolari che proclamano "bello", καλός, questo o quel ragazzo. Si tratta però di esclamazioni brevi, che si limitano in genere all'aggettivo unito al nome del ragazzo, spesso con un'asseverazione espressa da

ναί(χι) o da un'anafora' (on the inscriptions, cf. also Hoppin 1919, Lissarrague 1999 and Dettori 2001).

In literature, there are different texts where this definition of καλός appears (cf., among the others, Call. *Epigr*. 5 Pf..3: καλὸς ὁ παῖς, Ἀχελῷε, λίην καλός; Call. *Epigr*. 28 Pf., 5: Λυσανίη, σὺ δὲ ναίχι καλὸς καλὸς καλός; Theoc. 8.73: τὰς δαμάλας παρελᾶντα καλὸν καλὸν ἦμεν ἔφασκεν; AP 12.130.1: Εἶπα καὶ αὖ πάλιν εἶπα· 'Καλός, καλός). For this reason, here Xen. seems to follow a common pattern of Greek society.

To an extent, given the Platonic background which is emerging in other passages of the novel, it would be tempting to consider the following passage from the Lysis as a possible model used by Xen.: τὴν ὄψιν διαφέρων, οὐ τὸ 'καλὸς εἶ, ναί' μόνον ἄξιος ἀκοῦσαι, ἀλλ' ὅτι καλός τε κἀγαθός. However, there are too many examples identical to it to accept this hypothesis.

1.2.8: πάντες ἰδόντες Ἁβροκόμην ἐκείνων ἐπελάθοντο [...] μίμημα θεοῦ: with this sentence Xen. explicitly introduced a competition of beauty between the protagonists, in which Habrocomes wins: in this way, Xen. strengthens the prominence given to the male character in his presentation. This inversion increases the difference between our novelist and the other authors of the corpus, where the most beautiful protagonist is always the female member of the couple: this is particularly true in Char., whose Callirhoe is explicitly more attractive than Chaereas (4.1.10), and in Hld., where the superiority of the female beauty is even theorised (3.4.1).

In addition, as I have already stated in LI 7.1, this shift of attention from Anthia to Habrocomes seems to recall Charmides' entry into the gymnasium in the homonymous Platonic dialogue. This arrival happens immediately after Critias has shown to Socrates beautiful boys (154a) and when Charmides εἰσέρχεται, the whole audience seems to adore him, as all ἐκπεπληγμένοι τε καὶ τεθορυβημένοι ἦσαν (154c). As a consequence, οὐδεὶς ἄλλοσ'ἔβλεπεν αὐτῶν (ibid.) and then we find the already familiar expression πάντες ὥσπερ ἄγαλμα ἐθεῶντο αὐτόν (ibid.).

If we compare this passage with the present one, the similarity of the situation is evident. In addition, Xen. describes the Ephesians' wonder with the expression ἀπὸ τῆς θέας ἐκπεπληγμένοι, which contains the same verb and form as the Platonic one. Finally, the crowd pronounce a sentence which contains the Platonic comparison between a beautiful man and a statue (1.2.8 n.: οἷος). That being said, however, it is difficult to prove that Xen. might have read this dialogue (LI 7): for this reason I would consider this parallel promising but not really acceptable.

Finally, as Capra 2008 shows (GI 4), this scene of the contest of beauty might also echo a passage of the *Cyropaedia*, when Abradates leaves Panthea (6.4.11; see Capra 2008, 38: 'There is a striking parallelism between the two scenes'). However, differently from the historian, Xen. considers Habrocomes' beauty greater than that of Anthia and the lack of intertextual links makes this parallel uncertaing.

1.2.8: οἷος οὐδὲ εἷς καλοῦ μίμημα θεοῦ: as Capra 2008 clearly argues, this expression 'oscura e lambiccata: [...] in uno stesso luogo si concentrano difficoltà di ordine logico e soprattutto linguistico' (278). The connection, in fact, between οἷος εἷς and μίμημα seems missing.

Furthermore, 'il modo normale per esprimere il possesso di una qualità "come nessuno" è in greco ὡς οὐδείς, comune fin dalla prosa attica [...]. Al contrario, il nesso οἷος οὐδείς non ha paralleli nei romanzieri e nelle rare occorrenze in altri testi sembra doversi appoggiare ed accordare ad un sostantivo'.

Given these difficulties, Capra proposes a new reading of the passage by drawing on his aforementioned analysis of Ἀνθία ἡ καλή: as in the literary elaboration of this motif 'la qualifica di καλός è seguita da un ulteriore "complimento" introdotto da un connettivo relativo (ὅτι, ὡς), con discorso indiretto (for other literary references, see Capra 2004, 183-190), he replaces οἷος with οἷα and εἷς with εἰς. Consequently, his new reading is 'καλὸς Ἀβροκόμης' λέγοντες καὶ οἷα οὐδὲ εἰς καλοῦ μίμημα θεοῦ, which he translates with: 'e dicevano "Abrocome bello!" e cose che [non si dicono] neppure per la rappresentazione di un bel dio'. In this reading, the length of the direct speech is reduced, and he suggests that the incorrect presence of οἷος might depend on its occurrence in the following exclamation.

Although this proposal is based on interesting motivations, there is an element which is difficult to accept, which is the introduction made by Capra of a second hiatus between οἷα and οὐδὲ. This goes against the tendency of the *Eph*., where, as Reeve 1971, 134, shows, in fact, 'Xenophon not only avoided hiatus but also favoured certain rhythms'. For this reason, I would propose a new variant, which starts from the assumption that it was very easy for ancient copyists to confuse -εις- and -ει-. As a result, I would propose: οἷος οὐδείς εἶ καλοῦ μίμημα θεοῦ, with the translation "you are an image of the beautiful god more than anyone else". In this reading, the whole sentence returns to be part of the Ephesians' exclamation and this suggestion seems more reasonable, since the inclusion of the following οἷος in an exclamation makes its possession of the same role here plausible. In addition, it is interesting to notice how Xen. again refers to Habrocomes the motif of the comparison between him and divine statues, which is introduced at the end of the first chapter (1.1.6 n.: ὅπου). Following my interpretation, this passage would not be a mere repetition of the parallel, but would introduce a greater emphasis, giving birth to a sort of climax: while in the first occurrence Xen. states that the beauty of Eros' statues was darkened by that of Habrocomes, alluding implicitly at the prominence of the latter to the former, here the Ephesians would be more straight, saying that Habrocomes is the image of god. Since the parallel between these two episodes is not unlikely, καλοῦ θεοῦ might be included too. Thus, it appears a possible reference to Eros and not to a generic god, even though the ambiguity might be deliberately left by Xen.

1.2.9: εἰς ἑκατέρους: this is the first occurrence of a pronoun which Xen. uses often in his novel to underline the simultaneity of protagonists' action. See <u>NA</u> 4.5 on this.

1.2.9: ἡ περὶ ἀλλήλων … δόξα: this is the second appearance in the text of rumour (1.2.7 n.: διαβόητος). A specific focus on this theme on the creation of marriage has two interesting parallels in the novels, along with the Homeric model (see intr. 1.2): the first is the fragmentary novel *Chionem* where we read: ταχέως δὲ διεφοίτησε ἀνὰ τὴν πόλιν ἅπασαν [...] φήμ[η καὶ] οὐθε[ὶς] ἄλλο οὐδὲν ἐλάλει [ἢ] περὶ τοῦ γάμου (col. II, vv. 3-9, Stephens and Winkler 1995). The second is a

passage from Achilles Tatius, where Callisthenes falls in love with Sostratus' daughter only because of the fame of her beauty and Clitophon comments: καὶ ἦν ἐξ ἀκοῆς ἐραστής (1.13.1).

This suggests that also this specific elaboration of the motif might have had more occurrences than the ones attested. In addition, since only Lucian among the Early Imperial writers introduces the association between fame, διαφοιτάω and πόλις (see Alex: ὡς δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν διεφοίτησεν τοῦ μαντείου τὸ κλέος καὶ εἰς τὴν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν ἐνέπεσεν), it is not unlikely that the passage of the twelfth book of the *Eph.* and Chione are in an intertextual relationship. However, since the motifs are slightly different - in the present Xen.'s passage the city is missing, while in the second one in Rhodes marriage is not addressed, it is difficult to take this connection further.

1.2.9: ἥ τε Ἀνθία τὸν Ἀβροκόμην ἐπεθύμει ἰδεῖν, καὶ ὁ τέως ἀνέραστος Ἀβροκόμης ἤθελεν Ἀνθίαν ἰδεῖν: in this long sentence Xen. finds a new way to express simultaneity of actions (see <u>NA</u> 3.3), which is based on a chiasmus between the object and the main verb. In addition, this figure is part of a wider period in which there is a parallelism between the subject and the infinite of both sentences: the result is a textual emphasis on the protagonists' reciprocity. Interestingly, this figure of speech occurs again in the novel, especially in 1.3.1 in relation to the birth of love: ἁλίσκεται Ἀνθία ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀβροκόμου, ἡττᾶται δὲ ὑπὸ Ἔρωτος Ἀβροκόμης.

As Fusillo 1989 argues, the importance of parallelism in the *Eph.* appears as a reflection of the role of symmetry in the construction of the couple (see ibid. 187: 'i due elementi della coppia sono rappresentati come parti inscindibili di un tutto, insistendo sul loro parallelismo, che diventa così la figura retorica principale su cui si costruisce tutto il racconto'). Therefore, we are dealing not with a mere stylistic device, but with a reflection on one of the main themes of the novel (LI.7.1). In this case, the expression of symmetry goes along with that of simultaneity, as Xen. tries to assign the same events to the protagonists as long as they are together (see <u>NA</u> 3.3 for more on this).

CHAPTER 3

Falling in love and lovesickness (chapters 3-5)

After the preparation made by Eros through Anthia's presentation, the protagonists fall in love at the beginning of this chapter and they begin to perceive it as an imposing and dangerous force. The description of their suffering involves different events:

- chapters 3-4: the separation and the night;
- chapter 5, 1-2: the day after;
- chapter 5, 3-9: the days after, without a clear sequence.

As this part of the text, unlike the previous ones, directly addresses the erotic topic, we will find within it some important threads of the novel, such as the presentation of Anthia as an ἐραστής, the moral concern of both protagonists towards love and the key role played by the parents in the treatment of lovesickness. At the same time, as the topic invites Xen. to introduce erotic metaphors and motifs, these chapters offer a first evaluation of his literary knowledge, showing a limited but not poor knowledge, with mentions of surprising motifs.

1.3.1: ἐνταῦθα ὁρῶσιν ἀλλήλους: this is the traditional τόπος of the 'coup de foudre': its presence in Greek literature before Xen. is so widespread that we are dealing with a general cliché.

The proper origin of the literary tradition, in fact, is in Theocritus (see 2.82: χὡς ἴδον, ὣς ἐμάνην), but before him both Homer and Sappho underline the importance of sight in the transmission of love, although they do not completely exploit the motif of the first encounter (cf. Hom. *Il*. 14.294, where Zeus falls in love with Era, and Sapph. fr. 31, 7 V, with the interpretation given by Lanata 1996, 76 and Bonanno 2002. Cf. also Jouanno 1994, 151-2 for further references on the power of sight in the Early Greek poetry). Then, the peak of this τόπος is undoubtedly the Hellenistic poetry (see Jouanno, 152: 'Il n'en connaît pas moins une fortune grandissante à partir de l'époque hellénistique' (see 'falling in love at first sight' in table 3 in <u>LI</u> 2.3) and its fortune is inherited by the Greek novelists: as in the *Eph*., the same motif is frequent in the other novels (see 'falling in love at first sight' in table 2 in <u>LI</u> 2.3 on this τόπος in the Greek novels; cf. also Rohde 1960[4], 158-160; Letoublon 1993, 137-8 and Fusillo 1989, 196, n. 29). Only Longus provides an exception, because his protagonists fall in love after having grown together (1.13.2): as, however, he introduces the expression τότε πρῶτον αὐτῇ, he seems to echo the Homeric motif, exploiting the partial exploitation of it made by Homer (see on this Bonanno 2002, 15).

Although in <u>LI</u> 3 I have argued that Xen. is not consistently using the 'coup de foudre' as a distinctive feature of the protagonists' love, as it also concerns rivals, the presence of this motif here is significant. While it underlines the rapidity and strength of love's capture - a theme which is explored in the first chapters of the novel, with its use our novelist also acknowledges the importance of the erotic literary tradition, into which the 'coup de foudre' is certainly more famous than a slow falling in love.

1.3.1: ἁλίσκεται [...] ἡττᾶται: both these verbs, which describe the protagonists' falling in love, belong to the image of Eros as a warrior (see 1.2.1 n.): the former indicates Anthia's capture, while the latter Habrocomes' defeat. The first feature is also confirmed by the fact that ἁλισκάνω has only one occurrence in the novel in which it used in a warlike context (3.3.4, when Hippothous tells Habrocomes about Perilaus' attack to his band). Finally, as I have already shown, the first verb is used also to designate the falling in love of some rivals (see LI 3), while ἡττάομαι has its only other erotic occurrence in Habrocomes' self-confession of his defeat in his prayer to Eros (1.4.5 n.). The other mention does not have any relevance, since it concerns Eudoxus' decision to procure the poison for Anthia, which is generated by corruption (3.5.9: τοῦ ἀργυρίου καὶ τῶν δώρων).
The reason for this different fortune might be that "capture" was perceived by Xen. as a more suitable image to underline the power of love.

1.3.1: ὑπὸ Ἔρωτος: the author breaks a possible symmetry by attributing the birth of Habrocomes' love not to Anthia, but to Eros. This associates the two protagonists with two different patterns: while Anthia's falling in love is caused by Habrocomes' human attraction, that of Habrocomes is a consequence of divine power, of which Anthia is the instrument.
This difference is often repeated in the third and fourth chapters: in the third Anthia directly receives Habrocomes' beauty. Conversely, whenever Habrocomes is attracted by Anthia, Xen. states that the god is acting too (1.3.1: ἀπαλλαγῆναι τῆς ὄψεως ἐθέλων οὐκ ἐδύνατο, κατεῖχε δὲ αὐτὸν ἐγκείμενος ὁ θεός and 1.3.2: ὁ δὲ αὑτὸν ἐδεδώκει πρὸς τὴν θέαν καὶ ἦν αἰχμάλωτος τοῦ θεοῦ). In the fourth chapter, then, Habrocomes defines himself in his monologue as a victim of Eros (1.4.2: ὁ τῷ θεῷ λοιδορούμενος ἑάλωκα) and addresses the god directly (1.4.4: νενίκησας [...] Ἔρως) but he never mentions Anthia, while his beloved speaks only of him (1.4.6: ἐφ᾿Ἁβροκόμῃ μαίνομαι).
These features generate an asymmetry in the description, which might depend on a Platonic inspiration: while the process of Habrocomes' falling in love follows the Hellenistic general τόπος of Eros' vengeance, Anthia appears as a Platonic ἐραστής, because she receives the flow of beauty and declares to μαίνειν. Consequently, Xen.'s adoption of the Platonic model works as a variation of a more popular theme and, as I have already argued (LI 7.1), emphasises by contrast the active role of Anthia.

1.3.1: ἐνεώρα τε συνεχέστερον τῇ κόρῃ καὶ ἀπαλλαγῆναι τῆς ὄψεως ἐθέλων οὐκ ἐδύνατο: the "hypnosis" as the effect of the falling in love is a τόπος of the erotic literature and novelistic literature (see 'eye fixation' in table 2 and 3 in LI 2.3). A case in point is Clitophon's falling in love with Leucippe (1.4.5: τοὺς δὲ ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀφέλκειν μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς κόρης ἐβιαζόμην· οἱ δὲ οὐκ ἤθελον, ἀλλ᾿ἀνθεῖλκον [...]). The reason for its popularity certainly lies in the Platonic teaching of *Phaedrus*, where lovers are similarly attracted to their beloved: διὰ τὸ συντόνως ἠναγκάσθαι πρὸς τὸν θεὸν βλέπειν (253a).
In addition, this motif introduces two elements which are further explored by Xen. in these chapters: on the one hand, since Eros is responsible for this eyes fixation, we are dealing with the

first occurrence of the 'emotion's hold of the lover' (Cummings 2009, 116 and 1.2.1-2 n.: ὁ θεὸς). The apex of this attempt occurs at the end of this chapter: see 1.3.4 n.: ὁ ἔρως ἐν ἑκατέροις.

On the other hand, shortly after the "coup de foudre", Xen. focuses again on Habrocomes' sight: the role of eyes in the *Eph.* is very important, both in lovesickness and in the consummation of love and in this our author owes his debt to ancient erotic literature (see on this Cummings 2009, 129). Xen. ascribes two main roles to the eyes:

a) receptors of the beauty of the beloved;

b) projectors of the beloved's own beauty to the lover.

The first function has more occurrences: it concerns the present passage, where eyes welcome beauty as a "Platonic" effluence (1.3.2 n.: 1.3.2: ἀναπεπταμένοις) and as a "Platonic" image imprinted in the memory (1.3.4, 1.5.1 n.: 1.5.1: Τὰς εἰκόνας). A consequence of this is the protagonists' attempt to glance at one another, which indicates a lack of restraint (1.3.3 n.: ἀλλήλους βλέπειν, 1.5.3). This is clearly shown at the beginning of the wedding night, where shame blocks the protagonists from doing this (1.9.1: οὔτε ἠδύναντο [...] ἀντιβλέψαι). When, however, the event starts, we find the passage in which the eyes are most valorized: in a section of Anthia's speech which is particularly rich in metaphors (1.9.7-8 n.: ὦ πολλάκις), Habrocomes' eyes are directly addressed as those which welcomed Anthia's beauty. At the same time, this passage introduces the only occurrence of the second function: Habrocomes' eyes are also responsible for the birth of love in Anthia. Although the origin of this motif is more difficult to assess, a Platonic colour might be also here accepted (1.2.6 n.: ὀφθαλμοὶ). Finally, always in the wedding night the key role played by tears is an inevitable allusion to eyes, although they come from the soul.

That being said, there is no surprise in saying that the other novelists explore more nuances of vision, some of which are collected in the table 4 of the LI 2.3 (see 'Beauty like lightning', 'Eyes and persuasion', 'Wet eyes'). Finally, differently from Ach. and Hld., Xen. does not take this element further through 'explications pseudo-scientifiques proposées' (Jouanno 1994, 155: cf. Ach. 1.9.4-5, 5.13.3-4 and Hld. 3.7.3, 5).

1.3.1: ἐγκείμενος ὁ θεός: as Cummings 2009, 179 argues, 'one of the most common metaphors for emotion in Xenophon of Ephesus is that of "state", κεῖμαι, and most of its occurrences are used of ἔρως'. When it occurs, as in this case, with the prefix ἐν, 'an emotion is inside the container of the person' (for the other use with διά, see 1.3.2 n.: διέκειτο).

As a result, the attribution of ἔγκειμαι to Eros stresses the metaphor of the control of love on the beloved, which will have its climax at the end of Habrocomes' monologue (see 1.4.4 n.: ὁ θεὸς [...] αὐτῷ ἐνέκειτο), where the same verb is used with a different construction. Interestingly, in the whole novel ἔγκειμαι appears three other times, where it always describes the erotic insistence of a rival: this happens with Perilaus (2.13.8: πολλὰ ἐγκειμένῳ), Cyno (3.12.4: ἐγκειμένης τῆς Κυνοῦς) and Hippothous (5.9.12: ὡς ἐνέκειτο Ἱππόθοος), the three rivals who lead the protagonists to do something against their will. In the first two cases this coincides with the promise of a relationship, while in the last with an account of personal misadventures. In my opinion, it is not unlikely that through this verb and the present occurrence Xen. is building a parallel between Eros and his rivals,

suggesting that the latter are incarnation of the former (for the clearest example of this interplay, see Corymbus and Manto in 1.16.2 n.: λέγει, b).

1.3.2: διέκειτο δὲ καὶ Ἀνθία πονήρως: this expression is quite important in Xen., because it reflects Anthia's view of lovesickness and her moral concern about it. Before developing this point, which emerges from the adverb πονήρως, I would start to look at the verb διακεῖμαι: its presence introduces into the novel a second nuance of 'the state of emotion' (1.3.1: ἐγκείμενος), where, unlike ἐν, the prefix διά indicates the emotional disposition of a person towards an event. The occurrence of this verb with the adverb πονήρως is quite important in Xen., since it is often used during the description of lovesickness: in 1.4.6 it is referred again to Anthia, in 1.15.4 to Corymbus and in 2.3.3 and 2.4.2 to Manto (on the parallels between protagonists' and rivals' love, see <u>LI</u> 3). On the other hand, διάκειται πονήρως has also two occurrences that belong to a different context: in 1.15.1 it describes Habrocomes' discouragement during the journey with the pirates, while in 5.8.3 his physical exertion in the quarries. Overall, in each of these passages this state of emotion is always focalised on a specific character.

The repetitive use of this expression makes the search for its meaning very important: like the most common formula with ἔχειν, διακεῖμαι πονήρως means generally 'to be in a bad situation'. In this case, a more precise understanding of this expression depends on the meaning of the adjective πονηρός, from which the adverb comes. In relation to people, it indicates 'bad' in two senses:

a) 'oppressed by toils', where the person is the "victim" of something bad;

b) 'dishonest, malicious, wicked', where the person is responsible for something bad.

Given this remarkable difference, in my opinion Xen. has in his mind the second and I will show why. If we look at the two non-erotic passages, it is interesting how they are originated by a negative and unexpected event, namely the arrival of the pirates and the unsustainable work in the quarry, which make Habrocomes a "victim" of evil. This suggests that also in the other occurrences the same pattern should be at work: as a result, this formula expands the motif of ἔρως as an experience perceived as an evil by the lovers (see on this Cummings 2009, 180: 'This use of the adverb πονήρως is an evaluative one in that it portrays ἔρως as a negative experience' and <u>LI</u> 2.3).

That being said, there is a last point to decide: while in the non-erotic cases the nature of the evil is clear, since it is a concrete event - an attack and a hard work - which makes Habrocomes' life more difficult, in the present case there is more space for interpretation: love might cause either a physical suffering or a spiritual one or both.

In my opinion, the second and the third possibility are the most likely, because the adjective πονηρός in the novel is always focalised like the adverb and never lacks a strongly immoral connotation. A case in point is Habrocomes' kneeling in front of Apsyrtus, when we are told that πονηρὰ δὲ καὶ ἐλεεινὰ πεπονθὼς (2.10.2): since these events coincide with the tortures he has received by Anthia, in an episode in which the hero shows all his strenuous defence of chastity, the immoral connotation is there clearly addressed along with the concrete hardship undergone. Other examples are Hippothous' judgement about Hyperanthes' father, who is willing to be corrupted with money (3.2.7: πονηρὸν ἄνδρα) and the protagonist's assessment of Cyno (4.2.5: εἰ δὲ ὑπὸ γυναικὸς

προδέδομαι πονηρᾶς [...]): the corrupt nature of both is not disputable (the former is defined as καὶ ἐλάττονα χρημάτων, while Cyno's uncontrollable lust is one of the worst of the novel). Within this framework, there is only an exception, where the narrator is the speaker: as, however, this passage refers to Anchialus, the immoral connotation of πονηρός is even more stressed (4.5.6: καὶ Ἀγχίαλος μὲν δίκην ἱκανὴν ἐδεδώκει τῆς πονηρᾶς ἐπιθυμίας; for other passages, see 2.4.3, 2.10.2, 3.5.2, 4.2.8, 5.5.3; the last cases will be shortly mentioned). In my opinion, the specific concern of these passages makes it very plausible that the moral connotation is at work in the present formula.

This discovery is definitely confirmed by what Habrocomes states in his first monologue: ὦ πάντα ἄνανδρος ἐγὼ καὶ πονηρός. οὐ καρτερήσω νῦν; (1.4.2). Since this self-accusation has submission to love as its object and the moral connotation is clarified by the two words used before (LI 4) and after (1.4.2 n.: οὐ καρτερήσω), I would conclude that the female protagonist might be here interpreting love as an 'dishonest, malicious and wicked' force.

The reason for this reaction calls us back to Anthia's initial presentation as a follower of Artemis devoted to chastity. From this comparison it is easy to conclude that our heroine is afraid that love might end her chastity and this becomes even more clear in her following confession: τῶν παρθένοις πρεπόντων καταφρονοῦσα (1.3.2). In this respect, it is interesting that the second attribution to her of διέκειτο δὲ καὶ Ἀνθία πονηρῶς occurs shortly before her monologue (1.4.6-7), where this moral concern becomes clearer.

Overall, this discussion of πονήρως makes Anthia closer to Habrocomes: both the protagonists are worried about the passion that is conquering them and their reaction confirms that their approach to love is not merely fatalist, as if *eros* were something bad but indecipherable, but a deeper one, in which love is considered dangerous, because it arouses human desire.

Finally, it is interesting that at the end of the novel Anthia twice defines her life as πονηρά but for two reasons which are very different from the present: the death or the betrayal of her husband (5.4.11: εἰ δὲ ἐκεῖνος τέθνηκεν, ἀπαλλαγῆναι κἀμὲ καλῶς ἔχει τοῦ πονηροῦ τούτου βίου and 5.8.8: κάλλιον οὖν ἀπολέσθαι καὶ ἀπαλλαγῆναι τοῦ πονηροῦ τούτου βίου). In my opinion, both these occurrences are deliberately introduced by Xen. to emphasise the evolution of Anthia's view of love, according to which she will discover that this feeling can not only be positive, but also necessary to live. In addition, it is not impossible to see in this subtle interplay with πονηρός another hint at Plato's *Phaedrus*, where this adjective is the definition of the bad and intemperate horse (*Phdr.* 254e6): however, nothing more certain can be said, because the text does not offer any suggestion of this, except that this formula is immediately followed by a Platonic intertext.

1.3.2: ἀναπεπταμένοις τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τὸ Ἀβροκόμου κάλλος εἰσρέον δεχομένη: Anthia's reaction to her meeting with Habrocomes is significant, because it conveys the image of beauty as a stream which flows inside the lover. As I suggested in LI 7.1, this passage seems a plausible intertext with the Platonic *Phaedrus*, which allows us to define Anthia as a Platonic ἐραστής and to conclude that Xen. read at least some parts of this dialogue.

Given the importance of this connection, it must be carefully proved: since in Imperial literature the flow of beauty is certainly a common cliché, we should investigate whether Xen. is really drawing

from the *Phaedrus*. The passage where this topic is introduced by Plato is part of Socrates' discussion of the madness of love, where at a little distance the philosopher repeats this τόπος: in 251b, the lover's soul is warmed δεξάμενος γὰρ τοῦ κάλλους τὴν ἀπορροὴν διὰ τῶν ὀμμάτων. The same experience is repeated a few sentences later: ὅταν μὲν οὖν βλέπουσα πρὸς τὸ τοῦ παιδὸς κάλλος, ἐκεῖθεν μέρη ἐπιόντα καὶ ῥέοντ' - ἃ δὴ διὰ ταῦτα ἵμερος καλεῖται - δεχομένη (251c): here Plato likens erotic desire to a flow. Later, after the start of the relationship with the beloved, ἡ τοῦ ῥεύματος ἐκείνου πηγή again strikes the lover: οὕτω τὸ τοῦ κάλλους ῥεῦμα πάλιν εἰς τὸν καλὸν διὰ τῶν ὀμμάτων ἰόν (255c).

In my opinion, Xen. might have in this mind this motif. The first two Platonic quotations contain δέχομαι, which has two objects that have τὸ κάλλος as specification - τὴν ἀπορροὴν agrees τοῦ κάλλους and μέρη with τὸ τοῦ παιδὸς κάλλος. Similarly, Xen. introduces δεχομένη and κάλλος as its object. This combination might be interpreted as a Platonic intertext, because the phrase constituted by these two words,is not used by any other author in the whole Greek corpus, apart from the alchemist Comarius, which is too far from Xen. (see *De lapide philosophorum* 2.296), and by Ach. (6.7.5, see below for a comment) and Plutarch (*De anim procr.* in Timaeo 1013c: δεχομένην τὸ κάλλιστον εἶδος), who, however, support the connection with Plato. The former author, in fact, introduces five times the "flow of beauty" in this novel and this frequency, along with his use of terms from the *Phaedrus* ἀπορροή and διὰ τῶν ὀμμάτων make his debt to Plato evident, as Bychkov 1999 argues (see 39: 'Achilles Tatius must be making an allusion to Plato'). These are the five occurrences:

a) 1.4.4: κάλλος [...] διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν καταρρεῖ (in Clitophon's falling in love);

b) 1.9.4-5: ἡ δὲ τοῦ κάλλους ἀπορροή, δι'αὐτῶν [ὀφθαλμοί n.d.r.] εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν καταρρέουσα, [...] (Clinias in his explanation offered to Clitophon);

c) 5.13.4: ἡ δὲ τῆς θέας ἡδονὴ διὰ τῶν ὀμμάτων εἰσρέουσα τοῖς στέρνοις ἐγκάθηται. [...] ἡ δὲ τοῦ κάλλους ἀπορροὴ [...] ἐπὶ τὴν [...] καρδίαν [...]. (in Clitophon's falling in love with Melite);

d) 6.6.3-4: τί δέ σου τὸ κάλλος τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν εἰς γῆν καταρρεῖ; ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς μᾶλλον ῥεέτω τοὺς ἐμούς (Thersander's about his falling in love with Leucippe);

e) 6.7.5: ἐπειδὴ γὰρ εἰς τὰ ὄμματα τῶν καλῶν τὸ κάλλος κάθηται, ῥέον ἐκεῖθεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῶν ὀρώντων ἵσταται καὶ τῶν δακρύων τὴν πηγὴν συνεφέλκεται (in Clitophon's comment on Leucippe's tears).

Interestingly, the passage where Ach. uses δέχομαι and τὸ κάλλος directly follows the last occurrence: the novelist adds that ὁ δὲ ἐραστὴς δεξάμενος ἄμφω: as the pronoun ἄμφω includes beauty and tears, the Platonic exclusivity of this link is here confirmed (see Ach. 6.7.5). The same conclusion can be easily extended to Plutarch, since in the aforementioned passage he is presenting the Platonic theory on the soul.

That being said, one might argue that Xen.'s omission of the Platonic word for 'stream', ἀπορροή, constitutes an objection to this interpretation. However, his introduction of the participle εἰσρέον, might be Platonic too. Although this list of passages clearly shows how εἰσρέω is used by any sort of authors in different contexts, it is noteworthy that there is only one passage where it appears in an

erotic context before Xen.: in the Platonic *Cratylus,* where Socrates explains why ἔρως is so called, he says: ἔρως δὲ [ἐκαλεῖτο], ὅτι ἐσρεῖ ἔξωθεν καὶ οὐκ οἰκεία ἐστὶν ἡ ῥοὴ αὕτη τῷ ἔχοντι, ἀλλ'ἐπείσκτος διὰ τῶν ὀμμάτων (420b). Since this etymology 'is very close to the *Phaedrus* analysis of ἵμερος' (Tarrant 2000, 142, n. 9), the connection with our author is possible. In addition, there are two passages which seems to prove that this piece from the Cratylus was known to erotic writers in the Imperial Era. First, Ach. in his third use of "the flow of beauty" writes εἰσρέουσα and then immediately adds: ἔλκουσα δὲ τοῦ ἐρωμένου τὸ εἴδωλον ἀεί [...] (5.13.4): this interplay with the root of ἔρως in a Platonic passage seems to suggests that he was aware of the etymology. Furthermore, in 2.29.2, it is αἰδως that διὰ τῶν ὀμμάτων εἰσρέουσα: although the subject is here different, this image seems to recall again that of the flow of beauty. Second, there is also a passage from Lucian which fits this framework: σχεδὸν γὰρ εἰσρεῖ τι διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν ψυχὴν καλόν, εἶτα πρὸς αὐτὸ κοσμῆσαν ἐκπέμπει τοὺς λόγους (Luc. *Dom.* 4). As this sentence contains διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν and καλόν, it seems to intertexting with Plato and, thus, the connection of εἰσρέω with the philosopher is finally confirmed.

Given these two textual proofs, I would conclude that τὸ Ἀβροκόμου κάλλος εἰσρέον δεχομένη is a reference to Plato. One might still object that Xen. might be not aware of the Platonic origin of the etymology, but its appearance in passages where the Platonic flow of beauty is mentioned makes this point unlikely.

In conclusion, the readers of Xen. might have found here the first confirmation that the pun on the *Phaedrus* of the second book was the indicator of an intertext and not merely decorative.

Appendix: the main uses of εἰσρέω in the Greek Literature

a) Scientific and concrete use, in relation to every sort of liquid, such as rivers, blood and urine;

b) Metaphorical use:

- Wealth: Dem. De pace, 140;
- Knowledge: Plato *Phaedr.* 262b3, Phil. 62c7, Athen. *Legat.* 27.2;
- Music: Aristoph. *music.* (*hist. animal. epit.* 2.496, 2.565);
- Style: Dio Halicarnassensis *Ars Rhet.* 10.17, Phrynicus *Eclog.* 246;
- Movement of people (Plut. *Ant.* 24.2);
- Light (Luc. *Menip.* 22);
- Medicine (Galen, *De compositione medic.* X 12.820).

1.3.2: ἐλάλησεν ἄν τι, ἵνα Ἀβροκόμης ἀκούσῃς:

a) <u>The use of ἄν</u>

After having received Habrocomes' beauty, Anthia is associated with the action of talking to attract her beloved's attention and of displaying part of her body. Given this connection, the introduction of ἄν is significant: according to Kühner 1904's classification, there are three main uses of this particles: the iterative ἄν, the ἄν 'als sogennanter Potential der Vergangenheit' (212) and the ἄν that

expresses 'Nichtwirklichkeit' (214). The choice between these values is significant: while in the second and third cases the action expressed does not really happen, in the first case the adverb ἄν 'denotes a customary action, being equivalent to our narrative phrase "he would often do this" or "he used to do it"' (Goodwin 1894, 56).

Usually, the translators of the *Eph.* choose the 'iterative' value: see Borgogno 2005 'parlava facendo in modo che Abrocome la sentisse', Anderson and Henderson 2009, 'what she said was for Habrocomes to hear [...]'. Only Trzaskoma 2010 differs, as he does not present the action as really happening: 'Oh yes, she would say things just so Habrocomes would hear them [...]'. However, although this connotation of ἄν 'is well established' in the Greek literature (Seaton 1889, 343; see Goodwin 1894, 86: 'it is found in Herodotus and is common in Attic Greek') and is attested also in the Imperial Era (see Hld. 1.9.3, where Cnemon tells us how Demeneta behaves towards him: ἐφίλησεν ἄν προσελθοῦσα καὶ ὄνασθαί μου συνεχῶς εὔξατο and the presence of συνεχῶς clarifies the iterative mark), in my opinion here Xen. is not describing repetitive actions, but just those that happened after the unique circumstance of the falling in love. In addition, while in the first chapter the author insists in different ways on the iterative value of Habrocomes' actions (1.1.1 .: οὗτος ὁ Ἀβροκόμης), here no clue is given in this direction. The author stresses only the durative value of the protagonists' reactions (see e.g. 1.3.1: ἐνεώρα τε συνεχέστερον τῇ κόρῃ and 1.3.2: διέκειτο [...] πονήρως (1.3.2). As a result, in my opinion in this passage we area dealing with an ἄν 'als sogennanter Potential der Vergangenheit' (see above), where the if clause is omitted. Thus, I would translate this sentence with 'she would have said something that Habrocomes could hear and she would have uncovered all the possible parts of her body, so that Habrocomes could look at them'.

Finally, I also believe that this interpretation is more coherent with the development of the protagonists in the novel: Anthia is here facing for the first time the power of erotic desire and in her monologue in the fourth chapter (1.4.6-7) she seems a girl worried about the danger of love but still controlled. If she had really performed these actions, the present passage would be really a one-off passage and would put in question Xen.'s emphasis on Anthia's chastity. In addition, the following repetitions of the protagonists' shame and her return to Artemis' temple confirm that our heroine might have kept her modesty: only with Eros' approval will she allow herself to express her desire to Habrocomes (for a confirmation of this, see 1.5.3 n.: ἐστέναξεν).

b) <u>The nature of Anthia's attempted action</u>

Anthia's desire here is very simple: to talk aloud in order to attract her beloved. Although this motif does not seem to be common in erotic literature, it recalls the chats that in Latin Elegy some *garrulae* lovers have or try to have with their beloved. In Propertius this motif appears twice: in one case is part of the erotic relationship (3.23.17-18: 'et quaecumque volens reperit non stulta puella garrula, cum blandis dicitur hora dolis'), while in the other it is a feature which does not concern the bought woman to which the poet dedicates his poetry (2.23.17-18: 'nec poscet garrula, quod te astrictus ploret saepe dedisse pater [...]'; see 'desire to talk to attract the beloved' in table 3 in <u>LI</u> 2.3 for another occurrence'). A further reason why this parallel with 'garrulitas' might work is that in

the Latin conception this attitude 'vituperatur in hominibus' (*TLL*): as a result, it fits well into the immorality of Anthia's desire.

Overall, Xen. seems to refer here to a motif which is not common in the novelistic corpus. One might recall here Arsace's attempt to attract Thyamis, but in this case physical gestures are involved instead of words (7.2.2: ἐπέβαλλεν [...] νεύματα τῶν αἰσχροτέρων αἰνίγματα). Only the immoral connotation can be compared.

1.3.2: μέρη τοῦ σώματος ἐγύμνωσεν ἂν τὰ δυνατά: following the interpretation of ἂν as a particle which does not express a real action, this sentence is describing Anthia's unfulfilled desire. On this note, I would like to show how from a Greek perspective this reaction is really the opposite of the heroine's normal attitude and, thus, through this Xen. shows the interior battle which she is fighting.

<u>a) Nudity in Greek culture: the lascivious nature of Anthia's unfulfilled desire</u>

To begin with, in Greek society display of nudity was not commonly accepted: as Letoublon 1993, 205 argues, 'parce que nous voyons des Nus, féminins ou masculins, peupler nos musées, il ne faut pas pour autant croire que la nudité était d'usage dans la Grèce antique'. Only some divinities and heroines could be represented naked, like Aphrodite, Andromeda, Europe (see Ach. I 1.11) and Danae, but human beings were almost always clothed (see Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones 2002, VII: 'more often than not, the ancient body was clothed). The reason for this attitude is the human αἰδώς, which could be manifested 'both as an occurrent affect (shame, bashfulness) and as an abiding quality or disposition (modesty)' (Cairns 2002, 75).

Only some cases constituted exceptions: men were showing their body in gymnasia (see Letoublon 1993, 205: 'la nudité ne l'était que pour les hommes, et seulement dans l'espace réservé a l'exercice physique'), while women sometimes were involved in an 'interplay between concealment and display' (Blundell 2002, 144) of their body. Overall, since αἰδώς was the reason for not covering the body, it is evident that showing it 'carried intimations of eroticism' (Blundell 2002, 162). This nuance describes well what Anthia is doing.

In addition, since 'clothing was a basic component in the construction of the Greek female identity' (Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones 2002b, 163, n.8), as the famous myth of Pandora shows (Hes. *Theog.* 585-612 and *Works and Days* 69-105), this play with dress was obviously not exploited by men: therefore, showing the body was also 'part of the construction of femininity' (Blundell 2002, 155).

If we consider Anthia's episode within this framework, we can easily classify her desire as erotic and typical of her gender (cf. on this Haynes 2003, 53: 'Xenophon has placed a discreet, though titillating, textual veil over the heroine'). This act appears to be original in the context of Xen's novel: while in Ach.'s text 'il corpo umano è al centro degli interessi e delle emozioni degli uomini' (Liviabella-Furiani 2000-1, 134), Xen. is generally not keen on body-language; more specifically, as De Temermman forth. points out, he introduces it only in connection with the protagonists' reaction to love, before (cf. 1.5.2-3 and 1.5.5) and after their decision to marry (1.9.1).

As a consequence, this passage is exceptional in the context of the *Eph.* and it certainly plays an important role in the characterisation of Anthia: Xen. is willingly attributing to her an impulse which builds a contrast with her chaste behaviour and her role of priestess of Artemis. In the end, since Anthia does not perform this act, she maintains her morality: although she has just begun to experience love, she shows an awareness of the implications of this passion: this strengthens her association with Nausicaa (1.2 n.: intr.).

b) The ambiguous meaning of τὰ δυνατά

In my opinion, this impression that Anthia's desire is really opposite to the normal attitude is confirmed by the interpretation of τὰ δυνατά: the meaning of this expression is ambiguous, because it might indicate either that Anthia shows only the licit parts of her body - and thus not the most immoral ones (see LRG for this interpretation) or that she tries to show as much as she can, since she is dressed and being in a temple she cannot become completely naked. Evidently, in the former option Anthia's desire would be less provocative than in the latter. In my opinion, the second option is the most correct one, because δυνατός refers usually to a human ability and not to what is licit (see LSJ). In addition, when the cognate verb δύναμαι means 'to be able to do something' in relation with a 'moral possibility' (LSJ), it 'is mostly used with negations', unlike in this case, and this confirms our hypothesis.

c) Nudity and literature: the literary background of this lascivious desire

This unchaste though which develops in Anthia's mind not only has parallels in Greek society, but also in literature: nudity is explored in Greek texts, especially on epigrams, and seems to have a Hellenistic origin. However, as I have suggested in LI 2.3, this desire to display the body does not find a good parallel in the novels: thus, the existence of this motif might depend on Xen.'s debt to Hellenistic texts not considered by the other authors of the genre.

To begin with, nudity is a key topic of Greek epigrams, where it occurs in sexual consummations (see AP 5.2.3, 5.47.3 and 5.252.1-4) and in descriptions of the naked beloved in other contexts (see 5.13.3-4, 5.35.2, 5.36.4, 5.161.4, 5.192.1). In addition, some texts refer more explicitly, like Xen.'s case, to people who do a strip (see 5.69.3, 5.83.2, 5.104.4, 12.40.1 and 12.161.4). In each of these cases this act is clearly linked with an invitation to have sex and, interestingly, in some of them clothes are mentioned as an instrument which can subtly allow or prevent nudity, arousing the sexual expectations of the lovers. This ambiguous role is explicitly addressed by Marcus Argentarius, who tells her beloved that, because of her πέπλος, πάντα δὲ σου βλέπεται γυμνὰ καιὰ οὐ βλέπεται (5.104.4), while the last epigram, in my opinion, has a situation very similar with Xen.'s one. Although Asclepiades refers to a boy, he first describes his erotic attraction (see 1-2: ὡς ἁπαλὸς παῖς ἔσθαι πανδήμου Κύπριδος ὡκὺ βέλος) and then he states: γυμνὸν μηρὸν ἔφαινε χλαμύς (4). In my opinion, this boy does what Anthia would like to do: to show the sexies parts of the body, despite being dressed: thus, our heroine's wantonness fits well into the Greek literary framework.

The same features also appear in Roman erotic poetry: a case in point is Ovid's *Amores*, in which the poet describes his sex with Corinna praising her nudity (1.5.17-24). Interestingly, before the

consummation of this act, the girl tries to remain covered and fights with the poet who wants to undress her (see 13-16). However, her final decision is to become naked and her wantonness constitute a more emphatic example than that of Anthia.

The emergence of this framework is significant, because it proves that nudity is an issue not typical of ancient literature, but only of specific genres, like Greek and Roman Elegy. This silence, whose origin certainly lies in the aforementioned Greek taboo, pushes us to look at what the other Greek novelists do.

Overall, these authors seem to explore this topic very rarely. Both Char. and Longus describe baths of their protagonists: the former tells of Callirhoe's bath in Miletus (2.2.1-4; see 1.2.1 intr.) in a scene which 'has an erotic exploitation' (Morgan 2004, 161), while the latter introduces two scenes: both concern only Daphnis, but Chloe plays an active role in the scene looking and touching the beloved's body. Finally, at the end of the second episode, she even wears Daphnis' dressing, increasing the eroticism of the scene and anticipating the sex that she has with him (see 1.13.1-5 and 1.23.2-1.24.2). While this framework suggests that other novelists play like Xen. on the wantonness of nudity, the originality of our passage within the novelistic corpus remains Xen.'s focus on the display of the body as a voluntary act and the moral concern of the heroine. In this respect, Anthia appears to be different from Chloe, who is not aware of the sexual implications of her actions. Finally, the emergence of this desire makes Anthia also different from Charicleia, who never has a similar thought and when she is asked to show her spot on her arm, she has to be assured by Sisimitre that she is not performing an impious act: Γύμνωσον τὴν ὠλένην, ὦ κόρη [...] οὐδὲν ἀπρεπὲς γυμνούμενον τῶν φύντων καὶ γένους μαρτύριον (10.15.2). This invitation makes her chaster than our heroine and confirms that Xen. might be here referring more to models unusual for the novels.

1.3.2: ὁ δὲ αὐτὸν ἐδεδώκει πρὸς τὴν θέαν καὶ ἦν αἰχμάλωτος τοῦ θεοῦ: this is the first appearance of the image of the 'capture' of Eros (see 1.2.1-2 n.: ὁ θεὸς): it has already been referred to Anthia in the falling in love, where, however, the responsible party is Habrocomes.

1.3.3: ἀλλήλους βλέπειν ἐθέλοντες, ἐπιστρεφόμενοι: in my opinion, this desire of both protagonists to look at each other fits well into the preceding context where Anthia thinks of committing licentious actions. As Cummings 2009, 131 argues, 'a glance can indicate a lack of restraint, and staring can show the indifference to αἰδώς typical in a lover's stare' (131). If this connotation here is only hinted, it becomes more explicit two chapters later when the protagonists meet in the temple and Xen. writes: ἐν τούτῳ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς θεοῦ διημερεύοντες ἐνεώρων ἀλλήλοις, εἰπεῖν τὸ ἀληθὲς φόβῳ πρὸς ἑκατέρους αἰδούμενοι (1.5.3). Although the shame concerns the speaking, Anthia in looking at Habrocomes is certainly distracted by her duty towards Artemis. That being said, the level of this "infraction" is certainly lower than what Anthia would have reached with her unfulfilled desires.

This conclusion is strengthened by passages from Hld. where the same pattern is emphasised: in the first book, it is Thyamis who prefers not to look at Charicleia in order to keep control of himself

(1.24.3: καὶ ὁ μὲν Θύαμις ἐκ τούτων παρῃτεῖτο τὴν ὄψιν τῆς κόρης οὐ δυνατὸν βλέπειν τε ἅμα καὶ σωφρονεῖν ἡγούμενος). Then, a woman of impudic glances is Arsace, as it appears in the passage which I have already mentioned in relation to Anthia's desire for nudity (1.3.2 n.: ἐλάλησεν and Hld. 7.2.2: ὀφθαλμούς τε ἐπέβαλλεν οὐ σώφρονας).

1.3.3: ἀλλήλους βλέπειν ἐθέλοντες, ἐπιστρεφόμενοι: this motif, as the following one, lacks attestation in the Greek literature and it appears only in Latin poetry, as Ovid shows in the *Heroides* in Leander's description of the night with Hero. See the following motif for more.

1.3.3: ὑφιστάμενοι πολλὰς προφάσεις διατριβῆς ηὕρισκον: this τόπος, which is defined by Trankle 1963, 474 'Hinauszogern des Abschieds' and is connected with the previous one, is unexpectedly missing in the Greek Literature prior to Xen. In fact, the only similar theme which is attested is 'the wish to prolong a night spent with one's beloved' (on this, see McKeown 1989, vol. 2, 337-339, at 1.13), which is foreshadowed in Hom. *Od.* 23.241-6, where Athena makes the night longer, but in these examples the delay is attributed to natural entities and not to the lovers (for other occurrences, see Sappho fr. 197, AP. 5.3, 5.172, 5.173 and 12.137). Since the only attestation comes in the Latin Elegy, as I have argued in LI 2.4, Xen. might have borrowed this motif from Hellenistic lost texts.

The most significant Latin examples come from Tibullus and Ovidius, where this motif is developed in connection with the beloved's departure by sea (cf. Hollis 1977, 141, at *Ars Amatoria* 1, 701: 'Attempts at delaying the traveller and reproaches for his cruelty in leaving are common in a propempticon' and Rosati 1996, 102: 'Tipico, nelle scene di congedo in poesia elegiaca, l'atteggiamento dell'innamorato che cerca pretesti per rinviare il momento del distacco'). More precisely, Tibullus in 1.3.15-16 suffers from Delia's absence and remembers his attempt at delaying her departure: 'ipse ego, solator, cum iam mandata dedissem, quaerebam tardas anxius usque moras'. Similarly, in Ovid's *Heroides*, when Leandrus describes the night spent with Hero, he says: 'Atque ita cunctatus monitu nutricis amaro frigida deserta litora turre peto' (*Her.* 18. 115-6; for other occurrences of the motif, see 'attempt at delaying the separation' in table 3, LI 2.3).

Another reason why Hero and Leandrus' story is significant is that it is already mentioned before Ovid by Virg. *Georg.* 3. 258 and Hor. *Epist.* 1.3.3: increases the possibility that a Greek lost model was describing it and Xen. might have drawn from this model.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that this and the previous motif appears only other time together in the Greek novels during Hld.'s description of Arsace's lovesickness (7.9.1). When the Persian woman, in fact, has to separate from Theagenes, the first delay (ἀπεχώρει δὲ καὶ ἡ Ἀρσάκη μόλις μὲν καὶ πολλάκις ἀναστρέφουσα) involves false prayers to gods, while the second involves looking at Theagenes (πρὸς τὸν Θεαγένην ἕως ἐξῆν ἐπιστρέφουσα). Interestingly, Hld. uses here the verb ἐπιστρέφω: although Xen. uses the medial form, it is not impossible that the Hld. is also intertexting here with our author. This would further strengthen the relationship between their novels (GI 5).

1.3.4: ὁ ἔρως ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀνεκαίετο: this is the first appearance in the novel of the traditional image of love as a 'fire' (see on this Cummings 2009, 47). More precisely, Eros is here the fire lighter, who makes the flame rise in the protagonists' spirits. In addition, this process is here emphasised by the

presence of the 'container metaphor' (Cummings 2009, 49). Since the same image is repeated in the same section, Xen. is clearly stressing love's control of his victims and it is important that here Anthia is involved too, since the previous occurrences of this metaphor focused only on Habrocomes. From a linguistic point of view, the use of the prefix ἀνα- underlines the rise of the flame (see ibid.: 'it evokes the upwards direction of the flame as it comes into existence').

That being said, Xen. does not seem to insist on this metaphor like he does with the military one, as the following occurrences prove:

a) 1.5.8: ἔτι μᾶλλον ὁ ἔρως ἀνεκαίετο (again referred to the protagonists);

b) 2.3.3: δι'ἃ δὴ καὶ μᾶλλον ἀνεκαίετο (only the verb is referred to Manto in love, but without the 'container metaphor'.

On the other hand, Xen. also uses another compound of καίω, ἐκκαίω, as part of the same image: its only difference lies in its active form and transitive meaning. It has three occurrences in the novel:

a) 1.9.8: ἔχετε ψυχὰς ἃς αὐτοὶ ἐξεκαύσατε (Anthia's apostrophe to Habrocomes' eyes);

b) 1.14.7: αὐτὸν ἡ [...] συνήθεια ἐπὶ πλέον ἐξέκαιε) (Corymbus' love for Habrocomes);

c) 4.5.4: ἡ καθ'ἡμέραν τῆς Ἀνθίας ὄψις ἐξέκαεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν ἔρωτα (Anchialus' passion for Anthia).

In each of these cases, love uses a different instrument to light the fire: the eyes of the beloved, the sharing of life and the lover's contemplation of the beloved.

Finally, Anthia in her monologue before the wedding with Perilaus recalls her marriage with Habrocomes and states: παρέπεμπεν ἡμᾶς πῦρ ἐρωτικόν (3.6.2), which subtitutes the expression of the eight chapter μετὰ λαμπάδων. This expression of the metaphor of fire, which denotes an 'artistic motivation' (Hägg 1971, 76), is slighty different from the previous ones, since the action of kindling is substituted by the association between fire and human psychology: thus, here 'love is the heat of an internal fire' (Cummings 2009, 51). While this image is certainly more artistic that In addition, this image has also an analeptic value: since it places love at the origin of marriage, it recalls the parents' interpretation of the oracle: their decision to marry their sons, in fact, follows Apollo's suggestion in his second verse that love is the only remedy for love.

In my opinion, this link is interesting, because the divine response include an image of fire in the expression πῦρ ἀίδηλον (v. 6) and this opens the possibility of an association between the fire of love and this destructive fire, which might introduce a subtler reading of the novel. In the *Eph.*, there are real flames which approach the protagonists: in the first case it is the fire of their boat (1.14.1), while in the other two it is Habrocomes who is tortured by Manto's fire (see 2.4.4., 2.6.2, 2.6.4) and then punished in Egypt with the pyre, as part of Cyno's revenge (4.2.8). In my opinion, it is not unlikely that Xen. with Anthia's expression is suggesting that these flames are not only part of the πῦρ ἀίδηλον, but also of the πῦρ ἐρωτικόν. This would be another proof that Xen. is building his whole novel on Eros' revenge against the protagonists and that most of the trials in the novel echo the presence of this god. In conclusion, the emergence of this framework suggests that Xen. might be using the metaphor of fire in a subtle way.

The emergence of this sublety would confirm the coexistence in the *Eph.* of simplicity and sophistication. In this respect, the first feature emerges even more clearly in the comparison with

the other novelists, where the fire metaphor 'is not merely imagery, but gives structure to the emotion' (Cummings 2009, 56). I give here only some examples of connotations of fire which are missing in Xen. (for others, see in table 4 in LI 'Kiss and heat', 'Love and heat', Love and lamps', 'Love and wine'; for more, see Cummings 2009, 51-56):

- fire is the person who causes love (see, e.g., Char. 6.3.9);
- specification of the locus of ἔρως as a fire (see, e.g. Longus 3.10.4);
- love as a cosmological fire which has power on nature (Ach. 1.17.1);
- smouldering of emotion (Char. 6.3.3, Longus 1.29.1);
- potential extinguishing of the flame (Ach. 4.7.4, Hld. 1.15.8).

Finally, Xen's lack of variety is also proved by his decision of not using fire to connote other emotions, like jealousy (e.g. Ach. 7.3.7) and anger (ibid. 6.10.5).

1.3.4: ἀνεκαίετο: F has ἐνεκαίετο instead of this reading introduced by Hemsterhuius and accepted by O' Sullivan. The parallel with 1.5.8 and the presence of the preposition ἐν in ἐν αὐτοῖς prove the accuracy of this correction.

1.3.4: ἐπιθυμία: for the use of this verb as part of Xen.'s erotic vocabulary, see LI 3.

1.3.4: ἐπειδὴ εἰς ὕπνον ᾔεσαν: this is the first time reference of the novel, which plays the traditional role of marking the end of the previous scene (see "rhythm" on this; for similar indications about the morning, see 1.2.1, 1.5.1, 1.10.1, 4.6.1 and 5.15.1). Its form is not usual, since in the *Eph.* 'implicit indications of time like meals or going to bed are rare' (Hägg 1971, 60). This exceptional trait is confirmed by the reason why sleep is mentioned here: we are not dealing with a generic choice, but with a precise reference to lovesickness.

1.3.4: ὁ ἔρως ἐν ἑκατέροις ἦν ἀκατάσχετος: in this passage the erotic emotion's hold on the protagonists reaches its apex: while in 1.3.1 the emphasis was on the god's control of Habrocomes and thus on the emotion holding Habrocomes (κατεῖχε δὲ αὐτὸν ἐγκείμενος ὁ θεός), here Xen. introduces the container metaphor and thus places his emphasis on the failure of the subject to hold the emotion. In fact, ἀκατάσχετος means 'unholdable' (see Cummings 2009, 97: 'they can try and hold down the emotion, but it will not be successful'). This shift of focus, which underlines 'the impossibility of action of the couple' (ibid.), is subtly introduced by Xen. with the use of two cognate words κατέχω and ἀκατάσχετος.

The same adjective ἀκατάσχετος is used other times in the novel in passages which concern two other types of emotions: ὀργή and λύπη. The former refers to Manto's anger (2.5.5: ἡ Μαντὼ ἐν ὀργῇ ἀκατασχέτῳ γίνεται), while the latter to Perilaus' sorrow at the news of the abduction of Anthia's corpse (3.9.1: ἐν πολλῇ καὶ ἀκατασχέτῳ λύπῃ ἦν). In these two cases, however, unlike in the present one, the lack of the container metaphor makes the control of these feelings on the character less "shocking".

The same conclusion affects a last passage in which this adjective is substituted by the adverb ἀκατασχέτως: αὕτη ἡ Μαντὼ ἐκ τῆς συνήθους μετὰ τοῦ Ἀβροκόμου διαίτης ἁλίσκεται καὶ ἀκατασχέτως εἶχε καὶ ἠπόρει ὅ τι ποιήσαι (2.3.2). Its introduction suggests that 'Manto is not in control of her passions' (2.3.2:). In fact, although 'there is no mention of an emotion here, the presence of a conventional metaphor ἁλίσκεται indicates that she is feeling ἔρως' (Cummings 2009, 97). However, since Manto is the subject here, the metaphor has a minor effect than that of the present passage.

CHAPTER 4

After the description of the first night of suffering, Xen. dedicates an entire chapter to the personal reflections of the protagonists, which is expressed through two "reflexive and deliberative laments" and a "prayer" (<u>NA</u> 3). While this second definition does not need explanation, the former depends on the fact that in both cases the protagonists express their desperation (cf. 1.4.1: φεῦ μοι τῶν κακῶν, ἔφη, τί πέπονθα δυστυχής; and 1.4.6: τί ὦ δυστυχὴς πέπονθα;) and have 'un colloquio con se stessi' (Ferrini 1990, 79).

At a first glance, as Doulamis 2007, 161 argues, these speeches contain elements which hint at a 'symmetrical discourse' (161): after an almost identical incipit (cf. 1.4.1: φεῦ μοι τῶν κακῶν τί πέπονθα δυστυχής; and 1.4.6: τί ὦ δυστυχὴς πέπονθα;), both protagonists introduce a self-definition (cf. 1.4.1: ὁ μέχρι νῦν ἀνδρικὸς [...]   and 1.4.6: παρθένος), followed by a quick sequence of paratactic verbs (cf. 1.4.1: ἑάλωκα καὶ νενίκημαι καὶ [...] ἀναγκάζομαι and 1.4.6: ἐρῶ καὶ ὀδυνῶμαι) and by a series of questions (cf. 1.4.2: οὐ καρτερήσω νῦν; [...] and 1.4.7: τίς ἔσται ὁ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ὅρος [...]). Each of these features contribute to making these speeches tragic (<u>NA</u> 5).

Along with these similarities, however, Xen. seems to play with differences attributing only to Habrocomes a second speech and highlighting the different erotic pattern which characterises the protagonists' love: although they are both fighting an internal war against love, Habrocomes makes an emphatic attack on Eros, while Anthia adopts a more quiet and philosophical attitude, which is supported by the Platonic intertext.

The individuation of these differences is significant, because it suggests that here, as in other parts of the novel, that Xen. is using speeches to play against the apparent symmetry of the monologues (<u>NA</u> 3). In addition, the emergence of these elements prove clearly how monologues and dialogues are important to suggest a characterisation of the protagonists and of their approach to love.

1.4.1-1.4.3: *Habrocomes' first monologue*

The common thread of the first speech *is* again given by the military metaphor of love: see, e.g., ἀνδρικὸς (on which see below), ἑάλωκα καὶ νενίκημαι (1.3.1 n.: ἀλίσκεται Ἀνθία), ἄνανδρος, οὐκ ἔσομαι κρείττων Ἔρωτος;, νῦν οὐδὲν ὄντα θεὸν νικῆσαί με δεῖ and οὐκ ἂν Ἔρως ποτέ μου κρατῆσαι. The way in which these images are introduced shows a rhetorical ability which is not common in the *Eph.*: the abundance of nominal phrases (1.4.2 n.: ὦ πάντα ἄνανδρος) and of rhetorical questions (1.4.2 n.: οὐ καρτερήσω νῦν) and the initial anaphora on the article ὁ, which has a paratragic colour (1.4.1 n.: ὁ μέχρι), make this speech an exemplary lament.

That being said, Habrocomes here develops two main arguments: while in the first paragraph he admits his arrogance and he recognises his defeat against Eros, in the other two he tries to resist to him. As both themes are already introduced in the novel by the narrator (1.3.1 n.: ἐγκείμενος ὁ θεός and 1.1.5: μὴ θέλων), characterisation is here the main issue: Xen. focuses on the dramatic reaction of the protagonist to the recent events and underlines the mimetic connotation by introducing a

dynamic movement between the two parts of the lament, as he begin speaking like a man defeated and ends as a rebel.

Overall, the tone of the speech also has a clear moral connotation, which is at the core of Xen's attempted resistance and which is introduced by the following words:

- ἄνανδρος, which is anticipated in the first paragraph by ἀνδρικός and introduces the concept of ἀνδρεῖα (see LRG 4);
- the rhetorical question οὐ καρτερήσω νῦν recalls καρτερία, another virtue of the πεπαιδεύμενοι;
- the rhetorical question οὐ μενῶ γεννικός, in which Xen. identifies his nobility in the resistance to love.

Finally, as I have already suggested at the beginning of the second chapter (see 1.2.1), the emphasis placed here by Xen. on the erotic conflict is not common in the novelistic genre, which tends to make Eros' victory immediate and to explore the consequences.

The only parallels available come from Char.'s Dionysius and Artaxerses and from Hld.'s Charicleia, who similarly try to resist to love and whose moral concern is explicitly declared. In the former author, Eros finds an opponent in Dionysius' σωφροσύνη (2.4.5) and Chariton emphasises his battle against passions by saying τότ'ἦν ἰδεῖν ἀγῶνα λογισμοῦ καὶ πάθους [...] (2.4.4). The connection between this fight and παιδεῖα is assured by Dionysius' first presentation as πλούτῳ καὶ γένει καὶ παιδείᾳ τῶν ἄλλων Ἰώνων ὑπερέχοντα [...] (1.12.6). Afterwards, when in Persia the king Artaserses falls in love with Callirhoe, Artaxates invites him to try a similar resistance to Eros: δύνασαι γὰρ, ὦ δέσποτα, σὺ μόνος κρατεῖν καὶ θεοῦ (6.3.8). The king's obedience is part of his unnamed παιδεῖα: 'he is strongly modelled on Xenophon's Cyrus and on Hellenistic ideas of kingship and he prides himself on his σωφροσύνη and δικαιοσύνη' (Jones 2007b, 52). In my opinion, both these examples express more clearly what Habrocomes is suggesting: fighting the emotion in order to defend an image of his own excellence. Like these parallels, Habrocomes' attempt fails: his past morality is going to be overcome by a new one. In this respect, if Xen. wrote after Char., the readers might recall Dionysius and Mithridates' trial in the second part of our monologue. Conversely, Charicleia's fight, as I have already argued, might be drawn from that of Anthia and of Habrocomes (4.10.3: Ὡς ἐμέ γε λυπεῖ μὲν καὶ ἡ νόσος ἀκμάζουσα, πλέον δὲ [...] ἡττηθῆναι πάθους ἀπειρημένου μὲν ἐμοὶ τὸν πρὸ τούτου πάντα χρόνον λυμαινομένου δὲ καὶ μέχρις ἀκοῆς τὸ παρθενίας ὄνομα σεμνότατον and 1.2.6 n: ὀφθαλμοὶ γοργοί for this parallel).

1.4.1: λαβὼν δὴ τὴν κόμην καὶ σπαράξας <καὶ περιρρηξάμενος> τὴν ἐσθῆτα: these gestures are part of a stylised theatrical behaviour which is attributed to some characters in the novel.

To begin with, this sentence presents a textual difficulty, since in F καὶ περιρρηξάμενος is missing. The reason why this participle has been reintroduced is that ἐσθῆτα περιρρήγνυμαι is a typical formula. First, it appears three other times in the *Eph.*: it is used again before Manto's simulation (see 2.5.6) and it marks Perilaus' and Habrocomes' desperation over Anthia's loss (cf. 3.7.2 and 3.10.1; in this second passage, the noun is different: περιεερήξατο τὸν χιτῶνα). Second, ἐσθῆτα περιρρήγνυμαι is used in similar emotive contexts by DH (see 7.62.3), Philo (see Joseph. 16 and *De*

vita Mosis 1.138), Joseph (see *AJ* 6.358, 7.1, 7.40, 9.67, 11.221, *BJ* 2.315, 2.601) Char. (see 3.5.6 and 3.10.3).

While this framework of passages makes the introduction of this formula reasonable, the resulting sentence does not seem to be perfectly built: since Xen. likes introducing parallel structures in coordinate clauses (see, e.g., 1.4.4: εἷλκεν ἀντιπίπτοντα καὶ ὠδύνα μὴ θέλοντα), the first part seems to be too long, because it contains two participle, λαβὼν and σπαράξας, with the only object τὴν κόμην. For this reason, I would argue that one of the two might have not been in the original text: since the expression σπαράσσω τὴν κόμην is formulaic in the *Eph.* (2.5.6, where Manto is in front of her father, and 3.7.2, where Anthia is reacting to her imminent marriage to Perilaus), while λαμβάνω τὴν κόμην is not, I would eliminate λαβὼν and offer the new reading: τὴν κόμην καὶ σπαράξας <καὶ περιρρηξάμενος> τὴν ἐσθῆτα. In addition, the status as a formula of the first expression is confirmed by its occurrence in other novels: see Char. 2.7.2 and 3.10.4, Ach. 5.3.6 and Lucian, *Asinus* 22).

In theory, it is possible that σπαράξας was originally at the beginning of the sentence, but also the hypothesis of a chiasmus is plausible, since Xen. is also keen on this figure of speech. In addition, the chiasmus would explain better the mistake of the copyist: he might have not understood this construct and decided to eliminate the second of the two participles in the sequence: καὶ περιρρηξάμενος. Since, however, the nouns of the sentence were still two, he might have finally introduced λαβὼν at the beginning, which is a very generic verb and a possible gloss of σπαράξας. In this respect, it is significant that λαμβάνω τὴν κόμην has only one occurrence in the novelistic corpus which does not belong to a tragic passage, but it denotes Thersander's attempt to kiss Leucippe (Ach. 6.18.5: τῇ δὲ δεξιᾷ τῆς κόμης λαβόμενος [...]): its original presence in a stereotyped passage like this is really unlikely.

That being said, both σπαράξας and περιρρηξάμενος constitute two typical ways to express a tragic reaction: in this respect, it is interesting that Xen. uses περιρρήγνυμαι with ἐσθής to indicate one of the tortures undergone by both protagonists (cf. Xen. 2.6.2 and 5.5.2). Since in these two passages Habrocomes and Anthia's suffering is highlighted, this confirms the tragic mark of these acts.

1.4.1: φεῦ τῶν κακῶν: also this particle contributes to the tragic tone of the passage, since it is 'an exclamation of grief or anger frequent in tragedy' (LSJ; see e.g. Eur. *Phoeniss.* 1425: φεῦ φεῦ, κακῶν σῶν, Οἰδίπου, σ'ὅσον στένω). While φεῦ in Greek tragedy already constitutes a repetitive element of direct speech and occurs followed by exclamative genitives (e.g. Soph. *El.* 920: φεῦ, τῆς ἀνοίας), here Xen. seems to make the expression even more stereotyped, introducing the generic term τῶν κακῶν and detaching it from the rest of the sentence. In the Greek literature the only two parallels of the whole formula come from Lucian (*Fugit.* 33: Φεῦ τῶν κακῶν, ὀτοτοῖ, παππαπαιάξ) and Alciphron (*Ep.* 3.12.1: ἔνθα παραληφθεὶς φεῦ τῶν κακῶν οἷα ὑπέμεινα): the first is more significant, since the whole sentence has an intense tragic mark and the expression appears, as in our case, without a syntactic role (see <u>NA</u> 5).

1.4.1: ὁ μέχρι [...] ὁ καταφρονῶν [...] ὁ [...]: the anaphora of articles is typical of monologues from Greek tragedies: a case in point is a passage of the Sophoclean *Ajax*, where in his dialogue with Tecmessa the hero defines himself as: ὁρᾷς τὸν θρασύν, τὸν εὐκάρδιον, τὸν ἐν δαΐοις ἄτρεστον μάχαις (364-5). Interestingly, like Habrocomes, Ajax uses this anaphora of the article to refer to his past in opposition to his present status. This rhetorical device increases the literary quality of Habrocomes' monologue as well its nature as a lament (see NA 5).

The same expedient is attributed by Longus to Gnathon, when the parasite confesses to Astilus his erotic desperation: Ὁ μέχρι νῦν μόνης τραπέζης τῆς σῆς ἐρῶν, ὁ πρότερον ὀμνὺς ὅτι μηδέν ἐστιν ὡραιότερον οἴνου γέροντος, ὁ κρείττους [...] (4.16.2). Here, however, there is an ironical connotation which is not exploited by Habrocomes (see Pattoni 2005, 101, n. 159, 'paratragico è il modulo dell'articolo iterato e anaforico con cui Gnatone apostrofa se stesso').

1.4.1: ὁ μέχρι νῦν ἀνδρικὸς Ἀβροκόμης: with this sentence Habrocomes starts to admit the failure of his attempt to resist to love. For the importance and meaning of this reference to ἀνδρεῖα, see LI 4.

1.4.1: ὁ τῷ θεῷ λοιδορούμενος: Λοιδοροῦμαι, which expresses Habrocomes' arrogance toward Eros, is a verb traditionally used in this context, as it appears in Meleager (see AP 5.176.4, where the narrator declares: ἢν δ'εἴπω λοίδορα, καὶ τρέφεται) and in Plutarch's *Amatorius*, where there are lovers who τῷ μὲν Ἔρωτι λοιδοροῦνταί τινες [ἀλλὰ] ἀπέχονται <δ'> ἐκείνης [ἡ Ἀφροδίτη] [...]. (757a; see table 3 in LI 2.3 for other parallels). While this verb is the literary term, see 1.2.1 n.: ὑπερηφάνοις for the more frequent word adopted by Xen. to express the same theme.

1.4.1: παρθένῳ δουλεύειν ἀναγκάζομαι: this sentence expresses a famous nuance of the metaphor of Eros as a warrior (1.2.1-2 n.: ὁ θεὸς). As I argue in LI 3, it is interesting how this topic is related to the rivals' attitude towards the protagonists, which often make them slaves in the novel. The present reference, as well as the final ones made by Anthia to an erotic slavery, suggests that Xen.'s real aim in referring to slavery is to use it to underline the uncontrollable power of love.

1.4.2: ὦ πάντα ἄνανδρος ἐγώ: Habrocomes' use of nominal phrases, which recalls that made by the Ephesians in their exclamation about Habrocomes' beauty (see 1.2.8 above), is certainly one stylistic device used by Xen. to make quicker and more effective his direct speeches. Along with two other occurrences in the following sentences (see 1.4.3: καλὴ παρθένος εὔμορφος Ἀνθία), other examples occur in Anthia's first monologue (see 1.4.7) and in Corymbus' proposal to Habrocomes, for which see 1.16.5.

1.4.2: πονηρός: with this adjective Habrocomes expresses clearly how he considers immoral his subjection to love and Xen. makes him similar to Anthia: see 1.3.2 n.: διέκειτο.

1.4.2: οὐ καρτερήσω νῦν;: this is the first of a series of three rhetorical questions: their presence is a device typical of novelistic laments, which set Habrocomes' speech on a level of style different from the previous parts of the novel. Another 'frequent feature of laments' (see Birchall 10 for a list) is the introduction of a future, which contains 'a comparison between past and present, or past hopes and future reality' (10) and 'this appears to have developed from formal mourning' (ibid.). This confirms the impression that Xen. is shaping here a monologue by following traditional rhetorical patterns. The same opposition between present and future also occurs in the following lament of Anthia, in which four future verbs follow three present and the initial perfect (see 1.4.6-7). Conversely, the opposition between present and past will emerge in Habrocomes' prayer (see 1.4.5: ὑπερηφάνουν) and more clearly in other laments of the following books, where, obviously, the past story assumes more importance: see, e.g., the lament of Habrocomes in prison (2.8.1) and Anthia's lament in the brothel (5.7.2).

Having clarified this stylistic point, the presence of οὐ καρτερέω in this question invites our interpretation too: this formula, with the more common negation οὐκέτι, occurs repeatedly in the *Eph.* to describe the 'failure to resist to Eros / love' which involves both protagonists and rivals (see table 3 in LI 2.3 and LI 3). Thus, it plays the role of confirming the universal nature of Eros in the *Eph.* and, as Oikonomou 2010, 244 argues, 'lack of καρτερία [...] is a driving force, running through and again initiating action throughout the *Ephesiaca*', which is one of the ways adopted by Xen. 'to show the force and the power of Eros' (245).

That being said, the present passage has a double originality, as Habrocomes tries to resist to preserve his morality. As always Oikonomou 2010 ,245 suggests, here there might be the trace of the philosophical concept of καρτερία, 'which is a definition of ἀνδρεῖα in Plato's *Laches* and a prime ethical virtue in Stoic thought'. Since in the first case ἀνδρεῖα is καρτερία τῆς ψυχῆς (192b), it might be echoed in this passage, where 'Habrocomes interprets his wavering καρτερία as a sign of being ἀνανδρός (ibid.). As a result, this question can be considered part of Habrocomes' interior fight.

In addition, it is interesting that toward the end of the novel, in the only occurrence of καρτερέω in the fifth book, Habrocomes will express again his desire to resist, as he wants to build a grave for Anthia before dying (5.10.5: ἀλλὰ καρτέρησον, Ἀβροκόμη, καὶ γενόμενος ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τοσοῦτον ἐπιβίωσον χρόνον). Since this is the only other passage of the novel where Habrocomes mentions endurance, Xen. might be inviting the readers to compare it with the present one: this would be another proof of Habrocomes' development during the novel, since his resistance to love would be transformed into a resistance which has its reason in his love for Anthia.

1.4.2: οὐ μενῶ γεννικός: this adjective is not very common in the Greek literature and its main meaning is 'noble' (LSJ): in the *Phaedrus* Socrates refers its comparative to Isocrates by saying that he has a nobler character than Lysias (see 279a: ἤθει γεννικωτέρῳ). In Lucian's *Sale of creeds* Hermes, when discussing with Zeus, suggests to sell: βίον ἀνδρικὸν [...], βίον ἄριστον καὶ γεννικόν (7). Since ἀνδρικός and ἄριστος are commonly used to express the nobility of a man, γεννικός seems to reinforce the same idea. Finally, if we look at the Imperial Era, Longus, the only other

novelist who adopts γεννικός, uses this term in a comic context to designate the authenticity of a small cheese (see 1.19.1: τυρίσκων τινῶν γεννικῶν; see Alciphron 3.2.2 for another use in relation to food). Also in this case the idea of something pure is suggested.

As a result, I would argue that Habrocomes is here further emphasising how resistance to love is what makes him noble. Unlike καρτερήσω, however, this term does not become part of the development of the novel, since refers only to the pirates (1.13.1 n.: γεννικοί) and to Polyidus (5.3.1).

1.4.2: οὐκ ἔσομαι κρείττων Ἔρωτος; with this question, which is different from the previous ones, Habrocomes goes back to the image of 'Eros as a warrior' (see LI 2.3) and, thus, to a literary origin. The protagonist here challenges the invincibility of the god (see 'to be won by Eros' in LI 2.3), a very common theme which appears with the same word in an epigram of Meleager where the poet describe his new love by saying: κρείσσων οὗτος Ἔρωτος Ἔρως (AP 12.54.4).

1.4.3: τοῖς σοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, Ἀβροκόμη, εὔμορφος Ἀνθία, ἀλλ, ἐὰν θέλης, οὐχὶ σοί: this passage, which elaborates the motif 'love and free will' (see table 2 and 3 in LI 2.3), is the last attempt made by Habrocomes to persuade himself that it is possible to resist love.

The introduction of this theme is quite significant, because Xen. anticipates it other five times in the novel with an erotic use of ἐθέλω (see 1.1.5, 1.2.9, 1.3.1 and 1.3.3). In addition, at the end of the novel, it is interesting that the "Platonic" sentence τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐβούλοντο αἱ ψυχαί (5.13.3 and LI 7.1) will introduce again the same motif from a positive perspective: this evolution suggests that this theme is part of the *Bildung* of the novel and, thus, its analysis deserves a particular attention.

To begin with, it has been suggested that this passage has a Stoic colour: however, in my opinion this hypothesis lacks evidence and I will now demonstrate why. While Perkins detects the presence in this passage of the Stoic "proairesis" (see 1985, 92), Doulamis 2007 traces the echo of this and other two Stoic principles: 'the fundamental distinction between the true nature of things and our judgement or perception of them; secondly, the "proairesis", defined as the deliberate choice or purpose, which, when at work, does not allow physical experiences to affect the real 'self' of the individual; and, thirdly, the distinction between the vulnerability of the body and (mental) willpower' (153-4).

In my opinion, the first limit of this hypothesis lies in the fact that Xen. is not introducing any reference to the Stoic "proairesis", since our author does not refers to the "self". Conversely he simply draws a distinction between the effect of beauty on his eyes and on himself. In my opinion, since in this novel the eyes have just assumed a clear Platonic connotation (see 1.3.2: ἀναπεπταμένοις τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς), if we want to look for a specific model, Habrocomes might be expressing his resistance to love in Platonic term.

That being said, however, the most important reason why this Stoic interpretation does not seem correct is that there are some parallels from Greek literature that introduce the same motif of 'love and free will'. In my opinion, their analysis proves that Xen. is here acknowledging a literary tradition and not a philosophical one.

The power of love on freedom is already Sapphic: in her first fragment, in fact, she is promised by Aphrodite that her beloved αἰ δὲ μὴ φίλει, ταχέως φιλήσει κωὐκ ἐθέλοισα. (1.23-24). However, the most significant examples comes from Xenophon's *Cyropaedia,* where Araspas explains Cyrus that τὸ δ᾽ἐρᾶν ἐθελούσιόν ἐστιν· (5.1.11). This passage is really interesting, because it is at the beginning of a dialogue which offers a view of love very similar to that of our novel and, moreover, which contains similar motifs. Since our author had the *Cyropaedia* in his mind (GI 4), his knowledge of this passage is not implausible, although intertextual connections are missing. These are the themes shared which follow the previous one:

a) After Araspas' statement, the Persian kings raises some objections, which he attributes to some lovers. The first focuses on the pain caused to them by love (5.1.12: ἑώρακα καὶ κλαίοντας ὑπὸ λύπης δι᾽ἔρωτα).

b) The second addresses the slavery created by love (5.1.12: καὶ δουλεύοντάς γε τοῖς ἐρωμένοις).

c) Then, Cyrus mentions that these lovers consider love an evil (μάλα κακόν νομίζοντας).

d) Finally, love as a disease is introduced too and Cyrus expresses the lovers' unfulfilled desire to free them from this: εὐχομένους ὥσπερ καὶ ἄλλης τινὸς νόσου ἀπαλλαγῆναι.

e) After this explanation, Araspas states that these lovers are immoral people (5.1.13: οἱ τοιοῦτοι μοχθηροί).

f) Cyrus raises a final objection, repeating that Eros needs time to make the soul burn (5.1.16: [...] ὁ ἔρως πέφυκε συσκευάζεσθαι ἄνθρωπον).

g) Finally, he invites Araspas not to look at Panthea's eyes, to avoid falling in love (οὐδὲ γε σοὶ συμβουλεύω, ἔφη, ὦ Ἀράσπα, ἐν τοῖς καλοῖς ἐᾶν τὴν ὄψιν ἐνδιατρίβειν).

h) In his answers Araspas exhorts Cyrus not to be worried about him and he interestingly states that even if he stared at Panthea he would not commit illicit acts (5.17.1: οὐδ᾽ ἐὰν μηδέποτε παύσωμαι θεώμενος, οὐ μὴ κρατηθῶ ὥστε ποιεῖν τι ὧν μὴ χρὴ ποιεῖν).

In my opinion, this sequence of motifs is really close to our novel and this parallel concerns especially the two last passages, where the motif of the eyes is associated with that of the 'hypnosis', which also occurs in the *Eph.* (1.3.1 n.: ἐνεώρα). In addition, Araspas presents love as an immoral act (ὧν μὴ χρὴ ποιεῖν), as it happens with both Anthia and Habrocomes. As a result, the possibility of Xen.'s awareness of this passage is not remote. Although we cannot draw a definite conclusion, I would argue that the literary context of this discussion can instead be used as a certain proof against Doulamis 2007' interpretation.

After this significant parallel, many other occurrences of the motif are available in Greek and also in Latin literature (see 'love and free will' in table 2 and 3 in LI 2.3). I would mention only how Theocritus expresses the failure of free will to resist Eros (*Idyll* 30.28-29: Καὶ νῦν, εἴτ᾽ἐθέλω, χρή με μάκρον σχόντα τὸν ἄμφενα ἕλκην τὸν ζύγον, εἴτ᾽οὐκ ἐθέλω·). Interestingly, a similar defeat will be shortly attributed to Habrocomes. Overall, it is likely that Xen. is exploiting a common motif of Greek literature, with a possible closer influence from Xenophon of Athens.

1.4.4: ὁ θεὸς σφοδρότερος: the vehemence of love is a τόπος of the erotic literature (see tables 2 and 3 in LI 2.3). Within this motif, the use of σφοδρός is recurrent too: in the listed occurrences, it

occurs in Aesop, Parthenius and Nicolaus. Interestingly, this adjective, meaning 'impetuous', can be used to convey an immoral connotation: this occurs in Aesop, where a young man loves an old woman and in Parthenius, who describes respectively an extramarital love and an incestuous one. As I have already suggested in LI 2.4., since in Xen.'s view love is an uncontrollable force but not immoral, the occurrence of this formula seems to be focalised on the characters.

A good parallel of this comes from Char., where Ἔρως is defined as σφοδρός in his attack on the Persian king, who is forced to admit the victory of Eros (6.3.2: δεινὸν μὲν ὁμολογεῖν, ἀληθῶς δὲ ἑάλωκα). Then, Eros' approach to Dionysius is very similar (2.4.5: διὰ τοῦτο ἐπυρπόλει σφοδρότερον ψυχὴν ἐν ἔρωτι φιλοσοφοῦσαν). In both cases the moral concern of the characters seems at the origin of the choice of σφοδρός. In addition, the existence of the same pattern of divine attack and failed attempt to resist makes it very likely that one between Xen. and Char. was drawing this expression from the other.

1.4.4: ὁ θεὸς [...] αὐτῷ ἐνέκειτο [...] μὴ θέλοντα: this only use of ἔγκειμαι in the *Eph.* with a dative (1.3.1 n.: ἐγκείμενος) suggests that Xen. is constructing the metaphor of the loss of control of the beloved: Eros is inside Habrocomes and makes him do and suffer against his will. This image has a clear psychological value and marks a contrast with Habrocomes' previous declaration about the free will of love (1.4.3 n.: τοῖς σοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς). Two other ways in which this opposition is emphasised are the *polyptoton* of θέλοντα and the use of three words typical of the erotic language to express Eros' action: σφορδρότερος, εἷλκεν and ὠδύνα (see below). Each of these underlines how Eros with his power reaches Habrocomes. Finally, from a rhetorical point view, the variation in the negation realised through ἀντι- and μὴ has a hint of sophistication.

1.4.4: εἷλκεν: this verb, which is part of the motif of 'vehemence of Eros' (see table 3 in LI 2.3) is commonly referred to Eros: see, e.g., Philodemus, AP 5.25.5-6: ἦ γὰρ θρασὺς ἠδ', ὅταν ἔλκῃ, πάντοτ' Ἔρως [...] and Meleager, AP 12.84.3: ἕλκει τῇδ' ὁ βίαιος Ἔρως and 12.85.4: ἀγρεύσας ἕλκει τῇδ' ὁ βίαιος Ἔρως. The fact that Xen. uses this verb only here can be interpreted as a sign of his debt to the literary tradition.

1.4.4: ὠδύνα: ὀδυνάω and ὀδύνη are two words which are commonly used in the erotic tradition to designate the pain provoked by Eros (see AP. 5.106.2, 5.220.4, 12.49.4, 12.99.6, 12.172.2 and 12.212.2). A good number of parallel comes also from the Greek novel: in Char., when Plangon informs Dionysius of Callirhoe's intention to marry him, the lack of a positive reaction induces her to tell his master: παῦσαι [...] μάτην σεαυτὸν ὀδυνῶν (3.1.5). Then, Ach. provides the most significant occurrences. In 5.25.2 Melite includes in her desperate apostrophe to Clitophon the phrase ὀδυνωμένη τὸν ὀδυνῶντα ἐλεῶ, in which Clitophon is identified as the origin of her pain. In addition, Clitophon refers ὀδύνη to her erotic suffering cured by Leucippe with her kiss (2.7.5: τὴν ἐπῳδόν φιλῶ ὅτι μου τὴν ὀδύνην ἰάσω). As a result, I would conclude that Xen. is here exploiting a traditional word of the erotic language.

Within this framework, however, there is an originality, which lies in Xen.'s direct attribution of this verb to the god Eros, which follows his focus on Habrocomes' submission to the god. In this case, as in the falling in love (1.3.1 n.: ὑπὸ Ἔρωτος), the introduction of this pattern underlines again the opposition to Anthia's love, since in her dialogue the heroine refers the same verb to herself: ὀδυνῶμαι καινὰ (see 1.4.6). This confirms that, unlike her partner, she has immediately surrendered to love.

Finally, it might be worth mentioning that ὀδυνάω and ὀδύνη are used in this erotic sense for the first time by Plato in his *Phaedrus* and *Symposium*. The first dialogue offers the most significant occurrences: the erotic pain in the soul's lover is stopped by welcoming the beauty of the beloved (251c: μέρη ἐπιόντα καὶ ῥέοντα [...] δεχομένη τὸν ἵμερον ἄρδηταί τε καὶ θερμαίνηται, λωφᾷ τε τῆς ὀδύνης καὶ γέγηθεν; see also 255d for the same concept), while it is strong when the beloved is away (251d: ὅταν δὲ χωρὶς γένηται καὶ αὐχμήσῃ [...], ἡ ψυχὴ οἰστρᾷ καὶ ὀδυνᾶται). In my opinion, it is not unlikely that Xen. was aware of the Platonic origin of these terms, since they are connected with the motif of the flow of beauty, as the first passage shows (it occurs in fact both in 251c and in 255c). This connection becomes more plausible in the occurrence which belongs to Anthia's monologue, where more Platonic seeds seem to be present (1.4.6 n.: ἐφ' Ἁβροκόμῃ μαίνομαι and 1.4.7 n.: τί τὸ πέρας τοῦ κακοῦ). In addition, the fact that both monologues are pronounced when the protagonists are separated provides the same context as in Plato.

1.4.4-5: introduction to Habrocomes' prayer to Eros

a) Main analysis

In this second speech Habrocomes addresses Eros with a prayer: this statement is suggested, first of all, by its tripartite structure, which recalls that of the traditional Greek prayers (see Alderink 1997, 123, which lists these three parts: 'invocation of a deity, a narrative argument justifying the petition of the suppliant and, finally, the request itself'): after the initial apostrophe, which contains the statement on his defeat (1.4.4: νενίκησας, Ἔρως), Habrocomes briefly reminds the god of his condition (1.4.4: ἱκέτην ἔχεις, 1.4.5: τὸν ἐπὶ σὲ καταπεφευγότα, ἡττωμένῳ) and then he makes his request to him (1.4.5: Ἀνθίαν ἡμῖν ἀπόδος).

In my opinion, this basic structure suggests that the hero pronounces sincerely these words to Eros: he admits his defeat and asks him to avoid further punishments. This aim is supported by the use of the epithet τὸν πάντων δεσπότην (1.4.5 n.) and by Habrocomes' action of throwing himself to the ground (1.4.4 n.: ῥίξας ἑαυτὸν).

Finally, from a literary point of view, this passage is rich in erotic τόποι, whose apex is the trophy of love (1.4.5 n.: μέγα σοι τρόπαιον). That being said, literary parallels suggest that this kind of prayer is not widespread in erotic literature. Apart from Sappho, who recites a prayer to Aphrodite at the end of her hymn (see 25-28), in the Hellenistic literature the lover's invocation of Eros is not accompanied by a positive entreaty: it is more common to find requests for destruction (see Archias, AP 5.10.1: Νήπι' Ἔρως, πορθεῖς με, τὸ κρήγυον·, Meleager, AP 5.197.5-6: βαιὸν ἔχω τό γε λειφθέν, Ἔρως, ἐπὶ χείλεσι πνεῦμα· εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις καὶ τοῦτ', εἰπέ, καὶ ἐκπτύσομαι and AP. 12.48.1: κεῖμαι· λὰξ

ἐπίβαινε κατ'αὐχένος, ἄγριε δαῖμον and Rianus, AP 12.146, where the target of the god's revenge is to be erotic rival), or challenging provocations to the god's power (see Rufinus, AP 5.97 and Posidippus, AP 12.120.2: Ἔρως, μηκέτι μοι πρόσαγε), which are comparable with Habrocomes' previous attempt to resist. A last kind of prayer is a neutral admission of his uncontrollable force (see Lucillius, AP 5.68, Meleager, 5.198.5-6: οὐκέτι σοὶ φαρέτρη ... πτερόεντας ὀιστοὺς κρύπτει, Ἔρως· ἐν ἐμοὶ πάντα γάρ ἐστι βέλη and 12.87).

A possible exception which is close to Xen. is the following epigram of Meleager, with starts with this invocation: λίσσομ, Ἔρως, τον ἄγρυπνον ἐμοὶ πόθον Ἡλιοδώρας κοίμισον αἰδεσθείς Μοῦσαν ἐμὰν ἱκέτιν (AP. 5.215.1-2). However, this text, apart from the first verb, lacks the structure typical of Greek prayers: thus, Xen.'s piece is different from these Hellenistic examples.

The same originality is confirmed by the parallel with the Greek novels: to begin with, only Char. and Longus mention a religious act toward Eros, however they do not include a prayer, but only a sacrifice (made by the Persian king in Char. 6.2.4 and by Daphnis and Chloe in Longus 4.39.1).

On the other hand, if we look carefully at Char.'s prayers, which are mostly dedicated to Aphrodite, the prevalent tone is of complaint or accusation (cf. 2.2.7-8, 3.2.12-3, 3.8.7-8, 3.10.6-8 and 5.10.1 and 7.5.2-5).

As a result, I would conclude that within the erotic literature Habrocomes' devotion to Eros might have an originality, which would depend on Xen.'s simple exploitation of the motif of the revenge of the god.

Finally, this prayer is very significant in relation to Habrocomes' characterisation: our protagonist starts here is erotic growth, moving from hostility to acceptance of love. The next step will be to transform his passion into a social bond, overcoming the shame: for this, the oracle is needed. At the same time, Habrocomes here admits also his moral defeat, since the expectation of his ability to beat Eros has completely failed. This fact, which goes against his original σωφροσύνη, opens the space for a new kind of σωφροσύνη, which is chastity in marriage (see LI 4).

b) A last confirmation: comparison with the other prayers of the *Ephesiaca*

The comparison with the other eight prayers of the Eph. shows how Xen. is using a common pattern for this kind of speeches (on which see also NA 3), where a similar structure and the genuine nature of the request are maintained. This confirms our interpretation of the present passage.

Pass.	From	To	Where	Position of suppliant	Theme
1.4.4-5	Habro-comes	Eros	Home	on the ground	Simple request
2.11. 8	Anthia	Gods and Artemis	Goatherd's house	embrace of goatherd' feet	Simple request

Pass.	From	To	Where	Position of suppliant	Theme
4.2.4-5	Habro-comes	Nilus	Nilus' bank	on the crux	Request (tradi-tional structure)
4.3.3-4	Anthia	Isis	temple in Memphis	not told	Request (tradi-tional structure)
5.1. 13	Habro-comes	Apollo	Aegialeus' house	not told	Request
5.4. 6	Anthia	Isis	temple in Memphis	not told (only: ἱκέτις γενομένη)	Request (tradi-tional structure)
5.4.10-11	Anthia	Api	temple in Memphis	prostrate	Request (tradi-tional structure)
5.11. 4	Anthia	Helios	temple in Rhodes	not told	Complain
5.13. 4	Anthia and Habro-comes	Isis	temple in Rhodes	standing	Thanksgiving

As this table shows, the only exception is constituted by Anthia's suggestion made to Helios about his lack of care (see 5.11.4: μόνην ἐμὲ τὴν δυστυχῆ παρελθών), but the aim of this prayer seems less to protest against him and more to express her lament. In fact, she does not ask for anything from the god. In conclusion, Xen. is keen on a sincere type of prayers.

c) An interesting comparison: monologue and prayers from Roman Elegy

Another genre which offers us emotional prayers to Eros is Roman Elegy (for its possible links with the *Eph.*, see LI 2.3): in this genre the interior appeal of the poet to Eros as a metaphor of the interior conflict was certainly more developed than in Greek epigrams and in the Greek novel itself: this opens the possibility that Xen. was here aware either of lost Greek examples or of Latin texts himself, confirming his possession of an original literary knowledge (see again LI 2.3 for other examples).

The first example is Catullus' *Poem* 8, where the poet exhorts himself to control his reaction after the rejection of his beloved. Although the poet refers to his beloved instead of Cupid, the core of this text is Habrocomes' attempt to resist love: 'sed obstinata mente perfer, obdura' (11) and 'at tu, Catulle, destinatus obdura' (19). In addition, as I show in table 3 in LI 2.3, the Latin attestations of the motif "Attempt at resisting love" is really conspicuous: this confirms that these poets enjoyed this approach to love.

In addition, poem 76 is even more interesting: the beginning is sarcastic, since Catullus refers to his infidelity as a possible source of reward to his unrequited love (1-9). After this first part, the poet begins a series of questions in order to persuade himself to recover from love, although he is aware of the difficulty of this task (see 13-14: 'Difficile est longum subito deponere amorem; difficile est: verum hoc qua libet efficias'). The achievement of this aim would constitute the victory of the poet (15: 'hoc est tibi pervincendum'). Finally, the conclusion is a direct prayer to the gods to have pity on him: this request has a tone of real prayer which is very close to that of Habrocomes. The reason why this text is significant is because it does not only share motifs with our novel, but also the existence of dynamic movement within the text (1.4.1-1.4.3 n.: intr.).

Finally, another example comes from Ovid's *Amores*: in the first book, after the description of how Love has become his master, the poet asks himself: 'Cedimus an subitum luctando accendimus ignem?' (9). The line after he resigns his submission: 'Cedamus: leve fit, quod bene fertur, onus' (10) and then defines himself as Love's 'nova praeda' (19). Finally, Ovid mentions the triumph of Love, according to the Roman style, which is composed of his prisoners: 'Inque dato curru, populo clamante triumphum, stabis et adiunctas arte movebis aves' (26).

Overall, I would consider these parallels as promising and I think that the relationship between Greek novels and Roman Elegy is a topic which definitely warrants more exploration.

1.4.4: ῥίξας ἑαυτὸν εἰς γῆν: the performance of this act confirms Habrocomes' real submission to Eros, since 'kneeling on the ground is in general reserved for urgent prayers, addressed to deities that were close to the common people and who could be trusted' (Van Straten 1974 in Delbridge 1997, 175, 8). At the same time, this fall is certainly part of the series of theatrical gestures which characterise these monologues (NA 5).

1.4.4: μέγα τρόπαιον ἐγήγερται: Habrocomes introduces here a word which belongs to the military language to designate Eros' victory over him: since no other author introduces this in an erotic context, we are dealing with the apex of the metaphor thus far used: through this image Xen. emphasises Habrocomes' defeat. In addition, since the τρόπαιον indicates 'a monument of the enemy's defeat' (LSJ), its meaning here must be understood. In my opinion, since Habrocomes will shortly repeat the image of his defeat with ἡττωμένῳ (1.4.5 n.), the trophy coincides with him being submitted to Eros: it is this which gives glory to the god. This interpretation is supported by the prosecution of the novel, where Habrocomes never abandons love. At the same time, this image might be also proleptic: since in the oracle there is another expression which refers to conservation of memory, τάφος θάλαμος (1.6.2, v. 6), I would consider this second formula a second explanation of what this trophy is.

This combination of memory and glory in a novelistic context has a very interesting parallel in Char., who adopts three times τρόπαιον. However, in each of these occurrences the metaphor is missing: in 1.6.3 and 3.4.16 there is the display of Hermocrates' military. Then, in 8.1.17 it is Chereas who tells Callirhoe about his military trophies: πεπλήρωκα γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν τροπαίων. Since Xen. adopts this last term only here and in an erotic context, the possibility of his dependence

on Char. is more likely than usual: this suggest that Xen. is deviating from him to make his novel exclusively erotic. An operation like this would suggestively recall the start of Ovid's *Amores*, where the poet expresses his unfulfilled desire to dedicate his poetry to war (1.1.1-2: 'Arma gravi numero violentaque bella parabam edere, materia conveniente modis'). However, since he is in love, he cannot avoid composing erotic poetry (28-30: 'Ferrea cum vestris bella valete modis! Cingere litorea flaventia tempora myrto, Musa, per undenos emodulanda pedes').

Finally, while τροπαίον does not appear elsewhere in the erotic literature, also the motif itself does not seem to be popular. The only attested occurrence in the Greek literature comes from Alcaeus, who in a sarcastic way asks Eros after the defeat: ἢ τί τὸ σεμνὸν δηώσας ἀπ'ἐμῆς ἆθλον ἔχει κεφαλῆς; (AP 5.10.3-4). Then, in the Roman literature, there is a passage from Ovid's *Heroides*, where Phaedra associates Theseus and Hippolytus' erotic conquest with a trophy (4.65-66: 'Thesides Theseusque duas rapuere sorores: ponite de nostra bina tropaea domo'). This passage is the closest to the present one, although, as it is typical of Roman poetry, the role of Eros is played by the lovers. In addition, the Latin poetry offers a variation of this theme, where the trophy is substituted by the triumph of Love over the poet (see, e.g., Ovid, *Amores* 1.2.25, 28, 39, 49, 2.9.16, 18.18, Prop. 2.8.40, and Athanassaki 1992) or by the association between the woman conquered and the *spolium* (e.g, Prop. 2.14.24 and Ov. *Her*. 9.113). The success of the first motif might suggest that it could have originated as an elaboration of the Greek trophy, but there is no certainty about this.

1.4.4: Ἀβροκόμου τοῦ σώφρονος: this is the first reference of this important adjective to Habrocome. As I have already suggested (see LI 5), this occurrence constitutes an exception in the novel, because he anticipates marriage and refers to the chastity which concerns his behaviour at the beginning of the novel. As a result, it constitutes a parallel with Anthia's definition given by the Ephesians (1.2.6 n.: ὀφθαλμοί).

That being said, it is here significant how Habrocomes is referring this virtue to his past: as Eros has won over him, he is now ἱκέτης and no longer σώφρων. This statement leads to two considerations. First, this opposition seems to be part of the protagonists' consideration of love as an immoral passion (1.3.2 n.: διέκειτο and 1.4.2 n.: πονηρός). Second, it seems to me that this self-definition slightly corrects the initial presentation of Habrocomes made by the narrator through the eyes of the Ephesians. While in the first chapter the narrator insists on his arrogance, here the protagonist stresses his chastity, which before this passage has never been expressed so clearly. This shift seems part of the his attempt at showing a moral παιδεῖα which has already emerged in the precedent monologue. Since, however, love is prevailing on him, Habrocomes again disappoints the readers' expectation of his moral development, which was created by his lack of spiritual virtue in his presentation in the novel (1.1.2 n.: παιδείαν, d). The positive answer will arrive only after the pirates' attack, where Habrocomes begins to display his σωφροσύνη in marriage (see LI 5).

1.4.5: ἔχε: this is the first of six imperatives that characterise Habrocomes' prayer, two of which are negative. This first is introduced only by O' Sullivan 2005, who corrects the previous manuscript

version ἔχεις: in my opinion this reading is correct, because in the following prayer of the first book made by both protagonists to Corymbus (1.13.6 n.: τὰ μὲν χρήματα), there is a similar sequence of imperatives:

Habrocomes' prayer to Eros: ἔχε (O' Sullivan 2005), σῶσον, μή περιίδης, μηδὲ τιμωρήσῃ, ἀπόδος, γενοῦ.
Protagonists' prayer to Corymbus: ἔχε, φεῖσαι, μηκέτι φόνευε, ἀπόδου, οἴκτειρον.

Although in the second prayer there is one missing, there is a correspondence between the first two and the last two, as they share mood and presence of absence of negation. In addition, ἔχε of the second prayer is preceded by an object like that of this passage:

Habrocomes' prayer to Eros: ἱκέτην ἔχε.
Protagonists' prayer to Corymbus: τὰ μὲν χρήματα [...] καὶ ἡμᾶς οἰκέτας ἔχε.

In my opinion, these similarities support O'Sullivan's reading, as they suggest the existence of a similar structure in both speeches. Overall, this abundance of imperatives is not surprising, because it is a typical element of Greek prayers: it already emerges in Homer, where Ajax's Iliadic prayer to Zeus contains four of them (*Il.* 17.645-7: Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἀλλὰ σὺ ῥῦσαι ὑπ'ἠέρος υἷας Ἀχαιῶν, ποίησον δ'αἴθρην, δὸς δ'ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδέσθαι· ἐν δὲ φάει καὶ ὄλεσσον, ἐπεί νύ τοι εὔαδεν οὕτως). In this way, the suppliants, Habrocomes included, emphasise their dependence on the god and the need for an immediate answer (see Bakker 1966 for a more detailed study of this mood).

1.4.5: τὸν πάντων δεσπότην: as I said in 2.1.2 n., this epithet is a small hint at the cosmogonical power of Eros. Xen. refers to it through a very common formula, which in ancient texts referred both to divine and human beings. The first category contains two unusual occurrences from the tragediographer Philocles (see fr. 1: †σὲ τῶν πάντων† δεσπότην λέγω sc. Ἥλιε) and from the comic writer Philemon (see fr. 246 Kock, 10-11: ἔστι κἂν Ἅιδου κρίσις ἥνπερ ποιήσει θεὸς ὁ πάντων δεσπότης), while the *Septuagint* with its three references to God proves the typicality of the expression ὁ πάντων δεσπότης (Job 5.8, Salomonis 6.7 and 8.3). On the other hand, the same formula is used for human authorities by Xenophon of Athens, when he speaks of the Medes (*Cyr.* 1.3.18: τῶν ἐν Μήδοις πάντων ἑαυτὸν δεσπότην πεποίηκεν) and in the Imperial Era it becomes a title of Roman emperors (cf. Philo Jud. *Legatio ad Gaium*, 247: τὸν πάντων ἡγεμόνα καὶ δεσπότην ἐκκαλεῖσθαι and Flavius Joseph, *AJ* 16.118: τῷ πάντων δεσπότῃ Καίσαρι).
Since it is unlikely that Xen. is intertexting with these authors, because a wider connection with them is missing, Xen. demonstrates here his lack of sophistication in the description of Eros by extending to him a common epithet, which did not belong to a religious context. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that here Xen. does not follow Plato and the other novelists, who instead elaborate appropriate expressions to address Eros and his universal power:

- Plato's *Symposium* (Phaedrus' speech): μέγας θεός (178 a), θαυμαστός ἐν ἀνθρώποις τε καὶ θεοῖς (ibid.) and πρεσβύτατος (178c).
- Char. 6.3.2: κρατεῖ πάντων τῶν θεῶν καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Διός;
- Longus 2.7.1: κρατεῖ μὲν στοιχείων, κρατεῖ δὲ ἄστρων, κρατεῖ δὲ τῶν ὁμοίων θεῶν.
- Ach.: 1.2.1: οἷον ἄρχει βρέφος οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς καὶ θαλάττης and 1.16.1: ὁ Ἔρως τοσαύτην ἔχει τὴν ἰσχὺν;
- Hld. 4.10.5: μέγιστος θεῶν ὁ Ἔρως καὶ ἤδη καὶ θεῶν αὐτῶν ποτε κρατεῖν λεγόμενος.

Finally, ὁ πάντων δεσπότης is used by Xen. also with reference to Corymbus: see 1.16.2 n.: λέγει οὖν for a possible connection.

1.4.5: τὸν θρασύν: this adjective is very important, because it shows how Habrocomes, after having been conquered by Eros, changes his personal judgement about his past. While two lines before he defined himself as σώφρων, he now recognises that he has been superb. Although the status of the lover as θρασύς is a common pattern of erotic literature (see Meleager AP 12.101.3: τὸν θρασὺν εἷλον ἐγώ), the introduction of this topic, which will be also explored by Anthia (see 1.4.6), might depend on the issue of typical characterisation, since θρασύτης is, with δειλία, a vice whose corresponding virtue is ἀνδρεῖα (see Arist. *EN* 1107b1–4; *EE* 1220b40; *MM* 1186b7–18 and also De Temmerman 2007, 95). However, since this prayer has more erotic motifs than "philosophical" terms and θρασύς lacks other occurrences in the novel, this possibility is very difficult to accept.

1.4.5: γενοῦ μὴ πικρὸς μόνον ἀντιλέγοντι, ἀλλ᾽εὐεργέτης ἡττωμένῳ θεός: Habrocomes' final request to Eros has a sophisticated rhetorical construction, which marks with a parallel the two definitions of the god given by Habrocomes (πικρὸς [...] εὐεργέτης) and with a chiasmus the hero's self-definitions (ἀντιλέγοντι [...] ἡττωμένῳ). While the first combination synthesises what has happened thus far to the protagonist, with the personal move from opposition to acceptance of love, the second attests Habrocomes' present consideration of Eros and his future expectation. Since the protagonists' discovery of love as benefactor will definitely come only in the fifth book, εὐεργέτης works as a proleptic hint of their *Bildung*.

That being said, the meaning of the sentence is not clear. The first uncertainty concerns the value of the two participles: it is not clear whether ἀντιλέγοντι and ἡττωμένῳ are substantive participles referring to a generic person or conjunctive participles referring to an implied μοι. In my opinion, although Habrocomes' use of the persons in the whole prayer does not help, since he shift from the third singular (Ἁβροκόμου τοῦ σώφρονος) to the first singular (με) and the first plural (ἡμῖν), the use of the present ἀντιλέγοντι might suggest the first hypothesis. In fact, since it introduces a continuous action, it cannot refer to the current situation of Habrocomes, who, being a suppliant, has already changed his attitude. In addition, if we look at the previous monologue, we might notice that whenever Habrocomes refers to himself, he always uses a personal pronoun and the absence here is suspected. I am aware that the absence of the article τῷ leaves the passage not completely clear: in this respect, I would speculate that its omission might depend on Xen.'s desire to create a

poetic chiasmus: the articles would have made it less pure. As a result, I would accept Henderson's translation: 'don't be only a harsh god toward the gainsayer but also a benefactor to the vanquished'.

That being said, two further points must be discussed. First, the position of the adverb μόνον: although Henderson translates it as coming before πικρός, in the text it precedes ἀντιλέγοντι and the easiest translation would be: 'don't be a harsh god only toward the gainsayer, but [...]'. However, this would mean that Habrocomes is asking Eros to be even more bitter against him: since this would make the whole request sarcastic and would require us to attribute an ironical meaning also to εὐεργέτης, I would not accept this literal reading, since, as I have already stated, I believe that Habrocomes is sincerely addressing his god. Conversely, it is more acceptable to locate μόνον before γενοῦ: 'don't be only a harsh god toward to who opposes you, but also a patron god to the vanquished': in this case, the meaning would not be really different from the first one (see Trzaskoma 2010 on the first part: 'Don't just be bitter to me [...], but be a patron god'). That being said, in both Henderson's and this interpretation something seems to be missing: in the former the traditional καί after ἀλλ', while in the latter another imperative which could introduce the second part of the request. The search for a sophisticated style might be also here the reason for the missing word: in my opinion, both their translations can be accepted.

1.4.5: πικρὸς: this adjective recalls the famous Sapphic definition of love as γλυκύπικρον ἀμάχανον ὄρπετον (fr. 130.2 P-L). For other parallels, see 'bitter love' in table 2 and 3 in <u>LI</u> 2.3 and Carson 1998. Since in the novelistic corpus πίκρος is used as a metaphor for love only by Longus, Xen. shows here a degree of literary awareness which is higher than usual and contributes to the sophisticated stylistic quality of the piece.

1.4.5: εὐεργέτης: in the Greek literature this noun is commonly used to label people who did good for others (see e.g. Hdt. 6.30) and it can also serve the function of honorary title (see e.g. Hdt. 8.85). The first value is quite recurrent in the other novels, especially in Char., where εὐεργέτης is used by characters to recognise the protection and good received by others (see 1.12.10: Theron is a benefactor for Leonas, 3.9.1: Phocas for Dionysius, 4.4.7, 5.10.6: Mithridates for Chaereas, 6.1.5, 8.4.5, 8.5.13: Dionysius for Callirhoe, 7.5.15, 8.5.12: Dionysius for the Persian king, 8.5.14: Callirhoe for Dionysius). The same pattern appears twice in Longus (the protagonists use it to define Dorcon in 1.31.2 and Gnathon 4.29.5), while in Hld. three times (2.11.3: Thisbe's apparent killer for Cnemon, 7.23.6: Achaemenes for Arsace, 10.37.1: Idaspes for Theagenes).

Conversely, the attribution of εὐεργέτης to gods is very rare: apart from a passage from Plato about Hades (*Crat.* 403e: σοφιστής τε καὶ μέγας εὐεργέτης τῶν παρ᾽αὐτῷ), it occurs in Jewish (see e.g. Philo Jud. *De spec. leg.* 1.209: ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἀγαθός τέ ἐστι καὶ ποιητὴς καὶ γεννητὴς τῶν ὅλων καὶ προνοητικὸς ὢν ἐγέννησε, σωτήρ τε καὶ εὐεργέτης, μακαριότητος καὶ πάσης εὐδαιμονίας ἀνάπλεως) and Christian contexts (see Clem. Rom. 2.41.1).

Since Xen.'s link with these two environments has not emerged elsewhere, I would conclude that, as in τὸν πάντων δεσπότην, our author is referring to Eros a general term, usually adopted with

human beings. That being said, the parallel with Char. might be relevant too: if Xen. wrote after Char., his decision to attribute to Eros this term so widely used by the latter could be an intertext with him. Unlike *Callirhoe*, Xen. might be saying that in his novel there is only a protagonist who can be εὐεργέτης, Eros, whose presence lies under that of all the others.

1.4.5: Ἔρως ἔτι ὠργίζετο καὶ μεγάλην τῆς ὑπεροψίας ἐνενοεῖτο τιμωρίαν [τὸ] πράξασθαι τὸν Ἁβροκόμην: this 'narratorial statement' is focused on Eros' action and has both an analeptic and proleptic value. On the one hand, the presence of ἔτι in the first phrase recalls that Eros has already won on Habrocomes in the falling in love. On the other hand, the whole second clause confirms that the god's revenge will continue and, so, according to Xen.'s proleptic system, again 'something bad will happen' (Morgan 2007a, 459). For more on the presence of Eros in the novel, see LI 2.1, while for the other narratorial prolepses, NA 1.2.

1.4.6: οὐκέτι φέρειν: the 'failure to resist to love' is a common τόπος of the novelistic and erotic literature (see table 2 and 3 in LI 2.3). Here we are dealing with a metaphor of 'bearing' (Cummings 2009, 181), according to which 'eros is conceptualised as a load to be carried' (ibid.). While Xen. limits himself to the failure of this bearing, the other novelists exploit also the image of a successful bearing, which, however, results in being overloaded. This is the case of Chaereas when inslaved by the Persians (Char. 4.2.1: πολλὰ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐβάρει, κόπος, ἀμέλεια [...] καὶ τούτων μᾶλλον ὁ ἔρως), Calasiris (Hld. 2.25.2: πάθος ἐρωτικὸν ἐπιφορτισάμενος) and Arsace (7.8.6: τῆς ἐκείνου θεᾶς ἐμφορουμένη). The omission made by Xen. is a sign of his simplicity.

In this respect, an interesting parallel of this basic exploitation is given by Parthenius' *Erotica Pathemata*: although the relationship between this text and the novels is controversial (see Ruiz Montero 1981, esp. 288-295 for an explanation of some connections), the erotic stories which compose this work have a basic structure with repetitions of simple narrative patterns and motifs. Interestingly, the 'failure to resist of love' is repeated five times out of a total of thirty-six stories (see table 3 in LI 2.3); this confirms that Xen. is here introducing a very common motif of erotic literature.

1.4.6: πειρωμένη τοὺς παρόντας λανθάνειν: like the previous image, the attempt at hiding himself is another typical reaction of lovers. The reason for this popularity lies in its occurrence in the Euripidean *Hippolytus,* which made this motif become popular. Phaedra, in fact, overtly confesses to the choir that she tried to hide her passion (see 394: σιγᾶν τήνδε καὶ κρύπτειν νόσον). Among the following examples (see 'Attempt at hiding erotic passion' in table 2 and 3 in LI 2.3), a significant parallel is Dionysius' reaction to love, when he deliberately waits to confess his passion to Leona (2.4.1: τὸ δὲ τραῦμα περιστέλλειν ἐπειρᾶτο). As I have already suggested in LI 2.3, the originality of Xen. lies in the omission of the confession to the intermediary, which happens both in Phaedra's and in Dionysius' case, as well as in most of the other occurrences. For the meaning of this variation, see again LI 2.3.

1.4.6: παρθένος [...] πρέποντα: this expression makes present in a character text what the narrator has attributed to her in the third chapter (1.3.2: τῶν παρθένοις πρεπόντων καταφρονοῦσα). As in Habrocomes' case, the monologue focuses on the development of the protagonists' personality (1.1.5 n: μὴ θέλων).

1.4.6: ὀδυνῶμαι: see 1.4.4 n: ὠδύνα.

1.4.6: ἐφ'Ἀβροκόμῃ μαίνομαι: Anthia defines herself as mad for love. This very popular motif of erotic literature is also a novelistic τόπος (see see 'the lover's madness' in table 2 and 3 in LI 2.3), which is attributed to different kinds of characters, from the protagonists like Anthia here, Daphnis (1.25.2), Clitophon (Ach. 2.2.3), Theagenes (Hld. 4.2.3) and Charicleia (7.7.5), and to secondary characters, such as Melite (Ach. 5.19.4, 5.26.2), Thersander (6.11.3), Demaenete (Hld. 1.14.6, 1.15.4), Thermutis (2.14.3), Trachinus (5.20.6, 5.29.5), Pelorus (5.31.2) and Arsace (7.9.4, 7.23.1). While in each of these cases it is evident that the lover who becomes ἐμμανής 'denotes a lack of control' (Cummings 2009, 77), the strength of this loss and the length of this motif are variable: while in most of these occurrences madness is simply an attribute which stresses the strength of one's passion, it is only in Hld. that madness affects the behaviour of some characters. This happens with Demaenete, whose particular connection with this theme is underlined by her name, which is a pun on μανία: she is in fact tormented by the Erynnis (1.14.6: τὴν δὲ εὐθὺς Ἐρινύες ἤλαυνον). Also Charicleia in her reunion with Theagenes is overcome by the sight of him and runs towards ὥσπερ οἰστρηθεῖσα ὑπὸ ὄψεως ἐμμανής (7.7.5). Finally, Arsace spends a whole night moving in her bed and calling her slaves (7.9.3).
The reason for Hld.'s originality lies in his intertext with Greek tragedy, where erotic madness is an important topic: as a result, both Demaenete and Arsace are compared with Phaedra (see 1.10.2, when the former calls Cnemon Hippolytus, and 7.9.4, when the latter's degeneration into insanity recalls that of the heroine). Only Ach. is not really part of this division, because he makes Leucippe become and act mad (4.9.2), but the responsible party is not love, but a cup with an aphrodisiac given to her by Gorgias: in this way, he seems to play subtly with the second nuance of the motif.
Given this whole framework, I would suggest that Xen.'s passage, despite its brief reference, does not entirely fit into the first category: Anthia, in fact, is aware of being mad and is still able to restrain herself and to use this element to deepen her awareness of love. In my opinion, this approach is original and it is not unthinkable that also here Xen. is using Plato as a model. Erotic madness, in fact, has in Sappho 31.9-15, Euripides' *Hippolytus* (see 241, 248 and 1274) and Plato his first models and the philosopher focuses on this theme in the *Phaedrus*, where he states that ἔρως is a kind of madness and one that is divinely inspired (*Phdr.* 244a: νῦν δὲ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἡμῖν γίγνεται διὰ μανίας, θείᾳ μέντοι δόσει διδομένης). Since Anthia does not recall Phaedra (LI 9) and Xen. is not really fond of Sappho, the influence of this model is not unlikely. This hypothesis might be increased by the fact that slightly later in the dialogue Plato adds: ταύτης μετέχων τῆς μανίας ὁ ἐρῶν τῶν καλῶν ἐραστὴς καλεῖται (249e). As Anthia behaves as an ἐραστής, her connection with μανία becomes more plausible.

1.4.7: τί τὸ πέρας τοῦ κακοῦ;: the combination of πέρας and τὸν κακόν is not common in Greek literature and it has its first occurrence in the Platonic *Phaedrus*, in which the absence of this limit allows the bad horse to win his fight against the good one and the charioteer and approach the beloved (see 254b2: ὅταν μηδὲν ᾖ πέρας κακοῦ). Few lines before, Plato also tells that the black horse's aim towards his opponents is to μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι τῆς τῶν ἀφροδισίων χάριτος (254a6-7). Since the only other occurrences before Xen. of this expression appear in the *Septuaginta Salomonis* (14.27: γὰρ τῶν ἀνωνύμων εἰδώλων θρησκεία παντὸς ἀρχὴ κακοῦ καὶ αἰτία καὶ πέρας ἐστίν) and in Maximus Tyrius (see 12.6a: Τί δὲ τοίνυν ἔσται καὶ πέρας τοῦ κακοῦ), the latter's knowledge of Plato leads to the conclusion that Xen. might be intertexting here with the philosopher.

This possibility is supported by a further element: the part of the *Phaedrus* from which this passage comes follows two other expressions which Xen. might be quoting from Plato, such as πόθου κέντρων (253c5; 1.9.7 n.: ἐνθέντες) and τὸ ἐρωτικὸν ὄμμα (253e6-7; 1.9.7 n.: τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς [...] ἐρωτικοί) On the other hand, the Byblical expression, which might suggest that this expression was commonly used in a simple narrative style, cannot be taken as a proof, being the only case.

As a result, I would translate Anthia's second question with: 'what will be the limit to my evil?': our heroine is expressing with this question her desire of finding a restraint on her passion. The reason why this intertext appears to be significant is that it would make it clearer that Anthia's negative perception of lovesickness lies in her perception of the danger of sex. This would constitute an interesting development of the previous attribution to her of διακεῖμαι πονήρως, where erotic desire was at the origin of her uneasiness (1.3.2 n.: Διέκειτο). In this respect, the emergence of a Platonic intertext here might make the presence of the same model more plausible also in that case: this is very interesting, since πονηρός is like this passage used in relation to the bad horse of the *Phaedrus* (254e6).

At the same time, it is not impossible that a reader keen on Plato would also see in this interrogative a proleptic and ironical trait: like in the *Phaedrus*, there will not be any limit and so love will be consummated.

1.4.7: σοβαρὸς οὗτος ἐρώμενος: σοβαρός is an adjective which has many occurrences in the genre and, as Morgan 2004, 155-6 argues, it can have the more common meaning of 'cocky', as in Aristophon fr. 11 *PCG*, or 'imposing' in a positive sense. Since the issue of arrogance is involved in these two meanings, we should carefully analyse this adjective, trying to understand why Anthia is using this here and not ὑπερηφανός, which is often associated with Habrocomes' arrogance in the novel (1.2.1 n: ὑπερηφανός).

The answer to this question is given by the analysis of the novelistic occurrences of this term, where it does not always indicate a normal arrogance, that is a behaviour of superiority and hostility whose origin can be very different, but rather an arrogance generated by physical beauty and which makes the onlooker feel inferior. Interestingly, the origin of this arrogance does not seem to depend always on the object involved.

This "erotic" use of the term emerges already in *Callirhoe*: after the most traditional use of the word in relation to Theron (1.5.3: ὁ Ἀκραγαντῖνος ὑπὲρ ἅπαντας, λαμπρός τε καὶ σοβαρός), in the fifth book Dionysius confesses to himself his worries about losing Callirhoe and states: σοβαρωτέρα γέγονε ἤδη, καὶ οὔπω βασιλεὺς ἑώρακεν αὐτήν (5.2.9). In this case we are not dealing with an arrogant heroine. It is simply her shocking display of beauty which arouses erotic desire in other suitors. The same meaning occurs also at the end of the novel, when Callirhoe walks between Chaereas and Polycharmus immediately after her reunion with the beloved (8.1.12: ἐβάδιζε δὲ σοβαρά, Χαιρέου καὶ Πολυχάρμου μέσην αὐτὴν δορυφορούντων). A similar nuance is also introduced when the Persian King decides to go hunting to forget his love for Callirhoe: he tries to be ornate in order to be noticed by Callirhoe and Char. defines his appearance with the words: καθῆστο δὲ σοβαρός· (6.4.3): beauty and physical aspect, thus, are linked together in this passage too[380].

The same erotic interpretation of σοβαρός is exploited by Hld., where Theagenes' eyes deserve this adjective in two passages where also his beauty is mentioned: in 2.35.1 his ὀφθαλμὸς [...] σοβαρὸν τε ἅμα καὶ οὐκ ἀνέραστον βλέπων, while in 3.3.7 he σοβαρὰν τὴν ὀφρὺν κατὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐπιδινεύων and then Hld. comments: τὴν νικητήριον ἀνδρείας τε και κάλλους ψῆφον τῷ νεανίᾳ πάντες ἀπένεμον (3.3.8). At the same time, there are also two passages where the primary meaning is exploited, without any mention of beauty (see 7.25.1, where Achamaenes refers this adjective to Theagenes and 10.30.8, where the Ethiopian warrior is described). Finally, a sort of authentication of the erotic use of σοβαρός is given by Longus who describes Eros as παιδίῳ μάλα σοβαρῷ καὶ καλῷ (1.7.2). In this case, the god is not arrogant but it is the power of his love which induces a feeling of inferiority in the others.

Given this framework, I would argue that in the present passage Anthia is exploiting this particular connotation of the adjective: since a line before she has defined her partner as καλός and ὑπερήφανος (1.4.6), Anthia is here expressing a concept which is different from the traditional arrogance: the imposing attraction of her partner. This interpretation is also confirmed by her self-definition as παρθένος φρουρουμένη which belongs to the same sentence as σοβαρός: this suggests that in this first part there might be another hint to what is endangering her virginity and this adjective perfectly plays this role. In addition, since Habrocomes is here ἐρώμενος, Anthia is not looking at him as an active partner and, thus, his deliberate choice of being arrogant would not fit well here.

Finally, σοβαρός has another occurrence in the *Eph.* as part of Anthia's speech in the wedding night: there she addresses Habrocomes' eyes with the expression: οἱ τότε μὲν σοβαροί, νῦν δὲ ἐρωτικοί (1.9.7): in this distinction between refusal and acceptance of love, it is interesting how Anthia does not use ὑπερήφανος but σοβαροί. This implies another reference to Habrocomes' beauty, which fits well into this erotic scene.

---

[380] This occurrence recalls two analogue passages of Iamblichus, who, when describing the procession of the Babylonian king, he introduces an imposing ceremonial horse and his σοβαρότερος rider (1.38: ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ σοβαρώτερον πεπαιδευμένος οὐκ εἰς γαστέρα καθίεται, ἀλλ' εἰς γόνατα πίπτει and 1.47: ἐκ δὲ τούτων ὁ μὲν ἵππος εὐειδέστερος φαίνεται, ὁ δὲ ἱππεὺς σοβαρώτερος γίνεται). Here however, unlike Char., the attraction lacks an erotic connotation

In conclusion, the use of this adjective proves further the accurateness used by Xen. in creating his direct speeches. At the same time, it is also evident the difference of register between this adjective and ὑπερήφανος: since σοβαρός is clearly part of the erotic literature, the hypothesis that the latter might come from Theophrastus becomes slightly more plausible.

CHAPTER 5

1.5.1: Ταῦτα ἑκάτερος αὐτῶν δι'ὅλης νυκτὸς ὠδύρετο: this sentence is a 'brief repeating analepsis', which plays the most important function of 'effecting transitions and co-ordinating the separate narrative threads' (Morgan 2007a, 456). Its introduction addresses the issue of simultaneity through ἑκάτερος and it confirms the reference time appeared in 1.3.4 (ἐπειδὴ εἰς ὕπνον ἤεσαν, n.). The fruit of this connection is significant: unlike his usual limited technique (see <u>NA</u> 3.3), Xen. here refers simultaneity to an entire scene. This exceptionality might stem from his desire to emphasise one of the most original scenes of the novel which contains three protagonists' direct speeches.

1.5.1: ὠδύρετο: this is the first introduction of a lament in the novel. As Cheyns 2005 shows in his study (see 273, n. 29), in the novelistic corpus Xen. has the highest number of expressions of this type in proportion to the length of the text: this stems from both his interest in emotionality and the simplicity of his text, in which this kind of reaction appears to be a repetitive motif.

1.5.1: Τὰς εἰκόνας ἐπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀλλήλων ἀναπλάττοντες: this τόπος of the "obsessive presence of the beloved's image" is widespread in the erotic and the novelistic literature (see table 2 and 3 in <u>LI</u> 2.3). As the prefix ἀνα- suggests, giving the verb the meaning of 'refashion', Xen. himself has already introduced this motif, when the protagonists arrive home after their first meeting (3.1.4: ἔννοια ἑκάτερον ὑπήει τῆς ὄψεως θατέρου). Within the novelistic corpus, Ach. is particularly keen on this image, as the following occurrences demonstrate:
- 1.9.1: πάντα Λευκίππην φαντάζομαι (Cleitophon is speaking),
- 1.19.2: ἀπέλθουσα γὰρ τὴν μορφὴν ἐναφῆκέ μου τοῖς ὀφθαλμοις (Cleitophon again speaking of Leucippe);
- 2.13.2: ἀναπλάττων γὰρ ἑαυτῶι τῆς παιδὸς τὸ κάλλος καὶ φανταζόμενος τὰ ἀόρατα (Callisthenes in love with Sostratus' daughter);
- 5.13.4: ἕλκουσα δὲ τοῦ ἐρωμένου τὸ εἴδωλον ἀεί, ἐναπομάσσεται τῶι τῆς ψυχῆς κατόπτρωι καὶ ἀναπλάττει τὴν μορφήν (Cleitophon in front of Melite).
Given this framework, the origin of this motif is disputed among scholars: on the one hand, Goldhill 2002, 377 thinks that the Stoics might be responsible, while Bychkov the Epicureans and Morales 2004 suggest the atomists. While each of these interpretations focuses on Hellenistic schools, a more recent one is offered by Repath forth., which seems to me more appropriate: 'although I should not wish to preclude the use of Stoic and atomist theories and terms, I think it is vital for a more considered and organic reading of Achilles Tatius' novel to remember the significance of Plato and his *Phaedrus* in particular'. In this dialogue, in fact, when the lover falls in love ὥσπερ δὲ ἐν κατόπτρῳ ἐν τῷ ἐρῶντι ἑαυτὸν ὁρῶν λέληθεν (255d5-6) and, when his beloved is far, ποθεῖ καὶ ποθεῖται, εἴδωλον ἔρωτος ἀντέρωτα ἔχων (255d9-e1). Overall, the connection of these passages

with the aforementioned of Ach. is evident: they all share the same image and the third one also the significant Platonic words εἴδωλον and κατόπτρῳ.

As a result, since 'the Platonic basis is established succinctly and firmly towards the beginning of Cleitophon's narration' and 'it is only in Plato's *Phaedrus* that we find the discussions of visual perception in an erotic or amatory environment', Repath forth. concludes that 'the *sententiae* on vision should be read primarily through a Platonic lens'. This thesis is quite interesting, because it might suggest that also in the case of Xen. there is a Platonic influence, as it happens in other parts of his novel: the present passage must be carefully analysed.

A first positive answer is suggested by the phrase composed of ἀναπλάττω or πλάττω and εἰκόνα or εἰκόνες, which has a Platonic origin: it is introduced in the *Republic*, where Socrates, when discussing injustice, makes a proposal: εἰκόνα πλάσαντες τῆς ψυχῆς λόγῳ (588b10). Then, shortly afterwards, he similarly repeats: Περίπλασον δὴ αὐτοῖς ἔξωθεν ἑνὸς εἰκόνα (588d10): a bigger image of a human being, in fact, must be shaped near those of a mythological beast, of a lion and of a smaller man.

After the philosopher, the same phrase, with little variations, occurs in two different contexts. The former is religious: the content of a prophecy of the *Oracula Sybillina* is an εἰκόνα [...] πλασθεῖσαν ἀφ᾽ὕλης (8.378), while both Philo and Strabo use it to indicate the atheists' activity of worshipping divine idols (see, respectively, Philo *De ebriet.* 110: οἷς οὐκ ἐξήρκεσεν ἡλίον καὶ σελήνης [...] εἰκόνας διαπλάσασθαι and *Str.* 16.2.35, where Moses asks τίς ἂν εἰκόνα πλάττειν θαρρήσειε νοῦν ἔχων ὁμοίαν τινὶ παρ᾽ἡμῖν;). The latter is artistic: both Plutarch and Lucian introduce in their work artistic images (see Plut. Mor. 355c7 about Alexander's images: τὰς γραφομένας εἰκόνας αὐτοῦ καὶ πλαττομένας καὶ γλυφομένας and Luc. Imag. 23 τὰς εἰκόνας, ἥν τε σὺ ἀνέπλασας τὴν τοῦ σώματος). Finally, in Maximus Tyrius we find two interesting passages: in the first, the orator starts a lecture by saying Πλάττωμεν, εἰ δυνατόν, τοιαύτην εἰκόνα, ἄνδρα εὐδαίμονα τὴν ἐξ ἡδονῶν εὐδαιμονίαν (33 6a). Then he begins another with this sentence: Σωκράτης ἐν Πειραεῖ διαλεγόμενος πολιτικοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἀναπλάττι τῷ λόγῳ καθάπερ ἐν δράματι, πολεώς τε καὶ πολιτείας ἀγαθῆς εἰκόνα (37 1a). In both occurrences the context is metaphorical: human imagination creates an image of an ideal man and of a good city. Since we find here the same metaphorical use which characterises the *Republic* and since the latter occurrence is a summary of the dialogue itself, it is very likely that Maximus is drawing his words from the philosopher. This suggestion is confirmed by the fact that Plato's himself at the beginning of the *Republic* refers to the process of creating an imaginary city with the following words: ἐπλάττομεν τὴν πόλιν (*Rep.* 374 a5) and this appears to be 'a deliberate self-reference by the author' (Repath, forth.).

Given this list of passages, I would conclude that Xen.'s expression might have a Platonic background. Although the *Republic* does not have an erotic context, the quotations about religion and art, in fact, are not closer to our novel and are not enough to prove that words like these were part of the common vocabulary. Furthermore, apart from the obscure image of the *Oracula Sybillina,* their creation of an object is referred to a concrete representation, while in Plato, Maximus Tyrius and our novel the imagination plays a central role.

Having said that, however, it cannot be taken for granted that Xen. could have really known this Platonic image. On the one hand, the possibility that he read the *Republic* is difficult, because this work was mostly read by philosophers. On the other hand, Maximus Tyrius' occurrences might offer a new interpretation: following Dillon's 1996[2] definition (397), in fact, this author was a Platonic 'popularizer' and 'a sophist rather than a philosopher', as well as 'a distinguished member of the Second Sophistic movement' (ibid., 399). Therefore, he 'used all the resources of contemporary rhetoric to adorn traditional philosophic themes' and, although sometimes he took up a Platonic position on the question on which he dealt, his speeches give us 'striking images and instances of scholastic terminology, as well as 'inaccuracies' (Taylor 1994, 4). As a consequence, Maximus' use of εἰκόνα ἀναπλάττειν might represent the proof that this expression of the *Republic* had become in the Imperial Era familiar not only to philosophers but also to rhetoricians.

Furthermore, Repath forth. provides other three examples of Imperial texts where (ἀνα)πλάττω describes Plato's creation of a new city: cf. Lucian's *Verae Historiae* 2.17 (Πλάτων δὲ μόνος οὐ παρῆν, ἀλλ᾽ἐλέγετο αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ ἀναπλασθείσῃ ὑπ᾽αὐτοῦ πόλει οἰκεῖν), Lucian's *Philosophers for Sale* 17 (οἰκῶ μὲν ἐμαυτῷ τινα πόλιν ἀναπλάσας) and Athenaus *Deiphnosophistai* 505e (ὡς ἀνέπλαττε Πλάτων ὁ πεπλασμένα θαύματα εἰδώς). Each of these is important, because all together they confirm that there was a Platonic use of ἀναπλάττω in the literary framework of the Imperial Era, although in these cases without εἰκόνα.

As a consequence, even though Xen. might have not read the whole *Republic*, I would speculate that he could have learned from Imperial writers that πλάττειν (εἰκόνα) was a Platonic expression or he could have read it directly from the dialogue. The choice between these two options is very difficult to make: in my opinion, it is a striking fact that, chronologically, our author is the first of the aforementioned writers to introduce εἰκόνα ἀναπλάττειν. This peculiarity pushes me to open the possibility that our author was directly intertexting with Plato, although it is also possible that Xen. was drawing it from Hellenistic lost sources. In each of these cases, however, we can conclude that τὰς εἰκόνας ἐπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀλλήλων ἀναπλάττοντες has a Platonic mark.

In addition, again Repath forth. suggests the possibility of a further Platonic connection: in most of the aforementioned passages of Imperial writers the combination of the name of the philosopher and ἀναπλάττομαι seems to be a pun. Furthermore, the three passages of the *Republic* about the creation of a new soul or of the city (Pl. *Rep.* 374a5, 588b and 588d) and a few others (377b and c) allow us to say that the philosopher himself was already playing with this verb. Since, however, in this second case the name Plato was not explicitly mentioned, ἀναπλάττω alone became a pun and, therefore, it is not unlikely that also Xen.'s ἀναπλάττω would be an example of this. A confirmation of this might come from Char. and Ach., who both use ἀναπλάττω to express the motif of the 'obsessed image of the beloved'. This is clear in Ach., where Plato is the model, but seems to be true also for Char., where the word appears when the king Mithridates creates in his mind Callirhoe's figure (4.2.8: Καλλιρόην ἀναπλάττων ἑαυτῷ τοιαύτην and 6.4.7: ταῦτα ἀναζωγραφῶν καὶ ἀναπλάττων). Since in the first passage the name of the heroine is explicitly mentioned and

Καλλιρόην itself is a pun on the Platonic "flow of beauty" motif, due to its composition (κάλλος and ῥόη, 'stream'), it seems likely that also ἀναπλάττω was performing the same role.

That being said, one might use these parallels against our hypothesis, suggesting that our novelist could have drawn his expression from Char. However, if Xen. was imitating Char., it is unlikely that he picked up this motif without recognizing its Platonic origin: his general acquaintance with Plato, as well as that of Char., makes this possibility unlikely.

In conclusion, this passage of our novel seems to be an interesting example of Xen.'s dialogue with Plato, which is found at two different levels: intertextuality (direct or indirect) and pun. In addition, while this second element works well with the pun on φαιδροί of the second chapter (1.2.6 n.: ὀφθαλμοί), the first fits well in the parallel with Anthia's reception of the flow of beauty (1.2.3 n.: ὅλοις μὲν καὶ ἀναπεπταμένοις). Unlike that passage, where that motif underlines the heroine's role of ἐραστής, it is more difficult to understand why Xen. is recalling here Plato: on this, see LI 7.1.

1.5.1: ᾔει μὲν Ἁβροκόμης ἐπὶ τὰ συνήθη γυμνάσματα: here Xen. refers again to the main activities which are part of Habrocomes' παιδεῖα: θήρα, ἱππασία καὶ ὁπλομαχία. It is significant that Xen. uses here the same words as in the prologue, because it constitutes an example of intra-textuality. This clear example might have worked as a signal to the readers to look for this kind of connections in the whole text.

That being said, it is striking how Habrocomes, despite this initial reference, ends up to spending the rest of his days in the temple where Anthia is. This decision appears to be a further suggestion, like that which emerged in his monologue, that love makes Habrocomes unable to achieve his παιδεῖα, even the more practical one. The same failure is ascribed by Hld. to Theagenes, who, like Habrocomes, 'attempts to save social face' (Cummings 2009, 42): although ἔρως-afflicted, he 'forces himself to be cheerful and sociable in front of his public', but then 'he loses concentration' (see ibid. 42 and Hld. 3.10.5-3.11.1) and is unable to master his feelings.

The result is the attribution to both Habrocomes and Theagenes of the traditional motif of "neglect of the usual activities" provoked by love (see table 2 and 3 in LI 2.3 for occurrences). A similar transformation concerns Chaereas, who stops his frequentation of the gymnasium (Char. 1.1.9), and Chloe, who forgets her sheep (Longus 1.13.6), but in this case this interruption happens immediately after the falling in love.

1.5.2: τὰ σώματα […] πεπονηκότα: this is the first physical connotation of lovesickness, which has numerous parallels in erotic literature (see "physical consumption" in table 2 and 3 in LI 2.3). Interestingly, the same motif appears shortly thereafter exclusively focused on Habrocomes: after days spent together with Anthia in the temple, τὸ σῶμα πᾶν ἠφάνιστο (see 1.5.5 n.). This emphasis is unusual, since in the Greek tradition women are usually lovesick and increase the originality of the presentation of Habrocomes in the first chapter (see LI 7.1) and of the importance of his body (see LI 7.2).

1.5.2: ἐκ τῆς παρελθούσης νυκτὸς: this is an occurrence of the famous erotic τόπος of "sleepless nights" (see table 2 and 3 in LI 2.3). It is interesting how Xen. fill this lack of sleep with the monologues of the protagonists: this is typical of Greek epigrams and of Roman Elegy, where the lovers write pieces of poetry to pour out their sorrow.

1.5.2: τὸ βλέμμα ἄθυμον: although the notion of ἀθυμία is often used by Xen. in the novel (see 1.5.5 n.: ἐν πολλῇ ἀθυμίᾳ), the attribution of ἄθυμος to βλέμμα is quite unexpected, because a psychological attribute is related to a physical sense. This strangeness is increased by the fact that since Homer this adjective has been constantly used to refer directly to people and not to parts of the body (see, e.g., Od. 10.463). As a result, ἄθυμος is evidently a word which Xen. wants to be noticed and it seems to place greater emphasis on the lack of spirit which characterises the protagonists' lovesickness. In this respect, this expression can be compared with ἡ ψυχὴ καταπεπτώκει (see 1.5.5, below). Interestingly, a similarly strange combination appears in 1.9.1, where the spiritual verb ἐπάλλετο has τὰ σώματα as a subject (see 1.9.1 n. for more).

1.5.2: οἱ χρῶτες ἠλλαγμένοι: this alteration of the colour of the skin suggests that we are dealing with an expression of pallor, since tiredness and not love is at the origin of this change. As this is the only reference to skin in this description of lovesickness, 'no blush appears in Xenophon's *Ephesiaca*' (Lateiner 1998, 174). This omission appears unexpected, since this motif is popular in the novels (see 'blush' in table 4 in LI 2.3) and in the whole ancient literature (see e.g. see Ap. Rhod. 3681, Strato, AP 12.8.5, Catullus 65.24). In addition, as 'a blush expresses an individual's sense of shame or embarrassment', this reaction would have fit well into the descriptions of Anthia and Habrocomes, who are so focused on shame.

In my opinion, the reason for this exclusion is that a symptom of blush would have been too compromising for our protagonists and would have forced Xen. to break his attentive control of their reactions. In fact, 'blushing is involuntary' (Lateiner 1998, 167) and 'cannot be simulated or dissimulated': thus, though generated by shame, it makes people's shame dangerous, by revealing their desire. This is suggested by the novelistic occurrences of this τόπος: for instance, when the eunuch sees the Persian King blushing in Char., he asks him what he is hiding from him (6.3.1: τί κρύπτεις), forcing him to reveal his passion. Similarly, Ach. associates blushing with repulsion: both symptoms were generated by a direct erotic proposal (1.10.4: ἐρυθριᾷ καὶ μισεῖ τὸ ῥῆμα [...]). As a result, it is not possible to attribute such a strong reaction to Xen.'s protagonists, who are made frail by love.

Finally, it is interesting that 'Homeric epic [...] does not record this cutaneous manifestation' (169): Xen. might here be also following his model in obedience to the parallel between Anthia and Nausicaa (1.2.1 n.: intr.). In addition, asalready noted in LI 2.3, this omission is also part of Xen.'s general scant interest in the Sapphic description of love: also in this case, I would suggest that the erotic experience of the Lesbian poetess was too titillating to be entirely accepted by Xen.

1.5.2: χρῶτες: as Capra 2008, 281 notices, χρώς 'è fra le poche parole "poetiche" impiegate da Senofonte'. In addition, the same scholar suggests that the same word might have been used by Xen. another time in the final scene where the servants recognise Anthia in Rhodes (5.12.3). This passage has always been considered obscure, because F has τὸν ἔρωτα, which is an unlikely sign of identification like δάκρυα, ἀναθήματα, ὀνόματα and εἶδος. Capra, unlike other editors, proposes the reading: συμβάλλουσι δὲ πάντα, χρῶτα, δάκρυα [...] and his main argument is literary: 'l'associazione di χρώς con le lacrime è omerica: nell'*Odissea* [...] il termine è insistentemente impiegato per indicare il volto segnato con le lacrime, in particolare nel descrivere lo struggimento di Penelope per lo sposo perduto' (281).

Since this Odyssean connection is well attested (cf. Telemachus crying in *Od.* 2.376 and 4.749, Penelope in 18.172, 19.204, Odysseus in 19.263, where he invites Penelope not to cry with the words: μηκέτιν νῦν χρόα καλὸν, Eumaeus in 16.145 and Neoptolemus in 11.529), I would accept Capra's new reading.

1.5.3: εἰπεῖν τὸ ἀληθὲς φόβῳ πρὸς ἑκατέρους αἰδούμενοι: this sentence includes the first explicit mention of the fear and shame which prevents the protagonists from revealing to each other their passion. For the centrality of this motif in Xen.'s construction of lovesickness, see LI 2.3. While the same silence will be repeated just before the parents' decision to consulting the oracle (1.5.9: κατειπεῖν αὐτῶν τὴν συμφορὰν μὴ δυνάμενοι), it is interesting that both reactions will affect the protagonists also at the beginning of the wedding night, where the participle αἰδούμενοι and φοβούμενοι are placed close to each other (1.9.1 n.: ὑφ'ἡδονῆς). Although in that scene the protagonists are dominated by pleasure, the nature of these two feelings is not altered and emphasise how Anthia and Habrocomes are blocked by erotic desire.

1.5.3: ἐστέναξεν ἄν [...] ἐλεεινῶς: this sentence describes Habrocomes' attitude in the temple. As in Anthia's first reaction to falling in love (1.3.2 n.: ἐλάλησεν, b), the translators usually interpret this ἄν as an iterative and, thus, attribute to the protagonists actions that contradict the modesty of their behaviour during these first chapters. In my opinion, however, the context of the passage rather suggests that we are dealing with 'als sogennanter Potential der Vergangenheit' (Kühner 1904, 212). As a result, no real moral boundaries are broken by the protagonists.

This is not what Anderson 1989, Henderson 2009 and Borgogno 2005 think (cf. their respective translations: 'but Habrocomes got as far as moaning, weeping', 'Habrocomes went so far as moaning, weeping [...]', and 'Abrocome giunse al punto di gemere [...]'). Conversely, Trzaskoma 2010 attributes an unreal connotation to the sentence, by suggesting: 'It got so bad, Habrocomes would groan and cry [...]': in my opinion, this scholar is again correct, because the sentences before the controversial one do not suggest that Habrocomes' action is repetitive: this pattern clearly involves the protagonists' suffering, as Xen., after the mention of some symptoms of their lovesickness, adds: καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ πολὺ ἐγίνετο καὶ πλέον οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς ἦν (1.5.2). The same frequency involves the following action: when Anthia and Habrocomes gather, they keep looking one at the other in silence (1.5.3: διημερεύοντες ἐνεώρων ἀλλήλοις [...]). That being said, Xen.

adds: τοσοῦτο δέ and then the aforementioned sentence that starts with ἐστέναξεν ἄν ποτε. It seems to me that τοσοῦτο suggests the apex of the previous action: this, first of all, means that we are not dealing with another repetitive action. In addition, as Xen. has just said that the protagonists keep staring one at the other without speaking, it would be strange that one shortly manages to do so: to an extent, this would go against the shame on which Xen. is so focused. Finally, ποτε with reference to the past means usually 'once': thus, also this participle discourages acceptance of the iterative value. As a result, I would conclude that Xen. is rather describing an unfulfilled desire of Habrocomes, which I would translate in this way: 'It got so bad, that Habrocomes would have groaned and cried and prayed while the girl was listening with compassion'.

This makes Habrocomes closer to Anthia: as his future wife in the third chapter, he thinks of overcoming the boundary of shame but he stops: this fits this event better into his developing approach to love. In addition, at the end of the scene in the temple Xen. states that the protagonists' prayers λανθάνουσαι μέν, ἀλλὰ ἐγίνοντο ὅμοιαι (1.5.4). If Habrocomes had really spoken and prayed for Anthia, the first participle would become difficult to understand.

1.5.4: (ἑώρων δὲ ἅπασαι Ἁβροκόμην): this parenthesis does not fit well in a period like this which is particularly long and, in addition, it does not add any significant pieces of information, apart from reinforcing the hypothesis made in the previous sentence. As a result, I would explain its presence with a speculative reason: in my opinion, it is not unlikely that a late copyist might have found difficult to understand the construction of the sentence, which is based on a objective predicative and is enriched by the separation of βλεπούσας from γυναῖκας. Thus, he might have introduced this "unnecessary glossa" to explain it to the readers. This, however, has also the bad effect of breaking the more fluent hypothetical period.

1.5.4: δήλη ἦν λυπουμένη, μὴ παρευδοκιμηθῇ: Anthia here has experience of jealousy. While the fortune of this τόπος in the erotic literature does not deserve any comment (see "jealousy" in table 2 and 3 in LI 2.3), its attribution here is surprising, since it emphasises how Anthia, instead of worshipping Artemis, is distracted by love. Thus, her internal fight between shame and desire continues. At the same time, it is interesting that this motif is focused here on Anthia, since throughout the whole novel the heroine is more worried about this than Habrocomes, as the two occurrences in the wedding night further prove. See LI 5 for how jealousy seems to affect the end of the novel.

1.5.5: τὸ σῶμα πᾶν ἠφάνιστο καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καταπεπτώκει: this sentence expresses the apex of Habrocomes' lovesickness: the first part is the second occurrence of the "physical consumption" (1.5.2 n.: τὰ σώματα for the first), while the second is an expression of 'the fall of the human spirit'. In the Greek conception as well as in the current one, the fall of the human spirit represents the loss of hope and courage (a case in point is Il. 15.280: κάππεσε θύμος, where Achaeans army trembles in front of Hector). The soul, in fact, 'is conceived of as a concrete

entity' (Cummings 2009, 149) and its movement can be interpreted as the sign of an 'abnormal psychological condition' (ibid.).

That being said, the first combination is more traditional, since the association of ἀφανίζω - 'to make unseen'- and σῶμα is part of the Greek common vocabulary, as is attested by Menander' sententia: Ἅπαντ᾽ἀφανίζει γῆρας, ἰσχὺν σώματος in Mono 1.648. Thus, I would translate our passage with 'the whole body had disappeared'. Furthermore, the 'physical consumption' in the erotic literature often depends on the lover's abstinence from food and drink and, thus, it is concretely connected with thinness.

On the other hand, ἡ ψυχὴ is the subject of καταπίπτω only in one other passage of the Greek literature before the third century AD: this, first of all, suggests that Xen.'s introduction of this noun is fruit of a deliberate choice. What is strange is that this verb is usually used to refer to people and not to emotions. In addition, the 'fall of the ψυχή' is not a common element of Greek literature, as ancient poets and novelists explore rather the topic of the "anxiety of the soul". A case in point is Longus, who in 1.13.5 ascribes to the lovesick Chloe the following symptom: ἄση δὲ αὐτῆς εἶχε τὴν ψυχὴν), but without using Xen's metaphor. (1.13.5; see "soul-ache" in table 4 in LI 2.3). As a result, it needs a deeper interpretation.

Its only other occurrence is significant, as it belongs to a Maximus Tyrius' *Oration*, in which the rhetor 'is combining two well-established philosophical τόποι, both of ultimately Platonic inspiration: that of philosophical ἐπιστροφή - the turning of the intellect away from the world and its values - and that of the flight of the mind - Himmelfahrt' (Trapp 1997, 104, n. 36). After having described the soul's contemplation of Beauty, Maximus argues that this vision is not allowed to those who are overwhelmed by the tumult of desires (see τοῦ κυκηθμοῦ καὶ τοῦ θορύβου, 11.10). In fact, Καταπεσοῦσα γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ εἰς τουτονὶ τὸν θόρυβον, [...] νήχεται δυσέκνευστον πέλαγος (ibid.). Since our author has a familiarity with Plato, it is not unlikely that in a similar same way Xen. might be introducing a Platonic image with a new expression. Although it is not possible to develop a closer parallel between the two authors, I would suggest that either Maximus was quoting from Xen. or that this expression was used in a Platonic context in the Imperial Era.

As a result, I would conclude that Xen. might be here hinting at the Platonic fall of the soul, which is a consequence of the mankind's intemperance: when, in fact, the soul let herself be won by λήθη and κακία (*Phdr*. 248c7), βαρυνθεῖσα δὲ πτερορρυήσῃ τε καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν πέσῃ (248c7-8) and separates itself from Beauty and Truth. This connotation would support the view already introduced by Anthia of love as a dangerous thing, because of the presence of sexual desire (1.3.2 n.: διέκειτο, 1.4.7 n.: τί τὸ πέρας).

Finally, as I have already alluded in LI 7.2, it is significant that ἀφανίζω occurs two other times in the novel. The second passage is very close to our current one, since it is characterised by the same combination of σῶμα, πᾶν and ἀφανίζω: αἵ τε γὰρ πληγαὶ τὸ σῶμα πᾶν ἠφάνιζον (2.6.3). This hypothesis of an intratextuality between the two is confirmed by the focalisation of both passages on Habrocomes, which appears, at least in the first case, purposely chosen by the author, since Anthia suffers from the same sickness (see 1.5.2) and could have been attributed the same sentence.

That being said, the use there of ἀφανίζω with πληγαί is not easy to understand, because the body does not disappear as in the first situation, but it should become more visible because of the blood. As a consequence, I would speculate that the repetition of this verb here might betray Xen.'s interest in presenting this torture as another symptom of lovesickness. Thus, it might mark the negativity of Manto's love as destructor of the body and as the perpetrator of a new trap like that of Hephaestus on the wedding night (see NA 7.2). For this reason, I would accept the same translation as before, changing only the form - 'to make disappear'. At the same time, since ἀφανίζω in the Greek literature means also 'to destroy', which fits better into the context - Xen. might have chosen this second connotation as the main one, allowing the readers to admit also the first as a consequence of the memory of the other passage.

This framework might be supported by the last passage in which ἀφανίζω appears, since it is quite strange. When Manto falsely condemns Habrocomes, she tells her father: ὁ γὰρ σώφρων Ἁβροκόμης ἐπείρασε μὲν παρθενίαν τὴν ἐμὴν ἀφανίσαι (2.5.7). The use of ἀφανίσαι is also here odd, since παρθενία is not a visible object. Since Manto is pretending that Habrocomes has tried to rape her and παρθενία has to do with the purity of the body, the heroine might be here reversing the same concept as before: a rival's love leads to the destruction of the body and, thus, is not part of idealistic love.

1.5.5: ἐν πολλῇ ἀθυμίᾳ: this is the first of the many occurrences in which Xen. 'indicates the state of feeling' through 'being in emotion' (Cummings 2009, 171). In addition, in this case 'the emotion itself is conceived of as the container' (ibid.). Similar constructions concern other feelings in the Eph.: φόβος (1.5.6), ὀργή (2.11.2, 3.12.6, 4.6.2), λύπη (3.9.1), πένθος (5.6.2). Although this construction is attested in earlier literature (see Pl. *Rep.* 578e: ἐν ποίῳ ἄν τινι καὶ ὁπόσῳ φόβῳ οἴει γενέσθαι αὐτὸν), 'in the other novels we do not get the combination of ἐν and one of the emotion terms above' (Cummings 2009, 172), apart from three exceptions (Char. 2.4.5 and 6.7.13 and Ach. 5.26.12): since the construction with ἐν is far from being sophisticated, this is a sign of Xen.'s simplicity.

That being said, it is interesting that in this passage this emotion is ascribed to Habrocomes' parents: since ὑπὸ ἀθυμίας καὶ γήρως will be also the motivation for their death (5.6.3 and 5.15.3). Xen. is creating another subtle connection (on the key role of parents in lovesickness, see LI 2.3). Since Lycomede's black cloth in Habrocomes' second dream can be interpreted as a foreshadower of his death (1.12.4: dreams), the present expression might serve the same purpose of creating a connection between the role played by the parents in the first part of the novel and that in the second part.

Finally, if we look at all the other occurrences of ἀθυμία, it is striking how this emotion is never ascribed to Anthia and it concerns mostly Habrocomes, whose ἀθυμία emerges on Corymbus' ship (1.15.1), in prison (2.7.1), after Crisius' tale (3.9.7), twice during his wandering in Sicily (cf. 5.6.1 and 5.10.5) and finally in Rhodes before the reunion with Anthia (where the adverb ἀθύμως has its only occurrence in the whole text, see 5.12.3). The female protagonist is only related with this feeling in the passage where Xen. refers to both protagonists with the adjective ἄθυμοι, before the

pirates' erotic proposal (1.16.1; the other occurrence of this adjective concerns again only Habrocomes, see 3.9.3). Overall, this pattern is another proof of the subtle asymmetry between the protagonists (LI 7.1). Moreover, since ἀθυμία alludes to the lack of θύμος, which metaphorically designates the human spirit and strength, this feeling focused on Habrocomes appears to be the opposite of Anthia's ἀνδρεῖα (LI 4). This strengthens the difference between the protagonists' approach to difficulties.

1.5.5: χρόνου δὲ προϊόντος: this is a durative formula in the *Eph.*, in which 'the lapse of time itself is made the main thing to fill a gap in the narration' (Hägg 1971, 61). For other genitive absolutes which play the same role, cf. 1.10.3, 5.7.1, 5.9.1 and 5.6.1 (with variation). The recurrence of these expressions is another sign of Xen.'s vague time scheme (see NA 3.2).

1.5.6-7: εἰς τέλος εἰσάγουσι παρὰ τὴν Ἀνθίαν μάντεις καὶ ἱερέας [...] ἐκ ὑποχθονίων θεῶν: as Avaert 1948, Schwartz 1985, and Ruiz Montero 2007 suggest, in this description of priests and seers there is an incidental allusion to magic: Xen. is giving here an essential and traditional portrait of magicians.

Before analysing the details, it is worth remembering that in ancient Greece, unlike the contemporary context, a clear dichotomy between magic and religion was missing (see Graf 1991's new criticism about it: 'Frazer introduced a dichotomy, that now is not accepted yet'). As a result, in theory, Xen.'s μάντεις καὶ ἱερέας and their following actions (see: ἔθυόν τε ἱερεῖα καὶ ποικίλα ἐπέσπενδον) could be both a normal act of devotion and a performance of magic. The choice of the second option is strongly suggested by the following expression ἐπέλεγον φωνὰς βαρβαρικάς: as Graf 1991 shows, one of the few peculiar traits of magic is that 'not all its words are understood, or even understandable' (191). Further, ἐπίλεψω is a verb appropriate of the magic lexicon, which means 'utter, pronounce a spell'.

Then, the second strong reference to magic is the presence of τινας δαίμονας and of ὑποχθονίων θεῶν. Instead of the traditional gods, magicians used to invoke a different supernatural world, which 'has a clear hierarchy. [...] At the highest point is the supreme god, the "great name"; below him are the lesser gods, then the (evil) daemons and the helpful angels' (194-5). Among the 'lesser gods', 'the most popular are the καταχθόνιοι θεοί', who, as the gods of the underworld, played a key role in funerary rituals: also Xen. is referring to them, although with a slight different formula, ὑποχθόνιοι θεοί, which is attested only in Char. and in Ps-Apoll. Conversely, τινες δαίμονες is a very typical expression used by Greeks to call this sort of semi-divinities, that 'serve as an intermediary between man and the divine'.

Finally, the presence of the φωνὰς βαρβαρικάς might also fit into this same interpretation: as again Graf explains, the strangeness of most magical words with the fact that 'they derive from Near Eastern languages, especially Egyptian' (Graf 1991, 191). As a result, the epithet βαρβαρικός works well here.

While the presence of the magic is then indisputable, it may appear more difficult to understand why magicians are called to help Anthia: as also Hld.'s Calasiris proves (see LI 2.3), a common use

of magic, which includes amulets, was 'for protection and deliverance from diseases' (Kotansky 1991, 107). Furthermore, the magical papyri contained spells 'which often do not differentiate between the specific ailment afflicting the patient and the daemonic influence held responsible for the disease' (ibid., 117). Thus, from the archaic perspective it is reasonable that Anthia received this visit.

Given this framework, one might wonder whether this episode required Xen. to know magic. The answer is negative, since the presentation of barbaric magicians was a widespread literary motif. The proof of this is given, above all, by Lucian in the *Lover of Lies*, where the narrator criticizes the strange way of curing people that comes from an Egyptian magician: 'τοῦ τε πυρετοῦ καὶ τοῦ οἰδήματος δεδιότος ἢ ὄνομα θεσπέσιον ἢ ῥῆσιν βαρβαρικὴν' (9). Then, the author introduces another Egyptian character, who also speaks in a poor Greek (see 31). In the *Menippus*, instead, the Chaldean Mithrobarzanes makes a sort of incantation: first, he starts an unclear address, ῥῆσίν τινα μακρὰν ἐπιλέγων, then he invokes certain spirits (τινας ἐπικαλεῖσθαι δαίμονας). Finally, he invokes again the spirits (ἀνακραγὼν δαίμονάς τε ὁμοῦ πάντας), 'intermingling a number of foreign-soundings and meaningless words of many syllables' (παραμιγνὺς ἅμα βαρβαρικά τινα καὶ ἄσημα ὀνόματα καὶ πολυσύλλαβα). All these passages show that the description of a foreign magician, who performs similar actions to those of the *Eph.*, was a literary τόπος in an author chronologically close to our novelist.

In addition, Lucian himself owes a debt to previous authors, since in Classical Greece there were already foreign magicians such as Orpheus and Epimenides (at that time, their lands Thracia and Crete were considered as foreign). As a result, Xen.'s knowledge might either depend on his awareness of a common pattern of ancient culture or on a literary reading and one option does not exclude the other.

Finally, some scholars, such as Avaert 1948, suggest when discussing φωνὰς βαρβαρικάς that 'il s'agit sans nul doute de ces Ἐφέσια Γράμματα' which, according to Pausanias the lexicographer (Eust. *Od.* 20, 247, 1864), 'seem to have been written indistinctly on the feet, girdle and crown of Artemis'. Their specific role seemed to be to 'ward off of evil demons' (Arnold 1989, 15). However, the lack of an explicit reference to them and the omission of an Ephesian background in the description of Artemis makes this hypothesis difficult to prove, although not impossible.

1.5.9: ἔκειντο: this is the first occurrence in the novel of κεῖμαι, a verb which is often used by Xen. to describe the state of lying which concerns different characters. Interestingly, in some of the occurrence a particular feeling is expressed, as in the present passage νοσοῦντες reveals the protagonists' state of disease.
- 1.9.1: the protagonists at the beginning of the wedding night; pleasure (ἔκειντο ὑφ'ἡδονῆς, n.);
- 1.10.7: Anthia's parents during the departure scene; lack of spirit (ἔκειντο εἰς γῆν ἀθυμοῦντες, n.);
- 1.11.1: the protagonists after their departure; feelings: a variety (ἔκειντο πολλὰ ἐννοοῦντες, n.);
- 1.13.4: the sailors of the Ephesian ship lie when drunk;
- 1.16.1: the protagonists before the pirates' erotic proposal; lack of spirit (ἔκειντο ἀθυμοί, n.);

- 2.4.5: Anthia having discovered Manto's love for Habrocomes; astonishment (ἔκειτο ἀχανής, n.);
- 3.7.1: Anthia lies in Perilaus' θάλαμος, after having drunk the poison;
- 3.9.3: Habrocomes lies when he refuses to eat at the lunch with Hippothous and his companions;
- 3.10.4: Hippothous and his companions lie when drunk;
- 5.12.4: Leucon and Rhode lie after the recognition of Anthia; astonishment (ἔκεινto ἀχανεῖς).

Since the number of occurrences where a feeling is introduced is sufficiently high, I would argue that Xen. deliberately has chosen this verb to convey the emotions of his characters. That said, only in few cases, like 1.16.1, 2.4.5 and 5.12.4, the physical indication of the lying does not seem to be real and the author seems to adopt a merely metaphorical use. In the other case, instead, both connotations seems to coexist and, as I will show, there are two cases in which the physical indication assumes a clearly erotic meaning (see 1.9.1 and 1.11.1, n.).

1.5.9: πάνυ ἐπισφαλῶς διακείμενοι: this is another formula where διακεῖμαι is used to express a state of emotion. Unlike πονήρως διακεῖμαι (1.3.2), here the physical concern seems to prevail over the moral one, since ἐπισφαλής refers to νόσοι (Hipp. VM 9). In addition, this interpretation is confirmed by the previous participle νοσοῦντες.

1.5.9: τέλος: although the narration from 1.5.5 to the end of the section is full of events, it is striking how, unlike other passages of the novel that are rich in events (see, e.g. 1.11.2), Xen. does not give any chronological indication apart from this expression (for other uses of this or similar particles, see 1.13.4 (τελευταῖον), 2.8.1, 2.11.1, 3.11.4, 3.12.4, 5.9.12). This seems to confirm the particular atemporal framework of this narrative (see NA 4a). At the same time, this passage is exceptional, because it contains a dense sequence of facts which accelerates the narrative rhythm: this invites the readers to reach the end of the episode and this pattern might prepare them to be impressed by the coming oracle.

CHAPTER 6

Resolution of lovesickness, marriage and sex (chapters 6-9)

As is proper of the simplest kinds of fiction, divine intervention occurs when the protagonists' lovesickness has reached its apex and it introduces a quick resolution: this is the function performed by Apollo's oracle, which leads the protagonists to marriage through the mediation of the parents' interpretation. Then, the celebration of the wedding is emphasised by Xen. through other two devices:

     - the only *ekphrasis* of the novel (chapter 8);

     - another intense dialogue between the protagonists (chapter 9).

As in the description of lovesickness, Xen. exploits a good number of erotic motifs and some passages from the eighth and ninth chapters offer a hint of an unusual sophistication, which confirms his good knowledge of erotic literature.

1.6.1: τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ ἐν Κολοφῶνι Ἀπόλλωνος is indisputably 'il santuario a Claro, borgata non lontana dalla città ionica di Colofone' (Borgogno 2005, 394, n. 30) and the fortune of this shrine has always depended on its oracle of Apollo. As Strabo 14.1.27 reports, this oracular centre had a Homeric origin, since Mopsos, grandson of Tiresias and rival of Kalchas, was regarded as its founder. This suggests that it was active 'from very early, probably prehellenic periods' (Parke 1985, 126). A). Nevertheless, the extent and frequency of its activity until the Classical Era seems to have been scarce.

From the Hellenistic Era, instead, the oracle assumed importance, as Alexander moved eastwards the centre of the world: the sanctuary, in fact, together with other Apollo's shrines in Asia, started to 'step into the old traditional functions of the Delphic oracle' (Parke 1967, 123). Later on, in the Imperial Era, Tacitus and Aelius Aristides attest that the oracle 'enjoyed its greatest renown' (Burkert 1985, 114). The former describes Germanicus' visit to the temple in 18 AD (see Tac. *Ann*. 2.54 and Parke 1985, 136), while the latter a personal visit to Colophon in 147 AD. In this year Aristides prayed to Apollo for recovery from his illness and he was answered that Asclepius would cure him (see Aelius Aristides, *Or*. 15, p. 312,5; for the debated issue of the date, see Behr 1986, 62). Finally, over the same period, the oracle's fame made it 'not uncommon for Ephesians to ask there questions' (Cueva 2004, 41): when an earthquake struck in 149 AD, both the people of Ephesus and Smyrne sent an enquiry to Claros (see Aelius Aristides. *Or*. 15, p. 317, 20), because it was then 'a greatly recognised centre for divination' (Parke 1985, 148).

Given this historical context, it would be tempting to conclude that Xen.'s choice of Claros reflects his interest in a contemporary reality, but the poor description made by Xen. does not allow us to accept this. Our author does not mention any local feature of this oracle, such as the secret spring from where 'the priestess drank and chewed the sacred laurel' (Frazer 1957, 80) and he is also silent about the different kinds of officials who were in charge in the second century AD, such as the old priest, the prophet and the singer of oracles. As a result, Xen. does not seem to be interested in

realism of correspondence and his choice of the oracle appears to be the "obvious" consequence of the closeness of Colophon to Ephesus.

That said, Alperowitz 1992, 121-3 offers another interpretation of the choice of this oracle which is exclusively internal: in his view, the presence of Apollo is suitable for the plot of the novel. Since this god is traditionally both healer and guardian of σωφροσύνη, he might share with Eros the desire of taking revenge on Habrocomes. Personally, I would dismiss this theory, because Apollo does not play any active role in the oracle. He simply reveals Eros' action and the protagonists' destiny and, thus, the hypothesis of his hostile action is not acceptable.

1.6.1: σταδίων ὀγδοήκοντα: in Borgogno's (1995, 194, n. 31) view, the indication of the distance is a 'dato pressoché esatto' and it corresponds to '14-15 km' (see Avaert 1948, 28 for the same assessment). Conversely, other scholars do not see this number as evidence for Xen.'s realism: for instance, Lavagnini 1950, 147 believes that this information 'poteva essere facilmente desunta da uno dei tanti peripli o stadiasmi, o da un corrente trattato di geografia'. In my opinion, as in the distance between Ephesus and the temple (1.2.2: n. στάδιοι δέ εἰσιν), this debate cannot be solved. However, this impasse does not affect the interpretation of this passage: Xen. merely aims to introduce a place which was familiar to Greek readers but is not interested in further details.

1.6.2: THE ORACLE OF APOLLO

As Bianchi 2003 clearly illustrates, 'il testo dell'oracolo di Apollo resta uno dei punti più controversi del romanzo, sia sotto il profilo narrativo [...] che testuale' (176, n. 21). Given this importance, I will try to address it from this twofold perspective. As I have already suggested in NA 1.2, Xen. offers a two-level interpretation of this passage, according to which Apollo's words play the role of introducing a polarity between bad and good in the protagonists' life, as well as more precise suggestions on the kind of destiny they are progressively going to face.

Since we are dealing with a special passage, I will start my analysis by writing the text of the oracle: while the Greek is a personal adaptation from O'Sullivan's edition 2005, the translation is mine.

Τίπτε ποθεῖτε μαθεῖν νούσου τέλος ἠδὲ καὶ ἀρχήν; (1)
ἀμφοτέρους μία νοῦσος ἔχει, λύσις ἔνθεν ἀνέστη.
δεινὰ δ' ὁρῶ τοῖσδεσσι πάθη καὶ ἀνήνυτα ἔργα·
ἀμφότεροι φεύξονται ὑπεὶρ ἅλα λυσσοδίωκτοι, (4)
δεσμὰ δὲ μοχθήσουσι παρ' ἀνδράσι μιξοθαλάσσοις
καὶ τάφος ἀμφοτέροις θάλαμος καὶ πῦρ ἀΐδηλον.
Ἀλλ' ἔτι που μετὰ πήματ' ἀρείονα πότμον ἔχουσι (7)
καὶ ποταμοῦ ἱεροῦ παρὰ ῥεύμασιν Ἴσιδι σεμνῇ
σωτείρῃ μετόπισθε στήσουσ' ὄλβια δῶρα.

'Why do you long to discover the end and the start of this illness? (1)

Both one disease affects, and its cure will come from where it arose.

Terrible sufferings I see for them and endless toils;

both will take flight over the sea "madness-pursued"; (4)

they will bear chains at the hands of men "mingled-with-sea",

and for both the tomb will be the nuptial chamber and both will be destroyed by fire.

Yet in time, after their sufferings, they will fulfill a better destiny, (7)

and thereafter, alongside the streams of the sacred river,

they will offer rich gifts to august Isis, the Saviour goddess.'

1) The first interpretation: the oracle of Apollo as a basic prolepsis

a) A simple structure: polarity of bad and good

Overall, Apollo's verses clearly divide into three parts: after the introductory question, the second verse describes the easy remedy which can cure the protagonists' disease. While I will later focus on this point, I would only emphasise here that the oracle has a positive beginning. Then, the following section, which runs from verse 3 to 6, introduces 'the hardship of the journey'. Finally, the last three verses focus on the 'happy destiny'. As a result, the oracle describes a sequence of three clear elements, in which the whole protagonists' life is illustrated as a passage from "good" to "bad", with a final return to "good".

b) An imitation of a standard Greek oracle

In Ancient Greece the biggest and most famous tradition of oracles is the Delphic. Since there are many reasons why Apollo's response is very close to this, Xen. is certainly introducing a standard type of oracle: this confirms the simplicity of this passage.

To begin with, Delphic oracles have typically an epic meter and language: as this poetry usually gives words to divine characters, ancient Greeks decided to emphasise through it the supernatural origin of oracles. For this reason, also those that were pronounced in prose were then recorded in verse. Overall, Xen.'s oracle fits well into this framework. First, it contains nine hexameters, with a high priority of dactyls over spondees, which is a further sign of epic characterisation:

1: ddsdds, 2: dddddt, 3: dsdddt, 4: dsddds, 5: dsddds, 6: dddsdt, 7: dddddt, 8: dsddds, 9: sddsdt. Only the last hexameter constitutes an exception, because it starts with two spondees and two dactyls. This slowing down of the rhythm places an emphasis on the adjective σωτείρη and, thus, stresses the importance of Isis, whose role in the oracle will be shortly discussed.

Second, also the vocabulary of the oracle is inspired by epic: as Bianchi 2003, 176-7 argues, 'una coloritura solenne ed epica è intenzionalmente conferita dal romanziere a questi versi oracolari', as the Homeric words τίπτε, τοῖσδεσσι, ὑπεὶρ, ἀλλ'ἔτι που and πῦρ ἀίδηλον prove. In addition, Delphic oracles are characterized by a 'linguistic simplicity, an artistic quality, a frequently

deliberated pursuit of lexical ambiguity and the cleverness proper of epigrams' (Parke 1985,). Interestingly, each of these elements occurs in Xenophon's verses: the second emerges in pictorial images like ἀνέστη and πῦρ ἀΐδηλον, while the third in the two ἅπαξ λεγόμενα λυσσοδίωκτοι (line 4) and μιξοθαλάσσοις (line 5).

Finally, form, occasion and topic confirm the belonging of the oracle to the Delphic tradition. According to Fontenrose 1978, at Delphi responses can be classified into five categories: simple commands and instructions, conditioned commands, prohibitions and warnings, statements of past or present facts and simple statements of future events. Xen.'s piece clearly belongs to the last type and, particularly, to its sub-category of 'ambiguous and obscure predictions'.

While this link between our oracle and Delphi is not surprising, it is more relevant that the same correspondence is missing at Claros. As Oesterheld 2008, 571-577 reports, in this city most of the responses concern 'Krisensituationen der Polis', 'Res Publicae' and 'Res divinae', while 'Res Domesticae' as in Xen.'s case are missing. The only exceptions are the afore-mentioned requests made by Aelius Aristides (see Klaros 21 in Oesterheld 2008, 574), where the issue of disease is addressed. Then Oenomaus reports his enquiry to Apollo at Claros about his activity as a merchant, where he is disappointed by receiving a stock answer. Given this framework, the impression that Xen. is following the Delphian tradition obtains confirmation.

c) A simple function

A last feature of this simplicity is revealed by the basic function of the oracle, which I have already explained in <u>NA</u> 1.2: Apollo's words are a motivator of the plot and foretell the bad and good which the protagonists will experience (for more, see 1.7.4 n.: παντὸς δεινοῦ [...] ἡ φυγὴ [...] αἱ συμφοραὶ [...] τῶν ἐσομένων κακῶν).

2) <u>Philological analysis as the prelude to second interpretation</u>

After this first analysis of the text, I will now focus on some of the philological difficulties. This task here appears to be more complicated than in the other parts of the novel, because of the lexical obscurity typical of oracles. Overall, it seems to me that with a traditional approach some issues remain unclear. For this reason, I will suggest a new level of interpretation at the end of this section.

- Line 2: λύσις ἔνθεν ἔνεστι

This passage is quite important, because it describes the protagonists' liberation from lovesickness. Its last verb has been discussed: while F has ἀνέστη, since Hemsterhuius scholars have been sceptical on this reading and new ones have been offered: while Abresch 1745 proposes ἀνυστή, Zimmerman 1949-50 ἄμ'ἔσται and O'Sullivan 2005 suggests ἔνεστι.

Personally, I am satisfied with none of these readings. The first adjective, which means 'practicable' (*LSJ*), cannot be the correct form, because ἀνυστός has only two endings in Greek literature and this would be the only case where the feminine is attested. Similarly, the second expression is quite simple and does not fit well into an epic context like this. Finally, a similar

conclusion concerns O'Sullivan's ἔνεστι: as Capra 2007/2008, 17 notes, this verb belongs to a prose style.

Conversely, 'ἔνθεν (περ) ἀνέστη é formula omerica e da Omero utilizzata [...] sempre in fine verso' (Bianchi 2003, 176): these two words appear together only in the *Iliad* and in the *Odyssey* (cf. *Il.* 24.597, *Od.* 5.195, 18.157, 21.139, 166, 243, 392 and 23.164). Moreover, as the whole oracle has a clearly epic background, the obedience to F appears the most likely hypothesis. Further, I would not consider an obstacle the presence of the aorist: Griffiths 1978 argues that 'it expresses a well-established truth' (413, n. 10), but, personally, I would prefer to emphasise its aspectual connotation: Apollo would be saying that the cure from the disease comes unexpectedly.

Having clarified this first word, ἀνέστη, which means 'arise', has to be connected with λύσις ἔνθεν. This task, however, is easier: the pronoun in Homer always has a relative function and means 'from where'. Consequently, I would argue that there might be an implied genitive (τῆς νούσου) and predicate (ἔσται) before λύσις, which leads to the translation: 'its cure (of the disease) will come from where it arose'. Conversely, I would not accept the translation of ἔνθεν as an indefinite pronoun, which would relate it to λύσις ('the cure from the disease arises'), because this second use is not attested in Homer.

As a result of this interpretation, this verse of the oracle is revealed to contain the famous motif that "love is the only remedy for love", which has many parallels in ancient literature (see table 2 and 3 in LI 2.3; see also Goldhill 1995, 21: 'The failing search for a φάρμακον for desire is a τόπος of Hellenistic poetry'). The closest passage comes from *Callirhoe*, when Artaxerses reminds Mithridates of the oracle of Telephus, which contains the same motif: Φάρμακον γὰρ Ἔρωτος οὐδέν ἐστι πλὴν αὐτὸς ὁ ἐρώμενος· τοῦτο δὲ ἄρα καὶ τὸ ᾀδόμενον λόγιον ἦν ὅτι ὁ τρώσας αὐτὸς ἰάσεται (6.3.7). In conclusion, Xen. is suggesting here that Eros is both the origin and the end of the protagonists' lovesickness. That said, there is more to discover about the role of the god in the whole oracle.

- Line 4: λυσσοδίωκτοι

Only Dalmeyda 1926 substitutes λυσσοδίωκτοι with ληστοδίωκτοι, whose meaning is "followed by pirates or robbers". However, the presence of μιξοθαλάσσοις in the following line makes this variant less plausible: as it is composed of μείγνυμι and θάλασσα, this adjective is appropriate for pirates, because these people spend all their life at sea. Thus, a duplication of the same expression here is not likely.

- Line 5: δεσμὰ

As O'Sullivan 2005 explains in his critical apparatus, the presence of a δεινὰ here in F is a mistake due to the occurrence of the same adjective two verses before. The correction in δεσμὰ is strongly suggested by the presence of this noun in the questions asked by the protagonists' parents in the following chapter: οὔτε τίνα τὰ δεσμὰ (Eph. 1.7.1 n.: οὔτε γὰρ τίς and Zimmermann 1949-50, 257).

- Lines 7-9: the sequence of verbs

Along with these 'minor' points, the main philological difficulty concerns the last three verses. O'Sullivan 2005 introduces them in a sequence which is different from Dalmeyda 1926 and Papanikolau 1973, who instead follow the manuscript: like Merkelbach 1962, O'Sullivan 2005 transposes verses 7-8 of F to the end of the oracle. The reason for this shift is that 'the offering of gifts would naturally follow the attainment of a better fortune, and 'v. 9 (Ms.) "But after their woes" must follow directly on the catalogue of woes in vv. 3-6' (O' Sullivan 1994, 21, n. 3).

In my opinion, these arguments are not persuasive, because not every offering of gift is a thanksgiving. It can rather be a supplication to gods and require a sacrifice to reach the place where the divine presence is worshipped. For this reason, the order of the verses is still a controversial issue. Since Zimmermann's solution 1949-50 of expunging the verses 6-8 is quite radical, I would explore them further before accepting it.

- Line 8: Νείλου

As Morgan 2007a, 461 argues, 'the reference to the Nile is clearly a corruption, since in the next chapter the parents ask which river the oracle meant': consequently, I prefer to follow Locella 1796 and Henderson 2009 with ἱεροῦ. The only way to accept Νείλου is to assume that protagonists' parents were ignorant of the Egyptian river, but this is implausible in the Imperial Era.

That said, one might argue that the fathers' question is still too banal, since the holy river where Isis is worshipped is evidently the Nile and Xen. seems to want the readers to think of an Egyptian location. For this reason, Merkelbach 1962 decides to substitute Ἴσιδι in δαίμονι and attributes this change to the writer of the *Heliosredaktion*, who aimed at omitting Isis from the novel. However, since this theory has no solid foundation (AIM), I would prefer to accept the substitution of Νείλου with ἱεροῦ and I would speculate that the reason for the parents' questions might be a sincere lack of understanding of the geographical indication, which could be the consequence either of real ignorance or of temporary confusion due to their emotional reaction.

At the same time, I believe that Merkelbach's real contribution 1962 is to show that the final part of the oracle is difficult to interpret because Egypt is not mentioned at the end of the Eph. (see also Ruiz Montero's question 1994, 1098: 'Warum spricht es vom Nil, wenn das Wiedersehen der Helden in Rhodos stattfindet (V 13, 2), wenn auch neben dem Tempel der Isis, der von Apollon genannten Göttin?'): this omission invites our interpretation. Similarly, also the significance of the final gifts has still to be understood.

- Line 9: παριστᾶσ':

As O'Sullivan 1994, 21, n.3 explicitly declares, the form of F παραστῆς 'has no sense here', because the presence of a second person singular does not make sense. Similarly, the aorist subjunctive is not acceptable: although Griffiths 1978, 415, argues that this particular mood in Hellenistic Greek 'has the sense of an imperative', the presence of an order here would break the register of the whole passage. Therefore, both O'Sullivan 2005 and Henderson 2009 introduce a simple indicative present παριστᾶς', which refers to the protagonists and fits better into the context. Borgogno 2005 proposes instead παρίστασθ', as if the parents were making their offering, but we

would need to change the person of the other verbs of the passage to accept this variant: in this respect, παριστᾶς’ is more plausible.

That said, I believe that in O'Sullivan's reading 2005 the lack of a future is a problem, since we are dealing with an action which clearly looks forwards. While in an expression such as πότμον ἔχουσι the chronological perspective is included in its meaning, the same pattern does not concern παρίστημι. For this reason, I would introduce the future and, in order to fit the new form into the hexameter, I would eliminate the prefix: both στήσοντ’ or στήσουσ’ are acceptable.

3) The start of a new interpretation: Apollo's oracle as a foreshadower of events of the novel

The interpretation of the oracle thus far offered has failed to explain its most controversial issues. This might be the sign that Xen. is constructing the oracle in a more complicated way than the other prolepses of his text. As I have already suggested (NA 1.2), the emergence of another level of complexity is initiated by the reaction of the protagonists' parents to the oracle. Their list of questions indicates that Xen. might be using the different parts of his prolepsis as foreshadowers of episodes of the novel.

If we look for correspondences between the oracle and the whole Eph., important answers emerge, along with some difficulties:

Table 3.1: The correspondences between the oracle and the events of the *Ephesiaca*

Line	Events of the plot foreshadowed	Open difficulties
4: φεύξονται ὑπεὶρ ἅλα λυσσοδίωκτοι	Corymbus' attack (1.13.2: διέγνωσαν οὖν ἐπιθέμενοι τοὺς μὲν ἀντιμαχομένους ἀποκτιννύειν).	λυσσοδίωκτοι: λύσσα might be Ἔρως.
5: δέσμα [...] παρ’ἀνδράσι μιξοθαλάσσοις	- Habrocomes' imprisonment by Apsyrtus in Tyrus (2.6.4: προσῆγεν αὐτῷ καὶ δεσμὰ φοβερὰ). - Anthia is put in chains by Rhaenea and given to Clytus, with the order to sell her to a pimp (5.5.4: ἀπέκειρε τὴν κόμην αὐτῆς καὶ δεσμὰ περιτίθησι).	παρ’ἀνδράσι μιξοθαλάσσοις: who is this expression referring to? Moreover, in these two events the agents of the imprisonment are not men of the sea.
6: τάφος θάλαμος	During Anthia's *Scheintod* in Tarsus, Perilaus exclaims: εἰς οἷόν σε θάλαμον τὸν τάφον ἄξομεν (3.7.2).	- The syntactical structure of this line is ambiguous: which is the subject between τάφος and θάλαμος? - This expression centres only on Anthia.

Line	Events of the plot foreshadowed	Open difficulties
6: πῦρ ἄϊδηλον	- Corymbus' fire against the protagonists' ship (1.14.1: ἐνέπρησε τὴν ναῦν, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ πάντες κατεφλέχθησαν). This connection is encouraged by two Iliadic occurrences (see below). - Apsyrtus also uses the fire against Habrocomes (2.6.4: προσῆγεν αὐτῷ [...] πῦρ). - The governor of Egypt builds a pyre to destroy Habrocomes' body, but the Nile saves the hero (4.2.8: τὸ πῦρ ὑπετέθειτο).	- The syntactical structure of this line is ambiguous: does ἀμφοτέροις also refer to πῦρ ἄϊδηλον? - In the novel fire does not harm the protagonists, apart from the second episode, in which, however, chains are a more violent instrument of torture.
7: ἀρείονα πότμον	Happy ending in Ephesus: 5.15.3: καὶ αὐτοὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ διῆγον ἑορτὴν ἄγοντες τὸν μετ᾿ἀλλήλων βίον [...]	As I have already argued, Xen. is referring to Egypt. The connection between this location and the novel is missing.
8-9: παρὰ ῥεύμασιν [...] Ἴσιδι [...] ὄλβια δῶρα	-Protagonists' act of thanksgiving in Rhodes to Isis: 5.13.4-5: οἱ δὲ ἀναλαβόντες ἑαυτούς, διαναστάντες εἰς τὸ τῆς Ἴσιδος ἱερὸν εἰσῆλθον [...], προεκυλίοντό τε τοῦ τεμένους καὶ τῷ βωμῷ προσέπιπτον; - Anthia twice prays to Isis in the novel (4.3.3-4, 4.4.6).	Along with the persistent problem of the Egyptian location, sacrifices are missing in Anthia's prayers and do not occur at the end of the story.

- Overall, the first link seems to work: line 4 suggests a 'forced sea journey with pursuers' and the only parallel in the novel appears to be Corymbus' episode. The controversial point here is λυσσοδίωκτοι: according to Zimmermann 1949-50, λύσσα might be the punishing divinity Ἔρως. Personally, this interpretation seems acceptable, since in Plato's *Phaedrus* the lover's longing for his beloved is described as a man who λυσσᾷ (251d6: ἐκ δὲ ἀμφοτέρων μεμειγμένων ἀδημονεῖ τε τῇ ἀτοπίᾳ τοῦ πάθους καὶ ἀποροῦσα λυττᾷ) and this passage is part of the three chapters of the dialogue which Xen. seems to know very well (LI 7.2). Since Corymbus and Euxinus are also the first erotic rivals of the protagonists, this adjective is a plausible foreshadower of this action.

- In line 5 the word δεσμά, "chains", recalls Apsyrtus' imprisonment in Tyrus and Anthia's one by Rhenaea. The first seems more significant, because Habrocomes is then sent to prison and in this episode the role of chains is more stressed and has a Platonic colour (<u>LI</u> 7.4a). In addition, since Anthia visits Habrocomes in prison and embraces his chains to share his condition, this episode might correspond to Apollo's attribution of this torture to both characters.

a) The controversial sixth verse

With this verse the difficulty becomes greater: along with the ambiguous textual construction, the only parallel in the novel for τάφος θάλαμος seems to be Anthia's wedding in Perilaus' house, in which Habrocomes is not included. Conversely, the multiple occurrences of fire in the novel opens a question about what Xen. is alluding to by πῦρ ἄϊδηλον. In order to shed more light on both terms, I will explore them separately.

- *v. 6: τάφος θάλαμος*

With this expression Xen. introduces into his text a τόπος which is typical of the genre, the coincidence of tomb and chamber of marriage . This motif is often explored in relation to the *Scheintod*, the apparent death (see Letoublon 1993, 74-78 for its status of novelistic τόπος), and this connection occurs in the Eph. In the third book, Anthia "dies" in Tarsus (3.6.5) and Perilaus expresses his desperation by saying: εἰς οἷόν σε θάλαμον τὸν τάφον ἄξομεν.

As I have already suggested, this episode appears to be a good parallel of the oracle. On the one hand, since Xen. expresses there the idea that the grave is the nuptial bed, I would be tempted to consider τάφος as a subject also in the oracle. This possibility is supported by the fact that marriage is already alluded to by Apollo in the second verse and since the oracle refers here to a later stage of the protagonists' life, it is more likely that a new issue such as τάφος is being addressed. On the other hand, since throughout the whole novel the protagonists focus on burial and death as the only way to maintain their relationship (<u>LI</u> 5.3), τάφος θάλαμος seems to have more than one resonance in the text. This element is interesting, because it might affect our search for links in the novel. However, it is still unclear whether this expression might refer to specific episodes of the novel.

- *Appendix: the origin of this motif*

To begin with, the motif of the coincidence of tomb and θάλαμος has some occurrences in the novels:

- Char. 1.13.8: in his attempt to comfort Calliroe, Theron pretends to be the one who saved her from the grave: ἀνύβριστον ἀπολήψεταί σε Χαιρέας, ὡς ἐκ θαλάμου τοῦ τάφου σωθεῖσαν δι'ἡμᾶς.

- Ach. 1.13.5: Charicles' father mourns his son's death, which is real in this case, by saying: Τάφος μέν σοι, τέκνον, ὁ θάλαμος.

At the same time, there is also a variation in this motif according to which θάλαμος and τάφος are seen in contrast:

- Char. 3.10.8: Callirhoe imagines that Chaereas is dead and that his parents are preparing a nuptial bed in vain: κοσμεῖται δὲ θάλαμος οἷς ἴδιος οὐδὲ τάφος ὑπάρχει.

- Hld. 2.29.4: Charicles tells the unhappy story of his daughter, who died on her wedding night because a fire broke out in her chamber: ἀπὸ τῶν παστάδων ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμα παρεπέμπετο.

Overall, none of these passages is particularly close to that of Xen: this suggests that our author is simply exploiting a motif without intertexting and the same conclusion comes from the analysis of models prior to the novels:

- *Od*. 20.307: Telemachus rebukes Ctesippus by saying that, if he had hit Odysseus, his father could have been killed: ἀντὶ γάμοιο πατὴρ τάφον ἀμφεπονεῖτο ἐνθάδε.

- In Sophocles' *Antigone* the heroine defines herself as Acheron's bride (816: Ἀχέροντι νυμφεύσω) and she then refers to her τύμβος as a νυμφεῖον (ibid., 891).

- In Euripides' *Alcestis* Admetus' wife addresses her bed before dying: Ὦ λέκτρον, [...] χαῖρ'· οὐ γὰρ ἐχθαίρω σ'· ἀπώλεσας δέ με μόνον (177; 179-180).

- Finally, the occurrences in the *Anthologia Palatina* are numerous and come essentially from writers of the Hellenistic Era. A case in point is the epigram written by Anyte in the third century BC: Ἀντί τοι εὐλεχέος θαλάμου σεμνῶν θ'ὑμεναίων μάτηρ στῆσε τάφῳ τῷδ'ἐπὶ μαρμαρίνῳ παρθενικάν [...] (AP 7.649.1-3). However, since, as Szepessy 1972 argues, this τόπος 'becomes an independent literary theme in Greek epigram poetry only in the beginning of the Hellenistic Age' (355), it is likely that Xen. is exploiting the motif and not recalling a precise text.

In conclusion, Xen. is not here intertexting with any specific author. That said, since *Alcestis* is a play which he had in his mind (APP 4.2), it is not unthinkable that the sacrifice of this heroine was in the mind of our author.

- *v.6: πῦρ ἀίδηλον*

This formula is Iliadic and occurs in two similes to designate the destructive power of the Achaean soldiers and of Agamemnon (*Il*. 2.455 and 11.155), while it also appears in *Il*. 9.436 in a description of the fire used by Hector to destroy the Achaeans' ships. As a result, this formula is not focused on a particular hero, but it generally expresses the destructive action of war. After Homer, πῦρ ἀίδηλον is used only by Empedocles in a fragment about the recognition of similar things (ὀπώπαμεν πυρὶ πῦρ ἀίδηλον, fr. 109.8) and which is quoted by different authors, such as Aristotle, Posidonius, Galen and Sextus Empiricus (see Arist. *De an*. 404b, *Metaph*. 1000b; Posidon. fr. 395b, 461; Gal. *De placitis Hippocratis et Platonis*, 7.5.48; S.E. *M*., 1.303, 7.121 and 7.92). Although their number is significant, the philosophical context does not suit well our novelist. In addition, as Empedocles is an author of the fifth century BC, it is not unlikely that he borrowed this expression from Homer. Therefore, the epic origin of this formula can be accepted.

This discovery is significant: as I have already suggested in LI 6.5, πῦρ ἀίδηλον appears to be part of Xen.'s erotic exploitation of the *Iliad* and might share the role of metaphor for the destructive power of Eros (1.3.4 n.: ὁ ἔρως ἐν αὐτοῖς) with λύσσα (1.12.4. n.: dream) and Corymbus' fire (1.14.1 n: ἐνέπρησε τὴν ναῦν). In my opinion, the emergence of this subtle meaning might simplify the interpretation of the whole line: since there are moments in the protagonists' relationship in which the grave is the only space for love, πῦρ ἀίδηλον might be another predicative of τάφος. That

said, however, the incidences of fires and loves in the Eph. are numerous and, thus, the search for correspondences between this expression and the whole novel is still incomplete.

The conclusion of this analysis is twofold: on the one hand, the discovery of some links allows me to confirm that the oracle has a peculiar proleptic function. On the other hand, the interpretation of the connections is complex: although this might depend on Xenophon's intentional ambiguity, there are some further hints that suggest another option. It is at this point that the possibility of an intertext begins to enter this argumentation.

4) The intertextual approach: Tiresias' prophecy as Xenophon's model
As I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, Strabo informs us that the oracle of Apollo Claros has its mythological founder in Tiresias:

Εἶτα [...] ἡ Κολοφὼν πόλις Ἰωνικὴ καὶ τὸ πρὸ αὐτῆς ἄλσος τοῦ Κλαρίου Ἀπόλλωνος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ μαντεῖόν ἐστι παλαιόν. λέγεται δὲ Κάλχας ὁ μάντις μετ' Ἀμφιλόχου τοῦ Ἀμφιαράου κατὰ τὴν ἐκ Τροίας ἐπάνοδον πεζῇ δεῦρο ἀφικέσθαι, περιτυχὼν δ' ἑαυτοῦ κρείττονι μάντει κατὰ τὴν Κλάρον, Μόψῳ τῷ Μαντοῦς τῆς Τειρεσίου θυγατρός, διὰ λύπην ἀποθανεῖν (Str. 14.1.27).

Since 'this legend provided a pedigree for the prophets of Claros' (Parke 1985, 11), it is likely that it was known in the Imperial Era, where the fame of epic characters was widespread. Furthermore, our novelist's adoption of the name of Manto, Tiresias' daughter, supports this interpretation. If we combine this original element with Xen.'s general focus on the *Odyssey*, an interesting hypothesis seems to emerge: Apollo's oracle might have the Odyssean prophecy of Tiresias as its model. The plausibility of this idea is supported by the parallel analysis of the two texts.
To begin with, Apollo's oracle has three Homeric signals:
- δεινὰ πάθη ('terrible sufferings'; see LI 6.4);
- a similar sign emerges in ἤμελλόν τε γὰρ ἄλλην ὄψεσθαι γῆν καὶ ἄλλας πόλεις (see again LI 6.4);
- the third expression is even more significant: in Greek literature ἀνήνυτα ἔργα occurs only four times in the singular form and in two of these it refers to Penelope's toil with the loom. This suggests that Xen. might be here associating the protagonists' fatigue with that of Odysseus' wife. The first reference is in Plato's *Phaedo*, in which the philosopher's restraint from pleasures is compared to Penelope's endless toil:

ἀλλ' οὕτω λογίσαιτ' ἂν ψυχὴ ἀνδρὸς φιλοσόφου, καὶ οὐκ ἂν οἰηθείη τὴν μὲν φιλοσοφίαν χρῆναι αὐτὴν λύειν, λυούσης δὲ ἐκείνης, αὐτὴν παραδιδόναι ταῖς ἡδοναῖς καὶ λύπαις ἑαυτὴν πάλιν αὖ ἐγκαταδεῖν καὶ ἀνήνυτον ἔργον πράττειν Πηνελόπης τινὰ ἐναντίως ἱστὸν μεταχειριζομένης ἀνήνυτον ἔργον πράττειν Πηνελόπης τινὰ ἐναντίως ἱστὸν μεταχειριζομένης, [...] (*Phaedo* 84a2-6).

Conversely, in the last occurrence of ἀνήνυτα ἔργα Lucian uses the same image to describe the hardship of being a teacher of philosophy in a context in which the immorality of Cynics sheds a negative light on this discipline:

Οἱ ἰδιῶται δὲ ταῦτα ὁρῶντες καταπτύουσιν ἤδη φιλοσοφίας καὶ ἄπαντας εἶναι τοιούτους οἴονται κἀμὲ τῆς διδασκαλίας αἰτιῶνται, ὥστε πολλοῦ ἤδη χρόνου ἀδύνατόν μοι γεγένηται κἂν ἕνα τινὰ προσαγαγέσθαι αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ τὸ τῆς Πηνελόπης ἐκεῖνο πάσχω· ὁπόσον γὰρ δὴ ἐγὼ ἐξυφήνω, τοῦτο ἐν ἀκαρεῖ αὖθις ἀναλύεται. ἡ Ἀμαθία δὲ καὶ ἡ Ἀδικία ἐπιγελῶσιν, ὁρῶσαι ἀνεξέργαστον ἡμῖν τὸ ἔργον καὶ ἀνήνυτον τὸν πόνον (Lucian, *The Runaways* 21).

In this passage the expression is slightly different, because ἀνήνυτον refers to πόνον, but the context is Homeric. Due to these two occurrences, Xen. might be alluding to Penelope's stratagem with this formula.
At the same time, ἀνήνυτον ἔργον occurs also in Plato's *Sophist* and in Zenobius, a sophist of the second century AD, without a reference to Penelope. In the former work this Homeric image is used to describe the philosopher's attempt to find where false opinion and discourse lie.

Κατανοεῖς οὖν ὅτι πρότερον ηὑρέθη ψευδὴς δόξα καὶ λόγος ἢ κατὰ τὴν προσδοκίαν ἣν ἐφοβήθημεν ἄρτι, μὴ παντάπασιν ἀνήνυτον ἔργον ἐπιβαλλοίμεθα ζητοῦντες αὐτό; (Plato, *Soph*. 264b).

In the latter, Zenobius describes the meaning of the colloquial expression Αἰθίοπα σμήχων:
Αἰθίοπα σμήχων· ἐπὶ τῶν μάτην ἀνήνυτον ἔργον ἐπιτελούντων (Zen. *Epitome collectionum Lucilli Tarrhaei et Didymi*, Centuria 1 section 46).

Overall, the presence of these two last occurrences does not seem to contradict our hypothesis. First, the *Phaedo*, unlike the *Sophist*, was surely read in the Imperial schools and, therefore, it is more likely that Xen. knew the latter than the former. In addition, in these two dialogues Penelope's model is used in a similar way; thus, in the *Sophist* Plato might also have this image in mind. Second, although Zenobius makes a list of sayings, his use of ἀνήνυτα ἔργα is part of the explanation and therefore, as a sophist, he might be alluding to Plato too.
The discovery of this connection is very important: Apollo seems to compare the protagonists' journey with Penelope's fatigue and this recalls the last scene of the novel, where her battles against the suitors have a similar recognition (LI 6.2).

In my opinion, if we consider together this Homeric framework, the hypothesis that Tiresias' prophecy was the model of Xen.'s response obtains a first confirmation. Greater evidence is then offered by the close comparison between the two texts. First, their function is identical: Tiresias' prophecy describes the main sequences of Odysseus' life and, thus, it provides unity to the whole poem, as Xen.'s oracle does in the Eph. Second, if we look at the structure of Tiresias' speech, it has close similarities with Apollo's words:

Tiresias' prophecy: structure
- Apostrophe to Odysseus (100);
- Poseidon's wrath (100-3);
- Odysseus' misadventures (104-115a);
- First return, with fight against the suitors (115b-120);
- New departure from Ithaca: Odysseus' voyage inland to sacrifice to Poseidon (121-132);
- Odysseus' second return to Ithaca (132-134a);
- Odysseus's achievement of a happy destiny (136: γήρᾳ ὕπο λιπαρῷ) and of an easy death (γήρᾳ ὕπο λιπαρῷ) in Ithaca (134b-137).

- *The structure of Apollo's oracle as a reflection of that of Tiresias' prophecy:*
- Apostrophe to the fathers (line 1);
- Eros is the only remedy (line 2);
- Misadventures and fights with suitors (ἀνήνυτα ἔργα) (lines 3-6);
- Achievement of a happy outcome (line 7);
- Voyage to sacrifice to Isis (lines 8-9).

Overall, there is a good number of similarities: the only differences between the two structures lie in the absence in the Eph. of the first return home and in the different order, following O' Sullivan's text 2005, of sacrifice and happy destiny. In addition, there are two possible textual links. First, Xen.'s ἀνδράσι μιξοθαλάσσοις might recall Tiresias' reference to those men who οὐδὲ ἄλεσσι μεμιγμένον εἶδαρ ἔδουσιν (*Od*. 11.122-123), since the ἅπαξ μιξοθαλάσσοις might be considered as a calque of ἄλεσσι μεμιγμένον. In fact, μεμιγμένον and μιξο- are cognates, while θαλάσσοις can be also translated as "sea-water" and, therefore, is not far from ἅλς, which means "salt" in the plural. The second textual echo emerges in the final night spent by Odysseus with Penelope: after the former's repetition of Tiresias' prophecy, the latter defines his happy destiny as a γῆρας [...] ἄρειον (*Od*. 23.286-7), which contains the same adjective used by Xen. for πότμον.

This sharing of the same function, structure and textual parallels between Tiresias' prophecy and Apollo's oracle makes me conclude that the former is the hypotext of the latter. This notion is quite promising: in the *Odyssey* the adventures of the hero correspond in nature and sequence to the events described in the prophecy:

1) Helius' cattle (104-15a) >> Od. 12.260-446: Odysseus tells the episode;
2) Allusion to Calypso (114: ὀψὲ) >> Od. 12.447-453: Odysseus' brief mention;
3) Allusion to Phaecians (115: νηὸς ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίης) >> Od. 13.1 ff.: the scene of the poem is again set in Scheria.

As a result, Tiresias' prophecy might help us to solve the controversial points of Xen.'s oracle.

5) The Odyssean interpretation of the oracle: the oracle at the core of the structure of the novel

To begin with, this intertextual parallel seems to shed new light on the text itself: it becomes possible that Eros' role, like that of Poseidon, might be related to the whole oracle. This conclusion is important, as it confirms our "erotic" interpretation of ἀνήνυτα ἔργα and λυσσωδίωκτοι and invites to extend it further. In addition, the dispute about the order of the final verses seems to find its solution here: F might be correct in making the sacrifice precede the happy destiny, as the same sequence characterises Odysseus' life. O'Sullivan 1994, 21, n. 3 could object to this that the presence of καὶ and ἀλλὰ then becomes inconsistent, but, since Odysseus' sacrifice to Poseidon is part of his fatigue, also that of the characters might have the same value. Therefore, only the happy outcome in the final verse would deserve an ἀλλὰ to mark a difference.

As a second step, we should find out whether Tiresias' prophecy can clarify the connections between Apollo's oracle and the events of the novel. The test of this possibility is quite simple, since the fourth line of the divine response is linked with Corymbus' attack. If we look more carefully at this episode, something unexpected is discovered. As I will demonstrate in 1.12.3-1.14.1 n., Xen. is subtly presenting Corymbus episode as a double of that of the Oxen of the Sun. The reason why this parallel is significant is that just at its beginning Xen. interprets the drunkenness of Habrocomes' companions as ἀρχὴ τῶν μεμαντευμένων (1.12.3). Since the Oxen of the Sun episode is the first event foretold by Tiresias, the construction of the scene of the Eph. accords with the following web of associations:

Part of Xen.'s oracle	Event foreshadowed	Part of Tiresias' pro-phecy	Episode of the *Odyssey*
3: φεύξονται ὑπεὶρ ἄλα	Corymbus' attack	Helius' cattle (104-15a)	Oxens of the Sun

This table shows how deeply Xen. is using Tiresias' prophecy to build the structure of the novel: he does not only draw from the seer's words, but also from the Odyssean episode which correspond to these. This leads us to test whether the same combination characterises other connections and the answer seems to be positive.

In the *Odyssey*, after the Oxen of the Sun episode the Homeric seer alludes with ὀψὲ κακῶς to the Calypso episode, which then immediately appears in Odysseus' narration. Interestingly, in my previous interpretation of line 4 I have suggested that the final word λυσσοδίωκτοι might refer to the pirates' later erotic attempt. Since in Corymbus' proposal of love there is an echo of Calypso (1.16.4-5: εὐδαιμοσύνην), the parallel construction seems to be continuing: Xen. again recalls the double Odyssean combination of prophecy and related event.

Then, the third item introduced by Tiresias is the Phaeacian foreign ship and Scheria becomes again the scene of the poem in the thirteenth book. Similarly, Xen.s fifth line is connected with Apsyrtus'

imprisonment and, on further investigation, we find that the episode in which this event occurs is constructed by the novelist as a Phaeacian episode (<u>APP</u> 1.1). Finally, this sort of "game" becomes more complicated when Tiresias describes Odysseus' battle against the suitors in Ithaca, which constitutes the last big sequence of the poem, because Xen.'s sixth line does not contain a return home. However, the aforementioned issue of burial as the only place where fidelity and love can last works well in parallel with Odysseus' suitors, since erotic rivals are those characters who make our protagonists in the Eph. think of suicide. This analysis suggests an unexpected conclusion: Tiresias' prophecy appears to be the model not only of the text of Apollo's oracle, but also of the way in which Xen. is structuring the whole novel.

6) A speculative theory: the open ending of Xenophon's oracle and of the *Ephesiaca*

This discovery opens a new possibility: it becomes not unlikely that this intertext is also affecting the last part of Xen.'s oracle and, thus, that Apollo's words have the same open ending as the *Odyssey*. In other words, as in the poem Odysseus is asked to again leave his homeland, Xen. might be alluding to events after his protagonists' reunion.

To begin with, from an imaginative perspective a final one like that of the *Odyssey* does not immediately find a parallel in that of Anthia and Habrocomes. The only easy association concerns the sacrifice to a god, where Xen.'s Isis might recall that of Poseidon, since both these divine figures play an important role in the two works. Conversely, Odysseus' departure from Ithaca and his achievement of happiness and of a sweet death seem to be extraneous to Xen.'s story. In my opinion, as in the other parts of the oracle our author transforms sea into love, he could be here doing the same and the ambiguous sixth verse would be part of this operation. As a result, I would speculate that the departure by sea might become a betrayal in the relationship, while happiness and sweet death could coincide with τάφος θάλαμος and πῦρ ἀΐδηλον. The result of this "operation" would be the assignation of a heroic status to conjugal fidelity.

That said, if Xen. is deliberately proposing this kind of open ending in his text, it would be reasonable to find hints at this in the novel. At first glance, this does not seem to happen, since, unlike the *Odyssey*, the protagonists do not speak about their future during the final night in Rhodes. At closer inspection, however, we see that Anthia's nightmare, the final dialogue between the protagonists and the second occurrence of the motif of life as a feast introduce strange references which might support this interpretation. While the second element has already been explained in <u>LI</u> 5.4e, the first and the third require attentive analysis here.

The analysis of Anthia's dream is not easy and scholars have often struggled with this passage. Since it includes two unions, a positive one which involves her past union with Habrocomes and a terrible one in which another woman takes him away from her, Xen. might be saying that after the expected reunion the protagonists will have to deal with a further separation. This works well with the previous interpretation speculative reading of the end of Apollo's oracle and leads us to associate the second part of the dream with the betrayal in the relationship (for a more thorough analysis of this, see below 6.1).

Second, before the end of the novel there is a sentence which attributes to Anthia and Habrocomes

the motif of life as a feast for their entire life (5.15.3: καὶ αὐτοὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ διῆγον ἑορτὴν ἄγοντες τὸν μετ'ἀλλήλων βίον). On the one hand, this phrase appears to be a reminder of τάφος θάλαμος and this makes the proleptic value of this expression more plausible. That said, its content suggests that Anthia and Habrocomes are going to enjoy a happy life together forever and this can be taken as an objection to my aforementioned hypothesis of a separation. However, since in the only other occurrence of the motif in the novel life is described as ἅπας ὁ βίος (1.10.2, n.), I would suggest that Xen. might be producing a contrast between the two expressions. As a result, a subtle interpretation of τὸν μετ'ἀλλήλων βίον would be that at the end of the novel happy life concerns Anthia and Habrocomes only when they stay together, while there are other situations in which this positive experience of enjoyment can disappear. In conclusion, there might also be here an allusion to a possible separation, which would confirm the existence of an open ending in both the oracle and the whole text of the Eph.

7) Appendix: Anthia's nightmare as a Homeric prolepsis and analepsis

Xen.'s last dream concerns Anthia and appears to be different from the others (1.12.4, n.: dream), because its first part includes an unusual reference to the past, which seems to contradict the usual predictive nature of the novelistic dreams (on this, see Plastira-Valkanou 2001, 146: 'The deceiving element of the dream in question lies in the time'). As a result, the majority of the scholars have reached the conclusion that this dream is a one-off, which, unlike the others of the Eph., does not play a proleptic role. In my opinion, however, this is not correct and I will shortly explain why.

a) A review of the interpretations offered in secondary bibliography

To begin with, there is a group of scholars who state that this dream does not play any narrative role at all. The first is Dalmeyda 1926, 67, n. 1, who defines it as 'un ornement dénue de signification précise' and is followed by Hägg 1971, 232 and Liatsi 2004, 171. In addition, Giangrande 2002 and Fernandez Garrido 2003, 364 achieve the same aim through a scientific explanation: in the view of the former who focuses on Stoic oneirocriticism, Anthia's nightmare would be a 'false dream' which has no correspondence with the novel. Similarly, in the latter's view we would be dealing with a 'sueño subjetivo'.

Second, Oikonomou 2010 reaches a very similar conclusion although starting from a very different perspective: as Morgan 2004 argues in his comment on Longus 2.10, although 'most dreams in the novels are predictive (see 1.7.1)', some 'merely reflect the day's preoccupations (e.g. Arist. *Prob.* 957a; see also Gallop 1996, 9: 'dreams often merely rehearse our waking preoccupations' and Hdt. 7.16, who already expresses this idea)'. As a result, Oikonomou 2010, 192 argues that Anthia's dream might belong to this second type: 'the heroine would be influenced by the environment where she is', the brothel, in which her fidelity has been strongly put at risk and, thus, she 'would project things she perceives because of her environment to Abrokomes' (195). In her view, the existence of this pattern would be supported by the parallel with her husband's close monologue given in the quarry: for the same reason Habrocomes' opposite firm belief in Anthia's chastity (5.8.4) might be influenced by this environment in which his fidelity is not at risk. Finally,

Oikonomou 2010 enriches her view by arguing that the dream scene is a prolepsis of Hippothoos' falling in love with Anthia.

Unlike these scholars, only Plastira-Valkanou 2001 tries to find in this passage a narrative role comparable to that of the other dreams, but she does not extend it to the nightmare: she only identifies it in Habrocomes' calling of Anthia by name, but then she interprets the separation as a 'recollection of a traumatic previous event' which would correspond to Manto's relationship with Habrocomes. However, as Giangrande 2002, 30 clearly argues, this identification cannot be accepted, because 'Anthia did not object to Habrocomes being seduced by Manto'. Thus, Plastira-Valkanou's (2001) theory is not resolutive.

b) A literary interpretation of the dream

To begin with, I must confess that the scepticism of many scholars about the narrative role of this dream is not really justified: I firmly believe that Xen.'s proleptic apparatus is so clearly introduced earlier in the text that Anthia's dream might be easily part of it. For this reason, I am not convinced by merely external explanations. In addition, I would take issue with Oikonomou's (2010) analysis: although she has the merit of focusing on the text, she does not really take into account the previous dreams and builds her theory on three unconvincing points. To begin with, the possibility that the quarry, unlike the brothel, exerts a positive influence on Habrocomes is not suggested by the text, since the hero is damaged by that environment and the issue of fidelity is not explored there. More significantly, it is at the brothel that Anthia more emphatically demonstrates her conjugal fidelity (LI 4.2b) and the hypothesis of a negative influence on her of this place would go against Xen's purpose of emphasizing her virtue. Finally, the comparison with Hippothous' falling in love lacks textual connections.

Having expressed my criticism, I would like to offer a new interpretation of this passage which follows Xen.'s typical approach to prolepses. Although the past setting has been seen as controversial, Anthia's dream has a very traditional beginning: the memory of her first union with Habrocomes seems to work as a simple prolepsis of her reunion with him. This hypothesis receives legitimization by two important models. First, in *Callirhoe* Dionysius tells Leonas that he dreamt of his wife and that her appearance reminded him of the first wedding day: ἔδοξα δὲ εἶναι τὴν πρώτην ἡμέραν τῶν γάμων (2.1.2). After this description, the servant interprets this vision as a prolepsis of his master's second marriage to Callirhoe (see Morgan 2007b, 445 on this). Second, in the fifth book Callirhoe dreams of her wedding with Chaereas in Syracuse and she wakes up before having had the chance to kiss her husband (5.5.5-6). The prolepsis here is double, as it involves both Chaereas' appearance in the court and the final reunion in the eighth book and Plangon immediately underlines the positive outcome included in this response (5.5.6). The other model is even more authoritative: in the *Odyssey* Penelope dreams of a night spent with Odysseus before his journey to Troy. In her desperate monologue she confesses how happy she was to be with her beloved (Od. 20.88-9: αὐτὰρ ἐμὸν κῆρ χαῖρ [...]). Interestingly, this dream occurs just before the recognition between Penelope and Odysseus.

In my opinion, Char.'s dreams could well be in Xen.'s mind and the unusual pattern introduced by our author might confirm the hypothesis of the priority of *Callirhoe* over the Eph. (GI 2.1). In addition, an intertextual connection might concern the *Odyssey*, since Anthia after the dream is clearly represented as an Odyssean character. She does not only refer to her ἀνδρεῖα (5.8.7), but her sentence ἴσως ἀνάγκη τι εἴργασται (5.8.8) recalls Odysseus' forced relationship with Calypso, in which the same adverb is used:

ἀλλ᾽ ἦ τοι νύκτας μὲν ἰαύεσκεν καὶ ἀνάγκη

ἐν σπέσσι φλαφυροῖσι παρ᾽ οὐκ ἐθέλων ἐθελούσῃ· (*Od.* 5.154-155; for more on Anthia as Penelope, see APP 1.3).

As a result, this framework of passages confirms that the first part of the dream is a positive prolepsis of a reunion. The clear existence of a prognostic value leads me to extend it to the second part of Anthia's dream: Xen. might be deliberately transforming the positive model into a negative one and making Habrocomes' "abduction" by a beautiful woman another prolepsis. The plausibility of this interpretation is supported by the subtle tension which characterises the protagonists' relationship in the final part of the novel and which I have already described (see above, 6). That said, this foretold abduction is evidently not described in the novel: thus, I would interpret this nightmare as the second external prolepsis of the Eph. and for this reason its link with the oracle becomes definitely close.

8) In Apollo's oracle a new definition of the *Ephesiaca* and a challenge to the whole genre

Since Tiresias' prophecy exerts a great influence on Apollo's oracle, I would speculate that it might be used by Xen. also in a metaliterary key. In the *Odyssey* the whole text and especially the issue of the second departure offers a literary image of the epic as an open genre, characterised by a never-ending sequence of adventures. In my opinion, the same image might be in Xen.'s mind: according to his erotic reading of the prophecy, I would suggest that through Apollo's oracle the Eph. might be presented as a never-ending sequence of erotic adventures (LI 6.2a). Since the Greek novel is traditionally viewed as a genre that inevitably includes closure, Xen. would be challenging his readers with a deviation from the model.

9) Appendix: Bierl's unlikely interpretation of the oracle as a foreshadower of lovesickness and wedding night

As I have already suggested (NA 1.2), there is another interpretation of the oracle which is given by Bierl 2006. In my opinion, however, it is not acceptable, because it does not fit into Xen.'s text. The core of his thesis is expressed in the first part of the article, in which he argues that 'fast alle Inhalte der Prophezeiung einfach metaphorisch auf die Krankheit der Liebe selbst beschränken' (87). Then, he offers a list of associations between each element of the oracle and the events that concern marriage and wedding night:

    - v. 2: λύσις: 'die Hochzeit' (87);

    - v. 3: δεινά παθή: suffering of marriage as a 'rite de passage';

    - v. 3: ἀνήνυτα ἔργα: rituelle Handlungen' (87);

- v. 4: λυσσοδίωκτοι: 'es geht freilich um den Kampf gegen Eros';
- v. 4: φεύξονται ὑπεὶρ ἅλα: 'eine Absonderung von eigenen Oikos, der Ritus der séparation'; 'das Wasser wirder unter anderem mit den Tränen assoziiert' (δάκρυα 1.9.2);
- v. 5: δεσμὰ: 'Liebe ist immer auch eine Fessel, eine magische Kraft, die einen bindet';
- v. 6: πῦρ ἀίδηλον: 'das Feuer ist natürlich ebenso das der Liebe; man brennt vor Eros (καιόμενοι 1.9.1)'; in addition, there would be an allusion to Ἀίδης, the invisible, who would warn how love makes lovers blind;
- v. 7: ὄλβια δῶρα: 'die Gaben der Aphrodite (τῶν Ἀφροσίτης ἔργων ἀπήλαυον 1.9.9)'.
- v. 9: ἀρείονα πότμον: a 'besseres Los' follows always a rite of passage: see ἑορτὴ δὲ ἦν ἅπας ὁ βίος αὐτοῖς (1.10.2).

Given this list, Bierl 2006 concludes that the oracle find its fulfilment in the events in Ephesus and that the protagonists' journey is the consequence of their interpretation of the god's response. Although this hypothesis would support our reading of the fictitious nature of the protagonists' interpretation (1.10.3, n.: ὡς οἷον), it cannot be accepted, because in the tenth chapter the oracle is connected with destiny and future, as the parallel between τῶν μεμαντευμένων λήθη and οὐχὶ τὸ εἱμαρμένον ἐπελέληστο proves. In addition, if the oracle was already fulfilled in Ephesus, the protagonists' forgetfulness would be senseless. Finally, some of the associations found by Bierl are too loose: for instance, it seems exaggerated to interpret the recurrent image of the sea only in a metaphorical sense.

In conclusion, I would dismiss Bierl's (2006) interpretation.

10) Appendix two: final text and translation of the oracle

As a conclusion of my interpretation, I offer here a new version of the text and of the translation of Apollo's oracle:

Τίπτε ποθεῖτε μαθεῖν νούσου τέλος ἠδὲ καὶ ἀρχήν; (1)
ἀμφοτέρους μία νοῦσος ἔχει, λύσις ἔνθεν ἀνέστη.
δεινὰ δ' ὁρῶ τοῖσδεσσι πάθη καὶ ἀνήνυτα ἔργα·
ἀμφότεροι φεύξονται ὑπεὶρ ἅλα λυσσοδίωκτοι, (4)
δεσμὰ δὲ μοχθήσουσι παρ' ἀνδράσι μιξοθαλάσσοις
καὶ τάφος ἀμφοτέροις θάλαμος καὶ πῦρ ἀίδηλον,
καὶ ποταμοῦ ἱεροῦ παρὰ ῥεύμασιν Ἴσιδι σεμνῇ (7)
σωτείρῃ μετόπισθε στήσουσ' ὄλβια δῶρα.
Ἀλλ' ἔτι που μετὰ πήματ' ἀρείονα πότμον ἔχουσι.

'Why do you long to discover the end and the start of this illness? (1)
Both one disease affects, and its cure will come from where it arose.
Terrible sufferings I see for them and Penelope' endless toils;
both will take flight over the sea "madness-pursued"; (4)
they will bear chains at the hands of men "mingled-with-salt",

and for both the nuptial chamber will be a tomb and both will be destroyed by fire.

Afterwards, alongside the streams of the sacred river, (7)

they will offer rich gifts to Isis the Holy Savior

Yet in time, after their sufferings, they will fulfil a better destiny'.

CHAPTER 7

1.7.1: οὐτὲ γὰρ τίς: as I have already suggested, this puzzled reaction of the protagonists' parents seems to invite the readers to pay attention to the connections between the oracle and the whole novel. In the present passage, their reflection concerns what Zimmermann 1949-50, 261 calls 6 "catchwords".

In addition, its second function is to aid in reconstructing the original text of the oracle, as it has already emerged in relation to δεσμὰ and ποταμὸς. Unfortunately, although the sequence of these nouns reflects the sequence of the oracle, it does not help to shed more light on the issue of the final verses: their content is, in fact, simply foretold with the last two expressions ποταμὸς and ἡ ἐκ τῆς θεοῦ βοήθεια. While the former refers clearly to ποταμοῦ ἱεροῦ of F, the latter, because it is connected with a goddess, hints at the saving power of Isis, which is expressed in the same verse and in the following one with the words Ἴσιδι σεμνῇ σωτείρῃ. Consequently, this passage suits both the sequences of verses of the manuscript and of O'Sullivan 2005.

Finally, in this passage there is a textual difficulty: in the last catchword, F reports ἡ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ βοήθεια, in which the article was then changed by Abresch 1739 in τῆς. Among the scholars only Zimmermann (1949-50) defends the manuscript reading, by arguing that in the whole novel Isis is only connected with Anthia and, therefore, Xen. might be referring to Apollo here: as it was he that gave the oracle, the happy outcome could depend on him.

This explanation, however, does not seem convincing, because, despite the still difficult connection between this part of the oracle and the whole novel, in the oracle Isis is called σωτείρῃ and during the story she contibutes to the positive destiny of the protagonists. She, in fact, helps Anthia three times (3.11.4 - 12.1, in the relationship with Psammis; 4.3.3 and 5.4.7, at Memphis, trying to escape from Psammis and Polyidus). Then, the final recognition between the characters happens in Rhodes near a temple of Isis and the whole population join the characters in the thanksgiving to her (5.13.2). Conversely, Apollo does nothing for them and does not seem to be involved in the oracle: for this reason, I would dismiss Zimmermann's (1949-50) interpretation.

1.7.2: παραμυθήσασθαι τὸν χρησμὸν ὡς οἷόν τε: after πολλὰ βουλεουμένοις, the parents give their interpretation of the oracle: their children have to be married and, then, sent on a trip out of town for a while. The second part is repeated after the wedding in almost an identical way (1.10.3 n.: ὡς οἷόν τε ἦν).

In both cases, Xen. describes the parents' attempt with the expression παραμυθήσασθαι τὸν χρησμὸν ὡς οἷόν τε, whose meaning is discussed. As Ruiz Montero 1994, 1100-1101 clearly explains, most of the scholars offer two different translations: 'appeasing' (see also O' Sullivan 1994, 21-22, nt. 4) or 'fulfil' (see e.g. Zimmermann 1949-50, 262, n. 4). Since from a linguistic point of view both meanings are acceptable (the verb, in fact, in the Classical literature usually presents the first one, but from the Hellenistic Era "fulfil" 'die in den Papyri und anderen Texten der

Spätzeit übliche Bedeutung ist' in Ruiz Montero 1994, 1100), both Xen.'s uses deserve a particular attention and I would argue that, while in this passage 'fulfill' is the only option available, in the second 'appease' might be also accepted too.

The reason why in this passage 'fulfil' prevails is easy to demonstrate: the sentence τοῦτο καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ βουλομένου (1.7.2) proves that the parents' choice of marriage is their attempt to obey to the god's will. Conversely, 'appease' would suit a decision in which the actors do not want the god's will to happen. Further, ὡς οἷόν τε appears the sign that the parents are aware that their interpretation is an attempt made with capabilities which are limited compared to the divine ones. Finally, the ensuing decision to send their children away from Ephesus seems to be part of the same framework: since the parents are really puzzled by the oracle, they genuinely think that this journey far from Ephesus might fulfil it. In this respect, I would take issue with those scholars, such as Gärtner 1969, 2061 and O'Sullivan 1994, 21 nt. 4, who accuse here Xen. of inconsistency or masochism, since with this invitation the parents seem to inflict sufferings on their offspring, instead of protecting them. As Griffiths 1978, 415 rightly objects: 'it is only by a projection of modern ideas into the past that the reaction to the oracle in this novel becomes ridiculous. To the ancient mind oracles must be respected'. Thus, the parents' attempt here appears genuine and pious and not irrational. See 1.10.3 n.: ὡς οἷόν τε ἦν for the second mention of parents' interpretation, which in my opinion Xen. introduces a different nuance.

1.7.3: μεστὴ μὲν ἤδη ἡ πόλις ἦν τῶν εὐωχουμένων:

a) The protagonists' wedding as a standard Greek wedding

As I have already suggested in LI 2.4, in his text Xen. depicts the wedding as a simple public event in Greek society. The banquet indicated by τῶν εὐωχουμένων is the first element which belongs to its description, which then continues in the following chapter.

First, there are some typical elements which concern not only a marriage, but every collective ceremony, like the banquet, the presence of garlands (1.7.3: πάντα δ'ἦν ἐστεφανωμένα), the celebration of nocturnal feasts (1.8.1: παννυχίδες ἤγοντο), and the performance of sacrifices (1.8.1: ἱερεῖα πολλὰ ἐθύετο τῇ θεῷ). Evidence of this is given by a passage from Char., where Babylon is preparing for the trial between the main characters of the novel and πάντα δε εὐθὺς μεστὰ θυόντων, ἐστεφανωμένων (Char. 6.2.3; cf. also Ach. 5.26.9, where two elements are described as part of the thanksgiving for an unexpected discovery). Second, there are elements that are particular to a wedding, such as the mention of lit torches (1.8.1: μετὰ λαμπάδων), the passage of the spouse to the groom's house (Eph. 1.8.2; on these first two elements, see Westermarck 1922, 2, 510: 'In Ancient Greece and Rome the bride was always taken to her new home with torches'; the torches are also commonly attested in descriptions of marriage in Latin poetry, see e.g. Cat. 64.25.32), and the performance of the ὑμέναιος (see 1.8.1 n.). In addition, both protagonists are defined as happy by the population: as Nobili forth., 9 argues, the use here of ἐμακαρίζετο constitutes an echo of the μακαρισμός, a 'typical pattern of ancient hymenaioi' (10; cf. the chorus of Euripides' *Phaeton*,

240-244), 'where it served to praise the bride or the groom for the fortune they had in finding such a perfect partner' (10).

Overall, we are dealing with a general sketch of a marriage: the only unusual element is the canopy of Habrocomes' θάλαμος (1.8.2-3), with its extraordinary refinement: this leads to the conclusion that in Ephesus wealth is specially focused on Habrocomes: this confirms the pattern emerged at the beginning of the novel (1.1.1, n.: ἀνὴρ).

b) The comparison with the descriptions of Perilaus' wedding: confirmation of the standard pattern

Interestingly, the other marriage that takes place in the Eph., Perilaus' wedding, is a ceremony not dissimilar from the present event: most of the main elements of the Ephesian wedding occur, such as sacrifices (3.3.7), banquet (3.3.7 and 3.5.1), collective participation (from 3.3.7 onwards), Anthia's accompaniment into her husband's θάλαμος, with ὑμεναῖον (in 3.6.1). In addition, the refinement of Habrocomes' canopy is recalled by the peculiar abundance of Perilaus' ceremony (3.3.7: πολλὴ δὲ ἡ τῶν ἄλλων ἀφθονία and 3.5.1: δεῖπνον πολυτελὲς). This illustrates Xen.'s preference for a standard model of marriage (on the hymenaeus as a traditional element of weddings in Roman poetry, see Pichon 1966, 165) and does not want to use this issue to introduce a discrimination between protagonists and rivals. The only exception might lie in the suggestion of an immoral action performed by Perilaus, who leaves his wife alone to enjoy the banquet (3.6.4). However, since it is not stressed, this fact appears rather as functional to the narrative, as it allows Anthia to be alone and attempt suicide.

c) Comparison with the other novelists: a standard marriage as a generic τόπος

Given this Xenophontic framework, the parallel with the other novels confirms the existence of the same kind of marriage, as the following table shows:

Author	Ref.	Characters involved	Elements included
Char.	1.1.11-16	Callirhoe and Chaereas	Collective participation (11-13), conduction of the bride to the bridegroom's house, hymenaeus, wreaths and torches all over the city, wine, perfume (13), divine and mythological comparison, μακαρισμός (16).
Char.	3.2.10-17	Callirhoe and Dionysius	Pomp, rich banquet (10), wreaths all over the city (14), sacrifices, divine comparison (15), Milesian and precious cloth for Callirhoe, nuptial wreath (16), collective participation, with purple clothes.
Char.	5.5. 5	Callirhoe and Chaereas	Memory in Babylon: wreaths all over the city, passage of the bride to the bridegroom's house

Aut-hor	Ref.	Characters involved	Elements included
Char.	8.1.11, 13-14	Callirhoe and Chaereas	Clear reference to their wedding in Ephesus: flowers, garlands, wine, perfumes, mention of ἐπινίκια καὶ γάμοι. Finally, choice of the costly tent of the Persian king to spend the night with Callirhoe.
Longus	4.33. 4	Daphnis and Chloe	The city is prepared to celebrate the wedding: collective participation and μακαρισμός.
Longus	4.37.2 - 4.38.3	Daphnis and Chloe	Pomp (37.2), collective participation, rich banquet (38.1), familiar participation (38.2), rustic features (38.3).
Ach.	2.11.2-8, 2.15.1-2.	Cleitophon and Calligone	Calligone's costly cloth (11.2-3), preliminary sacrifices (12.1), wedding parade, parfumes (15.2), victims (15.3).
Ach.	5.14.3, (5.15.4)	Cleitophon and Melite	"False" celebration of marriage: rich banquet, collective participation, wishes, Melite's play with κενογάμιον.
Ach.	8.19. 2	Cleitophon and Leucippe	Very brief mention of this marriage, which is defined as much desired.
Ach.	8.19. 3	wedding of Cleitophon's sister	Very brief mention of this marriage: sacrifices, prayers.
Hld.	6.8.1-3	Cnemon and Nausiclea	Dance, ὑμέναιος, banquet (2), collective participation (3).
Hld.	10.40.2-10.41.	Theagenes and Chari-cleia	Generation of sons, sacrifices (40.2), collective partici-pation (41.1), wreaths, torches and musical instruments (41.2).

Overall, in each of these events the public dimension is always included, as well as similar elements. The only real difference is the quality of the goods involved. In this respect, it is quite interesting that Char.'s initial description in Syracuse appears to be an expansion of the Ephesian wedding in Xen., since the former includes more details. The only exception is our author's introduction of the canopy, which is completely missing in the first chapter of *Callirhoe*. This pattern is then reversed at the end of the novel, where Char., after having recalled the wedding (see LI 2.4), mentions Chaereas' decision to sleep in the luxurious house of the Persian king, which was available in every city (8.1.14). This display of prosperity appears again when the protagonists arrive in Syracuse: on their ship, in fact, there is a σκήνη συγκεκαλυμμένην βαβυλωνίοις παραπετάσμασιν (8.6.5), inside which Callirhoe lies on a χρυσηλάτος κλίνη and Τυρίαν ἀμπεχομένη πορφύραν (8.6.7). Interestingly, in the next chapter we will see how Xen. introduces in Ephesus a κλίνη χρυσῆ with στρώμασιν [...] πορφυροῖς (1.8.2) and covers it with a βαβυλωνία [...]

σκήνη. Although an exact correspondence of words is missing, the occurrence of these two particular objects in different locations of the novel makes it plausible that one of the two authors was deliberately quoting and deviating from the other. In addition, in this case I would suggest that Xen.'s dependence on Char. might be more likely, because in the latter the presence of Babylonian objects fits into the context of the novel. This discovery is significant, because it emphasises the different use of marriage of the two authors: while in Char. marriage is connected to prosperity both at the beginning and at the end of the novel and Chaereas uses this event to display his glory, Xen. limits marriage and wealth to the first book: the result, which might be interpreted as a deviation from Char., is his focus on a private and sentimental dimension, which is exclusive to the Eph. While this possibility marks further the different role played by wealth in the two texts, it also shows a different conception of marriage which underlies the two authors' works (LI 2.4).

1.7.4: ὡς ἐπύθετο καὶ τὸν χρησμὸν καὶ τὸν γάμον: this is the first recapitulation of the novel and it fits into the group of 'recapitulations associated with verbs for "learn", "get to know" and "hear"' (Hägg 1971, 270): cf. 1.13.1, 2.2.1, 2.7.4, 3.8.3, 3.9.1, 5.3.1, 5.5.1, 5.9.13. Within this category, our passage constitutes the simplest one, since it involves only 'nouns in the definite form' and only two occurrences (the same pattern occurs in 3.9.1, but there the two nouns are expanded with two genitives).

1.7.4: παντὸς δεινοῦ [...] ἡ φυγὴ [...] αἱ συμφοραὶ [...] τῶν ἐσομένων κακῶν): as I suggested in NA 1.2, the protagonists' first reaction to the oracle shows that both Habrocomes and Anthia see in it the presence of something bad which will affect their life. In this respect, the sequence of these words do not suggest anything more than something negative. This approach is clear evidence that Xen.'s oracle, as well as his prolepses, perform the function of foretelling the bad and the good that different characters will have to experience. At the same time, it must be noticed that both protagonists, being filled with the joy of the imminent consummation, do not really take the prophecy into account. For this reason, Capra 2007/2008, 18 notes that Habrocomes shows again 'la sua caratteristica tendenza all'ottimismo: come quando si credeva immune da amore e poi ci cade, così ora egli si sente immune dall'oracolo, e invece ovviamente non sarà così'. This lack of fear and of consideration of the oracle will appear again at the end of the wedding scene, when the protagonists experience real pleasure and joy for the consummation (1.10.1 n.: ἡδίονες). As a result, this motif constitutes a sort of frame of the wedding scene. On the one hand, this works as an anticipation of the inevitable sufferings that the protagonists will have to face. On the other hand, it also constitutes a warning for the readers that the experience of sex cannot be the final stage of the ideal love, because it is going to be soon interrupted soon.

1.7.4: πάντων τῶν ἐσομένων κακῶν Ἁβροκόμην ἔχουσα παραμυθίαν: παραμυθία, with the cognate noun παραμυθίον and the verb παραμυθέω, is a topic which is often explored by Xen. and which is always focalised on the protagonists. Despite this and the following occurrence (1.11.1), Xen.'s approach to it is substantially negative, since he underlines how much the lovers lack consolation.

Since the content of this theme will progressively change during the novel, this motif seems to be part of Xen.'s construction of the evolution of the couple. For this, see <u>LI</u> 4.4.

CHAPTER 8

1.8.1: ὡς οὖν ἐφέστηκεν ὁ τῶν γάμων καιρός: this temporal clause with its indefiniteness confirms Xen.'s 'vague' time: we are not told how many days pass between the oracle and the marriage. This emphasises the atemporal setting of this second event, which helps to express its idealised nature.

1.8.1: (βραδύνειν δὲ πάντα ἐδόκει: this is the first erotic motif introduced by Xen. to describe the sexual consummation of the protagonists (see 'impatience' in LI 2.4). Its location is quite significant: to begin with, it highlights how the protagonists' approach to love is different from the previous one, as it is positive and full of trepidation. In addition, since we are far from the event of the sexual consummation, this motif proves also the existence of an "initiation" of the protagonist to sex (see "Impatience" in LI 2.4).

That being said, this motif seems to be part of the epigrammatic tradition: Meleager in his apostrophe to the star of the morning asks that of the evening to come quickly, as he is waiting for another sexual consummation (AP. 12.114.1: ταχὺ ἔλθοις). Thus, we are dealing with a variation in the same motif. Also Ach. exploits it in relationship to Melite's passion for Cleitophon (5.15.4-6) and at the beginning of then novel Cleitophon himself cannot wait to have sex with Leucippe (esp. 2.1.1 and 2.10.3). Finally, Roman Elegy attests the same motif, as Ovid proves in Hero's answer to Leander, when he states: 'Leandre, [...] veni! [...] Non patienter amo' (*Her.* 19.1-4). What is significant here is that this motif occurs long before the sexual consummation: this suggests that the protagonist are looking forward to this event since the beginning. Interestingly, the same verb occurs also on the wedding night in Anthia's accusation to Habrocomes (1.9.4 n.: πόσον ἐβράδυνας ἐρῶν χρόνον), where Xen. subtly introduces a different erotic motif.

Finally, in a passage like this one might raise the objection that this parenthesis might not be authentic. However, this hypothesis is unlikely, not only for the meaningful motif that this expression introduces, but also because the presence here of the protagonists' names seems to work well with the following mention of τὴν κόρην, which otherwise might have been substituted by Anthia's name. Thus, we are probably dealing with the most outstanding example of 'functional' parenthesis.

1.8.1: τὸν ὑμέναιον ᾄδοντες, ἐπευφημοῦντες: if ὑμέναιος designates the love song typical of marriage (see Mathiesen, Apollo's lyre, 126), which was performed 'durante il corteo che accompagnava lo sposo alla casa della sposa' (Borgogno, 101, n. 10), also the participle ἐπευφημοῦντες might recall an element typical of the same ritual, the ἐπιθαλάμιον, 'which was traditionally sung to the newlyweds by a group of young unmarried men and maidens at the door of the wedding chamber' (ibid.). The appearance of these two elements is a confirmation of the generic sketch given by Xen. to the protagonists' marriage (1.7.3 n.: μεστὴ).

1.8.2: ἦν δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ θάλαμος πεποιημένος: the first indication of the place where the wedding night is set already underlines its sophistication, since we are told that the room has been built for the couple. In my opinion, it is not unlikely that from the very beginning of the echprasis Xen. is subtly playing with the association between the artisan's activity and his own literary production. This possibility works well with the fact that the canopy houses a metaliterary image of the novel, the love of Ares and Aphrodite: the present association with the whole room would give the idea of an exciting and enjoyable work, like this canopy is, and of an intimate story. Since both concepts are confirmed in the novel, I would accept this hypothesis.

Given this preliminary indication, I will now carefully analyse the whole following description.

8.2-3: *the only* ekphrasis *of the* Ephesiaca

The second and third sections of this chapter are significant, because they contain the only *ekphrasis* of the *Eph.* As Capra 2007/2007, 18 argues, this description is well fitted into the plot of the novel through a *Ringkomposition*: in 1.8.1 Xen. writes about Anthia being introduced in Habrocomes' room (εἰσαγαγόντες κατέκλινον) and, as soon as the *ekphrasis* ends, he writes again: κατέκλιναν τὴν Ἀνθίαν, ἀγαγόντες πρὸς τὸν Ἀβροκόμην (1.8.3). This technique is significant, because it creates an overlap between the protagonists of the novel and those of the artistic object: this constitutes an indication to the readers on how this passage should be read (see on this also Fusillo 1989, 83-4: 'In Senofonte Efesio si legge un solo esempio di descrizione, ma estremamente significativo, perché raffigura un mito in stretto contatto con il racconto principale')..

Given the coexistence of different elements here, I will divide my analysis into different parts.

a) The Babylonian canopy as a symbol of wealth and luxury

In Habrocomes' θάλαμος Xen. describes a golden bed covered with purple blankets and surrounded by a canopy. In theory the identification of this object as a canopy might be disputed, because in Ancient Greek σκηνή usually means 'tent' and 'stage-building' (LSJ) and not 'canopy', since this is not a Greek object. However, I would accept here the given meaning, because the complement ἐπὶ τῆς κλίνης makes it more plausible than the other two.

Having clarified this preliminary point, the presence of the adjective βαβυλωνία recalls the tradition of Eastern manufacture. However, since Xen. introduces the θάλαμος as πεποιημένος and the canopy contains Greek iconography, it is unlikely that we are dealing with an original Babylonian production, also because clear evidence of this tradition is missing. Thus, I would suggest that βαβυλωνία indicates a style.

That being said, however, I would not dismiss the implications of this particular origin: since in antiquity Eastern objects were traditionally considered symbols of wealth and sometimes of luxury, I would argue that Xen. is interplaying with this. A reason for this comes from the fact that in the *Eph.* wealth is not a constant ingredient and thus the appearance of this object constitutes an exception that encourages us to read it as exaggerated. A second proof comes instead from the parallel with Char.

<u>a1) The Eastern origin of the canopy</u>

To begin with, each of the elements described by Char. comes from the East. The first evidence concerns the κλίνη χρυσῆ, as Greeks were not keen on elegant beds (see Sm. Anth., s.v. lectus), but on simpler types, in which the only ornamental addition was constituted by bedsteads and cushions. Then, although in the Hellenistic and Imperial Greece στρώματα were added, gold was never adopted by Greece (see Richter 1966, 53, who argues that the material used by Greeks 'was sometimes bronze or iron, but more commonly wood'). As a result, we are dealing with an Eastern bed.

An Eastern origin can be easily attributed also to the purple sheets, since, as I have already suggested commenting Anthia's cloth (1.2.6 n.: ἀλουργής), this colour was originally Tyrian: thus, the non-Greek origin of this colour is indisputable.

Finally, the Eastern mark becomes more distinctive with canopies, which are completely extraneous to Greek archaeology and are instead attested in the Egyptian world of the Early Dynastic Period. Three exemplars come from the following locations:

a) tomb of Hesy-Re, a high scribal official, c. 2650 BC;

b) tomb of Queen Hetepheres, 2613-2494 BC (see Baker 1966, 43: 'her furniture included an ingeniously constructed gold-covered canopy');

c) tomb-chapel of Queen Meresankh at Giza.

After these examples, no other traces of these objects are preserved and this lack is quite surprising in Babylon. The only exception comes from the time of the Persian domination, when in Babylon Artaxerxes gave a canopy as a gift to the Greek Timagoras (see Athen. 2.48d-e: Ἀρταξέρξης σκηνήν τε ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ διαφέρουσαν τὸ κάλλος καὶ τὸ μέγεθος καὶ κλίνην ἀργυρόποδα, ἔπεμψε δὲ καὶ στρώματα πολυτελῆ καὶ τὸν ὑποστρώσοντα; for another testimony of the same story, see Plut. *Pelop.* 30.6). Although this fact might suggest that Persians inherited a Babylonian tradition, in consequence of the lack of material evidence I would rather suggest that in the Greek world "Babylonian" was a by-word for a generally Eastern style product, not necessarily having a connection with Babylon *per se*: as a result, there is no doubt that the Ephesians built for Anthia and Habrocomes a Eastern-fashioned θάλαμος.

Overall, the first reason why these passages are significant is that they both mention the existence of a Persian canopy. Further, it is interesting that Timagoras was also given Persian slaves, who could help him in building the bed, and the Persians justified this "addition" by saying: ὡς τῶν Ἑλλήνων οὐκ ἐπισταμένων (Plut., ibid.) and: φάσκων οὐκ ἐπίστασθαι τοὺς Ἕλληνας ὑποστρωννύειν (Athen, ibid.). In other words, the Greeks were accused of not being able to build proper beds. This idea is finally clarified by Athen., who says: Πρῶτοι δὲ Πέρσαι, ὥς φησιν Ἡρακλείδης, καὶ τοὺς λεγομένους στρώτας ἐφεῦρον, ἵνα κόσμον ἔχῃ ἡ στρῶσις καὶ εὐάφειαν. As a result, these literary sources confirm that canopy is an Eastern object. If the connection between Persian and Babylonian

artefacts is not clear, the presence in Char. of a golden Persian bed with a Babylonian sheet confirms this possibility (Char. 8.1.14 and *Eph.* 1.7.3 n.: μεστὴ).

a2) Habrocomes' canopy as a symbol of wealth

Along with the non-Greek origin, another proof which comes from the antiquity is that canopies were expensive and thus considered signs of prosperity. This is shown by Plato Comicus, who describes a piece of furniture where a purple sheet is combined with other Eastern ingredients:

κᾆτ' ἐν κλίναις ἐλεφαντόποσιν καὶ στρώμασι

      πορφυροβάπτοις

κἂν φοικινίσι Σαρδιακαῖσιν κοσμησάμενοι κατάκεινται (fr. Kock 1.208.1-2, Athen. 2.48d).

In his view, it is evident that the owners of these objects must be rich people. (for further evidence), proof of this, see Menander, fr. 24.1-3 Thierfelder, Körte, Athen. 11.484c-d).

Another confirmation of this given by the frequency with which other writers 'refer to Babylonian cloth with moralistic disdain as a byword for opulence and luxury' (Morgan 2007d, 29; see, e.g. Pliny NH 8.196, Josephus *BJ* 5.212, Arrian *Anab.* 6.29, Plut. *Cato Maior* 4, Lucretius 4.1029, Martial 8.28.17, Petronius 55.6).

That being said, a display of wealth can be considered as immoral, depending on the context in which it is introduced. In the Greek world, this second value was prominent and the aforementioned story of Timagoras constitutes an interesting example of this. When he was approaching Athens with his Eastern gifts, the Athenians killed him to punish his luxury. In my opinion, the context of the present passage might suggest that Xen. is referring to this immoral view: wealth is not a constant ingredient of his novel and a slight trace of lasciviousness characterises the whole wedding scene.

a3) The interesting parallel with Char.: Habrocomes' canopy as a symbol of luxury

This conclusion might be confirmed by looking at Char.: as I have already suggested in the analysis of marriage (1.7.3 n.: μεστὴ), the author of *Callirhoe* introduces at the end of the novel three Eastern pieces of manufacture:

- a special bed with purple sheets of Babylonian cloth (8.1.14: κλίνη μὲν ἔκειτο χρυσήλατος, στρωμνὴ δὲ Τυρία πορφυρᾶ, ὕφασμα Βαβυλώνιον), which is part of the Persian king's private and private house and houses the protagonists' reunion;

- a royal tent arranged by Demetrius to bring the Persian queen back to her homeland along with Rodogune (8.4.7: σκηνὴν βασιλικήν, πορφυρίδα καὶ χρυσοϋφῆ Βαβυλώνια περιθείς) ;

- a tent built on the bridge of Chaereas' ship and furnished with Babylonian clothes (8.6.5: σκηνὴν συγκεκαλυμμένην Βαβυλωνίοις παραπετάσμασιν).

Although Char. does not seem to describe with σκηνή a canopy but a tent, because this second object better fits its open-air location, these passages are comparable with the *Eph.*, as I have already suggested. That being said, in *Callirhoe*, unlike our novel, the introduction of a cultural

issue through these objects is indisputable. As Morgan 2007b argues, in the last book of Char.'s novel 'there are two contrasting geographical movements: the protagonists sail into the west, to resume their existence in a democratic polis, while the king and his court head back to the barbarian east' (29). Within this opposition, the second Babylonian object introduced by Char. plays a key role, since it is used by Demetrius to bring Statira and Rodogune back to Persia. In this respect, it 'is not a neutral object: it reeks of barbarism, despotism and luxury, an antithesis of the Hellenic values Demetrius ostensibly embodies' (29), being a Greek philosopher. This pattern, however, is used subtly by Char., since in the third case it is chosen by Chaereas as his way to enter Syracuse. Although in this last passage the tent does not shed an immoral light on Chaereas, being a trophy of war, it still forms an indication of luxury, as the Syracusans show by considering it a sign of πολυτελεία (8.6.6).

In my opinion, the existence of a parallel which is so close to our author might support the attribution of luxury to our canopy.

b) <u>The canopy as a symbol of lasciviousness</u>

After this first analysis of the object, I will now turn to the iconographic description. Interestingly, the decoration of the canopy confirms this indication of wealth, because of its rich artistic framework, and adds another important feature: a stress on sexual love with a hint of lasciviousness, which seems to work well as a parallel with the protagonists' first love. In addition, this double connotation is not extraneous to the nature of canopies, which were traditionally the place where royal people made love.

Having suggested this thesis, I would now demonstrate it through an attentive iconographic analysis. Above all, as the verb Xen. ἐπεποίκιλτο suggests, we are dealing with embroideries which are divided into two sides: the former has many Erotes as main subjects, while the latter Ares and the god Eros.

b1) <u>The first side of the canopy</u>

Since in this side we are dealing with many motifs which are typically attributed to Eros, it is generally difficult, if not impossible to establish whether Xen. is influenced by a specific literary or artistic models, since both literature and art contain them. For this reason, I will focus on possible sources only when a connection is plausible (otherwise I will give references to "iconography", while for the literary ones see <u>LI</u> 2.4). Within this framework I anticipate that οἱ μὲν Ἀφροδίτην θεραπεύοντες and οἱ δὲ ἱππεύοντες ἀναβάται στρουθοῖς constitute an exception, because they appear to be respectively a prominently artistic and literary motif.

That being said, the reason why this description is significant is that it seems to offer different images and attitudes which anticipate Anthia and Habrocomes' night: this makes the ekphrasis analeptic.

- *The structure of the scene*

Xen.'s introduction of Ἔρωτες παίζοντες suggests that this part of the canopy houses a group of young Erotes, who became very popular during the Hellenistic Era (1.2.1-2 n.: ὁ θεὸς, c). That said, the structure of the scene appears to be complex: since παίζοντες Ἔρωντες is followed by four different themes connected with οἱ μὲν and οἱ δὲ, the text seems to suggest that the Erotes players are performing all the following actions that are part of the representation. This, however, is not likely, since those who attend Aphrodite or plait garlands do not seem to be playing. In my opinion, an iconographic parallel might help to overcome this impasse: there is a crater which was produced in 420 BC (769 = Aphrodite 1218*) where many Erotes are playing together, plus one who has a garland and another who wants to crown Aphrodite. Although all these characters belong to the same scene, only the first are playing. Following this example, I would argue that most of the Erotes might be players, but a few others were performing the other tasks. As a result, παίζοντες Ἔρωντες could be a sort of title of the canopy's first side.

a2) παίζοντες Ἔρωντες

Literature: Ach. mentions this theme in his first *ekphrasis*: this constitutes a confirmation of the popularity of this image in both literature and art (Ach. 1.1.13: ἔπαιζον Ἔρωτες).

Iconography: 'Eros s'adonnant à divers jeux' (LIMC 3. 748-778), from 490 BC to the Imperial Era. The latest works, which date from the second century AD, are a marble group from Turkey (753) with two "putti" riding two cocks and two coins from Serdica (774*) and Aphrodisias (775*): this suggests that this image was still popular in Xen.'s time.

Prolepsis: the mention of παίζοντες does not seem only a mere acknowledgement of an erotic motif: rather it appears to be a first definition of the protagonists' love. This hypothesis is very likely, since at the end of the wedding night Anthia and Habrocomes play an erotic competition (1.9.9 n.: ἐφιλονείκουν). This conclusion is important, because, being at the origin of the whole ekphrasis, it invites the readers to find further connections in the progress of the description.

a3) οἱ μὲν Ἀφροδίτην θεραπεύοντες:

Iconography: as this motif is very common in Greek iconography, an iconographic inspiration seems here more plausible: from the fourth century BC to third century AD Eros often joins Aphrodite in her toilette or in her cult (LIMC 3.808-826, 'Eros serviteur ou prêtre d'Aphrodite'). Unlike these scenes, Xen.'s description lacks the mention of ritual objects. Surprisingly, in the Imperial Era this motif does not appear in Greek works, but is popular in the East: cf. a mural painting from the house of a Roman scribe in Doura Europos, an old Mesopotomic city (LIMC Eros in p.Orientalis 76), a figure in terracotta from Amman (LIMC 80*), and a Syriac bronze small statue (LIMC 81*). As a result, for the second time we find an Eastern iconographic tradition contemporary with Xen.

Prolepsis: we are dealing here with the second analeptic image of the *ekphrasis*, the *servitium amoris*, which has already been introduced by Xen. in Habrocomes' monologue (see 'love and

slavery' in table 1 in LI 2.3) and appears again on the wedding night as a description of Anthia's eyes (1.9.8: διακόνους). On the importance of this theme in the novel, see LI 3.

a4) (ἦν δὲ καὶ Ἀφροδίτης εἰκών)
In each of the aforementioned works Aphrodite is always represented with Eros. This corresponds to the content of this parenthesis, where the presence of the brackets introduces an alternative: we might be dealing with an interpolated explanatory note, instead of an explanation given by our author. To begin with, from a stylistic point of view the first option would be likely, since this sentence interrupts the flow of description, which, following a parallel structure with the participle at the end, seems to be constructed with attention by Xen. (for the strange anomaly constituted by οἱ δὲ ἱππεύοντες ἀναβάται στρουθοῖς, see below). This leads us to understand a possible reason for the introduction of this parenthesis and this has to be related to the presence of Aphrodite in the whole description. Although the second side of the canopy focuses on the traditional theme of her love with Ares, the presence of the goddess in the second scene is not clearly stated by Xen., who writes ὡς πρὸς ἐρωμένην τὴν Ἀφροδίτην κεκοσμημένος. In my opinion, the possible ambiguity implied in that passage is similar to that of the present one, where the popularity of the artistic combination of Aphrodite and Eros suggests that the presence of the latter was inevitable. Following this hypothesis, I would argue that the same conclusion might affect the bigger scene too: this reticence is not the fruit of a lack of attention of the author, but the consequence of his assumption that every Greek imperial reader would easily imagine the presence of the goddess, given her iconographical popularity at that time.
For this reason, I would argue that this canopy would have housed a small Aphrodite in the first side and a bigger one in the second and I would also delete this parenthesis: a late copyist, who was no longer acquainted with this kind of iconography, may have found himself lost in the description and tried to clarify it with this "unnecessary gloss" (GI 1).

a5) οἱ δὲ ἱππεύοντες ἀναβάται στρουθοῖς
Since, as I have just stated, this part of the description is in three cases based on the repetition of a parallel structure composed of article, noun and participle, this phrase constitutes a strange exception. In addition, ἀναβάται means 'riders' and there seems to be a redundancy between this οἱ δὲ ἱππεύοντες, which has the same meaning (see Anderson, 133, nt. 3 on this). For this reason, scholars have offered a new reading of this median term: Giangrande 1964 proposes Ἀραβίαις and Ἀραβικαῖς, while PAP Ναβαταίαις.
The solution of this issue is a consequence of the individuation of which animals are here described: the term στρουθός, in fact, designates both sparrows and ostriches. In my opinion, the first choice is the best one, because since Sappho, who might here be Xen.'s direct model, these animals are associated with Eros and became in Greece symbols of aphrodisiac. This discovery leads to a twofold conclusion: first, all the aforementioned readings become implausible, as they do not refer to sparrows, and they make the hypothesis of a posthumous gloss more likely. Second, these

sparrows can be interpreted as another parallel of the protagonists, which definitely assigns to them a trait of lasciviousness.

Iconography: sparrows are not animals who accompany Eros in ancient iconography, where rather, as they are "substituted" by swans, ducks, geese, cocks, doves and peacocks (see 'Eros chevauchant un oiseau' in LIMC 3, 193-201, from 330 BC to Imperial Era). This omission is not surprising, since sparrows are fragile birds and from a realistic point of view they cannot play this role.

Literature: conversely, sparrows are part of the literary parade of Aphrodite along with doves and geese. The first example comes from Sappho, where Aphrodite lies on a chariot carried by these animals: κάλοι δέ σ'ἆγον ὤκεες στροῦθοι [...] (fr. 1 LP; 9-10). Although scholars like Thompson 1895, 161 and Pollard 1977, 147 interpret στροῦθοι as a general term for birds and then suggest the identification with swans, which could more realistically than sparrows carry the goddess, the internal analysis of Sappho's poetry suggests the accuracy of our interpretation. In her poems, in fact, the attribution of a hyperbolic size to different characters occasionally creates humorous effects (cf. fr. 110a, 111 and 115, in Zellner 2008) and Athenaeus refers to this passage when discussing sparrows (9.46 and Spanoudakis 1999, 638). Finally, the absence of iconographic parallels and of other literary models makes it not unlikely that Xen. is here alluding to Sappho.

A new reading: this interpretation of στρουθοῖς as sparrows helps us to tackle the philological difficulty: since all the offered readings refer to ostriches, they are proved wrong. In fact, Xenophon the Athenian shows how the Arabic στρουθοί were μέγαλαι and parts of θηρία δὲ παντοῖα (Anab. 1.5.2). Therefore, they cannot be sparrows. Similarly, since Nabataean refers to an Arabian nomadic tribe, Papanikolau's 1973 with Ναβαταίαις is clearly referring to the same animals. This discovery is not surprising, since in their choice these scholars were probably following the realistic criterion. In theory, the aforementioned sources that focus on sparrows might offer new readings, such as ὤκεες (Sappho) or the Aristotelian adjective ὀχευτικός (see HA 564b11) attributed to these animals by Athaenaeus. Finally, Aristotle mentions in his works στρουθὸς ὁ Λιβυκός (see e.g. *De gener.animal*. 749b), who is generally considered an 'ostrich', but because the philosopher defines it as πολύγονος and associates him with fowls, partridges and pigeons, this expression might indicate a sparrow. Each of these three proposals, however, is never used by more than one author: thus, they are not convincing. This leads me to consider O'Sullivan 2005's suggestion of a *glossa*. If we combine this framework with the fact that the deletion of ἀναβάται gives to each member of the description the same length, I would consider this hypothesis likely. In addition, the presence of an interpolated parenthesis in the previous phrase suggests that we are dealing with a text revised by a late copyist and this confirms our interpretation. That being said, it might also become possible to invert ἱππεύοντες and στρουθοῖς in order to make the parallel structure of the sentence clearer, but the presence of a dative instead of an accusative leaves a sense of uncertainty about this option.

Prolepsis: that being said, the presence of sparrows does not only contribute generally to the erotic construction of the scene, but seems to offer a deeper connotation. As Athenaeus tells us in the previous passage about birds, sparrows in the Greek world were considered aphrodisiac (9.46: διὸ καὶ Τερψιχλῆς τοὺς ἐμφαγόντας φησὶν στρουθῶν ἐπικαταφόρους πρὸς ἀφροδίσια γίνεσθαι). Since Terpsicles, to which Athenaeus here refers, dates possibly from the third century BC, this association was part of the Hellenistic culture and, following Hutchinson 2001's suggestion, might be already attested in the Classical Era: in the Aristophanic comedy *Lysistrata,* when the eponymous protagonist is trying to control the Athenian girls, she finds one ἐπὶ στρουθοῦ μίαν (723): since the sparrow here indicates the man (cf. Schol. ad versum: Παρ'ὅσον τὸ ὄρνεον θερμὸν εἰς συνουσίαν), this suggests that these animals were more precisely symbol of lovers who have sex.

As a result, Xen.'s mention of sparrows seems to anticipate a third image of the protagonists' love, that of physical consummation, which would constitute a parallel with τὰ πρῶτα τῶν Ἀφροδίτης ἔρψων (1.9.9 n.). A late confirmation of this is offered by Apuleius' *Cupid and Psyche*, where sparrows follow Venus' chariot, which carried by doves (currum deae prosequentes gannitu constrepenti lasciviunt passeres', *Met.* 6.6.3). In this context, the use of the verb 'lasciviunt' underlines once more the sexual connotation (for two other late witnesses of this, cf. *Scholia ad Hom. Il*. 2.308-19 and Festus p. 313, 1.23).

a6) οἱ δὲ στεφάνους πλέκοντες:
Iconography: cf. 'Eros tient une couronne' (LIMC 3, 495-502), from beginning of the fifth century BC to 320 BC. This theme loses popularity in the Greek world shortly after the beginning of the Hellenistic Era, while in the Imperial Era it is attested in Pakistan (see 'Eros soutenant une guirlande', II century AD, in LIMC 3.23-25*).
Prolepsis: although στεφανοί are common elements of every Greek celebration (1.7.3 n.: μεστή, c), their mention in the wedding night introduces another foreshadower of that scene. This makes the presence of πλέκω important, since it conveys a fourth image of the lovers: weave is an efficacious way to express union, which is the Platonic topic of the wedding night and goes beyond the physical connotation (1.9.5 n.: συμφύντες).

a7) οἱ δὲ ἄνθη φέροντες:
Iconography: cf. 'Eros tient (ou tend la main vers) une fleur, un rameau ou un rinceau' (LIMC 3.91-114), from 510 BC to first century BC. This theme lacks popularity in the Eastern tradition.
Prolepsis: this typical decoration contains another pun on the name of the heroine (1.1.2 n.: συνήνθει). In this case, this play seems to be used by Xen. to support the ongoing comparison between this scene and the novel.

a8) Conclusion on the first side

Overall, Xen. seems to use this part of the canopy to subtly convey images which anticipate the wedding night. If we look at them altogether, their sequence seems to outline the sequence of an erotic scene which is not only chronological but also thematic: thus, we are dealing with a climax.

This works from a natural point of view: if love often starts as a game (first image), then the *servitium amoris* (second image) deepens the erotic relationship and leads to wantonness and sex, which are symbolised by sparrows (third image). This erotic consummation, however, cannot give the final achievement, because lovers want to spend all their lives together: the last image of the union between the lovers finds its place here.

In addition, this climax might more precisely suggest the sequence of Habrocomes and Anthia's love. Although these images are introduced in a different order in the ninth chapter, union is certainly the deepest theme explored there by Xen. which overcomes sex and offers a new interpretation of love where the asymmetry of slavery is transformed into symmetry.

The suggestion of this sophisticated framework proves the subtlety of this passage and creates an even bigger expectation for the second part of the description. That said, in this whole analysis an iconographic interest of our author has also emerged, with some associations with Eastern Imperial works: I will shortly return to this topic.

b) The second side of the canopy: Ares and Aphrodite's love

b1) The main topic

This second part of the canopy is dominated by the presence of only one topic: the love of Ares and Aphrodite. As I have already suggested, the presence of Aphrodite might be doubted here, since Xen. only states that Ares is ὡς πρὸς ἐρωμένην τὴν Ἀφροδίτην κεκοσμημένος. However, as the following analysis will show, in ancient iconography the presence of the goddess was so obvious that it does not seem possible to exclude it, given the general similarity of this canopy to a real artistic object.

As in the first part, I will now offer an interpretation of the literary and the iconographic traditions relating to this topic: the most interesting pieces of evidence will suggest that here Xen. is more keen on the former, as the obvious model of the *Odyssey* and a possible echo of the *Symposium* seems to suggest. This double occurrence is not a coincidence, since we are dealing with a passage in which Xen. introduces his first deep exploration of love (see on this LI 2.4).

Literature

The first model that the story of Ares and Aphrodite inevitably recalls is Demodocus' famous account in Scheria (*Od*. 8.266-367), where the gods have a sexual consummation out of marriage. The Homeric description is rich in actions:

- union of the gods (8.268-9: ὡς τὰ πρῶτα μίγησαν ἐν Ἡφαίστοιο δόμοισι λάθρῃ);
- Helios' first interventions as a spy (8.270-1);

336

- Hephaestus’ forging of a bed with invisible chains (274-5: δεσμοὺς ἀρρήκτους ἀλύτους);
- Hephaestus’ departure from Lemnos leads Ares and Aphrodite to have a second sexual intercourse in the dangerous bed (8.290-2);
- Helios’ second intervention as a spy (8.302);
- Hephaestus’ anger and request of vengeance to the gods (8.304-340);
- Hermes’ declaration of envy and laughter of the gods (8.338-343);
- Poseidon’s forcing Hephaestus to remove his trap (8.344-366).

That said, the description of sex is very brief. Only in the second consummation, a few details are given: Aphrodite first enters her legitimate husband’s house and, afterwards, Ares εἴσω δώματος ἤει, ἔν τ’ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρί, ἔπος τ’ἔφατ’ἔκ τ’ὀνόμαζε· “δεῦρο, φίλη, λέκτρονδε τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντες·” (8.290-2). Aphrodite accepts this invitation and they ἐς δέμνια βάντε κατέδραθον· (8.296). At the same time, this relationship deserves different definitions from the characters involved:
- Hephaestus refers to it with the words ἔργα γελαστὰ καὶ οὐκ ἐπιεικτὰ (8.307);
- some gods, among whom the presence of Poseidon is very plausible, define this relationship as adultery (332: μοιχάγρι’ ὀφέλλει);
- Hermes offers an appreciative view of the episode, based on his erotic desire (342: αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν εὕδοιμι παρὰ χρυσέη Ἀφροδίτη).

After Homer, the same story is alluded to by other authors: the first is Plato. In the *Symposium*, in fact, Phaedrus uses Ares’ defeat by Eros as a proof of the power of the latter: οὐ γὰρ ἔχει Ἔρωτα Ἄρης, ἀλλ’Ἔρως Ἄρη - Ἀφροδίτης, ὡς λόγος [...] (196d).
The second is Apollonius Rhodius, who, in his *ekphrasis* of Jason’s mantel, ‘sfrutta il valore antonomastico della coppia divina’ (Fusillo 1989, 84):
Ἑξείης δ’ ἤσκητο βαθυπλόκαμος Κυθέρεια
Ἄρεος ὀχμάζουσα θοὸν σάκος, ἐκ δέ οἱ ὤμου
πῆχυν ἔπι σκαιὸν ξυνοχὴ κεχάλαστο χιτῶνος
νέρθε παρὲκ μαζοῖο· τὸ δ’ ἀντίον ἀτρεκὲς αὔτως
χαλκείη δείκηλον ἐν ἀσπίδι φαίνετ’ ἰδέσθαι (Ap. Rhod. 1.742-746).
Here, Aphrodite looks at herself in the mirror of Ares’ shield, which she is carrying.
The third is Meleager, who justifies Eros’ violence with a reference to Aphrodite’s familiarity with swords and fire:
οὐ μάτηρ στέργει μὲν Ἄρη, γαμέτις δὲ τέτυκται
        Ἀφαίστου, κοινὰ καὶ πυρὶ καὶ ξίφεσι; (AP 5.180.3-4).
The fourth is Lucretius, who in the beginning of his poem asks Venus to give peace to Rome through her control on Mars:
effice ut interea fera moenera militiai
per maria ac terras omnis sopita quiescant;
nam tu sola potes tranquilla pace iuvare
mortalis, quoniam belli fera moenera Mavors

armipotens regit, in gremium qui saepe tuum se

reiicit aeterno devictus vulnere amoris,

atque ita suspiciens tereti cervice reposta

pascit amore avidos inhians in te, dea, visus

eque tuo pendet resupini spiritus ore.

hunc tu, diva, tuo recubantem corpore sancto

circum fusa super, suavis ex ore loquellas

funde petens placidam Romanis, incluta, pacem (1.29-40).

Finally, the last model is the Byzantine writer Macedonius consul, who confirms the existence of this topic in the *Anthologia Graeca*:

ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα σοι τὸν Ἄρηα, καὶ ἀζαλέον περ ἐόντα,

δείξω τῇ μαλακῇ Κύπριδι πειθόμενον. (AP 5.238.3-4).

That being said, there are also different explorations of the relationship between Ares and Aphrodite: in some literary sources the two gods 'sind vor alle bei böotischen Dichtern wie Hesiod und Pindar ein Paar' (LIMC, Aphrodite) who gives birth to Harmonia (see Aesch. *Septem* 135-144, Plut. *Pelop.* 19 and Ps- Apollod. 3.4.2).

By contrast, Simonides of Ceos introduces Eros as their son:

σχέτλιε παῖ δολομήδεος Ἀφροδίτας,

τὸν Ἄρῃ † δολομηχάνῳ τέκεν (Page, *PMG* frg. 575).

Although this mention is very brief, it is also repeated twice by Meleager and Asclepiades (cf. AP 12.56.2 and 12.86.1-3 for the former and 12.75.2 and 12.77.3-4 for the latter).

Finally, Pausanias informs us about the existence of cults shared by Ares and Aphrodite in the Agora of Athens (see 1.8.4), in Megalopolis (8.32.2-3) and, always in Arcadia, in Lycosura (8.37.12).

Given this framework, since Xen. introduces Ares and Aphrodite in an erotic scene, the first literary tradition seems the most appropriate and Homer seems to be his main model, since also Plato, Apollonius Rhodius and Meleager seem to allude to Demodocus' account too and do not give further details about this divine relationship. Further, the last two writers consider the episode from a different perspective to that of Xen., because they focus their attention on Aphrodite and her acquisition of military power, instead of highlighting Ares' loss.

That said, since Homer's description of the erotic consummation is very brief, Xen.'s dependence on him is general and is supported by the intratextual parallel with the last night of the novel (LI 6). This opens the space for the influence of other more erotic accounts. In this respect, Lucretius' model is interesting: while the different language makes him far from Xen. (see LI 2.3 on this), his mention of a physical contact between the gods might play a role here. Finally, this novelistic account of the role of Eros marks a difference from Homer, where Ares spontaneously and alone enters Aphrodite's house. In my opinion, Xen. might have been inspired by Plato here, as this

author is the only one who explicitly underlines the power of Eros over Ares. As a result, the *Symposium* might occur here again as a model of Xen.: this suggest that this Eros, might be different not only in quantity but also in quality from the many Erotes of the first scene: following Phaedrus' speech, there might be here a hint of the cosmogonic power of Eros, which is never introduced elsewhere by Xen. (1.2.1 n: ὁ θεός, c).

Iconography

While the iconographic tradition of the Homeric scene of Ares and Aphrodite is quite poor, the two gods are often represented together: the insistence placed in these representations on Ares' lack of weapons seems to suggest that Xen. might draw from there his Ἄρης οὐχ ὡπλισμένος. Finally, the emergence of other Eastern attestations leads us to make a final assessment of this issue.

b1a) **The Homeric scene**

a) Hellenistic ceramic in relief, contains a 'femme à demi nue et homme nu, armé d'une épée, assis sur un rocher et enlacés' (LIMC Ares 58);

b) Terracotta where 'A. et Aphrodite, nus et enlacés, sont immobilisés par les chaînes d'Héphaistos; de sa main droite, A. essaie de sortir son épée' (Ares 59*);

c) Archaic vase from Lemnus, where 'entre deux colonnes (?) sont accroupis, face à face, une femme nue et un homme portant casque, cuirasse, épée et cnémides' (LIMC 60*).

While this small number of artistic works and their lack of characterisation make it unthinkable that Xen. is influenced by them, it is interesting how in the terracotta Ares appears only with the sword: this might recall the lack of weapons of Xen.'s god. For this reason, I would analyse more generally the entire iconography treatment of the two gods.

b1b) <u>Non-Homeric representations of Ares and Aphrodite</u>

Unlike in the Homeric scene, the portrayal of these gods as a married couple, which is also attested by literature (see above), is often part of ancient iconography. Three examples are significant:

a) Classical marble relief where 'A. portant casque et manteau, bouclier posé à terre, patère dans la main droite, fait une libation au-dessus d'un autel de l'autre côté duquel se tient debout Aphrodite (?), drapée; derrière elle un personnage plus petit' (Ares 57*);

b) Attic cup, end of the fifth century BC where 'quatre couples divins banquetant, dont, sur la g., Aphrodite debout près d'A. couché sur un lit, barbu, nu jusqu'aux hanches et retenant la lance du bras gauche' (Ares 114*);

c) Lucanian amphora, fourth century BC, where we find a 'homme nu et imberbe portant bouclier dans la main droite et miroir dans la gauche tourné vers une femme assise tenant casque dans le main droite et lance dans la main gauche; au-dessus d'eux, Eros tenant couronne et auguière' (Ares 55*).

In addition, there is a further kind of representation, where the two gods appear together on a chariot and in one case there is an 'Ares barbu, portant une tunique claire et un manteau sombre, sur un char' (Ares 83*).

Overall, these works are interesting, because they all focus on an Ares who is less warrior-like than usual and does not use his weapons. This aspect is more emphasised in the last vase by the presence of the mirror and by the introduction of an Ares completely naked. As I have already suggested, this fact recalls Xen.'s definition of the god as οὐχ ὡπλισμένος. In addition, this kind of representation constitutes a clear opposition to the iconographic tradition of the god. Although Ares' representation was more military in the Archaic Era, 'conserve en général au moins sa lance' (LIMC, Ares). On balance, in Greek iconography the different tradition of Ares the lover was featured with the absence of weapons and this makes Xen.'s debt to this tradition really plausible.

b1c) The controversial issue of an artistic Eastern origin

That being said, in the Imperial Era the topic of Ares and Aphrodite seems to be very popular in the Near East, as the following works prove.

a) Marble relief in Aphrodisias, where 'Aphrodite tient sur ses genoux le petit E. en présence d'Arès (?); en haut à g. tête d'Hélios (?), allusion peut-être à l'histoire des amours adultères d'Aphrodite et Arès' (Eros 840bis);

b) Coin from Aphrodisia, 193-211 AD, where 'Aphrodite, debout et vêtue d'un long chiton, entoure de ses bras A., nu, casquê et portant la lance et bouclier' (Ares 48*);

c) Imperial coin from Amaseia (Ares 49), which contains the same motif as the previous one;

d) Older frieze from the Hekateion in Lagina, which houses 'A. portant tunique, cuirasse, [...], apparemment non casqué, se tourne vers Aphrodite (?) demi-nue; dans la main droite il tennait l'épée au fourreau'.

The emergence of this Eastern tradition focused on Eros and Aphrodite is confirmed by further coins which contain simpler representations of the two gods: see Eros 846* (Aphrodisias, 235-238 AD), Eros 847* (Bithynie, 198-235 AD) and Eros 848* (238-244 AD, Séleucie).

In my opinion, the existence of this framework, which is enriched by other Eastern parallels which belong to the first side of the canopy, might suggest that when Xen. write ὁ θάλαμος πεποιημένος is referring to a production which is plausible in this context. In Asia Minor, in fact, as in the more eastern coasts of the Mediterranean, representations like this were popular in the Imperial Era.

A further confirmation of this might come from Levi 1971's report of the excavations of the House of the Green Carpets in Antioch, where in April 1937 a new mosaic of the fourth century AD was discovered where 'the figure scene represented a pair sitting on the couch'. Following Levi's notes, 'the erotic character of the representation is indicated by the Erotes who supported a red cloth forming a sort of canopy over the heads of the pair. Therefore, the very likely names of Aphrodite and Ares, or Adonis, can be suggested. The two figures were sitting on the couch with bodies diverging, in three-quarter view and with the feet turned outwards, a scheme often used for erotic groups. [...] All the upper part of Aphrodite's body was nude, with a mantle falling from her

shoulders along her back, forming a lively contrast with her naked form, and wrapping all the lower part of her body from her hips down. [...] Near the stool on the ground a small, naked Eros, with a mantle flowing behind his body, holds some objects in his left arm, [...] while he offers similar objects with his right hand to the male figure above him' (I, 315-6). This description recalls surprisingly Xen.'s object, as it mentions the presence of a canopy, of our two main gods, of a small Eros and of general erotic flavour which characterises the mosaic. Only the date introduces a significant difference. Finally, Levi 1971 comments that 'the canopy supported in a similar manner can often be seen elsewhere in mosaics and paintings. We find it particularly in the sea-thiasos, supported by Erotes or by Tritons' (316) and he provides the example of a mosaic with the triumph of Poseidon and Amphitrite which is housed in the Louvre.

Overall, we are dealing here with a piece of evidence which seems to make the "realistic" origin of Xen.'s canopy more acceptable. A partial objection to it lies in the fact that the whole text has hints of a dramatic Classical date (GI 2b), but their small number does not make this hypothesis an objection to this point, which might only clarified by the emergence of new archaeological data.

b1d) Brief consideration of other elements of Xen.'s description

Before studying how this second important topic of the canopy is connected with the interpretation of the protagonists' love, I would briefly look at further details of the description.

- ὡς πρὸς ἐρωμένην τὴν Ἀφροδίτην κεκοσμημένος:

Literature: this part intertext with the initial passage of Artemis' ceremony, where the virgins' role is expressed (1.2.4: ἑκάστη δέ αὐτῶν οὕτως ὡς πρὸς ἐραστὴν ἐκεκόσμητο).

Analepsis: the emergence of this intertextual link seems to be simply a reminder of the main topic of the scene, marriage. This connection is different from the previous one that emerged in the first side of the canopy, because it is analeptic. In addition, it introduces a hint unusual in a relationship like that of Ares and Aphrodite which is not marital. While this is certainly another way in which Xen. strengthens the parallel between this scene and the protagonists' wedding night, it also opens a question about the role played by marriage in it, which I will shortly discuss.

- ἐστεφανωμένος:

Iconography: although Ares is usually depicted wearing a military helmet, he is sometimes crowned when he is depicted with Aphrodite: thus, we are dealing with another proof that there is an erotic iconographic tradition of the god, which Xen. seems to acknowledge (see LIMC Ares 55*, 56, 59*, 114*, 1286* and 1312*.

Prolepsis: here there is another possible reminder of garlands, which are part of the protagonists' sexual consummation.

- χλαμύδα ἔχων:

Textual difficulty: The attribution of a χλάμυς to Ares is textually disputed and Henderson 2009, following Hemsterhuius, chooses for χλανίδα. Although the material origin of the two is very similar, their usage is different: while χλάμυς is 'a male garment worn throughout the Greek world by horsemen, footsoldiers, ephebes, heralds and travellers and originating in Thessaly', the χλάνις was 'worn on festive occasions - sometimes as a wedding mantle'. Further, 'its softness sometimes marked out its male wearers as effeminate'. In my opinion, the second option is more likely: it would fit well into the context of the passage and it would also emphasise better the unusual role of Ares as a lover. Thus, I would accept Hemsterhuius' variant.

Prolepsis: following my interpretation, we are dealing with a prolepsis of love and possibly with another reminder of marriage.

- *Ἔρως αὐτὸν ὡδήγει, λαμπάδα ἔχων ἡμμένην*

Iconography: as I have already argued, since in ancient iconography Eros never appears alone with Ares, this confirms the plausibility of a Platonic intertext. From the artistic point of view, the stranger presence between the two is Ares, since Eros is depicted as the one who play a role in the wedding ceremony (see 'Scènes de mariage' in LIMC 3.Eros 639-649) and, in this kind of representation, he sometimes bears a torch too (see 'Eros tient une ou deux torches', LIMC 3, 366-387, from 460 BC to third century AD).

Prolepsis: the first part of the sentence seems to be a motto of this novel, since it very briefly expresses the power of this god. Interestingly, ὁδηγέω appears also in the description of the wedding night, where Anthia uses it to express how Habrocomes' eyes have caused her love for him to enter his soul (1.9.7 n.: τὸν ἔρωτα). Since this verb is also used by Aegialeus to describe an erotic context, as ἀμφοτέρους ὁδηγοῦντος θεοῦ (5.1.5) lies at the origin of his meeting with Thelxinoe, it would seem to me that ὁδηγέω constitutes a small sign of Xen.'s insistence on the power of Eros in his novel. Only the passage of 3.10.4 constitutes an exception, where it is an ἐλπὶς δυστυχής that guides Habrocomes in his difficult search for Anthia. Furthermore, only Hld. adopts this verb among the Greek traditional novelists, but not in an erotic context (cf. 5.23.1 and 10.27.3): this might confirm the originality of Xen.'s choice.

3) The meaning of Ares' and Aphrodite's love for the interpretation of the novel

3a) A perfect overlap between Ares and Aphrodite's love and that of the protagonists

After this wide literary and iconographic analysis of the second side of the canopy, I would like to focus on how Ares and Aphrodite's love might shed a new light on the protagonists' wedding night. While slight possible connections have already emerged, as the prolepses just mentioned proved, in this second part, unlike the first, the proleptic value is emphasised by the perfect overlap between the scene described and what is happening in the life of Anthia and Habrocomes.

This suggests to me a first consideration: since in the Homeric account Ares' entrance into Aphrodite's room is followed by the consummation of love, the omission of the second element appears here to be strange and raises also a suspicion on the presence of Aphrodite. Because of this

close connection between *ekphrasis* and the main story, I would argue that our author might be implying that the story of Ares and Aphrodite has its continuation in the ninth chapter, which perfectly coincides with the protagonists' erotic consummation. Within this hypothesis, we might even reconsider the possible absence of Aphrodite: as in the parallel passage from the second chapter, where the beloved of Anthia's maidens enter Artemis' procession after them; similarly, the goddess' epiphany might be anticipated in the eighth chapter and then realised in the ninth.

Three pieces of evidence further support this interpretation: the first two come from Xen.'s text: to begin with, from a practical point of view only Anthia and Habrocomes among the characters of the Eph. have the chance to see this representation, as it is made just for them: this suggests that they have taken it as a personal source of inspiration. Second, after having "hidden" Aphrodite in the description, our author introduces her only one other time in the novel and this corresponds with the sexual consummation between the protagonists: τὰ πρῶτα τῶν Ἀφροδίτης ἔργων ἀπήλαουν (1.9.9). Although the expression τῶν Ἀφροδίτης ἔργων is formulaic (1.9.9 n.: τὰ πρῶτα), its only occurrence there might be the subtle hint that Aphrodite is part of the scene, although in an allusive form.

The last piece, instead, coincides with Lucretius' occurrences of this motif: his emphasis on the embraces between Ares and Aphrodite, which draws on a Hellenistic inspiration, might be a hint that late authors, unlike Homer, were interested in describing the physical action between Ares and Aphrodite and, therefore, they were expanding Demodocus' account. Thus, our author's variation might be part of this new approach to the Odyssean scene.

3b) The role played by Ares and Aphrodite's love in the interpretation of the novel: sex and immaturity of love

Having argued this deep connection, we must now understand how Ares' and Aphrodite's love affects the interpretation of the protagonists' wedding night: the performance of this task inevitably leads us to explore the Homeric model, as it emerges as the main one.

At first glance, this analysis seems problematic, because the love between Ares and Aphrodite is explicitly defined by Homer as an adulterous relationship. Although scholars generally ignore this point, Schmeling 1980, 28 asks himself the unavoidable question: 'Why put such a scene over the marriage bed of especially chaste lovers?'

Rather than offering a personal answer, it is better to understand whether the Greeks perceived the same problem and how they interpreted Demodocus' story. Since this story is mentioned by many literary sources after Homer and Xen. does not transform it, it is not unthinkable that he was exploiting the common interpretation of it.

In this respect, a synthetic assessment is offered by Athenaeus, who, as I have already argued, offers us insights into the common thought of the Greeks. In a passage where he discusses the Greek symposia, he states:

ὁ δὲ παρὰ Φαίαξι Δημόδοχος ᾄδει Ἄρεος καὶ Ἀφροδίτης συνουσίαν, οὐ διὰ τὸ ἀποδέχεσθαι τὸ τοιοῦτον πάθος, ἀλλ᾽ ἀποτρέπων αὐτοὺς παρανόμων ὀρέξεων, ἢ εἰδὼς ἐν τρυφερῷ τινι βίῳ τεθραμμένους κἀντεῦθεν ὁμοιότατα τοῖς τρόποις αὐτῶν τὰ πρὸς ἀνάπαυσιν προφέρων.

'Demodocus at the Phaecian court sings of the amours of Ares and Aphrodite, not in approval of such passion, but to deter his hearers from illicit desires, or else because he knew that they had been brought up in a luxurious mode of life and therefore offered for their amusement what was most in keeping with their character' (Ath. 1.14c-d).

In my opinion, in these few sentences Atheneaus is able to pick up the two main elements suggested by the Homeric text. First, the Phaeacians are considered as hedonistic people: this is well documented in the *Odyssey*, where the Phaeacians are keen on amusement and luxurious living (see, e.g., *Od*. 8.248-9: αἰεὶ δ᾽ ἡμῖν δαίς τε φίλη κίθαρίς τε χοροί τε εἵματα τ᾽ ἐξημοιβὰ λοετρά τε θερμὰ καὶ εὐναί). Interestingly, in this attitude there is a more general predisposition to pleasures, as Heraclitus states: with the following label: ἄνθρωποι ἡδονῇ δεδουλωμένοι (69.7).

Second, Demodocus' story is ascribed a twofold function: the first is educative, as the illicit love of the god is a deterrent for the audience, while the second is entertaining, since the poet wants also to entertain the Phaeacians. This double colour characterises already the reaction of the gods in Homer: while one god makes the moral statement οὐκ ἀρετᾷ κακὰ ἔργα (329) and the angry Hephaestus includes this action into ἔργα γελαστὰ καὶ οὐκ ἐπιεικτὰ ἴδησθε (see *Od*. 8.306-20), Hermes has expresses in a highly amusing style his desire to have sex with Aphrodite (see *Od*. 8.339-342)

Interestingly, the existence of a didactic value is stressed by other Homeric commentators: Porphirius states that Demodocus wants to educate the immoral Phaeacians (οὐκ ἀτόπως ἐπὶ ἡδυπαθῶν ᾄδει ταῦτα ὁ κιθαρῳδός, δι᾽ ὧν ἥδονται σωφρονίζων αὐτούς) and Eustathius of Thessalonica considers Ares' and Aphrodite's behaviour as a negative example for men (see *Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*, vol. 1.298: περὶ κοινωνίας Ἄρεος καὶ Ἀφροδίτης μακρόθεν παιδεύει αὐτοὺς μὴ ἀσελγαίνειν [...]).

Given this framework, it is likely that also Xen. is following this interpretation of the passage, exploiting both its functions - education and entertaining - and identifying the protagonists and his readers with the hedonistic Phaeacians.

Three of these elements can be easily accepted: as I have already suggested in the introduction, the canopy provides the definition of the novel as a Phaeacian tale, in which entertainment is included. This definition seems to be further expressed by the metaliterary hint included in the πεποιήμενος of the second section.

Second, the protagonists' association with the Phaeacians is easy to understand, since wealth is a feature which is focalised on them in Ephesus (1.1.1 n.: ἀνήρ). In addition, as they are in love and ready to consummate this love on the first night together, they are certainly full of sexual desire. In my opinion, these two points constitute the clearer message conveyed by Xen. through this passage: the protagonists are having their first sexual consummation and the narrator with this divine model seems to invite them to enjoy this moment.

On the other hand, the existence of the educative issue must be proved. Although in the protagonists' reaction to their falling in love a moral concern has already emerged, the situation here is quite different: since the first moment of the ceremony the protagonists have looked forward to having sex and their past refusal or fear of love have faded away. In addition, if we take Athaenaeus' words literally, it is difficult to understand why the protagonists' love, being marital, might be considered as a παράνομος ὄρεξις. In my opinion, the answer to this issue is again suggested by studying the interpreters of Homer, with a particular focus on those who adopt a moral approach.

To begin with, the Homeric account of Ares' and Aphrodite's love is accused of being immoral since Xenophanes of Colophon, who with μοιχεύειν certainly refers to this episode: πάντα θεοῖσ' ἀνέθηκαν Ὅμηρός θ᾽ Ἡσίοδός τε, ὅσσα παρ᾽ ἀνθρώποισιν ὀνείδεα καὶ ψόγος ἐστίν, κλέπτειν μοιχεύειν τε καὶ ἀλλήλους ἀπατεύειν (fr. 11.3 Diels-Kranz). The Homeric poems, in fact, do not depict any other extramarital relationship. Second, another general attack is made by Zoilus, Greek rhetorician and philosopher of the fourth century BC, who condemns these two gods for having provoked the collective divine laughter (see T Scholium *Od.*, 8.332bis: ἐπιτιμᾷ δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ Ζωΐλος, ἄτοπον εἶναι λέγων γελᾶν μὲν ἀκολάστως τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις [...]). Third, Plato suggests a deeper interpretation, when he includes Demodocus' passage in those parts of the Homeric poems which distract men from exercising their self-control (see 390b: ἐγκράτεια and 390c). Later, when Heraclitus divides the gods according to their virtues and vices, Ares and Aphrodite belong to the second group, since the former is associated with ἀφροσύνη and the latter with ἀκολασία (see 54.1 and 7).

Finally, again Athenaeus in his twelfth book reports a discussion on the topic of τῶν ἐπὶ τρυφῇ διαβοήτων γενομένων, in which our episode is interpreted as the proof that every one, gods included, can be punished if subjected to pleasure: in fact ἡ ἡδονή is ἐπονείδιστος (12.511a). Shortly after, Ares' and Aphrodite's loves is described as ἔρωτες ἀλόγιστοι (12.511b) and the core of this argumentation is the Platonic opposition between pleasures and reason (see, e.g., Plato, *Philebus* 65c: ἡδονὴ μὲν γὰρ ἁπάντων ἀλαζονίστατον).

In my opinion, if we collect together the most important words which are part of this framework, like lack of ἐγκράτεια, ἀφροσύνη, ἀκολασία, ἡ ἡδονὴ ἐπονείδιστος and ἔρωτες ἀλόγιστοι, it is evident that Xenophanes' original accusation of adultery has been transformed in the Greek perception into a more general denigration of intemperance. In my opinion, this broader point can explain how Xen. is accommodating this model in his protagonists' wedding night: young people who are going to enjoy sex for the first time sex inevitably have a trait of intemperance. This feature does not necessarily mean that sex is wrong in Xen.'s worldview, but that is not yet complete love.

On the other hand, intratextuality might also suggest a further reason: if we start from the assumption that the Eph. was built on the opposition between two erotic nights and that Xen. was willing to use Homer to support this construction, we would need to conclude that Demodocus' story was the only choice available for the first night. Homer, in fact, does not describe the first night of Penelope and Odysseus, and the other famous love of the *Iliad* - that between Zeus and Era - was more difficult to exploit, because is not based on the consensus of both protagonists (see *Il.*

14.294-341). Following this interpretation, the presence of adultery would become an even less important issue.

In conclusion, I would suggest that Ares' and Aphrodite's story is a perfect explanation of Xen.'s view of marriage, for the combination of the transparent pleasure of sex and the subtler suggestion of its unfulfilled nature.

3c) A subtler level of the metaliterary interpretation

That being said, I would like to spend few more words on the metaliterary importance of this passage. While the association between the whole novel and a Phaecian tale has already been argued, I wonder whether Xen. might also be using this model to define himself as Demodocus and therefore as Homer, since Homeric singers are images of the authors of both *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. In addition, since no other story is mentioned about that of the adulterine love, the association with Homer would be established within the erotic and moral perspective which I have already acknowledged as the foundation of Xen.'s approach to the *Odyssey*. As a result, this would work well as an explicit confirmation of the main intertext of the *Eph*.

Second, while Anthia and Habrocomes are evidently the first addressees of the canopy and, thus, are defined as Phaeacians, also the readers share in this role, as they become aware of this story too. As a result, it is possible to argue that Xen. might be here suggesting that his whole work has the same aims towards the readers that the theme of the canopy has for the protagonists: their enjoyment as well as their education. This reflects the impression that the *Eph*. has on every attentive reader.

3d) The parallels between the two couples: the roles of the protagonists

A final point which is worth considering as part of this interplay between description and narration is the protagonists' role, because this is another element in which Xen. is interested from the beginning of his text.

Before offering an interpretation, we must understand which god the author is relating to each of the two protagonists. In theory, the answer could be double: the gender division suggests that Habrocomes might be compared to Ares, while the construction of the scene associates Anthia with the same god: the heroine literally does the same action as Ares, while Habrocomes waits like Aphrodite. That being said, however, since the parallel between *ekphrasis* and plot is so profoundly stressed, I would choose to focus on the second interpretation as it seems the most plausible one.

This statement seems to suggest that Xen. is subtler than is usually thought. If the first couple of associations were the only acceptable ones, our author would be making two simple points: the confirmation of Habrocomes submission to Eros and the definition of Anthia as ἐρωμένη, which would re-establish the traditional hierarchy after the unexpected balance of the beginning (LI 7.1).

Conversely, the adoption of the second option introduces an element of novelty and confirms Habrocomes' association as an ἐρώμενος. While the second element has an important echo in the persistence of a quality of passivity in his behaviour during the wedding night, the second appears to be a one-off, as it constitutes the first time in the novel where Anthia submits to Eros as a divine

god and not as an internal passion provoked by Habrocomes. In my opinion, this exception, rather than suggesting a new view offered by the author on Anthia's love (and this is confirmed by her leadership before having sex with Habrocomes), rather suggests that Ἔρως αὐτὸν ὡδήγει is a programmatic motto for the whole novel, explicitly confirming the silent but crucial role played by the same god in the oracle.

At the same time, Ares' loss of weapons might work as the sign that Anthia is losing her initial ἀνδρεῖα. Since this virtue has not already been introduced in the novel in relation to this heroine, while in her initial portrait she has been compared to Artemis the huntress, this image might signify that her subtle and initial resistance to love has been completely defeated: this works well with the emphasis Xen. places in the wedding night scene on her expression of desire (LI 2.4).

- A possible continuation of this model throughout the whole novel: Helios the witness of the protagonists' love

Given this interpretation of the present passage, the fact that this canopy is in relationship with the final night of the novel opens the possibility that this Homeric story might be used again throughout the novel. While I have already expressed my hypothesis about possible traces of Hephaestus (LI 7.2), I would now speculate that the appearance of Helios in the *Eph.* could also be related to this Homeric story.

As I have already suggested, in Demodocus' song the former god twice plays the important role of being the witness of love. Similarly, in the *Eph.* he is the protector of the passion between the protagonists: first, Anthia and Habrocomes offer him in Rhodes a πανοπλίαν χρυσῆν with a golden inscription (1.12.2 n.: οἱ ξεῖνοι). Then, this object and the same god play a key role in their final recognition (ibid.). Within this context, Anthia addresses the god and calls him ὦ τὰ πάντων [...] ἀνθρώπων ἐφορῶν Ἥλιε (5.11.4): this verb is a hint at Helios' traditional control of the human beings, that is at the origin of his Odyssean role as a spy.

Along with this parallel, there is also a big difference, since Helios is not here a spy against the protagonists as the divine god is. Since, however, both Anthia and Habrocomes voluntarily refer to him, the reason for this different treatment might lie in their positive approach to him. That being said, I would not insist too much on this association, which does not seem to be more than a small and inconsistent suggestion.

CHAPTER 9

Speeches and Rhetoric: the progressive achievement towards symmetry

As I have already argued in <u>LI</u> 2.4, the event of the wedding night plays an important role in both the *Entwicklung* and *Bildung* of the novel, since the protagonists break the silence of their erotic desire and manage to share it and to achieve a union. In addition, if we interpret this movement of Anthia and Habrocomes in terms of the balance of the couple, the novelty of this passage is the protagonists' achievement of symmetry (<u>LI</u> 7.1).

Given this framework, it is interesting that the dynamic of this chapter is constructed by Xen. with an attentive construction of the scene and of the speeches. To begin with, after the initial attribution to the protagonists of an identical reaction (1.9.1 n.: οὔτε προσειπεῖν), the first speech given by Habrocomes contains a first suggestion of symmetry. Although the lack of erotic initiative recalls his past passibity, he tries to present himself as an active lover (1.9.3 n.: τὸν ἐραστήν) and introduces the issue of fidelity in life as well as in death (1.9.3 n.: μεθ'οὗ ζῆν). That being said, it is with Anthia's two monologues that the real improvement happens. In this respect, it is interesting how Doulamis 2003, 82 individuates this trajectory in Anthia's words: after Anthia makes the connection between her suffering and that of her beloved (ἀπὸ τῶν ἐμαυτῆς κακῶν ἃ πέπονθας οἶδα), 'we have a transition from singular imperatives addressed to Habrocomes (ὑποδέχου) to first person plural subjunctives (ἀναμιγῶμεν, καταβρέχωμεν [...]). Then, 'the repetition of ἀλλήλων (see 1.9.5), that of verbs compound with the prefix συν- (συμφύντες, συνερῶσιν and συνήρμοκεν) and the two polyptota of χείλη and ψυχή reinforce the reciprocity'. The emergence of this movement toward symmetry inevitably affects our analysis of the chapter, since it leads us to pay a particular attention to the actions and words of the protagonists' dialogue.

1.9.1: οὔτε προσειπεῖν ἔτι ἀλλήλους ἠδύναντο: 'silence due to fear and shame' (see table 1 in <u>LI</u> 2.4) has already emerged during the description of lovesickness (1.5.3 n.: εἰπεῖν) as the main focus on Xen. (<u>LI</u> 2.3). In my opinion, the fact that Xen. starts this different erotic description from the same motif underlines further how the protagonists' main obstacle to love is the fear of their desire. In addition, this beginning might also help the readers to detect within this parallel what is really dissimilar, the initial experience of pleasure (1.9.1 n.: ὑφ'ἡδονῆς:). A further suggestion of this might be lie also in the following sentence οὔτε ἠδύναντο [...] ἀντιβλέψαι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, which, unlike the silence of modesty, subverts the protagonists' behaviour during lovesickness, when they could not avoid looking at each other (cf. 1.3.1 n.: ἐνεώρα).

1.9.1: ἔκειντο ὑφ'ἡδονῆς παρειμένοι, αἰδούμενοι, φοβούμενοι, πνευστιῶντες †ἡδόμενοι†:

a) A textual note

O'Sullivan 2005 obelizes the last participle because it is a repetition of the previous ὑφ'ἡδονῆς. In my opinion, this decision might be correct from a rhetorical point of view. As the parallel 'conflict of emotions' in Rhodes shows, Xen. likes introducing a sequence of four words where the homoteleuton is broken in the last position (see 5.15.3: πάθη, ἡδονή, λύπη and φόβος). For this reason, I would consider ἡδόμενοι not original, as it is the fifth element of the list.

Having said that, as Mazal 1971, 183 shows, however, this passage is clearly echoed by Aristaenetus in his fifth epistle of the second book, where a young girl expresses her love to a cythara's player by saying: αἰδοῦμαι, φοβοῦμαι, ὑφ'ἡδονῆς πνευστιῶ (2.5.16). Since Aristaenetus tends to be faithful to the *Eph.* (GI 5), his association of ὑφ'ἡδονῆς with πνευστιῶ might suggest the introduction of this complement at the place of ἡδόμενοι. Thus, the new variant would be: ὑφ'ἡδονῆς παρειμένοι, αἰδούμενοι, φοβούμενοι, πνευστιῶντες ὑφ'ἡδονῆς. In my opinion, however, this substitution would not work well: first, from a stylistic point of view, it would create an unlikely chiasmus based on a repetition and it would make less suitable the variation introduced with πνευστιῶντες. As a result, my final reading of the passage would eliminate the final ἡδόμενοι: ὑφ'ἡδονῆς παρειμένοι, αἰδούμενοι, φοβούμενοι, πνευστιῶντες. Schmidt 1882, followed by Papanikolau 1973, proposes καιόμενοι instead of ἡδόμενοι. However, since Xen. is not particularly keen on the image of fire and, moreover, the fire caused by pleasure is not a common literary image, I would consider this hypothesis too speculative.

b) The analysis of this 'conflict of emotions'

Having clarified this textual issue, I would reflect on the structure of this sentence and its complex meaning. These four participles describe the protagonists' emotive reaction, while they lie together in the bed. We are dealing here with an example of what Fusillo 1999 calls the novelistic τόπος of the 'conflict of emotions' (63; see NA 5). In this particular case, not all the feeling expressed are completely clear and, thus, I would like to analyse them more carefully. While the central ones clearly express the motif of 'fear and shame', which is connected with the silence found at the beginning of the chapter (1.9.1 n.: οὔτε προσειπεῖν), the meaning and function of ὑφ'ἡδονῆς παρειμένοι and πνευστιῶντες are subtler. As I will shortly show, they both describe the positive strong emotions endangered by pleasure and, thus, they produce a contrast with the other two, which focus on restraint. As a result, this conflict plays a really important role: since the protagonists' shame and fear was the dominant feature of their lovesickness, now the increase of love is introducing a novelty in them which has not yet completely prevailed. This will happen during the night.

Given this general thesis, I would now focus on the single words.

- ἔκειντο: since Xen. is describing a wedding night, I would argue that this verb might assume a subtle erotic connotation along with the more general one (1.5.9 n.: ἔκειντο). To being with, a compound of the same verb, συγκατακεῖμαι, is typically used by Plato and other ancient writers to express sexual intercourse (see table 2 in LI 2.4) and Xen. himself adopts it once to describe Aristomachus' erotic relationship with Hyperanthes (3.2.10: εὑρίσκω συγκατακείμενον τῷ παιδί). The same use affects κεῖμαι, as Longus shows when his protagonists dream to have sex together: γυμνοὶ μετ'ἀλλήλων ἔκειντο (2.10.1). Further, the same author introduces the same motif "to lay with the lover" with the other verbs κατακλίνεσθαι (3.18.3) and συγκατακλίνεσθαι (2.7.7 and 4.40.3): interestingly, the second of the two has three occurrences also in the *Eph*. and one is in relation to the wedding night (1.7.3: ἡ δὲ οἵῳ μειρακίῳ συγκατακλιθήσεται). Finally, the same function is performed by the Latin verb 'iaceo' (see table 1 and 2 in LI 2.4) to describe sexual intercourse. A case in point is this statement made by Ovid: 'Nunc iuvat in teneris dominae iacuisse lacertis; si quando, lateri nunc bene iuncta meo est' (*Am*. 1.13.5-6). In my opinion, here Xen. might be suggesting that the protagonists are in bed waiting for the consummation.

- ὑφ'ἡδονῆς: in Greek literature ἡδονή can signify both a generic 'enjoyment' and, more specifically, 'sexual pleasure'. In this case, the second meaning is the most suitable, being this scene set in a θάλαμος. In addition, in the *Eph*. this expression seems to be particularly emphasised by two elements. First, ἡδονή has only one other appearance in the novel as part of a 'conflict of emotions' (5.13.3), in which, being followed by λύπη, it seems to mean more generically 'joy'. Second, ὑφ'ἡδονῆς is cognate with the verb ἥδετο, which has already appeared at the beginning of the description of marriage to designate Anthia's excitement about having Habrocomes (1.7.4: ἡ Ἀνθία ἥδετο μὲν ὅτι Ἀβροκόμην ἕξει and 'sexual pleasure' in table 1 in LI 2.4). As a result, the sexual connotation of this word is acceptable and constitutes a one-off in the novel.

- ὑφ'ἡδονῆς παρειμένοι: that being said, we should understand the meaning of this sentence. Overall, παρίημι in the passive form means 'to be overcome' and this can suggest both a positive and a negative feeling depending on the agent. Thus, while with sleeping the verb means 'to be relaxed' (Eur. *Cycl*. 591: παρείμενος ὕπνῳ), with a disease it means 'to be weakened' (see, e.g. Eur. *Or*. 881: παρείμενος νόσῳ). In my opinion, the decision between the two depends on the interpretation of πνευστιῶντες.

- πνευστιῶντες: this is a clear symptom of lovesickness (see 'to breath hard' in LI 2.4) and occurs both in Theocritus and in Longus (e.g. in a monologue pronounced by Daphnis, where we read: ἐκπηδᾷ μου τὸ πνεῦμα). That said, the effect of this sickness on the characters is not negative, as it is provoked by pleasure. Thus, Xen. is here employing a new approach to this topic, which will shortly appear also in relation to the use of tears (1.9.2 n.: ἡ δὲ ἐδάκρυε). This shift occurs often in erotic literature, when the pain of desire is related with a possible satisfaction. This is attested for example in an elegy of Tibullus, where the poet, after a year of passion for his beloved, describes his condition by saying: 'iaceo dum saucius annum et faveo morbo, nam iuvat ipse dolor' (2.5.109-110). While the first expression expresses the wound typical of the lovesick, the new approach to this topic is given by 'faveo'.

The emergence of this framework leads me back to ὑφ᾽ἡδονῆς παρειμένοι: in my opinion, this expression, being in parallel with the aforementioned, must be considered another symptom of lovesickness read from a positive light. As a result, I would read it as 'to be weakened by pleasure'. Unlike the previous motif, which is merely typical of the real lovesickness, this one has an interesting parallel in the Roman Elegy, where, as Pichon 1966, 183 argues, 'languidi e sse dicuntur ii qui fessi vix corpus movere possunt [...] ob amorem'). A case in point is a passage from Ovid's *Heroides* 13.115-6, where Laodamia expresses her wish to embrace her husband arms by asking him: 'quand ego, te reducem cupidis amplexa lacertis, languida laetitia solvar ab ipsa mea?'. In my opinion, this weakness wished by Laodamia - which is source of happiness, as 'laetitia' suggests - is the same as that which the protagonists are experiencing.

In conclusion, Fusillo's 1999 definition of this passage as a conflict can be accepted, but in this case we are not dealing with a simple exploitation, since every feeling plays an important role in the passage and in the novel. In addition, the attribution itself of this motif to the couple as a whole constitutes the first sign of the symmetry that characterises the wedding night (1.9.5 n.: ἀναμιγῶμεν). For more on these conflicts, see NA 5.

1.9.1: ἐπάλλετο δὲ αὐτοῖς τὰ σώματα καὶ ἐκραδαίνοντο αὐτοῖς αἱ ψυχαί: in this expression the impact of the erotic scene on the protagonists reaches its apex and Xen.'s originality lies in the combination of body and soul to express the erotic trembling. In addition, as in the apex of Habrocomes' lovesickness (1.5.5 n.), 'the motion of the external body is replicated in the motion of the internal seat of emotion' (Cummings 2009, 149-150).

While the nature of this reaction in itself is not surprising, its location and the verbs adopted by Xen. deserve more attention. To begin with, as in the beginning of this chapter, the protagonists are having an experience of pleasure and not of pain, as in the previous chapter. As a result, here Xen. is expressing the excitation of the protagonists for their imminent consummation. In this reaction we might be reading also a hint of embarrassment, but nothing more serious or negative.

Second, the linguistic strangeness lies in the association between of πάλλομαι, 'to tremble', with τὰ σώματα: in the novelistic uses of the verb, in fact (see 'trembling of body and soul' in table 2.4), the verb is always referred to ἡ καρδία, a combination whose origin is in Homer (see *Il.* 22.461: παλλομένη κραδίην, where it describes Andromache's reaction when she discovers her husband's death). Although this combination occurs in the Imperial literature (cf. Aetius *De Plac. reliquiae*, where the Democritean atoms are defined as τὰ σμικρότατα ἐκεῖνα καὶ λεπτότατα σώματα ἅ [...] ἄνω καὶ κάτω παλλόμενα, Plut. *Mor.* 30a, where πάλλεται τὸ σῶμα it refers to Trojans' fear in front of Ajax, Rufus 17, who, like Galenus *De sympt. causis* 7.162, is describing the effects of diseases), the lack of examples in the erotic literature gives the impression that Xen. is going against the common trend.

The same conclusion concerns κραδαίνομαι, 'to quiver', which never occurs with ψυχή in the Greek literature, but it is used four times with σώματα and never in an erotic context (cf. Plut. *Alex.* 74.6, Cicero 35.5, Maximus Soph. 9.6.3 and Galen *De locis Affect.* 8.340; Iamblichus 9.6 and Hld.

9.4.3 and 10.31.6 use simply the verb in military and public situations). The only other occurrence is again in Xen., when the author describes the protagonists' fear in front of the pirates' imminent proposal (1.16.2: αἵ τε ψυχαὶ ἐκραδαίνοντο).

As a result, Xen. introduces here an unusual couple of phrases and this gives the impression that he might be pointing out to his readers that the nouns - body and soul - are more important than the verbs (see LI 7.2). More precisely, I would also suggest that our author's originality might lie in his introduction of a motif proper of lovesickness at the beginning of a sexual consummation. As a result, his sort of inversion of names might underline that the nature of this trembling is quite different from that of those who experience love as a disease. In this respect, ἐπάλλετο δὲ αὐτοῖς τὰ σώματα might suggest that the protagonists' bodies, after a moment of lying, are starting to move because of the excitement, giving birth to the physical relationship.

1.9.2: περιέλαβε: this is the first verb in the *Eph.* which describes a physical contact between two characters. In the whole novel Xen. adopts also περιβάλλω and ἀσπάζομαι to describe the embrace and he introduces these verbs in contexts where this act expresses either love (see, e.g., 4.5.5, where Anchialus' attempt at raping Anthia includes the participle περιληψόμενος) or affection (see e.g. 5.12.1 and 6, where Anthia embraces - περιβάλλει [...] καὶ ἀσπάζεται - and kisses Leucon and Rhode), without marking a distinction between them. Thus, he is not keen on building an erotic vocabulary: simplicity prevails. The apex of this use occurs in 2.7.5, where Anthia's attitude towards Habrocomes in prison is emphasised through the exploitation of all the three verbs: ἐφίλει τε αὐτὸν καὶ περιέβαλλε καὶ τὰ δεσμὰ ἠσπάζετο [...]. For a subtler interpretation of this passage, see Plato 7.2.

1.9.2: ἡ δὲ ἐδάκρυε [...] τὰ δάκρυα:

a) A textual issue
this sentence might appear controversial, since in theory both τῆς ψυχῆς and τῆς ἐπιθυμίας might be the subjects of προπεμπούσης. In addition, the mention of soul and the possible link between with is also not completely clear. The answer to the first question is suggested by a passage of Ach. in which Clitophon reacts desperately to the false news of Leucippe's death (7.4.3: ἦλθε δέ μοι τότε δάκρυα καὶ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τὴν λύπην ἀπεδίδουν) and he tells how his tears do not immediately come out. This being a strange phenomenon, the protagonist explains it carefully: tears are the blood of the soul (7.4.5: δάκρυον γὰρ αἷμα τραύματος ψυχῆς) and only when the soul softens the blows it receives it is able to let them flow. Conversely, when it is hit, there is an obstruction which blocks the tears. More precisely, Ach. exploits the comparison with the blood by associating the progressive visibility of bruises with the delivery of tears. Since Ach.'s pseudo-scientific explanations often reflect and deepen ideas that were part of the common mentality, I would accept this as an explanation of the current passage: the control of the soul on tears makes me accept τῆς ψυχῆς as the subject of προπεμπούσης. In addition, in the Greek literature there are other occurrences that confirm that, as in the modern language, the soul was generally considered the

origin of tears: see, e.g. Men. fr. 599: ἀεὶ δὲ τοῖς παροῦσι δακρύοις ἐμποιεῖ τὸ θῆλυ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀναβολὴν τῷ πάθει and Clemens Romans Ps.-Clem. 156: Τούτων ὁ μακάριος Κλήμης ἀκούσας καὶ παθὼν ἐπὶ τῇ τῆς γυναικὸς συμφορᾷ τὴν ψυχὴν εἰς δάκρυα [...] κατάγεται.

That said, this interpretation can be also used to solve the other issue, since τὰ δάκρυα are σύμβολα τῆς ἐπιθυμίας and not τῆς ψυχῆς.

b) Tears as the first important ingredient of the wedding night

Having clarified this first point from a textual point of view, I would like to understand the reason for this association. In order to perform this task, I will start by considering more broadly the value of tears in the whole wedding night, since in this passage they play an important role which is comparable only to that of the eyes: after this controversial first sentence, which constitutes their first appearance, there are other occurrences:

- 1.9.3: Habrocomes collects Anthia's tears and finds them very sweet;
- 1.9.3: for him drinking her tears is the apex of love, as it is described as the remedy to his love;
- 1.9.5: above all, Anthia asks Habrocomes to collect her tears;
- 1.9.5: second, she invites her beloved to drink her tears with his hair;
- 1.9.5: finally, she asks that they drench each other's garlands;
- 1.9.5: in this last invitation, the reciprocity concerns also the tears (τοῖς παρ'ἀλλήλων δάκρυσιν).

At a first glance, this framework suggests that we are not dealing with the most traditional value of tears as symbol of desperation, which occurs in the novel every time the lovers undergo perils and meet dangerous rivals (see e.g. 2.1.1: ἔκλαιον, ὠδύροντο). As the protagonists are experiencing pleasure since the beginning of the chapter, another value seems to be ascribed to tears here. To an extent, the most obvious hypothesis is that they might denote both desperation and joy, as it can happen in every human life (for an ancient reflection on this common human behaviour, see Alex. Aphrod. *Physic. Problems*, 1.31). In this respect, they might express the contradictory feelings expressed in the initial contrast of emotions.

However, since the passage has a clear literary framework, it is likely that Xen. also had in his mind a model from the erotic tradition. A positive answer to this is suggested by the recent study of Fögen 2009 on *Tears in the Graeco-Roman world*: as I will shortly show, in the tradition of Greek epigram writers, especially in those of Meleager, δάκρυα designate the mix of hope and suffering which is provoked by Eros' bitter-sweet (see Konstan 2009, 331: 'Love in fact, however painful, brings with it the hope of pleasure, which coexists with tears') and this seems the possible model of our author.

This twofold value is not already attested in the Homeric poems, where tears are associated with different kinds of emotions, from different kinds of sadness (see Föllinger 2009, 21 ff.: 'rage', 'despair', 'spontaneous reaction to a personal loss', 'fear', 'yearning', 'defeat in a sporting event') to the joy experienced after reunions or returns to home. In this second category the episode of Penelope and Odysseus constitutes the clearest example (see *Od*. 23.207-8, 23.231-40). If this pattern is very interesting, because of the closeness between Homer and Xen., in my opinion it is not here predominant, because Anthia and Habrocomes have not been yet separated for a long time

and the intensity of the former's tears is different from the weeping of a couple re-united: thus, Xen.'s source of inspiration is certainly later than Homer.

After the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, tears preserve similar connotations in Greek tragedy (see Suter 2009, 60, where 'they may be prompted by a variety of emotions, such as grief [...], loneliness, [...] joy [...] and anger'), while they are criticised by Plato, who considers them a sign of weakness, especially for the minds of men 'that ought to resist emotions' (Baumgarten 2009, 85). As a result, it is only in the erotic literature that tears restore their literary importance. Within this branch of literature, which shares the context with the present passage of Xen., tears assume two principal values. On the one hand, as the Roman elegists show, tears are usually a key ingredient of the 'lover's complaint' (Fögen 2009b, 204) for the absence or the misbehaviour of the beloved, and their frequent introduction depends on the fact that 'the entire existence of lovers is depicted as scarcely happy' (ibid., 182). Among the most specific themes associated with weeping there are jealousy (Prop. 1.5, 2.20.1-8, Ovid. *Amor.* 1.4.60-62, Ovid. *Ars Amat.* 3.673-682), unrequited love (Prop. 1.5.15-6) and the *paraklausythyron* (Prop. 1.16, Ovid. 1.16.17-8). While these are human tears, also women sometimes weep and this happens when there is a conflict in the relationship. Overall, this pattern typical of the Roman Elegy does not seem to explain what Xen. is doing, since in our novel the protagonists are neither physically nor spiritually separated.

On the other hand, there is the aforementioned approach to this theme adopted by Meleager, who gives birth to the new motif of Eros' γλυκύδακρυς (AP. 7.419.3 and AP. 12.167.2): the meaning of this epithet lies in the opposition between the sweetness of the longed-for erotic pleasure and the pain caused by its non-fulfillment. This twofold theme is already attested in Euripides' *Hippolytus*, where the choir invokes Eros as the god ὁ κατ'ὀμμάτων στάζων πόθον, εἰσάγων γλυκεῖαν ψύχα χάριν οὓς ἐπιστρατεύσῃ (525-6), and might also recall the Sapphian definition of Eros as γλυκυπικρός (Sappho fr. 130). However, it is Meleager's frequent use of sweet tears which transformed this into a common τόπος of the erotic literature, as it emerges from the following texts. The first is particularly significant:

Χειμέριον μὲν πνεῦμα· φέρει δ' ἐπὶ σοί με, Μυΐσκε,
   ἁρπαστὸν κώμοις ὁ γλυκύδακρυς Ἔρως.
χειμαίνει δὲ βαρὺς πνεύσας Πόθος, ἀλλά μ' ἐς ὅρμον
   δέξαι, τὸν ναύτην Κύπριδος ἐν πελάγει (AP 12.167).

In this text, Eros is identified with a 'blustery wind' (1) and a 'desire which heavily blusters'. At the same time, within this naval metaphor, the beloved Myiscus is the harbour. As Konstan 2009, 324 argues, 'if passion is marked by sweet tears, then, it is because ἔρως is essentially a state of suspense: the hope of a safe anchorage in the arms of the beloved provides the pleasure. [...] but the joy is contaminated by the pain of separation from the beloved'.

The same idea is more simply expressed in AP 5.177, an epigram which celebrates the power of the cosmogonic Eros (see table 2 and 3 in LI 2.3: 'Eros' power over gods and nature') and in which the god is portrayed as a παῖς γλυκύδακρυς (v. 3). The reason for this definition is that he inflicts pain on the people (7: πάντη γὰρ καὶ πᾶσιν ἀπέχθεται), but, since his presence lies in Zenophila's eyes

(10), this makes the poet's experience sweet, as the object of conquest is beautiful and attractive (for another similar occurrence, see AP 5.178.4, 5.212.2, 12.132.6).

The confirmation of this coexistence is given by another epigram in which the beloved is absent and, as a result, the tears stop being sweet: see AP 12.72, where the poet concludes the epigram by saying: καὐτὸς Ἔρωτος ἕλκος ἔχων ἐπὶ σοῖς δάκρυσι δακρυχέω (5-6). Only the morning is sweet (1: ἤδη μὲν γλυκὺς ὄρθρος), because daylight traditionally brings comfort (for a parallel see AP 5.166.2).

As a result, in Meleager's poetry tears are a symbol of the painful desire of love for the beloved and it is his presence that makes them sweet. This reminds us of the positive approach to lovesickness that has already emerged in Xen.'s introduction of παρειμένοι and πυρευστιῶντες (1.9.1. n.).

In my opinion, Xen., being aware of these erotic motifs, is introducing Anthia's sweet tears to underline her desire for the beloved, which is painful, because it has not yet been fulfilled, but at the same time sweet, because the partner has just embraced her. As a consequence, these tears appear to be a prolepsis of the sexual consummation which concludes this episode (on this see Konstan 2009, 320: 'The tears that are the tokens of Anthia's desire may be a consequence of the repression of her passion till now or its sudden satisfaction'. In my opinion, the satisfaction is alluded to but not already consumed). In this respect, Anthia's tears might recall Habrocomes' weeping in the fifth chapter (1.5.3), where, however, the sweetness was not present, because there was no real contact between the two. That being said, it is also relevant that the indication of the sweetness of tears is focalised through Habrocomes: in my opinion, this is the fruit of the original approach of our poet, who, unlike the writers of epigram, has the chance to exploit the motif in a contest of requited love.

In conclusion, I would definitely accept Xen.'s definition of tears as symbol of desire: our author is here using this image to suggest a new step in the erotic relationship of the protagonists, which lies in Anthia's expression of erotic desire (see also 1.9.5 n.: δάκρυα for the following step). The appearance of this image is certainly a good proof of Xen's knowledge of literary motifs, also because sweet tears do not appear in a sexual context in the work of the other novelists, who simply associate weeping and joy in some 'conflict of emotions' (Long 1.31.1, 2.24.1, 4.22.1; Hld. 10.38.3-4)

1.9.2: ὦ τῆς ἐμοί [...] ποθεινοτάτης νυκτός: apostrophes to the night are quite common in the Hellenistic Greek epigrams, especially in Meleager, where the νύξ is usually invoked as a witness of the beloved and of her possible faithfulness or betrayal (see AP 5.8, 5.165, 5.166 and 5.191, while 5.164 is written by Asclepiades).

On the other hand, in the Roman Elegy there is 'il topos "romantico" della notte cara agli amanti, in opposizione al giorno, alla lux che impedisce i loro incontri segreti; esso è tra i più diffusi della poesia amorosa già greca' (Rosati 1996, 178). A case in point is represented by the Ovidian night of Ero and Leander, where the latter exclaims: 'non magis illius numerari gaudia noctis Hellespontiaci quam maris alga potest' (*Heroides*, 18.107-108).

Given the existence of this framework, Habrocomes' speech seems to be exceptional, since our protagonist is speaking in front of his beloved and his night lacks any opposition to the day, being

the legitimate consummation of his wedding. As a result, Xen. seems here to transform a common motif into the new pattern of a reciprocal relationship: this fits well into the whole intent of the chapter.

Within this hypothesis, the use of ποθεινοτάτης is significant too: in the *Eph.* this adjective is always focused on Habrocomes and it occurs in two other crucial moments of protagonists' relationship: first, in his oath shared with Anthia soon after the departure from Ephesus, his apostrophe to her contains the comparative form of the adjective (see 1.11.3: Ἀνθία τῆς ψυχῆς μοι ποθεινότερα). Second, in the last dialogue of the protagonists in Rhodes, ποθεινός is the epithet of the day (1.14.3: τὴν μόγις ἡμῖν ἡμέραν ποθεινὴν εὑρημένην). In my opinion, this web of passages referring to ποθείνος might invite the readers to make a comparison between the first and the last occurrences: although in Rhodes the protagonists are spending together a night as in Ephesus, Habrocomes' mention of the day appears a willing swerve from the first night and this might strengthen one of the differences between the two events, which lies in the different consideration of sex.

Finally, while νύξ ποθείνη have no other connections in Greek literature, ἡμέρα and the same adjective appear in Aristophanes's *Pax* (see 556: Ὦ ποθεινὴ τοῖς δικαίοις καὶ γεωργοῖς ἡμέρα,) and in Euripides' *Helen* (see 623-4: ὦ ποθεινὸς ἡμέρα, ἥ σ' εἰς ἐμὰς ἔδωκεν ὠλένας λαβεῖν.). In the first passage the leader of the chorus welcomes the arrival of Peace on the scene, while in the second Menelaus expresses his joy after having met and recognised his real Helen. Finally, in Euripides' *Electra* the protagonist makes a similar exclamation after having recognised her brother: ὦ χρόνιος ἁμέρα (585). Since the first occurrence has been interpreted by scholars as 'an allusion to a standard tragic welcome scene' (Olson 1998, 190), Xen.'s use of it and his adaptation to the night can be considered part of the novelistic exploitation of tragic formulae, which emerges also in the monologues of the fourth chapter.

That being said, while in theory it is not unthinkable that Xen. is directly intertexting with Euripides' *Helen* (LI 9), practically, since in the tragic scene Menelaus' surprise of 'ritrovare una sposa fedele e innamorata come il primo giorno di nozze, dopo averla creduta a lungo adultera e seduttrice' (Fusillo 1989, 16) is not echoed by Habrocomes' reaction, the hypothesis of an active exploitation of this intertext is not likely.

1.9.3: τὸν ἐραστὴν ἔχεις ἄνδρα: as Doulamis 2003 argues (81, n. 239), there are two possible translations of this sentence: τὸν ἐραστὴν, in fact, can be taken either as a general term to indicate 'the man who loves you' or as a more specific reference to the traditional figure of the lover. While Anderson 1989 and Trzaskoma 2010 propose the former translation, Henderson 2009, 231 alludes to the latter possibility with: 'you have your lover as a husband' and Dalmeyda 1926 does this more clearly with his 'tu as pour époux ton amant appassioné'.

In my opinion, both options are allowed by the text: the second is suggested by Habrocomes' behaviour, which has been active neither in the previous chapters nor in the beginning of this. Thus, as in the second part of his apostrophe Habrocomes addresses the issue of marriage, the hero might here simply 'declare his everlasting love to her' (Doulamis 2003, 81). That being said, since Xen.

from the beginning of the novel is playing subversively with the traditional roles of the ἐραστής and of the ἐρώμενος, the readers are invited to see irony in this self-definition as an ἐραστής, since Habrocomes has thus far always failed to be like that.

Finally, also Anthia's following apostrophe ἄνανδρε καὶ δειλέ (1.9.4) seems to be part of the same game, since she reminds the readers that Xen. is effectively lacking dominance in love.

1.9.3: μεθ'οὗ ζῆν καὶ ἀποθανεῖν ὑπάρξαι γυναικὶ σώφρονι: this relative clause introduces the topic of "fidelity in life as well as in death". As I have argued in LI 2.5, this topic does not play an important role in the scene and the reason for this silence lies in the fact that fidelity becomes the main issue of the novel from the oath onwards. That being said, the occurrence of σώφρονι must here be underlined, because it is the first use of this term with reference to fidelity in marriage (see LI 4): thus, we are dealing with a small but at the same time significant anticipation of the oath.

1.9.3: ὑπάρξαι: this is the first desiderative optative of the novel. As Mann 1896, 28 argues in his analysis of Xen.'s language, 'der unabhängige obliquus wird regular gebraucht als Optativus im engerem Sinne und in Verbindung mit ἄν als Potentialis der Gegenwart'. While the less pure value emerges in 1.2.9, in 1.4.3 and in 1.11.4, where the optative simply 'expresses with ἄν a future action dependent on circumstances or conditions', the stricter one emerges here and in two other speeches of the first book, in which a character expresses a wish. The first is uttered by Anthia in her second answer to Habrocomes in the wedding night, which includes an optative (1.9.8: βλέποιτε), while the second by Megamedes, who introduces four of them in his farewell to the protagonists (1.10.10n.: εὐτυχοῖτε). In comparison with these two other cases, here Habrocomes' desire appears less strong.

1.9.3: νέκταρος ποτιμώτερα [τὰ δάκρυα]: this passage makes it explicit to the reader that Anthia's tears are sweet and not bitter (1.9.2 n.: τὰ δάκρυα). That being said, Xen.'s choice of the comparison with nectar is unusual, since this parallel is usually introduced in connection with the taste of kisses: see, e.g., Lucian's definition of Ganymede's kiss (cf. 8.2: τὸ φίλημά σοι ἥδιον τοῦ νέκταρος and 8.3, where the same concept is repeated), AP 5.305.2 (νέκταρ ἔην τὸ φίλημα, τὸ γὰρ στόμα νέκταρος ἔπνει) and, among Latin writers, Hor. 1.13.14-15 ('oscula quae Venus quinta parte sui nectaris imbuit'). This pattern is confirmed by the novelists, where nectar appears only in Ach., who, after the description of Ganymede as οἰνοχόον τοῦ νέκταρος (2.36.4), describes the boy's kisses with the clauses εἰ νέκταρ ἐπήγνυτο καὶ χεῖλος ἐγίνετο (2.38.5).

Since no other Greek author associates δάκρυα and νέκταρ, here Xen. appears as a creative and, possibly, slightly sophisticated author.

1.9.3: παντὸς δὲ τοῦ πρὸς ὀδύνην φαρμάκου δυνατώτερα: in this passage φάρμακον belongs to a traditional metaphor of love (1.2.1 n. and 1.6.2 n.), according to which it designates the 'remedy' of love. This is suggested not only by the general erotic context, but also by the use of the word ὀδύνη. Since this noun has here its only appearance and is anticipated in the novel by its cognates ὀδυνάω (1.4.4 n.) and ὀδυνάομαι (1.4.7), which both describe love, I would argue that here Xen. is

suggesting that tears are more successful than any φάρμακον against love. This leads us to conclude that we are dealing with another repetition of the oracle's motif 'Love is the only remedy for love': since tears are desires, Xen. might be here saying that the only cure for love is to welcome the erotic πόθος: this is another metaphor which emphasises the new step of the protagonists' night.

1.9.4: δοκῶ σοι καλή·: an expression like this, which is focused on the combination of δοκέω and the adjective καλός, is very simple, as its appearance on Greek vases to express beauty further proves (1.1.5 n.: ὅτι εἷς καλὸς αὐτὸς). Interestingly, in the *Eph.* Xen. adopts it as a formula for a love which constitutes a danger for conjugal fidelity and which can be real or possible. Since Anthia introduces here this theme as a question, we are dealing with another subtle expression of "jealousy" (1.5.4 n.: λυπουμένη). For this reason, here Anthia seems:

a) 2.4.2: δοκεῖς τινι τῶν δεσποτῶν, Ἁβροκόμη, καλός: real love of Manto to Habrocomes (Leucon is speaking);

b) ματαίως ἔδοξας Πολυίδῳ καλή: invented love for Leucon refers this formula to Manto's love for Habrocomes;

c) 5.5.3: real love of Polyidus for Anthia (Rhaenea is speaking);

d) 5.8.7: ἄλλη που δέδοκται καλή: possible love of Habrocomes for another woman (Anthia after her nightmare).

That being said, it is interesting that the last occurrence is pronounced by Habrocomes in the final night in Rhodes, where the protagonist wants to assure his wife about his fidelity: οὐτὲ παρθένος ἐμοί τις ἔδοξεν εἶναι καλή (5.14.4). This passage creates a link between the wedding night and the last one. In this respect, as Doulamis 2003 notes, in Rhodes Habrocomes 'responds to Anthia's points, but in reverse order' (95): also his precedent sentence - οὔτ'ἄλλη τις ὀφθεῖσα ἤρεσε γυνή (5.14.4) - intexts with Anthia's words on the wedding night, as she uses ἀρέσκω in her second question and this verb does not have any other occurrences apart from these two.

While, to an extent, the discovery of the parallel between these two events is not surprising, since they constitute the only two situations of the novel where the protagonists sleep together, two points seems to be worth making. First, the fact that Habrocomes waits through the whole journey to answer Anthia's questions shows that, as in the oath (LI 2.5), Xen. introduces fidelity as the dimension of love which can be achieved only with the passing of time. Second, the fact that in Rhodes Habrocomes, unlike Anthia, recalls the wedding night and not the oath introduces an asymmetry in the couple and seems to suggest that Habrocomes is less keen than Anthia on fidelity.

1.9.4: ἄνανδρε καὶ δειλέ: in this passage Anthia introduces the motif of the "cowardice of love" (table 1 and 2 in <u>LI</u> 2.4). Before analysing the effect of this on the characterisation of both protagonists, it is significant that δειλία, as ὑπερηφανία (1.2.1 n.: ὑπερηφάνοις), is both a vice in Aristotle's ethical works and one of the Theophrastan characteristics that similarly represent deficiencies of virtues. As a result, also here Xen. might be referring to character typification, sharing the habitual erotic approach to it adopted by novelists.

This is the first hint that Anthia is now able to speak in a persuasive way, having completely overcome her previous shame. More precisely, in this passage she shows a mix of arrogance and impudence, which confirms her unusual status as ἐραστής. At the same time, the effect of her words appears to be a recognition of Habrocomes' lack of ἀνδρεῖα and, thus, a recognition of his similarly unusual status as an ἐρώμενος. This sort of accusation is increased by the fact that the hero not only lacks erotic courage, but he has already failed to be morally ἀνδρεῖος and to resist love (1.4.1 n.: ὦ πάντα ἄνανδρος). While this more broadly 'questions the attainability and the legitimacy of ideal masculinity' (Jones 2007b, 144), the passage also generates humour, since it is Anthia who attacks Habrocomes and introduces an implicit self-attribution of ἀνδρεῖα (see on this Jones 2007b, 117: 'when a speaker or author highlights the absence of παιδεία, he implicitly suggests that, by contrast, he himself possesses that quality. The same may be said of ἀνδρεῖα'). In addition, Anthia seems to be even harsh toward her partner: in her question καὶ μετὰ τὴν σὴν εὐμορφίαν ἀρέσκω σοι;, the use of μετὰ, 'after', refers to the prominence of his beauty and in this context this allusion sounds like an ironical criticism of his previous arrogance. As a result, Xen. seems to give to Anthia a marked rhetorical ability. Interestingly, an interplay with lack of erotic courage occurs in Ach., where Clitophon underlines his δειλία. As soon as the protagonist starts to pursue Leucippe, he expresses the following fear to Satyrus: δέδοικα δὲ μὴ ἄτολμος ὢν καὶ δειλὸς ἔρωτος ἀθλητὴς γένωμαι (2.4.4) and his servant uses again δειλὸς in his following question (2.4.5). Shortly after, Clitophon in a soliloquy explicitly connects his lack of ἀνδρεῖα with his lack of erotic courage (see 2.5.1) and the same erotic connotation is repeated in 2.10.1 and in 4.1.2 through the verb ἀνδρίζομαι.

Since, however, Ach. does not make another character say these things, Anthia's sensual provocation remains unparalleled.

1.9.4: πόσον ἐβράδυνας ἐρῶν χρόνον: with this sentence Anthia attributes to Habrocomes the erotic motif of the 'slow lover', who does not answer love. This τόπος is quite common in Roman Elegy: a case in point is Hypsile's letter to Jason in Ovid's *Heroides*, where she complains about his disinterest towards her by saying: 'Quid queror officium lenti cessasse mariti?' (6.17; for other parallels, see 'the slow lover' in LI 2.4). Interestingly, this motif is subtly introduced by Xen. with a variation on the previous occurrence of the same verb, where the impatience of love was introduced instead (1.8.1: βραδύνειν; see 'the slow lover' in table 1 and 2 in LI 2.4).

1.9.5: ἰδού [...] ὑποδέχου [...] πινέτω: the fact that Anthia and not Habrocomes uses imperatives on the wedding night confirms her preservation of the leadership role within the couple. On this, see LI 7.1.

1.9.5: δάκρυα μὲν ὑποδέχου τἀμά: this request appears as further re-elaboration of the definition of tears as symbol of desire: in Anthia's mind, her request to Habrocomes to accept her tears coincides with the request of accepting her love. In this respect, this imperative anticipates the following explicit invitation introduced with ἀναμιγῶμεν.

This possibility has a parallel in a pseudo-scientific explanation of tears given by Ach.,when Leucippe cries in front of Thersander. The novelist starts here from the common belief that εἰς τὰ ὄμματα τῶν καλῶν τὸ κάλλος κάθηται (6.7.5) and he introduces tears in his Platonic description of how beauty is welcomed by the lover. When beauty moves from the eyes of the beloved to those of the lover, δάκρυα move with beauty and are kept by the lover in his eyes. The reason for this lies in the lovers' desire to use them as μαρτυρίαν of love (6.7.6). Following this explanation, I would confirm that Anthia's invitation to Habrocomes coincides with the request to reciprocate her love.

In addition, this idea of using tears as a witness leads me to include in this pattern Anthia's invitation to Habrocomes to drench his hair. This part of the body, in fact, constitutes in itself an important μαρτυρία, since it remains wet for a long time. Further, in our case Anthia is certainly using ἡ καλή σου κόμη to make a pun on Habrocomes' name (1.1.2 n.: συνήνθει): thus, the witness which she is really looking for is Habrocomes in his entirety: Anthia is subtly but insistently asking Habrocomes to answer her love.

Overall, the emergence of this pattern leads me to make these further remarks: to begin with, the fact that Anthia takes the initiative and Habrocomes simply has the task of answering confirms that Anthia still plays the leading role in the couple (see LI 7). A further proof of this might lie in the fact that the object of Anthia's first invitation here coincides with what Habrocomes has already done: this suggests that only through the heroine can the erotic actions of her husband achieve their aim. Second, this sophisticated approach to tears appears to be persuasive sign of how Xen. is able to use precious erotic motifs when he so wishes. A further proof of this subtle will appear in the second part of Anthia's speech (1.9.7-8 n.), where the heroine demonstrates a similar sophistication in relation to eyes.

1.9.5: συμφύντες ἀλλήλοις ἀναμιγῶμεν: the first reason why this phrase is important is its inclusion of an exhortative conjunctive and of a first plural person. As I briefly suggested at the beginning of this chapter, with this verb Anthia's attitude towards Habrocomes definitely changes: while she was treating him before as a sort of subordinate, here the heroine starts to consider him an equal. Significantly, this change happens exactly when she addresses the issue of a profound union with him.

Interestingly, this idea is not only developed through the close introduction of συμφύω and ἀναμείγνυμι, but seems to be emphasised through a plausible Platonic intertext. The first verb, in fact, occurs in Aristophanes' myth in the Platonic *Symposium*: in this famous passage, in fact, after the cut of the human form decided by gods, each half longs for its fellow and περιβάλλοντες τὰς χεῖρας καὶ συμπλεκόμενοι ἀλλήλοις, ἐπιθυμοῦντες συμφῦναι (191a).

In my opinion, this connection is not unthinkable, because, although συμφύω in the passive form, where it means 'grow together' or 'unite', has many occurrences in the Greek literature, it is almost never used in an erotic narrative. The two more important contexts where we find it are scientific descriptions, where the high number of motifs makes impossible their mention here, and philosophical texts, from fragments of Empedocles (26 and 72) to Plato, who uses it to define love (*Phdr*. 246d: τὸν ἀεὶ δὲ χρόνον ταῦτα [body and soul] συμπεφυκότα), to Epictetus (Diss. ab Arriano

dig. 4.1.113). At the same time, συμφύομαι is also adopted in more general and non-technical contexts: for instance, Xenophon of Athens express through it the need of a rider of a horse to be one with his animal (*Cyr.* 4.3.18-19: διώξομαι δὲ τῷ ἵππῳ, τὸν δ'ἐναντίον ἀνατρέψω τῇ τοῦ ἵππου ῥύμῃ, ἀλλ' οὐ συμπεφυκὼς δεδήσομαι ὥσπερ οἱ ἱπποκένταυροι).

Given this framework, only two other authors use συμφύομαι in an erotic context in the Early Imperial Era: the first is Plutarch, who in Antony's biography describes his passion for Cleopatra by saying that he was ἑλκόμενος ὑπὸ τῆς γυναικὸς ὥσπερ συμφπεφυκὼς καὶ συμμεταφερόμενος (66.4). As this author is keen on Plato, it is likely that this passage itself was inspired by the philosopher. Second, the Early Imperial grammarian Phrynicus in his *Praeparatio Sophistica* explains the meaning of ψυχὴ μία ἥστην with the following sentence: ἐπὶ τῶν σφόδρα στεργόντων ἀλλήλους καὶ οἷον συμπεφυκότων ἐν φιλίᾳ (128). As he writes works on Attic usage and his main models are Plato, Demosthenes and Aeschines, also this passage seems to confirm that συμφύομαι was considered Platonic by Imperial writers.

This idea is further supported by looking at the other Greek novelists, where συμφύομαι occurs often in passages that are more clearly intertexting with the *Symposium*, also because of the introduction of erotic embraces. In my opinion, these parallels support the aforementioned statement that this verb had a Platonic mark in the Imperial Erotic literature and, thus, make the existence of this in the Eph. more plausible.

To begin with, Longus describes how Daphnis and Chloe, before her meeting with the master, συνεχῆ μὲν οὖν τὰ φιλήματα καὶ ὥσπερ συμπεφυκότων αἱ περιβολαί (4.6.3): here both the verb and the embraces occur. A similar erotic scene occurs in Ach.'s novel. When Leucippe survives her "Scheintod" and see Clitophon, ἐπιπεσοῦσα δέ περιπλέκεταί μοι καὶ συνέφυμεν καὶ ἄμφω κατεπέσομεν (3.17.7). In the first book, instead, Clitophon dreams of a terrible woman who cuts and separates him from his sister, to whom he was attached (συμφῦναι: 1.3.3). This image itself recalls the Platonic cut of Aristophanes' speech and it is relevant that the novelist uses the two words ὀμφαλοῦ (ibid.) and συμβολαί (1.3.4) which play a key role in Aristophanes' description. Finally, when in the *Aethiopica* Theagenes and Charicleia are left alone in the cave, they kiss and embrace one another and εἴχοντο ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἀλλήλων οἰονεὶ συμπεφυκότες (5.4.5; an identical situation lived by the protagonists is described in 2.6.3, but there ἡνωμένοι substitutes συμφέομαι): the Platonic sequence is again respected. As I have already suggested, this framework of passages supports the Platonic connotation of Xen.'s συμφύομαι. On the possible parallel with the conclusion of the novel, see LI 7.1.

Overall, the emergence of this model seems the the best authentication one could give to the achievement of unity made by Anthia and Habrocomes.

1.9.5: καταβρέχωμεν δὲ καὶ τοὺς στεφάνους τοῖς παρ'ἀλλήλων δάκρυσιν: after the hair, Anthia extends the motif of tears to garlands. As the different mood already suggests, the heroine here introduces a further step in her proposal: since garlands are symbols of the promise of marriage (1.7.3 n.: μεστὴ), with this new erotic invitation Anthia seems to ask Habrocomes for a love that can last longer, echoing the aforementioned theme of the *Symposium*.

From a literary point of view, as Giangrande 1974, 31 argues: 'Las variaciones sobre el motivo de las coronas son innumerables en la poesía helenística'. Οἱ στεφανοί, in fact, can be destined to the beloved's head (see Meleager, AP 5.147) and they are either sent or given directly by the lover (see Rufinus, AP 5.74.1-2 for the former case and Marcus Argentarius, AP 5.118.2, Meleager, AP 5.136.3, Propertius 1.3 and Paulus Silentiarius in AP 5.288.2 for the latter). On the other hand, garlands can also be hung at the door of the beloved's house (see Rufinus, AP 5.92.3).

Finally, in sophisticated authors like Meleager, the garland becomes also the object which loses the contest of beauty with the beloved (see AP 5.142.1-2, 143.1-2 and 145.6) and the treacherous sign of both the consummated love (see AP 5.175.4, Meleager) and of the numeros rivals in love (see AP 12.156.2). On the other hand, Strato transforms the garland made by a beloved into an object of supplication to gods (AP 12.8-1.2 and 7-8), Callimachus uses the loss of flowers from the garland as a sign of the falling in love (AP 12.134.3-4) and Asclepiades attributes the same function to the fall of the garland from the head (AP 12.135.4).

Given this framework, Xen. achieves two goals. First, he introduces the motif of dipping the garlands with tears, which, though less popular than the previous ones, is common in erotic literature: in fact, it appears in Asclepiades (AP 5.145.1-3: Αὐτοῦ μοι, στέφανοι, [...] μὴ προπετῶς φύλλα τινασσόμενοι, οὓς δακρύοις κατέβρεξα), in Meleager (again AP 5.136 and AP 5.191.5-6: ἐπὶ προθύροισι μαράνας δάκρυσιν ἐκδήσω τοὺς ἱκέτας στεφάνους) and in an anonymous epigram (AP 12.116.1-2: παῖ, λάβε τοῦτον τὸν στέφανον, τὸν ἐμοῖς δάκρυσι λουόμενον). Unlike the previous cases, however, the first of these models seems here to be very close to Xen.'s text. Since Asclepiades shares with our author the use of the verb καταβρέχω in association with στεφανοὺς and ὀφθαλμοῖς, it is not unthinkable that Xen. was intertexting with him. This possibility is difficult to test: what is evident is that Xen. changes Asclepiades' location of garlands, as both lovers hold and dip them. Although the hypothesis of a variation like this is not typical of our author, the emergence in this chapter of a more sophisticated style make this hypothesis not unlikely.

Second, unlike all the other models, in Xen. tears are not negative but joyful: this further emphasises how keen he is on sweet tears and how willing to play with erotic tradition.

1.9.5: τοῖς παρ'ἀλλήλων δάκρυσιν: this expression is Anthia's last reference to tears and constitutes the ideal conclusion of her exploitation of them, since tears are used as a further comment on the "Platonic" allusion to the union of the beloved.

1.9.5: ἵν'ἡμῖν καὶ οὗτοι συνερῶσιν: this sentence has another trait of sophistication, since the garlands are personified: this phenomenon is a sign of the sophistication of erotic literature. A case in point is Meleager's definition of a rose as φιλέραστον (AP 5.136.5): as this is part of the beloved's garland and she is crying, also our author seems here to refer also to a literary motif.

1.9.6: τὰ χείλη τοῖς χείλεσι φιλοῦσα συνηρμόκει: although kisses have occurred before the wedding night, it is interesting that lips appear only here. The reason for this delay seems to lie in Xen.'s intention of using them for a new step of the protagonists' love, which involves their soul. With this

sentence we have a standard exploitation of lips. The representation of a kiss as an encounter between them is a common τόπος of the erotic literature. It is interesting that the two other examples of this share with Xen. the use of the polyptoton: cf. Meleager in AP 5.171.3 (ὑπ᾽ἐμοῖς νῦν χείλεσι χείλεα θεῖσα) and Marcus Argentarius in 5.128 (χείλεά τε γλυκεροῖς χείλεσι συμπιέσας). This second case is even more significant, since the same figure of speech concerns three other parts of the human body. The existence of these parallels confirms the wantonness and the stylistic quality of Xen.'s expression. The same τόπος occurs also in Latin poetry (see Ov. *Am*. 3.14.9, Ov. *Her*. 13.117, 15.319, *Ars. Am*. 1.682, 3.650).

1.9.6: ὅσα ἐνενόουν διὰ τῶν χειλέων ἐκ ψυχῆς εἰς τὴν θατέρον ψυχὴν διὰ τοῦ φιλήματος παρεπέμπετο: after the first mention, it is with this sharing of kisses and thought that lips become important. After the declaration and correspondence of erotic desire suggested through tears and the establishment of a union, the experience of love here goes further in depth through the involvement of the soul: the effect is an 'empathy' (Cummings 2009, 150).

From a literary point of view, the link between kissing and the soul is often introduced in Greek literature to underline the intensity of this erotic gesture: see. e.g. Meleager in AP 12.133, 5-6, where the poet says: καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ τὸν καλὸν ἐν ἠιθέοισι φιλήσας Ἀντίοχον ψυχῆς ἡδὺ πέτωκα μέλι and AP 5.171.4. In addition, this motif is also novelistic, since it occurs in Longus (see 1.17.1, where Chloe's kiss to Daphnis is πάνυ δὲ ψυχὴν θερμᾶναι δυνάμενον) and in Ach. (see 4.8.3, where Clitophon states that τοῖς μὲν γὰρ χείλεσιν ἀλλήλους φιλοῦμεν, ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς ἡ τῆς ἡδονῆς ἐστι πηγή).

The same conclusion can be extended to the use of a kiss as an instrument for the exchange of thoughts between the souls, though is slightly less common. On the one hand, Plato in his epigram dedicated to Agathon describes the transfer of his soul into that of the beloved: Τὴν ψυχήν, Ἀγάθωνα φιλῶν, ἐπὶ χείλεσιν ἔσχον· ἦλθε γὰρ ἡ τλήμων ὡς διαβησομένη (AP 5.78). On the other hand, Rufinus is more allusive, as he says that the beloved's kiss τὴν ψυχὴν ἐξ ὀνύχων ἀνάγει (AP 5.14.4). Similarly, Ach. suggests that souls go up as a consequence of the kiss (see 2.8.2: Αἱ γὰρ τῶν στομάτων συμβολαὶ [...] ἔλκουσι τὰς ψυχὰς ἄνω πρὸς τὰ φιλήματα; cf. also 2.37.10, where the same movement is attributed to ἡ καρδία).

This framework seems to suggest that Xen. might here rephrase a common motif of the tradition, in order to deepen the relationship of his protagonists.

1.9.7: φιλοῦσα δὲ αὐτοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς: the action of kissing the eyes asa sign of love is attested in Greek literature since Homer, who describes Eumaeus' welcome to Telemachus by saying: κύσσε δέ μιν κεφαλήν τε καὶ ἄμφω φάεα καλά (*Od*. 16.15). Identically, Penelope kisses Telemachus (*Od*. 17.39) and Anfithea, Odysseus' grandmother, does the same with his grandson's head and eyes (see *Od*. 19.417).

Having said that, however, only two other Greek sources attest this action and they both refer it to a Roman custom: to begin with, Epictetus introduces this gesture when he describes people who offer congratulations to a new tribune: πάντες οἱ ἀναπαντῶντες συνήδονται· ἄλλος τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς

καταφιλεῖ, ἄλλος τὸν τράχηλον, οἱ δοῦλοι τὰς χεῖρας (Dissert. ab Arriano digest., 1.19.24). Second, Dio Cassius tells us that Nero greets her mother in Bauli φιλήσας καὶ τὰ ὄμματα καὶ τὰς χεῖρας (61.13.2). This second passage seems the most interesting, because, unlike the first two, it might have an erotic connotation, since a few lines before we are told that Nero ἔλεγεν ὅτι καὶ τῇ μητρὶ ὁμιλοίη (61.12.1).

Given the Roman contexts of these two passages, it is not surprising to find two other attestations of the same behaviour in Latin writers: Cicero refers to his brother Tiro by saying 'Ego [...] tuos oculos, etiam si te veniens in medio foro videro, dissaviabor' (*Fam.* 16.27), while Catullus in his ninth poem writes: 'applicansque collum iucundum os oculosque suaviabor' (9.8-9).

This framework of passages leaves Xen.'s occurrence unclear: he might be either drawing generically from a normal behaviour or be inspired by possible lost Greek elegiac texts, if not by Catullus himself. Although our author's general attitude would suggest the first option, the elaboration of this chapter and especially of this section leads me to choose the second.

1.9.7-8: ὦ πολλάκις με [...] τηρήσατε: Anthia's second speech on the wedding night is an insisted apostrophe to Habrocomes' eyes. This part shows further her rhetorical ability: the heroine decides here to go back to her past lovesickness and she does this in a very original way, presenting the "old" models in a new form which is focused on eyes (for these motifs see again table 1, 2 and 3 in LI 2.3). As I have already argued (1.3.1 n.), the device adopted to achieve this variation lies in a particular focus on eyes and on the attribution to them of a twofold function: eyes are not only receptors of beauty, but also projectors of it. The first element, which is more common in the *Eph.*, involves first Habrocomes' reception of Anthia's beauty and is introduced through the following metaphors and sentences:

- διηκονήσατε: metaphor for serving (1.9.7);

- τὸν ἔρωτα τὸν ἐμὸν καλῶς εἰς τὴν Ἁβροκόμου ψυχὴν ὡδηγήσατε (1.9.7): 'love and slavery', with the use of the metaphor of 'leading along a path' (Cummings 2009, 117);

- ὑμεῖς δὲ ἀεὶ βλέποιτε ταῦτα [...] ἄλλος εὔμορφος (1.9.7): appeal to fidelity referred through the eyes.

At the same time, Anthia refers briefly also to her own eyes: her definition of them as τοὺς Ἁβροκόμου διακόνους (1.9.8) is part of the same function of receptors of beauty, which is introduced through the other common metaphor of slavery.

On the other hand, the beginning of Anthia's speech addresses Habrocomes' eyes as projectors of his beauty:

- πολλάκις με λυπήσαντες ὑμεῖς (1.9.7): here there is the common description of love as pain;

- ὦ τὸ πρῶτον ἐνθέντες τῇ ἐμῇ κέντρον ψυχῇ: here Anthia exploits the typical association of love with a 'goad'.

- the same perspective on Habrocomes' eyes concludes the speech: ἔχετε ψυχάς ἃς αὐτοὶ ἐξεκαύσατε (1.9.8), where there is the metaphor of love as a fire.

Overall, what is surprising is that Anthia introduces here the most traditional images of love, as well the invitation to fidelity through the eyes: this insistence betrays a rhetorical ability which has its

parallel with the previous game played with tears. In addition, since the first theme - eyes as receptors of beauty - has already introduced by Xen. in relation to Plato (1.3.2 n.), I would suggest that the whole passage has a Platonic colour: if we compare this with Anthia's monologue (1.4.6 n.), we might conclude that the heroine is aware of being a Platonic ἐραστής (see 1.4.6: μαίνομαι and LI 7.1).

1.9.7: ἐνθέντες τῇ ἐμῇ κέντρον ψυχῇ: as Cummings 2009 argues, 'κέντρον denotes any "sharp point", but significantly it is often used to mean "goad"' (85). Although it is originally related with the bee's sting (see ibid.: 'In the sting image there is predominantly the notion of one animal, the cow, being stung by another, the gadfly'), here it indicates 'the personification of the emotion' (ibid) and, more accurately, of love. The origin of this metaphoric image lies in Euripides' *Hippolytus*, where Aphrodite defines Phaedra as a woman ἐκπεπληγμένη κέντροις ἔρωτος (38-39) and a similar definition is given by Artemis towards the end of the tragedy: τῆς γὰρ ἐχθίστης θεῶν ἡμῖν [...] δηχθεῖσα κέντροις (1301-3) .

Interestingly, the second occurrence in Greek literature is a passage from Plato's *Phaedrus*: where the philosopher is describing the birth of an erotic passion in the charioteer, he writes: πόθου κέντρων ὑποπλησθῇ (253e6-254a1). Since Xen. seems to know this dialogue more better than the tragedy (LI 7), it is not unthinkable that he is intertexting with Plato. In addition, the context of the Platonic passage has connections with our scene, as the black horse will shortly try to have sex with the beloved like the novel's protagonists.

Furthermore, this possibility might by strengthened by the fact that after the philosopher 'the goad of love' preserves the relation with the bee sting in erotic literature, as three epigrams of Marcus Argentarius, Meleager and Stratone show (cf. respectively AP 5.32.4: κέντρῳ τύμμα φέρεις ἄδικον and AP 5.163.4: κέντρον Ἔρωτος, two texts which start with the apostrophe Μέλισσα; see also AP 12.249, which similarly starts with βουποίητε μέλισσα and ends with κἠγὼ κέντρον ἔρωτος ἔχω; see also Cummings 2009, 84-5). The same evidence is provided by Longus, who twice introduces the same metaphor: cf. 1.14.2 and 1.27.2.

Conversely, the only erotic mention of κέντρον without bees occurs in Hld.'s description of Demeneta's love in 1.14.6: οἷον ἐγκεῖσθαι τῇ καρδίᾳ κέντρον ἀγνοεῖν τὰς ἄλλας ἔλεγεν, but this author's proved debt to Plato might support and not contradict our theory (conversely, Agatias Scolasticus's example is not relevant, since he writes in the Byzantine Era: see: 5.220.1-2: τὸ θαλυκρὸν [...] κέντρον ἐρωμανίης).

Finally, it is interesting that in novels other emotions can also be associated with the 'sting': a case in point is Achaemenes' erotic delusion, which includes also ὀργή and ζηλοτυπία (see 7.29.1: ὑπ'ὀργῆς ἅμα καὶ ζηλοτυπίας καὶ ἔρωτος καὶ ἀποτυχίας οἰστρηθείς).

1.9.7: τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς [...] οἵ ποτε σοβαροὶ μέν: on the meaning of σοβαροὶ, see 1.4.7 n.: σοβαρὸς.

1.9.7: τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς [...] ἐρωτικοί: although the connection between love and sight is popular, the attribution of this adjective to the eyes has no other parallel in the Greek literature. However, a

partial exception might be made by a passage of Plato's *Phaedrus*, where the philosopher introduces the syntagm τὸ ἐρωτικὸν ὄμμα (253e5).

The hypothesis that Xen. is drawing from this expression is difficult to test, also because in Plato ὄμμα seems to have the translated meaning of 'face' (LSJ). However, it is not impossible, since this expression just precedes the afore-mentioned κέντρον.

1.9.7: διηκονήσατε [...] ὡδηγήσατε: the use of these two past aorists, along with the following ἐξεκαύσατε, is interesting from a stylistic point of view, because it recalls other direct speeches of the novel - especially the laments (see 1.4.3) - as well as in Anthia's first intervention in this night (see 1.9.4: ἐβράδυνας and ἠμέλ<λ>ησας), where past and present are used to draw a distinction between them. This connection is not surprising here, since Anthia is also referring to her past. The only difference lies in the fact that Anthia aims here to underline the continuity of the erotic task of Habrocomes' eyes. This feature appears a further sign of the achievement of harmony between the protagonists.

1.9.7: τὸν ἔρωτα [...] ὡδηγήσατε: for the particular value of ὁδηγέω in the *Eph.*, see 1.8.2-3 n., Ἔρως αὐτὸν ὡδήγει).

1.9.8: διακόνους: with this epithet Anthia extends the aforementioned attribution of the *servitium amoris* to Habrocomes' eyes to her own eyes. The rhetorical quality of the passage is suggested by her adoption of the polyptoton. While a positive evaluation of eyes is also given by Ach., where ὀφθαλμὸς γὰρ φιλίας πρόξενος (1.9.5), it is interesting how in Greek epigrams eyes with their predisposition to fall in love are also object of the poets' accusation. This happens with Meleager, who defines his eyes Ὦ προδόται ψυχῆς, παίδων κύνες, αἰὲν ἐν ἰξῷ Κύπριδος, ὀφθαλμοί (5.92.1-2). Anthia's positive choice is another proof of her positive view of love.

1.9.8: ὑμεῖς δὲ ἀεὶ βλέποιτε ταῦτα καὶ μήτε Ἀβροκόμη [...] ἄλλος εὔμορφος: with this expression Anthia introduces the erotic τόπος of jealousy. Also in this case we are dealing with a new reading of a previous occurrence, since jealousy already affects Anthia in the fifth chapter (1.5.4 n.: λυπουμένη). Interestingly, the novelty here does not only lie in the use of eyes, but also in the attribution of this motif to both of them. See also LI 5 for more.

1.9.8: τηρήσατε: this verb, in relation with the reciprocal wish not to be jealous, introduces a further step of the protagonists' love, which lies on fidelity. As I have already suggested (LI 2.4), while this topic is only hinted here, it becomes central in the oath and then it is developed throughout the whole novel. In my opinion, the briefness of this reference might be the reason why Xen. has decided to write shortly after a long oath on this. That being said, the introduction of this topic here makes the *Bildung* of the wedding night outstanding in its richness.

Finally, the proleptic nature of this passage is suggested by the use of this verb, which occurs constantly in the whole novel to describe the progressive fidelity of the protagonists: see LI 4.

1.9.9: περιφύντες ἀνεπαύοντο: the verb περιφύομαι, 'to cling', indicates an act which is part of the protagonists' physical sex. This verb, being a compound of φύομαι, is certainly connected with the previous one introduced by Anthia in her speech, συμφύντες (1.9.5), which is a reminder of the union of the halves in the Platonic *Symposium*. However, the meaning does not seem to be the same: while συμφύομαι means 'grow together', περιφύομαι refers more simply to a merely physical act of embracing. As a result, this variation might be the sign given by the narrator that the protagonists have not reached their union yet, despite their consummation of sex. This fact would work well in Xen.'s *Entwicklung* of the protagonists' love (LI 2).

1.9.9 τῶν Ἀφροδίτης ἔργων: as the adverb τὰ πρῶτα, the following adverb ἀπήλαυον and the second part of the sentence suggest, we are dealing here with the description of the erotic consummation, which represents the last step of the erotic night.

Before offering further comments, the text itself needs a clarification, since the manuscript reading here is ἐρώτων: while O'Sullivan accepts Peerlkamp's variant ἔργων, another option offered is ὀργίων. In my opinion, following the fortune of these formulae in the Greek literature, O'Sullivan's choice seems the most adequate.

While the manuscript reading is never attested in Greek literature and, thus, it does not seem to be right, both the other options are attested. Τὰ Ἀφροδίτης ἔργα has more occurrences, as since the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* is the by-word for love (see 1-2: Μοῦσά μοι ἔννεπε ἔργα πολυχρύσου Ἀφροδίτης Κύπριδος) and the content of this song is how Aphrodite makes gods, men and animals fall in love each other; for other repetitions of this formula in the same text, see 9 and 21). Two identical occurrences belong also to Hesiod's *Works and Day* (521: ἔργα πολυχρύσου Ἀφροδίτης) and to Diod. Sic, (where the historian reports the decision of a eunuch minister of the king Ptolemy to fight instead of cultivating love: ἀποτεθειμένος τῶν τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἔργων τοὺς Ἄρεως ἀγῶνας ἠλλάξατο, 30.15.1).

After this first group of passages, there are five others, most of which later and close to our novel, where the same formula starts to designate more specifically sex (for a parallel in the Latin world, see Ov. *Am*. 2.7.21: veneris famulae conubia). Three of these, with another that is uncertain because of an elision in the text, contain the singular τὸν ἔργον instead of the plural:

- Critias gives this advice about the time for having sex: καλῶς δ' εἰς ἔργ' Ἀφροδίτης πρός θ' ὕπνον ἥρμοσται (fr. 6.18-19);
- Plutarch uses the formula in the singular in his description of the activity of a whore: σκοπῶμεν οὖν εὐθύς, ὅτι τῆς Ἀφροδίτης τὸ ἔργον † ἔρωτος ὤνιόν ἐστι δραχμῆς (Plut. *Mor*. 756e);
- Plutarch in another dialogue starts from the definition of τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἔργον as sex to suggest a deeper kind of erotic relationship (Plut. *Mor*. 156c);
- Antoninus Liberalis describes Polyphonte's rejection of love with the following sentence: αὕτη τὰ μὲν ἔργα τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἐξύβρισεν (21.1).

- Ach. calls sex τὸ ἔργον τῆς Ἀφροδίτης (4.8.1).

Conversely, τὰ ὄργια τῆς Ἀφροδίτης is a less common formula, which appears only in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* and in Ach. 4.1.2, when Clitophon asks Melite: Μέχρι πότε χηρεύομεν τῶν τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ὀργίων.

As a result, following a criterion of quantity I would dismiss τὰ ὄργια. That being said, the two passages from Plutarch and Ach. where sex is clearly expressed with τὸ ἔργον open the possibility of a substitution of number; however, the passage from Antoninus Liberalis and the most ancient ones are still relevant and, for this reason, I would maintain the plural in obedience to the ending of F.

Having clarified this philological point, I would like to make three further observations. First, as I have already suggested (1.8.2-3: intr.) the mention of Aphrodite here clearly matches the appearance of the goddess in the canopy and works as a reminder of the comparison established by Xen. between the *ekphrasis* and the love of his protagonists. Second, if we accept O' Sullivan's variant, it is not impossible to see in it a deliberate reference to an epic colour, given the two early first occurrences of the formula. In this way, the Homeric love would be recalled again in a subtle manner. Finally, this brief and only reference to Aphrodite's work can be connected with Ach.'s numerous references to sex made using Aphrodite and Eros. Unlike Xen., Ach.'s preference is for the world τὰ μυστήρια (see 'Eros / Aphrodite mystery cult' in table 4 in <u>LI</u> 2.3). Interestingly, the abundance of this expression in his text is the consequence of an emphasis on this author's emphasis on sex, which is missing in our novel.

1.9.9: ἀπήλαυον: the enjoyment of sex is here expressed by Xen. with the first occurrence of the verb ἀπολαύω, which is part of the erotic vocabulary which Xen. uses to feature both protagonists' and rivals' love (<u>LI</u> 3).

That being said, it is interesting that this verb is traditionally used when sexual pleasure is assessed as a vicious form of love (see, e.g. De virtutibus et vitiis, 1250b12-4: ἐγκρατείας δ' ἐστὶ τὸ δύνασθαι κατασχεῖν τῷ λογισμῷ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ὁρμῶσαν ἐπὶ φαύλας ἀπολαύσεις καὶ ἡδονάς, καὶ τὸ καρτερεῖν). A clear proof of this is given by Plutarch in his *Amatorius,* when he makes Protogene draw a distinction between noble love (Ἔρως) and erotic desires (οἱ ἐπιθυμίαι): while the former results in virtue, the aim of the latter is ἡδονὴν καρποῦσθαι καὶ ἀπόλαυσιν ὥρας καὶ σώματος (750d). And, shortly after, there is this significant sentence: Τέλος γὰρ ἐπιθυμίας ἡδονὴ καὶ ἀπόλαυσις (750e).

In my opinion, Xen.'s decision to use this verb is a further confirmation of his emphasis on the sexual and, thus, partial nature of the protagonists' love.

1.9.9: ἐφιλονείκουν: as I have already suggested in 1.2.1: φιλόνεικος, Xen. introduces here a variation in the motif of Eros' dispute against men attributing it to the fight between lovers. This shift, which has a parallel in Ach. (6.18.5), is quite common in Roman poetry, where 'Proelia sunt amantium inter se contentiones, aut etiam rixae and aut lusus rixis similes aut denique venerei lusus' (Pichon 1966, 241). A case in point is Propertius' definition of his dedication to love, where

he writes: 'nos contra angusto versantes proelia lecto'. As a result, Roman poetry constitutes an interesting parallel also in relation to this motif.

CHAPTER 10

<u>The departure from Ephesus as the start of the protagonists' adulthood</u>

As is typical of fiction, the apex of the enjoyment is always the prelude to a new series of sufferings. This pattern characterises what follows the wedding night: the oracle, immorally forgotten by the protagonists and strangely interpreted by the parents, forces them to leave Ephesus. While in their mind the protagonists thought at the end of the wedding night that they had reached their *Bildung*, in the reality this process has just begun.

1.10.1: ἡδίονες: this common comparative is the first of a series of terms which Xen. adopts to describe the satisfaction of the protagonists on the wedding night (see also εὐθυμότεροι, ἀπολαύσαντες, ἐπεθύμησαν and "sexual pleasure" in table 1 in <u>LI</u> 2.4). This insistence on the same concept, which is suggested also by the same root which characterizes the second and the last of these terms, is typical of Xen.'s way of expressing emotions. In addition, it certainly helps him to build a contrast with the misadventures that will soon come.

Finally, although the mention of the pleasure of love is quite common in erotic literature, this is not true for the Greek novels, where sex is rarely addressed and the reference to the pleasure given by sex are even rarer: only Ach. makes Clitophon state after his intercourse with Melite: αὐτοφυῆ γὰρ ἔχει τὴν ἡδονήν (5.27.4), with a focus on the spontaneity of their act. Conversely, Char. omits any reaction from the protagonists when mentioning their sex after their reunion (8.1.17) and so does Longus at the end of his novel, where he rather introduces the motif of ἀγρυπνία in a new positive perspective. Conversely, a motif like this is very popular in Roman Elegy, where 'gaudere saepissime hoc vocabulum amatorias corporeasque voluptates significat' (Pichon 1966, 149).

As a result, I would conclude that Xen.'s focus on the pleasure of sex has an originality within the corpus and this marks the value of this episode in the *Bildung* of the novel (<u>LI</u> 2.4).

1.10.2: ἑορτή δὲ ἦν ἅπας ὁ βίος αὐτοῖς: the motif of living the whole life as a festival plays a structural role in Xen., as it appears again with slight variations at the end of the novel (5.15.3: καὶ αὐτοὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ διῆγον ἑορτὴν ἄγοντες τὸν μετ'ἀλλήλων βίον and 1.6.2 n.: oracle, 6). This fact constitutes a one-off in the novelistic corpus, where no other author exploits this motif.

Only Ach. and Hld. introduce twice the metaphor of the ἑορτή to describe a positive situation: the former adopts it to describe the great gathering of Egyptians on the Nile (see 4.18.3: ἦν ἅπας ὁ ποταμὸς ἑορτή), while the latter employs it to suggest the return of happiness in his final scene (see 10.38.4 τῶν στυγνοτάτων εἰς ἑορτὴν μεταβαλλομένων).

However, in both cases the comparison with life is not exploited and, furthermore, the referent of this experience is not constituted by the protagonists, as it is in Xen. This originality and its role of textual marker invites us to study this motif carefully. To begin with, its origin is pre-Classical: it

was created by Pythagoras, who compared the life to a πανήγυρις, in which normal people compete with each other, while the noblest are merely spectators (see Diog. Laert. 8.8: καὶ τὸν βίον ἐοικέναι πανηγύρει· ὡς οὖν εἰς ταύτην οἱ μὲν ἀγωνιούμενοι, οἱ δὲ κατ' ἐμπορίαν, οἱ δέ γε βέλτιστοι ἔρχονται θεαταί;). After this "aristocratic" interpretation, it is with the Stoics that the criterion for living life as a "festival" becomes personal morality. This is evident in a the passage from Epictetus where he discusses with those men who do not want to die. His argument there is that God τῶν συνεορταζόντων δεῖται, τῶν συγχορευόντων (4.1.108), but he will exclude τοὺς <ἀ>ταλαιπώρους δὲ καὶ δειλούς. The reason for this condemnation lies in the fact that they οὐδὲ γὰρ παρόντες ὡς ἐν ἑορτῇ διῆγον οὐδ' ἐξεπλήρουν τὴν χώραν τὴν πρέπουσαν, ἀλλ' ὠδυνῶντο, ἐμέμφοντο τὸν δαίμονα, τὴν τύχην, τοὺς συνόντας (ibid.). The origin of their fault lies in their refusal of μεγαλοψυχίας, γενναιότετος, ἀνδρείας, αὐτῆς (110.) τῆς νῦν ζητουμένης ἐλευθερίας (109-110; see also *Arr. Diss.* 3.5.10, 4.1.108-9, 4.4.24 for other references). Interestingly, the same approach to this motif also occurs in Philo, who declares εἴ γε μὴ παρευημέρησαν αἱ κακίαι καταδυναστεύσασαι τοὺς περὶ τῶν συμφερόντων λογισμοὺς οὓς τῆς ἑκάστων ψυχῆς ἐξῴκισαν, ἀλλ' ἔμειναν αἱ τῶν ἀρετῶν δυνάμεις εἰς ἅπαν ἀήττητοι, μία ἂν ἦν ὁ ἀπὸ γενέσεως ἄχρι τελευτῆς χρόνος ἀδιάστατος ἑορτὴ (*De Spec. Legibus* 2.42). Since Philo is not only attracted to Stoicism but he is also interested in Plato, the occurrence in his work of this motif seems to suggest that in the Imperial Era life as a feast was a motif exploited by many philosophers. A final confirmation of this comes from Plutarch, who tells us how Diogenes, the founder of the Cynics, asked to people who were gathering for a specific feast: "ἀνὴρ δ'" εἶπεν "ἀγαθὸς οὐ πᾶσαν ἡμέραν ἑορτὴν ἡγεῖται;" καὶ πάνυ γε λαμπράν, εἰ σωφρονοῦμεν (*Mor.* 477C).

Overall, the emergence of this framework leads me to the following considerations. First, Xen. is playing here with a motif which has a philosophical patina. Second, our author seems to be ironically deviating from the aforementioned parallels, because his protagonists are not depicted here as highly moral and virtuous people: they are so focused on the pleasure of sex that they forget the oracle. This hypothesis is supported by the expressions which follow the motif. To begin with, εὐωχία, unlike ἑορτή, does not appear in the aforementioned philosophical passages and refers always to an actual banquet. Thus, Xen. is offering here a view of the protagonists' feast as a literal and luxurious feast. Further, τῶν μεμαντευμένων λήθη is certainly a marked expression, which offers an image of the protagonists as impious. In this respect, it is interesting that this motif is focused on the protagonists and I would interpret αὐτοῖς as an ethical dative: 'from their perspective their whole life was a festival'.

That being said, the reason for this variation does not appear to be merely ironical, but to be part of the *Entwicklung* of the novel. Thus, the second occurrence of the motif seems instead to re-establish its positive original value, since it lacks a connection with pleasure and concerns the protagonists shortly after they have fulfilled all their moral and religious duties in Ephesus (1.6.2, n.: oracle, 6). As a result, in the present passage Xen. is showing how maturity has yet to be achieved by the protagonists.

1.10.2: οὐχὶ τὸ εἱμαρμένον ἐπελέλῃστο: the way in which Xen. introduces the motif of the implacability of destiny contains an unexpected expression, τὸ εἱμαρμένον, which comes from the verb μείρομαι and is cognate with the famous noun μοῖρα, the Homeric portion of life assigned by gods to men. This definition of destiny is unusual both for Xen. and for most of the authors of Greek literature, who more commonly adopt ἡ εἱμαρμένη to designate the same concept (for some occurrences, see Democr. fr. 5.127, Epic. *Epist. ad Meneceum* 134, Polyb. 16.32.4, Dem. *De cor.* 205a and Marc Anton. Polemon *Declam.* 2.12).

Since the few writers who choose τὸ εἱμαρμένον belong to different genres (cf. Plutarch in *Pyrrhus* 16.14, Apollonius the Sophist in *Lex. Hom.* 16.15, Marcus Aurelius 2.2.1 and Phalaridis' *Epistle*, 87), the only reason why Xen. might have selected it is to surprise his readers with an expression that, belonging to the highest divine sphere, underlines the difference between human and divine plans. As a result, there is nothing deeply religious or philosophical here, but we are rather dealing with an exceptional narratorial statement, which emphasises a shift in the narration and makes the readers wait for something new to happen which will contrast the protagonists' joy (NA 1.2 for the few other examples). In this respect, the fact that Xen. refers shortly after to Eros is the proof that he is not including τὸ εἱμαρμένον in his articulated framework of gods (1.10.2 n.: οὐδὲ ὅτῳ). A possible confirmation of this hypothesis comes from a passage of Ach. where Clitophon describes the failure of his father's plan of making him marry Calligone. Before describing the human event which changed it, he writes αἱ δὲ Μοῖραι τῶν ἀνθρώπων κρείττονες ἄλλην ἐτήρουν μοι γυναῖκα and then he adds that οὐ γὰρ εἱμαρμένης δύνανται κρατεῖν (1.3.2). With this sentence Ach. is introducing neither a religious nor a philosophical reflection, but he is creating in the readers an expectation that something unpredictable is going to enter the scene of the action: this will shortly be fulfilled with the experience of a terrible dream (1.3.4), as it happens in the Eph.

1.10.2: οὐδὲ ὅτῳ ἐδόκει ταῦτα θεῷ ἠμέλει: as Chew 1998, 51 argues, 'this is the final time Eros plays an overt role in the action'. At the same time, since the oracle has just been mentioned, here Xen. is for the first time explicitly connecting the god to it. For more on Eros in the novel, see LI 2.1, app.

1.10.3: ὡς οἷόν τε ἦν, παραμυθήσασθαι: as this passage contain the parents' interpretation of the oracle, it immediately recalls the part of the seventh book where the same issue is addressed (1.7.2 n.: παραμυθήσασθαι). The parallel between the two passages is evident, as Xen. constructs it through the repetition of ὡς οἷόν τε ἦν, παραμυθήσασθαι and ἐκπέμπειν. Also the content is similar, with the only difference being that the present passage concerns the events after the marriage, which, thus, are not nominated. As a result of this framework, I would suggest that also here παραμυθέομαι means 'fulfil' and the protagonists' parents are still trying to make the oracle happen with the idea of a journey far from home.

That being said, within this general similarity, the present passage has in its middle a completely new sentence: ἤμελλόν τε γὰρ ἄλλην ὄψεσθαι γῆν καὶ ἄλλας πόλεις. In my opinion, this phrase might be a subtle way in which Xen. is introducing another nuance: while the generic idea of a

journey far from home matches the idea of 'fulfilling the oracle', I would argue that this new concept is less suitable, since it defines the same journey as a touristic trip and it is more difficult to interpret it as an expiation. For this reason, I would suggest that an attentive reader might have detected this difference and seen in the following παραμυθήσασθαι the other meaning 'appeasing'. That being said, I would like to show how there might be other signs in the text which makes this hypothesis plausible.

a) Between the two occurrences of παραμυθήσασθαι Xen. shows how Habrocomes is a παραμυθία for Anthia (see 1.7.4: πάντων τῶν ἐσομένων κακῶν Ἀβροκόμην ἔχουσα παραμυθίαν), which means 'consolation'. This passage is quite significant, because, like the present one, it follows a reference to the forgetting of the oracle (ibid. τίς δὲ ἡ φυγὴ ἢ τίνες αἱ συμφοραὶ κατεφρόνει). In my opinion, it is not unthinkable that Xen. might be here assigning to the cognate verb παραμυθέομαι the same meaning and 'to console the oracle' can be interpreted as to 'palliate' or 'appease'.

b) Before the day of departure, the narrator suggests that the destination of the journey is Egypt (1.10.5). This element seems to support our interpretation, since the parents might be trying to make the trip the easiest possible by directing their offspring to the place where the god has promised them happiness and enabling them to evade the difficulties: this would suit well the expression ὡς οἷόν τε ἦν.

c) If we take literally the words spoken by Megamedes in his final libation in the departure scene (1.10.10), his invitation φύγοιτε τὰ σκληρὰ τῶν μαντευμάτων (1.10.10) sounds like a confirmation that his son's trip might allow him and his wife to avoid the terrible sufferings foretold by Apollo.

d) Finally, a further confirmation of this second hypothesis is given by the "epic formula" ἤμελλόν τε γὰρ ἄλλην ὄψεσθαι γῆν καὶ ἄλλας πόλεις (LI 6.2.d1 and 6.4): this suggests that the parents are proposing to their sons a journey which lacks the maturation of that of the *Odyssey* and, since in Homer growth comes from misadventures, a journey which lacks perils and sufferings. In my opinion, this Homeric "game" supports the impression that we are dealing with a softened view of the journey and thus confirms the plausibility of the translation 'to appease'.

Finally, as I have already argued, it is very interesting how later in the first book the protagonists seem to have an experience of the journey which is exactly like that suggested by the parents, as they visit Rhodes as tourists (1.12.2, n.: ἐξιστορήσαν). This confirms indirectly the truth of the present demonstration: after the wedding night Xen. is really emphasising the protagonists' lack of maturity.

1.10.4-10: Παρεσκευάζετο [...] ἀναγκαίαν: the scene of departure

a) Introduction
Xen.'s departure scene is divided into three parts:
1) preparation of the cargo accompanied by preliminary public sacrifices (1.10.4-5);
2) effective departure, in which the send-off of the Ephesians is followed by that of the
   protagonists' parents (1.10.6-7);

3) a private final farewell, when the ship is already distant from the harbour, which involves only the protagonists and their parents (1.10.8-9) and is concluded by Megamedes' prayer (1.10.10).

As this sketch already suggests, Xen. here adopts a typical departure scene, with a special focus on the emotional involvement of the whole population. This confirms Xen.'s interest in theatricality (GI 5) and civilised society (LI 1).

On the one hand, the presence of these two elements is not surprising, because, as I will shortly show, both elements appear in famous literary models prior to our author such as Homer, who describes Telemachus' departure from Ithaca (*Od*. 2.388-433) and then from Pylus, Pindar (*Pyth*. 4.188-206) and Apollonius Rhodius (Ap. Rhod. 1.234-450), who portrays Jason when leaving his homeland and finally Thucydides, who writes about the famous departure of the Athenians for Sicily (see Th. 6.30-32).

On the other hand, Xen.'s piece is rather an exception in the novelistic corpus, where the only other description of a departure as a public event occurs in Char., who, in fact, constitutes the most likely model of our author (cf. Char. 3.5 and 8.4.7-11, when Chaereas leaves and then come back to Syracuse). Conversely, Ach. gives only a brief description of his intimate flight to Alexandria with Leucippe, which is briefer than Xen.'s passage and involves neither the crowd nor preparations (2.32.1). Similarly, Hld. refers to Calasiris' nocturnal departure with the protagonists from Zakynthos, which is the opposite of a public event (see 5.22.4).

b) <u>The narrative elements of the most important departure scenes from Classical and Hellenistic sources</u>

That being said, I will now more carefully analyse the most important parallels.

To begin with, each of these scenes contains a similar structure, which might reflect the real Greek execution of this event.

- *Telemachus' departure from Ithaca*

1) Preparation of the ship and gathering of companions in the harbour (*Od*. 2.388-392);

2) Arrival of Telemachus and embarkment (407-417);

3) Start of the navigation (417-429);

4) Libation to gods (430-433).

- *Telemachus' departure from Pyle*

1) Preparation of the ship by Telemachus' companions (*Od.* 15.217-221);

2) Prayer and sacrifice to Athena (222-3);

3) Embarkment on the ship (282-6);

4) Start of the navigation (286-291).

- *Pindar's departure*

1) Gathering of heroes around Jason (*Pyth*. 4.198-191);

2) Departure (4.191-192);

3) Jason's request to Zeus and the forces of the sea for a propitious journey and a safe return (193-198);

4) Positive omens give hope to the whole crew (199-201).

Apollonius Rhodius' departure

1) Preparation of the ship (1.234-237);

2) The departing people walk from the city to the harbour accompanied by crying women (1.238-267);

3) Desperate farewell of Jason's mother (1.268-293);

4) Jason's encouraging answer to his mother (1.294-305);

5) Gathering of the crew and last preparations of the ship for the departure (1.306-401);

6) Before the departure, construction of an altar to Apollo and prayer made by Jason, followed by a sacrifice arranged by the whole crew (1.402-449).

Thucydides' departure

1) Preparation of the ships with a collective and emotional participation (6.30.1-2);

2) The departure as a spectacle and a display of wealth and power: description of the costly armament (digression, 6.30.2-6.31);

3) Departure announced by the trumpeter, prayers and libations of the sailors joined by the whole population (6.32.1-2).

To begin with, the first two passages are quite significant, because, as I will shortly show (see 1.10.8: καὶ ἐλύετο), Xen. seems to intertext with them: this small connection reinforces his wider intertext with Homer.

At the same time, it is interesting to notice how the motifs 'preparation of the ship', 'gathering of people', 'departure', 'sacrifices and prayers to gods' occur not only in Homer, but also in the other narrations. In addition, the similarity between literary models coincides with a reference to real customs. A case in point is the constant inclusion in these scenes of sacrifices to gods: since in Ancient Greece 'seafaring was exposed to incalculable risks', offerings were made on embarking and on disembarking' (Burkert 1985, 266). As a result, I would conclude that Xen. is here trying to represent a standard departure scene, adopting the same technique employed in his introduction of marriage (LI 2.4): as a result, both these elements contribute to the description of his civilised society (LI 1.2). In addition, since it is unlikely that departures like public events happened after the Classical Era, when πόλεις were no longer involved in public battles or expeditions, I would conclude that Xen. seems to have in his mind a Classical society (GI 2.2).

Having said that, a richer interpretation can be developed if we assume that Xen. was reading Char. and, especially, his first departure, which constitutes the beginning of Chaereas' search for Callirhoe (3.5).

Chariton's departure

375

1) Preparation of the ship (3.5.1-3);

2) Departure, with public greeting followed by a personal farewell from both Chaereas' parents (3.5.3-6);

3) Final greeting of Polycharmus when the ship has already been launched (3.5.7-8);

4) Chaereas' prayer to Poseidon (3.5.9).

To begin with, the structure of this scene is close to that of Xen. and, thus, there seems to be an intertextual relationship between the two passages. Following Tilg's argumentation (GI 2.1), this scene provides evidence that Xen. wrote after Char. The discovery of this parallel is significant: since Char.'s Syracuse is clearly a Classical Greek πόλις, the evidence of our author's interest in a Classical Ephesus would be certainly strengthened.

This similarity leads us to consider the role played by Thucydides in Char. and Xen.'s departure scene. The former's debt to the historian is evident: as Smith 2007, 179 argues, 'not only is the scene in Chariton's novel generally reminiscent of the Thucydidean scene, but Chariton also uses some of the same vocabulary as Thucydides in describing both the expedition and the emotions stirred by the expedition' (see ibid. for a series of examples; a case in point is the sharing of a preamble about the weather: see Char. 3.5.1 and Th. 6.30.1). The result of this literary exploitation is that Char. gives to his Syracusan embassy 'the image of a "Sicilian expedition" in miniature, with Syracuse no longer the object, but the subject of invasion' (Smith 2007, 180). Thus, Char. introduces a military image of the ceremony.

Since this element is missing in our novel and no intertextual echoes to Thucydides are present in the *Eph.*, I would conclude that while Xen. very probably knew Char., nothing certain can be said about his relationship to the historian. As a reader of Char., he was certainly aware of Thucydides as the model of this scene, but it is not possible to say whether Xen. decided to explore activately his text (for the hypothesis of this connection, see Ruiz Montero 1994, 1101).

1.10.4: καὶ τὰ ἐπιτήδεια ἐνεβάλλοντο, πολλὴ μὲν ἐσθὴς καὶ ποικίλη, πολὺς δὲ ἄργυρος καὶ χρυσός, ἥ τε τῶν σιτίων ὑπερβάλλουσα ἀφθονία: this description of the cargo of protagonists' ship is a clear sign of prosperity which confirms how wealth is a distinctive feature of Habrocomes' nobility (LI 1 and 1.1.1 n.: ἀνὴρ). In addition, in the other novels lists like often include Eastern objects (cf. Char. 6.3.4, 6.9.6, 8.6.12, where it designates Persian objects), and Hld. (see 1.3.2, 1.22.3 and 2.17.2, where it refers to the protagonists' Aethiopian treasure). This further increases the protagonist' luxury.

That said, the word τὰ ἐπιτήδεια, 'provisions' is significant in the Eph., because it is used by Xen. to show how Habrocomes progressively loses this initial characteristic: in the fifth book this noun constitutes with ἀπορία a formula which expresses the lack of provisions. Since it is referred twice to Habrocomes (see 5.8.1 in Nuceria and 5.10.5 in Rhodes), it further proves that wealth is not important in the final society in love as it was in the civilised one (LI 5.4a).

1.10.5: ἐπ᾽Αἴγυπτον: on the parents' choice of this destination, see 1.10.3 n.: ὡς οἷόν.

1.10.5: δάκρυα πάντων, ὡς μελλόντων ἀπαλλάττεσθαι παίδων κοινῶν: the tears of the Ephesian population are the first emotional indication of this scene. For more, see 1.10.9, n.: βοὴ δὲ.

1.10.6: πολλοὶ μὲν οἰκέται, πολλαὶ δὲ θεράπαιναι: as I have already suggested in LI 1.4, the presence of slaves in the Eph. concerns both the civilised and the uncivilised societies. In this mention Xen.'s emphasis is certainly on their high number: since in Greek society 'criticism of owning large numbers of slaves' happen 'in the context of attacks on luxury' (Wiedemann 1981, 5), this element is part of the prosperous characterization of Habrocomes in the first book.

1.10.6: <ἐνεβιβάζοντο>: in F there is a lacuna instead of this verb. Zagoiannes 1897 proposes this integration, while Papanikolau ἐπέβαινον. The former variant is criticized by Garzon Diaz 1986, 98-99, who states that 'no se pueden defender, ya que el verbo usual dentro del marco de la novela es el compuesto de βαίνω, y ἐμβιβάζω apparece tan sólo en dos ocasiones (5.5.4: ἐμβιβάσαντα and 2.9.2: ἐμβιβάσαντας) y nunca en la forma propuesta por Dalmeyda'. In addition, he shows how often Xen. uses ἐπιβαίνω with the meaning of 'embark' in the novel (see 3.2.11, 3.5.8, 11; 3.10.4, 4.4.2, 5.3.3, 5.10.1, 5.10.2, 5.15.1).
In my opinion, however, on closer examination his proposal of ἐπιβαίνω is not correct, because in its other occurrences of the novel this verb never describes the main action of the sentence, but is always accompanied by a more important verb of navigation. Therefore, unlike this present passage, Xen. uses ἐπιβαίνω when the focus is not on the action of embarking:
3.2.11: νεὼς ἐπιβὰς [...] ἔπλεον;
3.5.8: ἐπιβὰς νεὼς [...] πλεῖν;
3.5.11: ἐπιβὰς νεὼς ἐπανήχθη;
3.10.4: ἐπιβὰς ἀνάγεται;
4.4.2: ἐπιβὰς σκάφους ἀνήγετο;
5.2.7: ἐπιβάντες ἔπλεον;
5.3.3: ἐπιβὰς ἀναγομένῳ πλοίῳ ἐπανήχθη;
5.10.1: νεὼς ἐπιβὰς [...] ἀνάγεσθαι;
5.10.2: ἐπιβὰς ἔπλει;
5.15.1: ἐπιβάντες νεώς [...] ἐπανήγοντο.
The only exception is 3.2.6, where, however, ἐπιβὰς [...[τῇ Περίνθῳ means 'to set foot on' (LSJ).
Conversely, there are some parallels from Greek authors where ἐμβιβάζω is used in a similar context with that of Xen. to describe people boarding ships. To begin with, in Char. 8.3.12, when Chaereas starts his journey back to Syracuse, he chooses twenty triremes and on this ἐνεβίβασεν Ἕλληνας μὲν ἅπαντας ὅσοις παρῆσαν, Αἰγυπτίων δὲ καὶ Φοινίκων ὅσους ἔμαθεν εὐζώνους (4.3.12). Before the novelist, also Thucydides and Xenophon of Athens adopt this verb in a similar context (cf. Thuc. 1.53: ἔδοξεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ἄνδρας ἐς κελήτιον ἐσβιβάσαντας, when the Corinthians decide to send men to the Athenians, and Xen. *An*. 5.3.1: εἰς μὲν τὰ πλοῖα τούς τε ἀσθενοῦντας ἐνεβίβασαν, when the Spartans try to recover from their battle against the Mydians).

As I result, I agree with O'Sullivan's decision to follow Zagoiannes 1897 and Dalmeyda 1926.

1.10.6: ἐπανάγεσθαι: Xen. uses this verb constantly in the novel for 'to sail' (1.11.2, 3.5.11, 5.3.3, 5.8.1, 5.9.3 and 5.15.1). Since in Ancient Greek ἐπανάγω has the wider meaning of 'bring up' (LSJ), our author is here exploiting the specific connotation which it assumes in a naval context and which was exploited by some authors in the Imperial Era (see, e.g., Gospel Luke 5.3). As Zanetto 1990, 235 shows, this attitude concerns three other verbs which appear for the first time in the eleventh and twelfth chapters: κατάγομαι, which means exclusively 'to land' (see 1.11.6, 1.12.1, 1.14.6, 1.15.2, 5.1.1, 5,5,7, 5.6.1), ἀνάγομαι, 'to sail' (see 1.12.3, 2.7.4, 3.8.5, 3.10.4, ib., 4.4.2, 5.1.8, 5.3.3, 5.6.4, 5.10.1, 5.10.2, 5.10.3, ib., 5.11.1) and ἐκβαίνω, 'to disembark' (1.12.1, 5.2.7 and 5.15.2). Given this phenomenon, Zanetto 1990, 235 argues that Xen.'s language shows sometimes 'un sapore un pò tecnico', which, apart from ἐκβαίνω, is attested in other Imperial writers.

In my opinion, the appearance of this kind of language in this part of the novel is not sheer coincidence, but it proves that Xen.'s consideration of the uncivilised society as more realistic does not only depend on the introduction of dangerous enemies, but also on his presentation of the protagonists' journey (for ideal and real societies in the Eph., see LI 1.1). Further evidence will emerge in the following chapters.

On the other hand, it is interesting that in the novelistic corpus only Char. shares with Xen. this technical use of ἐπανάγομαι (see Char. 8.6.3; ἀνάγομαι, instead, occurs in all the novels, see LRG) and other similar verbs (cf. κατάγομαι in Char. 1.11.8, 8.2.7, 8.5.5, 8.7.9 and 8.8.1 and ἐκβαίνω in Char. 1.9.1, 8.2.1 and 8.2.8). This similarity can be interpreted as a small proof of the special relationship that Char. and Xen. have in this genre, which seems to depend on their early chronology.

1.10.7: πάντων ἅμα ἐν ὑπομνήσει γενόμενοι, τοῦ χρησμοῦ, τοῦ παιδός, τῆς ἀποδημίας: this is the first 'recapitulation' of the *Eph.*, which is exceptionally attributed to Habrocomes' parents and not to the protagonists themselves . It includes a list of the main events that have already happened and which constitute the reasons for their worries. Since only three facts are mentioned and each of these has just happened, the main function of this recapitulation is to describe emotions: we are dealing with a "psychological" recapitulation (NA 1.1a1).

1.10.8: ἐθορύβουν οἱ ναῦται [...] καὶ ὁ κυβερνήτης τὴν αὐτοῦ χώραν κατελάμβανε: this is the only brief description made by Xen. of the crew of a ship in his novel. Only οἱ ναῦται are mentioned other four times, but always in connection with this Ephesian boat (1.10.4, 1.11.6 and 1.12.1.3). The simplicity of this portrait does not allow to identify any specific ship. However, given the Homeric context, we must acknowledge that these three words, ναῦς, ναύτης and κυβερνήτης are Homeric. While the first two have the general meaning of 'ship' (see νηῦς in *Il.* 1.26) and 'sailor' (see, e.g. *Il.* 19.375), the κυβερνήτης is a slightly more technical word, which designates the 'commanding officer who manned the helm' (Casson 1971, 300; see, e.g., *Od.* 9.78). Finally, the Ephesian boat will soon reveal its function as sailing ship (see 1.11.2 and 1.12.3), which occurs in Homer also (for

a more detailed analysis of Homeric ships, see Casson 1971, 43-48). As a result, this essential description seems to fits well into the Homeric colour of the scene.

1.10.8: καὶ ἐλύετο τὰ πρυμνήσια: the action of releasing the mooring cables is here expressed with a Homeric formula: in the *Odyssey*, in fact, τοὶ δὲ πρυμνήσι’ἔλυσαν occurs in *Od.* 2.418 and 15.286 and 552, while ἀνά τε πρυμνήσια λῦσαι in 9.178, 9.562, 11.637, 12.145, 15.548. Before Xen., the latter is only used by Apollonius Rhodius, which confirms the epic nature of this formula (1.912 and 4.857), by Diodorus Siculus (*BH* 14.55.2) and Alexander, *De fig.* 19. Since it is unlikely that Xen. was drawing from these two last authors, we can conclude that he is intertexting with Homer. Even more interestingly, the two Odyssean passages where λύω and τὰ πρυμνήσια appear concern Telemachus’ two departure scenes. This confirms that Xen. might have been considering both passages - and especially the first one - as a model for the protagonists’ departure (see above).

1.10.9-10: βοὴ δὲ [...] ἀναγκαῖαν: as I suggested in <u>NA</u> 4.5, this is one of the two “dialogues in movement” of the novel, where the whole scene is exceptionally based on an internal focalisation. This particular scene is created by the fact that the departure precedes the last farewell between the parents and the protagonists: this transforms the reactions of the different characters in volume and intensity. As a result, the readers are invited to shift their focus between the land and the sea, as the following list demonstrates:
- 1.10.9: ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς (land);
- ἐν τῇ νηὶ (sea);
- ὦ παῖδες φίλτατοι (land);
- ὦ πατέρες (sea; here the contrast is also underlined by the sequence τῶν μὲν [...] τῶν δὲ);
- ἀλλήλοις ἐγκαταλείποντες τὸ ὄνομα (both land and sea);
- 1.10.10: ὁ δὲ Μεγαμήδης [...] (land);
- ἐν τῇ νηί (sea).

Finally, in the tenth section ὡς ἐξάκουστον εἶναι τοῖς ἐν τῇ νηί is very important, because it suggests that the whole speech given by Megamedes is part of this scene: this proves the existence of a climax in emotional intensity in the whole dialogue (for the novelistic use of ἐξάκουστος see <u>NA</u> 4.5).

In addition Xen. takes this indication literally, because in the emotional reaction of the protagonists at the beginning of the following chapter they seem to react to the different parts of Megamedes’ speech: this confirms that the “dialogue in movement” has really happened.

Finally, the originality of this passage is emphasised in the hypothesis that Xen. had the opportunity to read Char.: unlike Xen.’s, in *Callirhoe* Cheareas’ parents greet the heroes before the departure and only Polycharmus enters the scene when the ship is already on the sea (3.6.7). Furthermore, this friend does not speak with the protagonists and the narrator introduces an analepsis about the reason for his delay. As a result, in the departure scene Char. does not focus on emotions as Xen.

1.10.10: ὁ δὲ Μεγαμήδης φιάλην λαβὼν καὶ ἐπισπένδων ηὔχετο: as I have already stated, libations during a departure is an element typical of this kind of scenes since Homer (see, e.g. *Il.* 16.225-7 and 24.306f.). To begin with, in Pindar Jason before praying to Zeus χρυσέαν χείρεσσι λαβὼν φιάλαν (*Pyth.*) 4.193) and this passage, according to some scholars (see Hornblower 2008, 381), has been considered the source of Thucydides' sentence ἐκπώμασι χρυσοῖς τε καὶ ἀργυροῖς οἵ τε ἐπιβάται καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες σπένδοντες (6.32.1). Then, in Apollonius Rhodius Jason ἀκρήτους χέε λοιβὰς (1.435).

At the same time, other sources attest other libations made on the sea, when the contents are poured into the water: the first passage comes from Herodotus, when Xerxes is preparing for the crossing of the Hellespont (see 7.54: σπένδων ἐκ χρυσέης φιάλης ἐς τὴν θάλασσαν εὔχετο πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον [...]). Then, this custom is attributed three other times by Arrian to Alexander the Great during his embarkations with the same formula σπένδειν ἐκ χρυσῆς φιάλης ἐς τὸν πόντον (1.11.6, 6.3.1 and 6.19.5).

Although this second kind of libations is extraneous to Xen., all these passages show the sacrality of this element of the departure: in the following lemmata, I will show how this feature is reflected by the tone and style of Megamedes' words.

1.10.10: εὐτυχοῖτε: Megamedes' insistent use of the optative marks the distinctive nature of this passage as the only proper wish of the whole novel. From a stylistic point of view, three of the four optatives share the homoteleuton, with the Xen.'s typical variation in the third member. At the same time, these verbs explore serious topics, such as happiness, oracle and homeland: overall, their use gives solemnity to the speech.

1.10.10: τὴν φιλτάτην [...] πατρίδα: the motif of the 'dear homeland' is a quite common pattern of the Greek society, as well as of some modern ones. While its Homeric colour is indisputable, since Odysseus in primis but also some other epic heroes yearn for their homeland, the occurrences in the following Greek literature are so numerous than Xen. is here acknowledging a cliché. For the role of homeland in the novel, see 1.1.1 n.: γυναικὸς ἐπιχωρίας and L5.4b.

1.10.10: ὁδὸν δυστυχῆ μὲν ἀλλ' ἀναγκαίαν: this formula, which because of its content can be considered as Xen.'s "epic formula" (LI 6.6), is another opportunity given to the protagonists' parents to express their view of the journey. As in their second interpretation of the oracle (1.10.3 n.: ὡς οἷόν), there seem to be two readings of the first adjective. While ἀναγκαῖος indisputably refers to the divine necessity of the events and thus establishes the connection with the oracle, δυστυχής might have two different meanings. The most basic one is certainly 'unlucky' and it often occurs in the novel: whenever δυστυχής or δυστυχία are attributed by Xen. to persons (a considerable total of 17 occurrences), they always emphasise their unfortunate destiny (e.g. 1.14.5: Habrocomes' old tutor; 2.11.2, Manto; 3.2.13, Hippothous; 3.7.3, Perilaus; 1.14.5).

That being said, I wonder whether at a subtler level δυστυχής might also signify that this journey is 'contrary to destiny' and this possibility would serve as a reminder of the interpretation of the

journey as an attempt to appease the oracle. In my opinion, this speculative hypothesis might find a confirmation in the last part of the protagonists' reaction to Megamedes' words: along with their fear of the oracle and their suspicions about going abroad (1.11.1: τὸν χρησμὸν δεδοικότες, τὴν ἀποδημίαν ὑποπτεύοντες), the narrator adds: παρεμυθεῖτο δ'αὐτοὺς εἰς ἅπαντα ὁ μετ'ἀλλήλων πλοῦς. This sentence is surprising, because it contains again παραμυθέομαι and what gives consolation to the protagonists is ὁ μετ'ἀλλήλων πλοῦς. This noun can be interpreted in two ways: it can more simply refer to the present condition of being together on a ship or be a more general definition of the whole journey together far from Ephesus. Since the second option is not implausible, the protagonists might be proving here to have the same touristic and reductive view of the trip as their parents and this fits well with their future behaviour in Rhodes (1.11.2, n.: ἐξιστόρησαν).

Finally, Capra 2007/8, 18 offers another interpretation of δυστυχής suggesting that we are dealing with an 'augurio prolettico, ma per antifrasi: l'accenno sinistro dei genitori infatti si realizzerà, almeno per la parte che riguarda loro: moriranno prima del ritorno dei due sposi, che torneranno sani e salvi'. This hypothesis seems to be valid, because it could match the mention to Lycomedes' death which occurs in Habrocomes' second dream (LI 4.5b). Although I have interpreted his black clothes as an allusion to his child's death, it might also be part of this anticipation of the parents' end.

CHAPTER 11

1.11.1: ἀλλήλοις περιφύντες: this participle is used by Xen. only at the end of the wedding night (1.9.9, n.: περιφύντες), in which it is accompanied by the description of sex between the protagonists. While the use of ἔκειντο appears a possible sexual allusion, the use of περιφύομαι, which simply means "to cling to", negates this connotation: we are dealing with a "sexual" scene without sex.

1.11.1: πολλὰ ἐννοῦντες, τοὺς πατέρας οἰκτείροντες, τῆς πατρίδος ἐπιθυμοῦντες, τὸν χρησμὸν δεδοικότες, τὴν ἀποδημίαν ὑποπτεύοντες: this sequence of participles is interpreted as a 'conflict of emotions' by Fusillo 1999 (NA 4.3) and as a 'recapitulation' by Hägg 1971, 271. In my opinion, both definitions are acceptable and for this reason I included this passage in the group of "psychological recapitulations" (NA 1.1a1). Further, in this case Xen.'s inclination towards a theatrical style is emphasised by the fact that the protagonists seem to precisely react to most of Megamedes' words, confirming that they have listened to them.

1) Τοὺς πατέρας οἰκτείροντες recalls Megamedes' allusion to his death and that of his wife: ἴστε οὐδὲ ἡμᾶς ἔτι ζησομένους;
2) τῆς πατρίδος ἐπιθυμοῦντες echoes ὑμᾶς ἀνασωθέντας ὑποδέξαιντο Ἐφέσιοι and τὴν φιλτάτην ἀπολάβοιτε πατρίδα;
3) Τὸν χρησμὸν δεδοικότες recalls on φυγοῖτε τὰ σκληρὰ τῶν μαντευμάτων;
4) Τὴν ἀποδημίαν ὑποπτεύοντες seems to comment on ὁδὸν δυστυχῆ μὲν ἀλλ'ἀναγκαῖαν;
5) παρεμυθεῖτο […] ὁ μετ'ἀλλήλων πλοῦς recalls ὦ παῖδες εὐτυχοῖτε.

Following a simplified scheme, the protagonists in their sharing of emotions focus on five different issues:
   1) Parents 2) Homeland 3) Oracle 4) Journey 5) Joy of being together.

Similarly, Megamede addresses four of the five issues:
   1) Children 2) Oracle 3) Homeland 4) Foreboding of death 5) Journey

Only one theme constitutes a real difference between these two passages: the children's joy contrasts with the parents' foreboding of death. This draws a distinction between the older and the younger generations. As a result, we are dealing with a sophisticated connection of passages, which extends further the interaction provoked by the 'dialogue in movement'. At the same time, this rich reflection of the protagonists contrasts with their joyful and excited reaction at the beginning of the ninth and tenth chapters: this variety and subtlety suggests that a new stage of their maturity has begun.

Finally, the style also marks the importance of this passage, since Xen. introduces a homoteleuton of the participles which is variated with δεδοικότες and a sequence of three accusatives which belong to the three different genres and which is interrupted by the genitive member τῆς πατρίδος.

1.11.1: ἐννοῦντες: since F has ἀνανοοῦντες, which is an ἅπαξ, scholars have proposed new readings, moving from the most faithful ἅμα ἐννοῦντες to the present one chosen by O'Sullivan 2005. As this scholar suggests in his apparatus, I think that the parallel with the other 'conflict of emotion' in 3.5.2 offers the best interpretation. When Anthia is going to marry Perilaus, ἐνενοεῖτο δὲ ἅμα πολλά, τὸν ἔρωτα, τοὺς ὅρκους, τὴν πατρίδα, τοὺς πατέρας, τὴν ἀνάγκην, τὸν γάμον. Although we are dealing here with a list of noun, Xen. seems to construct the two episodes as parallels, since they both express contrasting feelings and the mention of both homeland and fathers is common. For this reason, I would agree with O'Sullivan's (2005) introduction of ἐννοῦντες and, moreover, I would add ἅμα before ἐννοῦντες. The presence of ἀνανοοῦντες in F, in fact, makes it plausible that the copyist confused ἀνα- with ἅμα and then he made an apheresis of the participle ἐννοῦντες, transforming ἅμα ἐννοῦντες into ἀνανοοῦντες.
Conversely, I would not accept ἅμα νοῦντες because the use of the simple verb with this adverb is not common in Greek narrative.

1.11.2: οὐρίῳ χρησάμενοι πνεύματι: the origin of οὐρίον πνεῦμα, 'propitious wind' is poetic, since it is invented by Euripides who adopts it twice in his *Helen*. Although Xen.'s debt to this model is here not convincing, see (<u>APP</u> 4.3), I would argue that this expression is stylistically more sophisticated than others used by Xen. during the journey, especially those belonging to mundane language (see, e.g., ὑδρεύσασθαι in 1.11.6).
On the other hand, in Casson's (1971, 272) view, the propitious wind might be also a realistic feature, (1.10.6 n.: ἐπανάγεσθαι), since 'during the heart of this curtailed sailing period, Mediterranean winds were prevailingly northerly' (272). Having said that, it is not possible to assess the accuracy of this statement, since Xen. does not indicate the season of the protagonists' journey.

1.11.2: διανύσαντες τὸν πλοῦν: this expression is used often by Xen. in the novel to designate the completion of a journey (see 1.14.6, 5.1.1, 5.6.1, 5.6.4, 5.10.3, 5.11.1, 5.15.1; in 3.2.12 the verb is in the passive). In an exceptional case τὸν πλοῦν is substituted by τὴν ὁδὸν (3.1.3). This type of formula is the simplest one used by Xen., because it does not play the role of connecting different scenes.

1.11.2: εἰς Σάμον [...] τὴν τῆς Ἥρας ἱερὰν νῆσον: this "cultic" definition of the city reflects well the reason for the protagonists' stop there, as they make sacrifices and prayers to Era in this place. In the novel this epithet is attributed also to Memphis, which is called τὴν ἱερὰν τῆς Ἴσιδος (4.1.3): in this second case the relation between the definition of the city and the protagonists' activities is more stressed, since Anthia twice prays there to Isis and requests an oracle from Apis (cf. 4.3.3,

5.4.6 and 5.4.8), and, thus, our author seems to deliberately choose the epithets of the places according to the narrative they house (for a confirmation, see below: 1.11.6, n.: μεγάλη).

Finally, a short and religious stop like this has also a parallel in the fifth book, where, despite the absence of the same epithet, Habrocomes calls at Cyprus and εὐξάμενος τῇ πατρίῳ Κυπρίων θεῷ (5.10.4).

Overall, these three "cultic" visits confirm that "religion" is part of our author's interest and of the protagonists' ideal and positive behaviour. In addition, Oikonomou 2010, 239 suggests that 'perhaps the choice of places is not random but connected to the deity associated with the place', since Hera 'is the goddess and protector of family' and then, 'while Habrocomes is looking for his "beloved", Habrocomes prays to Aphrodite' (240). In my opinion, however, since 'Xen.'s geography is, on the whole, accurate, as is required by the neat circular pattern of his novel' (Capra forth.), the reason for the choice of the places seems to obey to a realistic construction of the protagonists' journey (1.10.6, n.: ἐπανάγεσθαι). While later in the novel there are some exceptions, such as Cyprus, which does not fit in a realistic route, this statement is easy to prove in the first book, where Samos is close to Ephesus and is part of the route from the protagonists' homeland to Rhodes.

1.11.2: δειπνοποιησάμενοι: as the sleep in 1.3.4, lunch is a rare temporal marker in this novel: the only other occurrence is in 3.9.3, where Hippothous eats with his companions, but in that passage the chronological apparatus is less marked: thus, our current passage is a one-off, which seems to emphasize the start of the new temporal setting of the narration (NA 2.2).

1.11.2: κἀκείνην μὲν τὴν ἡμέραν [...] νυκτὸς ἐπιγινομένης: this section constitutes a clear example of 'summary', as it contains the main stylistic features of this category (see NA 2.1 for a list). Its exceptionality, which is echoed by the summaries in 1.12.3 and 1.14.6, lies in its "strategic" position before and/or after long scenes (the first before the oath; the second between the visit to Rhodes and Corymbus' attack; the last after Corymbus' attack). This fact seems Xen. to accelerate the rhythm of the narration and this seems to relax the readers' concentration, between one emotional climax and another.

1.11.3-5: *oath of fidelity between the protagonists*

The ship houses the second real dialogue between the protagonists, which is composed of a shared initial question followed by one intervention by each character. The core of this scene is the reciprocal "oath" sworn by the protagonists. Although oaths are typical in Greek literature and in the Greek novels, this passage has a unique importance: as I argued in LI 2.5, it establishes fidelity as the main erotic ideal of the novel and as the virtue that the protagonists must preserve and display.

For this reason, this passage has a "programmatic" role for the rest of the novel. This function, which is clearly established, confirms Xen.'s desire to structure his novel in a proleptic way, as has

already emerged in the oracle and, at the same time, his predilection for direct speeches as the place for showing literary sophistication and directly exploring the main topics of the novel.

a) The oaths in the *Ephesiaca*: the primacy of this oath

The popularity of oaths is attested by Xen. himself, who introduces many examples in his text. However, this is evidently the most important: most of the others are described only by the narrator and they have an immediate impact on the event narrated: this is the case of the three oaths sworn by erotic rivals, which symbolise their immediate conversion (see Lampo in 2.9.4, Amphinomus in 5.2.5 and Polyidus in 5.4.7) and suggest that for Xen. swearing is an act that only pious men perform. Even less important is the one made by Eudoxus, who answers a request made by Anthia (3.5.6).

The only example closer to the present one is the repeated oath of Aegialeus and his wife at the beginning of their relationship (5.1.6: ὠμόσαμεν ἀλλήλοις πολλάκις ἕξειν καὶ μέχρι θανάτου); in this case, since this couple, like the protagonists, uses the oath as a foundation of their relationship, this passage appears to be a parallel with the present one.

Having established that fidelity is the main topic of this oath, I would like to explore how the protagonists explore it and how Xen. manages to connect these pieces with the rest of the novel.

b) Analysis of the two oaths: similarities

Although both Habrocomes and Anthia speak in a sophisticated way, they show a different kind of rhetoric: while the former has a moralistic and less emphatic tone, the heroine shows a more emotional eloquence: in my opinion, with this couple of speeches Xen. gives further proof of his interest in rhetoric and draws a distinction based on gender.

To begin with, there are certain similarities, which show how both speeches are carefully composed:
- Length of speech;
- Emotional state: both are crying;
- Articulated structure of sentences: to begin with, both introduce a hypothetical period which is more sophisticated than that of Megamedes' wish (1.10.10, n.: εὐτυχοῖτε): Habrocomes introduces in it two clauses, while Anthia makes it dependent on a declarative clause, which consists of a nominal phrase. Second, while Habrocomes shows a sophisticated use of verbs moods, since he introduces an optative desiderative (see 1.11.3: εἴη), an exhortative subjunctive (see 1.11.4: ὀμόσωμεν) and a potential optative (see ibid.: ἂν συνοικήσαιμι), Anthia introduces in the first period a relative clause of second grade of dependence (see 1.11.5: ἥτις οὐδέ ζήσομαι τὴν ἀρχὴν ἄνευ σου;), while the second has a length that exceeds the usual standard of Xen.

Overall, all these features make these speeches the most sophisticated pieces thus far met in the novel. This is certainly a way in which Xen. emphasises the importance of the topic and also suggests a development in the protagonists' personalities.

c) Analysis of the two oaths: differences

The first sign of the existence of dissimilarities is suggested by the variation with which Xen. uses identical words and themes:

- 1.11.3: μέγα ἀναστενάξας vs. 1.11.5: μέγα ἀνωλόλυξε;
- 1.11.3: Ἀνθία at the beginning vs. 1.11.5: Ἀβροκόμη as the third word;
- 1.11.4: ἀπαλλαγῶμεν vs. 1.11.5: ἀπαλλαγῶ;
- 1.11.4: ὁμόσωμεν vs. 1.11.5: ὀμνύω.

These examples invite us to look for deeper differences and the main one certainly lies in the content of the speech: while both protagonists speak of their possible separation, Habrocomes' solution lies in reciprocal conjugal fidelity, while that of Anthia lies in her personal death. As a result, while the former is more rational and he exhorts himself and his wife to be immaculate models of virtue, the latter thinks immediately of the most desperate option.

This distinction is at the origin of the others: Habrocomes' tone is serious and argumentative, as both the hypothetical clause and the use of different moods show, but at the same time it lacks emotional expressions, apart from the conventional initial epithet and the superlative φιλτάτη. Conversely, Anthia seems to copy Habrocomes' words in order to express them in a more sentimental way: the aforementioned relative clause which includes her key topic, οὐδὲ ζήσομαι, is in fact repeated with variation before the end (see 1.11.5: οὔτε ζήσομαι οὔτε τὸν ἥλιον ὄψομαι) and it appears to be an expansion of Habrocomes' expression σῴζεσθαι μετ'ἀλλήλων (1.11.3). In addition, her question περὶ ἀνδρὸς ἔτι καὶ γάμου σκέψομαι (1.11.4) is certainly more emotional than Habrocomes' correspondent sentence ἄλλῃ γυναικὶ συνοικήσαιμι (1.11.4).

In conclusion, Xen. is using these speeches to characterise his protagonists and gender is confirmed to be the main difference between them: the serious and moral Habrocomes is opposed to a tragic Anthia. This hypothesis is supported by a further element: when Habrocomes asks Anthia to be faithful, he does not promise to do the same, but simply not to marry another woman. This emphasis on building a new family (συνοικέω) suggests that he has now acquired a masculine personality and he is ready to take the lead in the relationship. As a result, Habrocomes expresses here the desire to overcome the unusual asymmetry of the beginning of the novel (LI 4.2a).

Finally, there is a last difference within the couple that can instead be explained by looking at the whole novel: while Habrocomes does not mention any god, Anthia refers to Artemis, Eros and the sea: if this list of gods might recall the initial "religious" portrait of the heroine, Habrocomes' atheism is more difficult to judge. Although this character is impious toward Eros at the beginning of the novel, after the wedding night he seems to have started on a path of reconciliation. That being

said, however, throughout the whole novel Habrocomes addresses Greek gods only at the beginning of the second (Eros in 2.1.2) and of the fifth book (Apollo in 5.1.13), while Anthia consistently honours them. In my opinion, while Anthia's religious devotion confirms her closeness to Artemis, Habrocomes' behaviour can be considered a heritage of his initial hostility to the divine world: in this respect, it is significant that Habrocomes prays to gods only when he is really in danger, as it happens in Egypt in the fourth book (cf. 4.2.6 and 9).

d) The programmatic role of this oath for the whole novel

Having clarified how both protagonists are personally involved in this oath, I would like to show how Xen. manages to use this passage as a starting point for the rest of the novel: the method adopted is based on direct references to the oath or on repetitions of formulae of the oath in strategic passages of the plot.

To being with, Habrocomes' promise seems to work in relationship with the rest of the novel and especially with the two women who test his fidelity, such as Manto and Cyno. First, συνοικέω or, according to O'Sullivan 2005, its variant συνοικίζω is used by Manto to describe her proposal made to Habrocomes in a letter (2.5.2: πατέρα τὸν ἐμὸν Ἄψυρτον ἐγὼ πείσω σοί με συνοικίσαι) and the hero clearly refuses it (2.5.4). Having said that, the protagonist's behaviour toward Cyno is more difficult to assess: when this immoral figure promises him sex and marriage, his first reaction follows the same pattern as that to Manto: δεινὸν ἐδόκει τοῦτο Ἀβροκόμῃ, καὶ πολλὰ ἅμα ἐσκόπει, τὴν Ἀνθίαν, τοὺς ὅρκους, τὴν πολλάκις αὐτὸν σωφροσύνην ἀδικήσασαν (3.12.4). However, despite this premise, Habrocomes accepts ἤδη ἐγκειμένης τῆς Κυνοῦς συγκατατίθεται (3.12.5). Then, after Cyno's murder of her husband, the protagonists flees. The reason why this passage is controversial lies in the fact that the hero seems to act against the oath with his first positive answer to Cyno. Having said that, however, I would suggest that the verb συγκατατίθημαι, which is twice used by Xen. before this passage, might clarify this apparent contradiction.

In its first occurrence in 2.4.5 it is Anthia who admits the possibility of Habrocomes' betrayal as a way to save his life (συγκατάθου δὲ τῇ τῆς δεσποίνης ἐπιθυμίᾳ), while in 2.13.8 always the heroine accepts Perilaus' proposal with the clause of the deferment of marriage (δείσασα μὴ καί τι τολμήσῃ βιαιότερον, συγκατατίθεται μὲν τὸν γάμον). This last passage seems to be in an intertextual relationship with our current one, since Perilaus' insistence is expressed with the words πολλὰ ἐγκειμένῳ (2.13.8), while Anthia's acceptance with συγκατατίθεται μὲν τὸν γάμον, and no other erotic proposal occurs in the texts between the two.

As a result, I would conclude that Xen. might have put his readers in a position in which they could immediately read Habrocomes' refusal as part of a strategy and not as an expression of his will (for this reason, I would also dismiss the suspicion of epitome, contrary to Borgogno 2005, 464, n. 145). This conclusion is also supported by the repetition of the same motif of the false acceptance of love in Hld., which suggests that we are dealing with a common τόπος (Charicleia does this with Thyamis in 1.22.5 and Theagenes with Arsace in 7.26.2).

Consequently, we can see that Habrocomes' victory against his two suitors is conceived by Xen. in a relationship to the oath.

That being said, this pattern also concerns Anthia in the same way. The difference here is quantitative: since Anthia has more suitors, there are more occasions – six – in which her promised of fidelity expressed in the oath is recalled and, as I will also show later, there are three other formulae of the oath which are attributed to her during the novel (1.11.4 n.: ἐμοὶ μενεῖς ἁγνὴ and 1.11.4 n.: ἄλλον ἄνδρα οὐχ ὑπομενεῖς and 1.11.5 n.: οὔτε ζήσομαι οὔτε τὸν ἥλιον ὄψομαι):

1) 2.1.5: τάχεως γε τῶν ὅρκων ἀνα<μνησθῆναι ἀνα>γκαζόμεθα: the pirates' erotic proposal makes Anthia think of the oath;
2) 2.7.5: ἐγὼ μενῶ σὴ: Anthia repeats this formula of the oath in a direct speech to her husband;
3) 3.5.7: οὔτε γὰρ τὰς συνθήκας παραβήσομαι τὰς πρὸς Ἁβροκόμην οὔτε τὸν ὅρκον ὑπερόψομαι: Anthia refers to the oracle in her dialogue with Eudoxus;
4) 3.6.5: ὦ φιλτάτη […] Ἁβροκόμου ψυχή, ἰδού σοι τὰς ὑποσχέσεις ἀποδίδωμι: this mention belong to her tragic apostrophe to Habrocomes;
5) 5.8.9: Ἁβροκόμης μὲν γὰρ εἰ καια τοὺς ὅρκους παραβέβηκε: Anthia thinks of the possibility that Habrocomes has broken the oath after her nightmare;
6) 5.14.3: ἢ μή τις ἠνάγκασέ σε ἐπιλαθέσθαι τῶν ὅρκων τε κἀμοῦ; Anthia recalls the same issue in her last question in Rhodes.

Overall, these passages confirm what has already emerged in relation to Habrocomes and at the same time add an important element: since they are part of emphatic speeches spoken by Anthia, the heroine is clearly establishing her model of virtue with reference to the oath. This attitude has its peak in the final speech in Rhodes, where she assumes the same moralistic tone contained in Habrocomes' oath.

The discovery of this pattern confirms further the importance of the oath, because it does not only support the exploration of fidelity in the novel, but also Anthia's performance of ἀνδρεῖα (LI 5). As I result, I would conclude that the oath serves a function which is comparable with that of the oracle, but has a different content: while Apollo's response foreshadows the events of the plot, the oracle works as a prolepsis of the virtues of the protagonists. This confirms the existence of a clear structure in the Eph.

e) Oaths in the Greek novels: the originality of Xen.'s case
In the exploitation of oaths the Greek novels follow a long tradition started by Homer and make this act a τόπος of the genre, with an innovative focus on fidelity and chastity. That being said, a structural use of oaths as that emerged in the *Eph.* has its only parallel in Longus: this confirms the originality of the present passage and opens the possibility that Longus himself is following our author in relation to this topic.

The appearance of oaths in the Greek literature starts with Hesiod, who writes about Zeus' false oath of abstinence from sexual intercourse with Io (see Hes. *Cat. Wom*. fr. 72 Most). Then, from the Hellenistic Era there is the famous binding oath sworn by Cydippe to Acontius and based on the apple (see Call. *Aitia* fr. 75.22-29), along with one from Theocritus (see 27, 35-6, where Daphnis swears on Pan a promise of conjugal fidelity to a shepherd girl) and several from Greek authors of epigrams (see, e.g., again Callimachus in AP: 5.6, Asclepiades in AP 5.7 and Meleager in AP 5.184.2-3). As a result, there is no doubt that erotic oaths were typical of the literature prior to the Greek novels.

That being said, an interesting feature, which concerns most of these examples, is that erotic oaths are not kept. This τόπος was already introduced by Hesiod: if the Pseudo-Apollodorus describes, Ἡσίοδος οὐκ ἐπίσπᾶσθαι τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν ὀργὴν τοὺς γινομένους ὅρκους ὑπὲρ Ἔρωτος (see Hesiod fr. 72 Most), with reference to Era's fury after Zeus' rape of Io. This motif is also well explored by Roman elegists: Tibullus, for example, alludes to the same mythical episode: 'Gratia magna Iovi: vetuit Pater ipse valere, iurasset cupide quidquid ineptus amor' (1.4.23.4). Similarly, Catullus is sceptical on his woman's promise of love in his *Poem* 70, in which he concludes 'sed mulier cupido quod dicit amanti in vento et rapida scribere oportet aqua' (vv. 3-4).

Overall, the existence of this framework of broken oaths suggests that the Greek novels introduce a new approach, as oaths are generally respected. Further, in the whole genre, they are used in association with the two linked themes of conjugal fidelity and virginity.

The first is theme is addressed by all the novelists: in Char. a past oath of fidelity by Aphrodite and Eros is recalled by Callirhoe in a prayer to the goddess (3.2.12-13), while in Longus an entire section is dedicated to the oath of reciprocal fidelity shared by the protagonists (see 2.39), which is shortly renewed in another shared dialogue (see 3.10.3-4). Finally, before the end, Daphnis and Chloe independently interpret the apparent betrayal of the other as a breaking of the past oath (cf. 4.27.1-2 and 4.28.3). On the other hand, Ach., with his subversive attitude, introduces the oath of fidelity in Clitophon's adulterous relationship with Melite (see 5.14.2-4), which is recalled by the former shortly after (5.26.4), while Hld. attributes it more classically to the main couple but with a variation: along with the very brief mention of 8.12.1, he in fact builds an articulated scene in 4.18.6-4.19.1, in which Chariclea asks Theagenes for a promise not of fidelity, but for patience in the consummation of the relationship. In addition, the latter complains because he thinks that a divine oath obscures the spontaneity of his behaviour.

Conversely, virginity is omitted by Xen., Char. and Hld. and only briefly explored by Longus in Daphnis' dialogue with Dionysophanes about Chloe (4.31.3). Here the exception is Ach., who plays consistently with virginity in the second part of his novel and makes it a key element in two oaths sworn by Clitophon to Melite (cf. 5.12.3 and 5.16.7) and, especially, in the final trial of the Styx (see 8.11.2), in which the latter has to prove her chastity to Thersander. Similarly, Clitophon makes the same promise to Leucippe in a letter (5.20.5).

This collection of passages shows how novelists focus on oaths and tend generally to respect them. While Xen. fits well into this pattern, a first distinction can be made from a stylistic point of view:

an oath of fidelity occurs in a direct speech only in the present passage of the *Eph*. and in that of the second book (see above 2.7.5), because in the other novels they are always told in an indirect speech. In Longus and Hld. there are cases in which a protagonist expresses in the form of a dialogue his request of the oath, but the performance of it is then made by the narrator (cf. Chloe's request in 2.39.2-4 and that of Charicleia in 4.18.4-5): this gives an absolute trait of originality to Xen.'s three oaths.

A second point of distinction concerns the value of the oath in the whole novelistic genre: within the whole corpus only Xen. uses this piece to introduce the topic of fidelity, while all the other authors do not have this need, as this topic is already familiar with them. In addition, the "programmatic" use of the oath has its only parallel in Longus and I would like to explore briefly this comparison. Overall, the latter seems to realise Xen.'s pattern in a clearer and more artistic way.

To begin with, Longus' system of oath is characterised by clarity: unlike Xen, Longus introduces references to the first oath only through both protagonists. In addition, the breaking of the oath, which in Xen. is alluded to by Anthia after her dream, is made more explicit by Longus in the last reference to the oath, in which both Daphnis and Chloe think of this possibility. That being said, Longus does not insist on formulaic connections like Xen.: the only word which is introduced in relation to the oath is πιστή (2.39.4), which is the adjective attributed by Chloe to herself and has no other occurrences in the novel.

Second, Longus' artistic touch emerges in the construction of the first scene. As in the Eph., Longus uses the divine figures to introduce a difference between the protagonists similar to that of Xen.: Daphnis, in fact, swears by Pan while Chloe by the Nymphs (see 2.39.1-2). However, Longus uses this opposition to create an explicit diffidence in Chloe and to underline the ingenuity of the latter, who identifies sheep as her gods. In addition, Longus attributes to both characters the different topics explored by Anthia and Habrocomes: the more tragic one is the first (2.39.1-2), while the moral one comes after (2.39.4). This extension allows Longus to make the protagonists constantly interact one another. Thus, in the first case it is Chloe who transforms Daphnis' motif of the futility of life without the beloved into the sharing of both life and death. In the second, instead, it is Daphnis who expands Chloe's request of fidelity, by saying that he will kill himself and not her in the case of betrayal. Overall, this interaction highlights the unity of the protagonists over those of Xen. At the same time, it must be noticed that Longus omits Xen.'s subtle distinction between fidelity in marriage and chastity, and plays no less than our author with gender distinction.

Given this framework, I would be tempted to conclude that Longus was inspired by Xen.'s approach to the oath and wrote his work with the Eph. in mind. Unfortunately, this connection is difficult to prove. A suggestion in this direction is given by the first sequence of motifs, since Daphnis' promise of death recalls Anthia's reference to suicide in her first oath, while Chloe's sharing of life and death echoes Anthia's point in the second oath. Finally, in the fourth book Chloe explores Daphnis' motif with words similar to Anthia (cf. Longus 4.27.2: ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ ζήσομαι and Xen. 1.11.5: οὐδὲ ζήσομαι […] ἄνευ σοῦ). However, the popularity of this last motif discourages any certain conclusion. As a result, there is insufficient evidence available to prove an intertextual relationship.

Thus, the real utility of this comparison lies in its assistance in producing a critique of Xen.'s system of oaths and in further emphasising how its main features are attentive to structure and moral concern.

1.11.3: τῆς ψυχῆς μοι ποθεινοτέρα: this is the first of Xen.'s erotic epithets which contain ψυχή (table 1 in LI 4.5a). While the combination of ψυχή ποθεινός occurs only here (see 1.9.2 for the importance of this adjective in the novel), that of δεσπότης and soul, which characterises the other two epithets (cf. 2.4.5 and 5.14.2), is also introduced by Char. and Ach.

In the former's novel Chaereas assigns it to Callirhoe (3.3.7: Ἀπολογοῦμαί σοι δέσποινα, τῆς ἐμῆς ψυχῆς), while in the latter it appears in Melite's prayer to Clitophon (5.26.7: ἀλλὰ δέομαι, Κλειτοφῶν δέσποτα - δεσπότης γὰρ εἶ ψυχῆς τῆς ἐμῆς). For this reason, the use of soul to refer to the beloved can be considered a novelistic τόπος.

1.11.3: συγκαταβιῶναι μετ'ἀλλήλων: συγκαταβιόω, 'to spend life together', is a very important verb of this passage, as it constitutes the core of the reciprocal oath: in fact, both protagonists' laments are conceived in relation to this verb.

In addition, Xen. himself seems to attribute to συγκαταβιόω a special function: in fact, he also adopts it in Habrocomes' lament of the fifth book, in which the hero expresses the false hope of ἐλπίδα εὑρήσειν σε καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ συγκαταβιώσεσθαι (5.8.4). Since this formula synthesises the aim of the hero's life, this confirms that Xen. considers this verb a crucial element of the life of his protagonists.

Having said that, what is really interesting is the particular meaning which συγκαταβιόω seems to have. Since in all of Greek literature this verb is very rare, it appears to be a simple derivation from καταβιόω. This verb has a particularity: the presence of κατὰ- gives the verb a possible second meaning, that is 'to bring one's life to an end' or, more briefly, 'to die'. To an extent, this nuance is also implied in the main meaning of the verb, because καταβιόω always means 'to live all of life until death' and this value emerges clearly in a final passage of the Eph. which refers to Hippothous in Ephesus: διέγνω ὁ Ἱππόθοος ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τὸν λοιπὸν καταβιῶναι χρόνον (5.15.4).

Given this framework, I would speculate that συγκαταβιόω might signify not simply 'to life together', but 'to life together until death'. As a result, this verb seems to describe even more fully the union of the protagonists, since it involves their whole life, recalling the formula of Apollo's oracle τάφος θάλαμος (1.6.2). This would confirm the hypothesis that this "poetic combination", along with a more immediate reference to Anthia's *Scheintod* (3.7.2), might also represent the final shared destiny of the heroes (see 1.6.2, n.: oracle, 6).

1.11.4: ἐμοὶ μενεῖς ἁγνὴ: this phrase is a "motto" which characterises Anthia two other times in the novel: first, she assigns it to herself during her first prayer to Isis (4.3.3: μέχρι νῦν ἁγνὴ μένω) and then she repeats it in the final dialogue of the novel with Habrocomes (5.14.2: ἁγνὴ μένω σοι). These two occurrences further stress that the oath has a programmatic value for the whole novel and confirms its focus on Anthia.

In addition, in the Eph. the adjective ἀγνός is always related to her: in fact, it occurs three other times as part of another formula, τήρειν (γάμων) ἁγνήν, which is attributed to Anthia by the erotic rivals Perilaus (2.13.8), Amphinomus (5.2.5) and Polyidus (5.4.7). Since the only other occurrence of this adjective is in Hld. in relation to Charicleia, our author is doing something original with it. In this respect, it is significant that ἀγνός, which means 'holy' and 'chaste', is always related to the divine sphere, since it designates 'places and things dedicated to gods', as well as the gods themselves (see LSJ). Its attribution to people, which started after Homer, did not eliminate this supernatural trait: thus, as the space of the holy marks a difference from the rest of the world, since it is not subjected to human contamination, people who are ἀγναί are separated from the pollution represented by sex. As a result, I would conclude that Xen.'s attribution of this adjective to Anthia might confirm her holiness and virtue and, fits well into his religious view of love and chastity, which has its only other parallel in Hld.

Finally, the occurrence of the sentence μένειν ἀγνή in both the oath and the final scene in Rhodes further confirms the connection of these two episodes: we have the "literal" proof that Anthia interprets her entire journey as the opportunity to show her fidelity and to be ἀνδρεῖα (LI 4.2c).

1.11.4: ἄλλον ἄνδρα οὐχ ὑπομενεῖς: like its simple verb μένω, also ὑπομένω seems to be part of the construction of the oath in relation to the whole novel. In fact, it is used by Xen. in five monologues given by Anthia, where it describes her patience and virtue: thus, its repetition seems to answer positively the invitation made here by Habrocomes.

1) 2.1.6: μηδ'ὑπομείναιμι ὑβρισθεῖσα ἰδεῖν τὸν ἥλιον: Anthia expresses her lament after the pirates' proposal;
2) 3.5.3: ὁ μέν γε ἵνα ἐμὸς ἀνὴρ μείνῃ, καὶ δεσμὰ ὑπομένει καὶ βασάνους καὶ ἴσως που καὶ τέθνηκεν: Anthia stresses Habrocomes' fidelity.
3) 3.5.7: ἀδύνατον […] τὸν μέλλοντα ἀμήχανον ὑπομεῖναι γάμον: Anthia re-states her commitment to chastity when rejecting the wedding with Perilaus. Interestingly, this sentence comes after an explicit reference to the oath: this increases the connection thus far suggested (see 3.5.6);
4) 4.6.6: οἵαν ὑπομένω τιμωρίαν: Anthia laments in the ditch;
5) 5.8.7: ἐγὼ μὲν καὶ πόνους ὑπομένω πάντας: Anthia defines her virtue after her nightmare.

In my opinion the existence of this framework is also helpful for understanding the present passage, where ὑπομένω lacks the meaning it usually carries when referring to people, 'await'. Here, Xen. seems to use the same meaning as in the other passages where the object is not a human being, that is 'to be patient under' or 'submit'. If this further emphasises the attention given by Xen. to the use of this verb in the whole novel, Habrocomes seems to suggest passivity as the proper behaviour of a wife. Given the unusual asymmetry of the beginning of the novel (LI 2.1), the hero seems to show also here his desire to re-establish a traditional hierarchy.

1.11.5: τὴν πάτριον ἡμῖν θεόν, τὴν μεγάλην Ἐφεσίων Ἄρτεμιν, καὶ ταύτην ἣν διανύομεν θάλατταν καὶ τὸν [...] ἐκμήναντα θεόν: this tripartite formula partially reflects the custom typical of real Greek oaths and partially that of literary ones.

On the one hand, the combination of divinities and elements of nature is clearly Homeric: see Agamemnon's oath in the third book, in which he invokes Zeus, the Sun, the rivers and the earth (see *Il.* 3.277-9). This proves that religious oaths were part of the Greek society and Xen.'s introduction of an example of this in the novel is significant in itself, because a good number of novelistic oaths are not referred to gods. In addition, the mention of the sea is part of the Greek attitude to involve 'the entire cosmos' (Burkert 1985, 251) in an oath and its invocation is also inspired by the Greek tendency to include among the addressees the "objects" with which they were dealing (see, e.g., *Il.* 15.39 f., where Hera swears by her marriage bed). In relation to this, it is interesting that in the *Argonautica* Jason invokes in a prayer the forces of the sea (see 1.193-8), while in the *Aethiopica* Tyrrhenus the fisherman swears an oath by Poseidon and the gods of the sea (see 5.20.2: τὸν Ποσειδῶ σοι τὸν πελάγιον ἐπόμνυμι καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐναλίους θεοὺς). Finally, 'in post-Homeric times the various individual polis gods also appear prominently in the oath' (Burkert 1985, 251): this pattern is followed by Xen. with the introduction of Artemis, who appears again in Eudoxus' oath requested by Anthia (3.5.5).

On the other hand, Eros is not involved in public oaths, as he is not a proper divinity. For this reason, his introduction stems from the author's literary choice. This is confirmed, first of all, by Meleager's oath by Eros in AP 12.76.3 and from the parallel with the aforementioned oath in Chariton of the third book, in which Callirhoe invokes the sea, Aphrodite and Eros (see again 3.2.4-5). Because this combination is very similar to that of Xen. and it involves only the substitution of Artemis with Aphrodite, who plays the similar role of the main divinity of the novel, it is possible to conclude that the two passages are intertexting. In addition, in the novelistic oaths such a rich combination occurs only in Theagenes' oath of fidelity to Charicleia (4.18.5: ἐπώμνυε δ᾽ὅμως Ἀπόλλω τε Πύθιον καὶ Ἄρτεμιν καὶ Ἀφροδίτην αὐτὴν καὶ Ἔρωτας). Conversely, Pan and Nymphs are the only divinities invoked in Longus, while Ach. mentions Isis once in 5.26.4 and Artemis once in 8.12.2-4, while Hld. addresses Apollo once in 4.16.7 and the Sun once in 7.26.3).

That being said, these two authors do not seem to exploit more subtly each other's oracles; thus, we are dealing with a superficial connection. In this respect, a more sophisticated trait introduced by Xen. seems to be Anthia's description of Eros as τὸν [...] ἐκμήναντα θεόν: see below.

1.11.5: τὸν ἐπ᾽ἀλλήλοις ἡμᾶς καλῶς ἐκμήναντα θεόν: since love is the main topic of Anthia's speech, there is no doubt that ἐκμαίνω, "to drive mad", is describing Eros. In my opinion, more than this choice of verb, it is surprising than Anthia is referring to the god, since before this passage she has never mentioned him in her speeches. As a result, this reference to Eros, like that in the description of the canopy (1.8.3), might be interpreted as proof that also Anthia and not only Habrocomes is under the education of Eros: this confirms that Xen.'s *Bildungsroman* concerns both the protagonists.

That being said, the meaning of the verb ἐκμαίνω has to be assessed. To begin with, the mention of erotic madness establishes an inevitable link between Anthia's monologue and her μαίνομαι (1.4.6, n.: ἐφ'Ἁβροκόμη): as in that passage, also here both the association between madness and lovesickness and the tragic colour of the expression appear to be confirmed. As a result, the heroine seems here to refer to her past sufferings: this constitutes an exception in her whole oath, which is so focused on the future and confirms the subtlety of her speech and its status as repository of the main topics of the novel.

That being said, what is here less clear is whether ἐκμήναντα can be interpreted as a Platonic signal: in my opinion, the textual evidence is too scarce here to admit this possibility. To begin with, the first two uses of ἐκμαίνω in an erotic context come from Sophocles' *Trachiniae* and Aristophanes' *Women at the Assembly*. In the first text, the choir reveals to Hercules how Dejanira has used Nessus' poison to inflame his passion (1142: τὸν σὸν ἐκμῆναι πόθον), while in the second a young man in love makes the following invocation to Aphrodite: Κύπρι τί μ'ἐκμαίνεις ἐπὶ τινι; (966). Then, Plato uses this verb only once in an epigram about Dio's death, which has the following conclusion: ὦ ἐμὸν ἐκμήνας θυμὸν ἔρωτι Δίων (AP 7.99.6). Finally, its nature as a τόπος is revealed by Theocritus' *fifth Idyll* (see how Cratida's love is expressed in 90-1: κἠμὲ γὰρ ὁ Κρατίδας τὸν ποιμένα λεῖος ὑπαντῶν ἐκμαίνει) and by numerous novelistic occurrences (cf. Ach. 2.3.3 and 5.11.5 and Hld. 1.9.2, 1.15.4, 7.20.5 and 10.19.1).

As a result, the only possibility of a Platonic colour might be admitted by the parallel with Anthia's monologue.

1.11.5: οὔτε ζήσομαι οὔτε τὸν ἥλιον ὄψομαι: this is the first presentation in the novel of the common motif that life is not worth living without the beloved: this fact is very significant. Since proposed suicides are a typical motif of the *Eph.* (LI 4.4-5), the introduction here of the first hint at suicide is the last confirmation of the "programmatic" value of this oath.

A further sign of this is also given by the second sentence spoken by Anthia on this topic. In fact, οὔτε τὸν ἥλιον ὄψομαι occurs twice in the novel: the first time is in her lament during the last dialogue before the separation from Habrocomes (2.1.6) and the second in a monologue at Tarsus (3.8.2, where the expression occurs with a slight variation: οὐδ'ἂν ἐπιδοίμι τὸν ἥλιον). As a further proof of the connection, in both cases this phrase is accompanied by two others which are synonymous (cf. 2.1.6: μὴ οὕτως ἐγὼ φιλόζωος γενοίμην and 3.8.2: οὐδ' [ἂν] εἰς φῶς ἐλεύσομαι).

Since τὸν ἥλιον ὄψομαι is not common in the novels (Char. 2.11.2 for the only other occurrence), this framework suggests a further reason why the oath launches this motif in the whole novel.

1.11.6: μεγάλη καὶ καλή: these epithets, which make Rhodes a "touristic" centre, are, along with geographical details, the second way in which Xen. designates his places. If μεγάλη καὶ καλή are 'conventional adjectives, which can be found in archaic poetry as well as in accounts of journeys like Xenophon's *Anabasis*' (Saïd 1994, 218-9), it is interesting how the same combination of adjectives concerns other important ancient cities such as Mazaca (3.1.1), Syracuse (5.1.1) and an island like Sicily, where we find the variation μεγάλην καὶ εὐδαίμονα (5.3.3).

In theory, these repetitions might imply a common pattern exploited by Greek novelists, who 'are interested in exotic travels and try to satisfy the taste of their audience for tourist attractions' (Saïd 1994, 228). However, here Xen. seems rather to be merely interested only in a materialistic perspective, since each of these "big" places is visited by characters of the novel to answer a specific need. Thus, in Rhodes the purpose of the visit lies in the need for loading fresh water and new supplies (cf. 1.11.6 and 1.12.3), while in Mazaca Hippothous is looking for new member of his band (3.1.1). Similarly, Hippothous goes to Sicily to διατραφήσεσθαι (5.3.3) and, thus, as soon as he arrives there, ἐζήτει καιρὸν δι'οὗ τὰ ἐπιτήδεια ἕξει (5.6.1). In this same pattern Syracuse is also included, with the exception that Habrocomes is not looking there for goods but for news about Anthia (5.1.2).

Only in the first city there is a proper touristic goal, which lies in the protagonists' tour of the city, and is then quickly dismissed. The same technique concerns Psammis in Alexandria, who wants to see the city (3.11.2: κατὰ θέαν τῆς πόλεως καὶ κατὰ χρείαν ἐμπορίας) but then focuses on Anthia's purchase (see 3.11.3). Similarly, in Laodicea Hippothous and his band are introduced as tourists (see 4.1.1: κατὰ θέαν τῆς πόλεως), but then nothing is added.

In conclusion, in all these passages Xen. merely reflects a common cliché: this marks a difference between him and the three later novelists, Ach., Longus and Hld., who conversely are more concerned with tourism. In the first two, in fact, a tourist's curiosity seems to inspire the description of ancient sites (cf. Ach.'s Sidon in 1.1.1, Tyre in 2.14.2-4 and Alexandria in 5.1.1-6 and Longus' Mytilene in 8.30.20). On the other hand, in Hld. two touristic visits are properly described: the first description is made by Charicles, who after his daughter's death wandered in many lands and also managed to visit the short rapids of the Nile (2.29.5: ἦλθον δὲ καὶ τὴν σὴν Αἴγυπτον καὶ Καταδούπους αὐτοὺς καθ'ἱστορίαν τῶν καταρρακτῶν τοῦ Νείλου). Further, he spends some time in the Egyptian city in order to buy precious objects that are difficult to find in Greece (2.30.1). The second visit concerns the King of Aethiopia, who inquires about the origin of the Nile (9.22.2) and visits two wonders of Syene (9.22.4-7). In addition, Hld. gives accurate descriptions of classical sites such as Athens and Delphi, which contrast with Char.'s and Xen.'s omission of the most famous monuments of his cities and, in Said's view, 'illuminate the development of the novel as a genre' (232).

Finally, both Ach. and Longus seem to play even more subtly with this motif, since they introduce it at the beginning of their works: in Leucippe, in fact, 'the narrator presents himself as a tourist' (Saïd 1994, 228 and 1.1.2: Περιιὼν οὖν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην πόλιν καὶ περισκοπῶν τὰ ἀναθήματα [...]) and the whole initial *ekphrasis* is a consequence of his visit. Similarly, also Longus' prologue contains his visit to the grove and his discovery of the painting: ἐν Λέσβῳ θηρῶν ἐν ἄλσει Νυμφῶν θέαμα εἶδον κάλλιστον ὧν εἶδον (prol. 1).

Overall, all these examples expand what is merely hinted at in the *Eph.*: we here are dealing here with proof of Xen.'s simplicity.

1.11.6: ὑδρεύσασθαι: this verb is part of mundane vocabulary, since it refers to the ordinary task of 'carrying water' since Homer, where it is used in the description of the two sources in Scheria

where people ὑδρεύοντο πολῖται (*Od*. 7.131) and then has many occurrences in the Greek Literature. I shall mention just one of these, found in a passage from the Imperial author Lucian: in the introduction of one of his *Dialogues of sea-god* Triton introduces it to describe the pretty Amymone's coming to Lerna every day for water (8.1: Ἐπὶ τὴν Λέρναν, ὦ Πόσειδον, παραγίνεται καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ὑδρευσομένη παρθένος, πάγκαλόν τι χρῆμα). A verb like this contributes to the realistic connotation of the protagonists' journey (1.10.6, n.: ἐπανάγεσθαι) and has an evident parallel in ἐπισιτίζομαι, which indicates the parallel action of 'furnishing oneself with food' (LSJ) and appears in the description of the protagonists' departure from Rhodes (1.12.3: ἐπειγόντων τῶν ναυτῶν ἀνήγοντο ἐπισιτισάμενοι).

That being said, its introduction here seems to ascribe a trait of dishonesty to these sailors: since the water supply in Greek sailing ships had a large capacity (see Casson 1971, 177 for a description), it is not realistic that the Ephesian ship needed to stop after only one day of navigation. This impression is supported by Char., who uses ὑδρεύσασθαι in a realistic way by making it the reason for Theron's stop in Athens (1.11.8). In his case, in fact, the longer trip from Syracuse to Athens required provisions.

As a result, Xen.'s episode here would already assume that sinister aura which will become clearer later in the novel and I would suggest that ancient readers, given their great experience on the sea, could pick up this connotation more easily than us.

CHAPTER 12

1.12.1-2: the narration of the protagonists' visit to Ephesus is classified by Hägg 1971, 54 as 'Xen's second type of day-night-phase, which is filled with accounts of concrete courses of events, in which the narrator never leaves his distant standpoint'. Within this pattern, it is very strange that 'temporal expressions are almost completely missing' (ibid.) and the only chronological hint is given by the sailors' desire for rest in Rhodes (1.11.6, n.: ὑδρεύσασθαι).

As a result, after the temporal framework which characterises the start of the protagonists' journey (1.11.2, n.: δειπνοποιησάμενοι), we return here to an atemporal one. In my opinion, this shift might have been purposely chosen by Xen. to give an appropriate setting for the protagonists' divine visit to Rhodes, which has its model in the Homeric Scheria and recalls the initial Ephesian context (LI 6.2c). Two further arguments can be provided in support of this hypothesis: on the one hand, as Hägg notices, another day-night-phase like this occurs in the passage of the second book where the protagonists arrive in Tyre and are worshipped like gods: also there the omission of time indicators suits the content of the passage well (2.2.3-5). On the other hand, as Morgan 2007a, 455 argues, in 3.4.1-4 there is a strange and unique 'narratorial completing analepsis', in which Eudoxus' arrival to Tarsus is introduced as an event that happened before the celebration of the wedding. Since 'the anachronicity of this section is unparalleled in Xenophon', the first impression is that 'it serves no particular purpose' (ibid.). On closer inspection, however, it is interesting to note that Eudoxus is a double of Odysseus (APP 1.2) and I would speculate that the detachment from chronology might there be an indicator of this epic model: this would confirm that also here the atemporal setting fits well into the epic parallel.

In conclusion, Xen.'s use of time confirms his continuous exploitation of Odyssean scenarios and, especially, between Ephesus and Rhodes.

1.12.1: τὸ κάλλος τῶν παίδων καταπεπληγότες: this construct appears to be unusual, since the most common construction of καταπλήσσω with the meaning of 'to be astounded' (LSJ) and an object occurs in the passive form. This complement in the accusative is usually related to 'verbs expressing fear, hope, confidence, wonder and shame, which take an accusative of the feeling or that wherein it consists', like φοβέομαι and θαυμάζω (Jelf 1842, 173). A good example of this is given by Isocrates' *Ad Antipatrum*, where Isocrates alludes to Diodotus' envy toward Antipatrus with the following sentence: τήν τε γὰρ ἀπειρίαν τὴν αὑτοῦ καταπεπλῆχθαι καὶ τὴν λαμπρότητα τὴν ὑμετέραν (11). Even more interestingly, Xen. himself adopts it to describe Corymbus' wonder at the protagonists' beauty (2.21: κατεπλάγη τὴν εὐμορφίαν) and the same happens in Char., when in Chaereas' speech to his army we read: μηδεὶς οὖν καταπλαγῇ τὴν πρᾶξιν ἐφ᾽ἣν ὑμᾶς παρακαλῶ (7.3.9).

That being said, however, in Imperial authors the same construction is achieved with the active perfect: Pausanias shows this in 10.22.2, where he writes: οἱ μὲν δὴ ἡγεμόνες τῶν βαρβάρων οἱ ἄλλοι κατεπεπλήγεσαν τὸ Ἑλληνικόν and an even more interesting passage comes from Dionysius

from Halicarnassus, since it contains a participle identical to that of Xen: τότε δὴ καταπεπληγότες τὸ τῶν Ῥωμαίων τάχος (11).

As a result, I would conclude that Xen. is using here a construction which is rare but attested in contemporary writers. He also further modifies it in the fifth book, where Hippothous' wonder at the recognition of Anthia is expressed with the following words: ἐπὶ τῷ συμβάντι καταπλήσσεται (5.9.5).

In addition, giving the linguistic context of this passage, it is interesting that here, as well as in the other two passages of Xen., we encounter the motif of 'influence of beauty on other characters', which is transmitted through the sight. As Cummings 2009, 116 argues, the focus of this image is not to convey eroticism, but to 'refer to surprise as a startling emotional reaction'. The first element emerges clearly only in Hippothous' case. This general value of the verb is shared by the other novelists: Char., in particularly, uses καταπλήσσομαι to denote the different reactions to Callirhoe (1.14.1.2, 2.2.2, 2.5.4), to military events (6.7.12, 6.8.3) and parts of the trial (4.7.1, 5.7.1). Then, with the same verb Ach. describes Clitophon's reaction to Leucippe's letter (5.18.2) and Hld. Persinna's wonder at Charicleia's display of tokens (10.14.2).

1.12.1: ἐπιδημίαν ἐκ τῶν θεῶν: Xen. employs here again the τόπος of the divine comparison of the protagonists and for the first time he relates it to them as a couple. The word ἐπιδημία, which means 'visit' and is used by Xen. only here, introduces another nuance of this general theme: while previously Anthia was identified with Artemis (1.2.7, n.: ἐπὶ τοῦ τεμένους) or defined as a divine envoy (1.2.7, n.: ὑπὸ τῆς θεοῦ), here she is a god who visits Rhodes with Habrocomes.

This idea of a divine visit to the human world has a Homeric origin and was very developed in the Hellenistic and Imperial Era. Since in the *Odyssey* this motif occurs in the Phaeacian episode, I would consider the Homeric memory to be very likely, because of the parallel association between Ephesus and Scheria. That being said, the frequent occurrence of this theme in the Hellenistic Era proves that it became a cliché: thus, I think that no other motif here could have been more natural for Xen. to introduce, since he wanted to explore the association between his protagonists and gods.

To begin with, the theme of the divine visit occurs in the Phaeacian episode, where Alcinous offers the following divine interpretation of Odysseus' arrival to his homeland:

εἰ δέ τις ἀθανάτων γε κατ᾽ οὐρανοῦ εἰλήλουθεν,

ἄλλο τι δὴ τόδ᾽ ἔπειτα θεοὶ περιμηχανόωνται.

αἰεὶ γὰρ τὸ πάρος γε θεοὶ φαίνονται ἐναργεῖς

ἡμῖν, εὖθ᾽ ἔρδωμεν ἀγακλειτὰς ἑκατόμβας,

δαίνυνταί τε παρ᾽ ἄμμι καθήμενοι ἔνθα περ ἡμεῖς (*Od.* 7.199-203).

In addition, later in the poem one of the suitors in Ithaca warns Antinoous, who has just committed an act of violence against Odysseus, that his victim might be a god:

καί τε θεοὶς ξείνοισιν ἐοικότες ἀλλοδαποῖσι,

παντοῖοι τελέθοντες, ἐπιστρωφῶσι πόληας,

ἀνθρώπων ὕβριν τε καὶ εὐνομίην ἐφορῶντες (Od. 17.485-7).

Since in the parallel episode of Ephesus Xen. explicitly alludes to the Phaeacian episode, I would accept here a debt to Homer.

That being said, later in the history of Greek literature a similar theme appears: as Martin 1995, 153 argues, 'motif of deity or other superhuman being wandering about on earth in disguise was familiar in the Hellenistic world as it is folk tales generally' and the people who were visited by them offer an unconscious '*theoxeny*'.

A first famous example is Ovid's story of Philemon and Baucis (Met. 8.611-724), where Zeus and Hermes are beggars who ask for hospitality in Phrygia and only this poor and simple couple welcomes them (for a discussion of these sources, see Hollis 1970, 106-109). At the beginning Ovid underlines the human appearance of the gods by saying: 'Iuppiter huc specie mortali cumque parente venit Atlantiades positis caducifer alis' (626-7). Similarly, Eratosthenes, Callimachus' pupil, is credit with the almost entirely lost poem *Erigone*, which addressed the story of Icarus' daughter, who received Dionysius when the god came to Attica and in return was taught how to plant the vine. Similarly, Euphorion of Chalcis and Ovid in his *Fasti* tell the story of Hyrieus, the son of Poseidon and Alcyone who offered hospitality to Zeus, Poseidon and Hermes. They do not reveal their divine status (5.404: 'dissimulantque deos') and they give Hyrieus the son Orion as a reward. Finally, an interesting parallel comes also from the *Acts of Apostles*, where Paul and Barnabas are taken for visiting Zeus and Hermes by the inhabitants of Lystra (11-12: οἵ τε ὄχλοι [...] ἐπῆραν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτῶν Λυκαονιστὶ λέγοντες· οἱ θεοὶ ὁμοιωθέντες ἀνθρώποις κατέβησαν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ἐκάλουν τε τὸν Βαρνάβαν Δία, τὸν δὲ Παῦλον Ἑρμῆν), who even want to offer them a sacrifice (13).

As a result, Xen. seems here to introduce a very common motif and the parallel with the *Acts* also opens also the possibility that our author might be acknowledging a behaviour which was attested in the real life. Although it is difficult to identify the origin of Xen.'s operation, in my opinion the parallel with Ephesus, as well as the general Odyssean framework, makes it plausible that we are dealing with a literary debt.

1.12.1: ἐκ τῶν θεῶν: the correctness of these words from a philological point of view is disputed: O'Sullivan 1982, 57 illustrates the main problems:
  - 'ἐκ has no place in the syntax and τῶν is unsuitably generic';
  - 'λέγω does occur in the author with the sense of "speak of" and "mention" (1.2.8, 3.3.4), but it is a relatively rare use of the word';
  - 'Palaeography notwithstanding, one has to consider the claims of εἶναι here' and O'Sullivan 1982 recalls here the passage of the second book where the Tyrians welcome the protagonists as divine: ἄνθρωποι βάρβαροι μήπω πρότερον τοσαύτην ἰδόντες εὐμορφίαν θεοὺς ἐνόμιζον εἶναι τοὺς βλεπομένους (2.2.4).
In my opinion, although these points clearly demonstrate that this passage is controversial, I would suggest that the meaning of ἐκ τῶν θεῶν might suit the image which Xen. is associating with the protagonists. If we follow the Phaeacian interpretation of Odysseus' arrival, Homer mentions that τις ἀθανάτων would come κατ'οὐρανοῦ (*Od.* 7.199). In my opinion, ἐκ τῶν θεῶν might similarly underline the supernatural provenience of Anthia and Habrocomes and this works well with the

consequent kneeling of the Rhodians, giving a sort of verticality to the scene, which might be part of Xen.'s interest in theatricality (NA 4). In addition, the two passages in 1.2.8 and in 3.3.4 are good parallels: in the former the Ephesian population is praising Anthia (ὡς δὲ παρῆλθε τὸ τῶν παρθένων πλῆθος, οὐδεὶς ἄλλο τι ἢ Ἀνθίαν ἔλεγεν), while the second belongs to Chrysion's tale, in which Anthia πατρίδα ἔλεγε τὴν σὴν (3.3.4). As a result, I would accept the manuscript reading.

That being said, I would consider also as likely the possibility that ἐκ is an addition made by a copyist, which could have been induced to do it by the presence of ἐπι- in the precedent name. Conversely, the presence of εἶναι seems to be less appropriate, because the infinite would have an unusual position between the noun and the genitive, and this option would stress less the importance of this arrival.

Finally, I have not discussed αἰσίω, which is the variant proposed by Schmidt 1982: as Garzon Diaz 1986, 100 argues, it is weak, because it has no other occurrences in the novel.

1.12.1: διεπεφοιτήκει τὸ ὄνομα Ἀβροκόμου καὶ Ἀνθίας: this is the only occurrence of διαφοιτάω in Xen.: for its originality and parallel with Char., 1.2.7, n.: διαβοήτος.

1.12.2: ἑορτήν: this is a private feast and not an official ceremony, like that celebrated at the end of the novel (5.11.2 and LI 5.2). This omission of a public feast appears to be a further nuance of the idealistic presentation of the first Rhodes of the novel.

1.12.2: ἐξιστόρησαν: this verb, which has no other occurrences in the novelistic corpus, recalls the autopsy which Herodotus considered essential to his historiographical approach. In this context, this verb suggests the idea that the protagonists are touring Rhodes and this seems to meet the expectation created by the previous epithets μεγάλη καὶ καλή (1.11.6, n) and by the second subtler interpretation of the oracle made by the parents (1.10.3, n.: ὡς οἷόν).

That being said, if we compare the novelistic exploitation of the "touristic" motif (1.11.6, n.: μεγάλη καὶ καλή) with the present passage, it is remarkable how Xen. does not describe any aspect of Rhodes, apart from the brief mention of the temple of Helios. Although this lack of references might be interpreted as a trait of simplicity, the comparison with the other novelists who clearly describe the places mentioned (1.11.6 n., μεγάλη καὶ καλή), and especially the richer portrait of Rhodes in the first book (LI 5) seem to suggest that this silence is deliberately chosen by our author. As a result, I would speculate that Xen. is using ἐξιστορέω to confirm the general idea of the protagonists' journey as a tour, but not to truly construct it as a real tour. For this reason, he might be ironically playing with it, creating an expectation of a Herodotean approach which is never adopted.

1.12.2: οἱ ξεῖνοι [...] πολῖται: this is the first ἐπίγραμμα of the Eph. From a textual point of view, we are dealing with two dactylic and simple hexameters which are 'epigraphically not implausible, but rather literary and post-archaic in its flavor' (Sironen 2002, 290). In fact, the language has epic and tragic reminiscences, since the expression τεύχε᾽ἔθηκαν is used by Homer (Il. 19.12-13: Ὥς ἄρα

φωνήσασα θεὰ κατὰ τεύχε' ἔθηκε πρόσθεν Ἀχιλλῆος) and χρυσήλατα by tragic writers. In addition, in the Iliadic passage Athena offers Achilles the divine weapons used by the dead Patroclus: as a result, the motif of Xen.'s dedication sounds epic, being focused on a military object (for a deeper consideration of this element in relation to Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, see <u>GI</u> 4).

Given this brief description, it is important to establish the function played by these two verses: as Sironen 2002, 299 shows in his final appendix, in the whole novel Xen. introduces two other dedications: 'a donor inscription commemorating the previous slave masters' (5.10.6) and 'a dedication of hair to Helius' made by Anthia'. Finally, there is also a grave epigram composed by Hippothous for the dead Hyperanthes (3.2.13).

While this last piece seems to perform an emotional function, emphasising the tragic nature of Hippothous' love story, the present passage shares with the other two Rhodian inscriptions a narratological role: this dedication is a 'seed' (Morgan 2007a, 464), which plays a strategic role in the final and mutual recognition of the protagonists. Interestingly, this event happens in fifth book through the help of two other inscriptions: this confirms the existence of a deliberate frame of passages which perform this narratological function:

a) in 5.10.6 the protagonists' ex-servants see the present inscription and set up a stele in golden letters in honour of Habrocomes and Anthia, including their names; when the former reads this and his sees the golden panoply, he starts complaining and in this way reveals his identity to the dedicators;

b) in 5.11.6 Anthia offers Helios a lock of her hair and accompanies it with another inscription. The discovery of this made by Leucon and Rhode opens the road for their mutual recognition.

If this first function shared together by these inscriptions is clear, it seems to me that Xen. might also be hinting at two other ones.

The first is suggested by a comparison with the other novels: what our author does with his dedications is not so common in the genre: as Sironnen shows, it is only in the *Historia Apollonis Regis Tyri* that dedications play the same role as in Xen., while among the other authors some ignore them, like Char., Ach. and partially Longus, and some use them in a more sophisticated way, especially Hld. and some fringe novels (see Sironnen 2002, 294-295 for a demonstration of these differences; Char. introduces dedications but without the text and often assigns to them a "realistic" function, while Longus and Hld. instead use tokens as important seeds). This suggests that Xen.'s approach to this kind of text might be original. Given this hypothesis, I wonder whether the fact that each of the three dedications is set in a religious context and is the fruit of a private dedication might play also a metaliterary function: the Eph. is a novel focused more than the others of the corpus on the presence of gods and on an intimate dimension of love and Xen. might be using inscriptions also to emphasise this.

A support to this idea and the emergence of a second function can be suggested if we look at what Sironnen 2002 calls the final 'authentication' of the novel (5.15.2), in which the protagonists consecrate their story to Artemis in Ephesus. The reason why this piece has not been included in the previous list is that, first of all, its definition as a γραφή seems to indicate a painting and not an inscription (see Wouters 1989-90, 473). In addition, its first reason for existence is different from

those of the previous dedications, since it seems to depend on the novelist's desire to create an impression of authenticity for their story, in accordance with the so-called novelistic *Beglaubigungsapparat* (for more on this, see Wouters 1989-90). The emergence of this distinction, however, does not prevent the observation that there is a connection between this final act performed by the protagonists in Ephesus and the previous ones, since they are all preceded by a mention of the verb ἀνατίθημι or of the noun ἀνάθημα: as a result, they are all dedications in a broader sense. Having suggested this link, I would propose that this last dedication, being a clear referred to the whole novel, might support the argument of the previous metaliterary hint, since it is placed, like the previous ones, in a religious and intimate context.

Finally, if we compare the content of the present inscription, that of Anthia and the final one, there seems to be a progression in the conception of the protagonists' characterisation: as a result, I would attribute to each of them a framing function too.

1.12.2

Οἱ ξεῖνοι [κλεινοὶ] τάδε σοι χρυσήλατα τεύχε' ἔθηκαν, (5)
  Ἀνθία Ἁβροκόμης θ', ἱερῆς Ἐφέσοιο πολῖται

5.11.6

ΥΠΕΡ. ΤΟΥ ΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΑΒΡΟΚΟΜΟΥ ΑΝΘΙΑ ΤΗΝ. ΚΟΜΗΝ ΤΩΙ ΘΕΩΙ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ.

5.15.2

ἀνέθεσαν πάντων ὅσα τε ἔπαθον καὶ ὅσα ἔδρασαν.

While in the former ἀνάθημα Anthia and Habrocomes are defined by their status as Ephesians and as Homeric guests, as the word ξεῖνοι and the Iliadic tone of the passage prove, in Anthia's dedications the protagonists are defined by their erotic relationship. Finally, in the last dedication there is a clear emphasis on their sufferings which has an Odyssean colour (LI 6.6). In my opinion, this trajectory, especially the difference between the first and the last two dedications, recalls interestingly the shift of the novel from an ideal self-image of the protagonists as divine inhabitants of an ideal homeland to a couple who really experience that it is only worth living for conjugal love, as a fruit of the hardship of their journey.

As a result, we are here dealing with a further sign of Xen's introduction of a second more sophisticated reading of inscriptions.

1.12.3: ὀλίγας ἡμέρας ἐν τῇ νήσῳ μείναντες: 'durative expressions with ἡμέρα in the plural are common' (Hägg 1971, 61) and, thus, are part of Xen's stereotyped use of temporal indicators. However, along with eleven occurrences like this, 'only in a few cases is the number of days specified: 30 (2.13.8, 3.3.7) and 10 (3.1.3) and 3 (1.14.6, 5.4.8)' (ibid.).

In addition, this formula serves here the function of marking of scenes: it concludes the one set in Rhodes and fulfils the same function later in the novel: see 2.7.1, 3.1.3, 5.2.6, 5.6.4 5.11.2, and 5.15.1.

1.12.3: παρεπέμπε δὲ αὐτοὺς ἅπαν τὸ Ῥοδίων πλῆθος: this verb, which designates the Rhodian crowd's farewell to the protagonists, creates a parallel with their departure from Ephesus, where we read πᾶν μὲν τὸ Ἐφεσίων <πλῆθος> παρῆν παραπεμπόντων (1.10.6). This confirms the analogy between the two cities and, from a textual point of view, it proves the correctness of Hemsterhuius' (1733) introduction of πλῆθος in the first passage.

The hardship of the journey (1.12.3-1.16.7)

After the departure from Rhodes, the protagonists definitely start their troublesome journey, characterised by sufferings and real peril. While this makes their life more difficult, at the same time it is what makes them grow. For these reasons, Xen. seems to emphasise in this beginning how the protagonists' departure from Ephesus coincides with their acquisition of independence, which is symbolised by the physical detachment from the homeland as well as from parents and tutors.

1.12.3: οὐρίῳ πνεύματι [...] ἀσμένοις: these two expressions describe the positive start of the protagonists' navigation. However, since the last time in which Anthia and Habrocomes shared joy was shortly followed by the start of their suffering (1.10.2, n.: ἑορτή), a sense of foreboding might here affect the readers.

Furthermore, the same pattern of the interruption of a joyful navigation exists already in the Odyssean description of the storm. When Odysseus leaves Calypso, Homer writes: οὖρον δὲ προέηκεν ἀπήμονά τε λιαρόν τε. γηθόσυνος δ' οὔρῳ πέτασ' ἱστία δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς (Od. 5.268-9). Then, eighteen days later, the storm arrives making him desperate (5.291-305). Although the obstacle for the hero is natural rather than human, the first part constitutes a possible parallel with this episode in the Eph.

Similarly, Ach. begins his description of a storm by underlining the same shift from positive to negative conditions: τρίτην δὲ ἡμέραν πλεόντων ἡμῶν ἐξ αἰθρίας πολλῆς αἰφνίδιον ἀχλὺς περιχεῖται (3.1.1). Then, Hld. introduces both propitious wind and calm in an episode which seems to intertext with Xen. (see 1.13.1 n.: intr.). Finally, Lucian plays explicitly with this motif: when the narrator describes his return from Cloudcuckooland to the sea, he writes: θαυμασίως ὑπερηδόμεθα καὶ ὑπερεχαίρομεν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐκ τῶν παρόντων εὐφροσύνην ἐποιούμεθα καὶ ἀπορρίψαντες ἐνηχόμεθα· καὶ γὰρ ἔτυχε γαλήνη οὖσα καὶ εὐσταθοῦν τὸ πέλαγος (30). This description includes both the naturalistic and the psychological elements present in the Eph. However, the situation shortly deteriorates when a great number of sea beasts and whales appears. What is interesting is how Lucian describes this change: Ἔοικε δὲ ἀρχὴ κακῶν μειζόνων γίνεσθαι πολλάκις ἡ πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον μεταβολή. Since this sentence is the synthesis of our motif, it supports our interpretation of the present passage.

That being said, the discovery of the popularity of this τόπος in Imperial literature does not exclude the presence in the Eph. of the *Odyssey* as a direct intertext. First, Ach.'s whole scene is drawing from the Odyssean one and, thus, it is not unlikely that Xen. has the same epic passage in mind. A support of this interpretation might also come from ἀσμένοις: in the *Odyssey* the same adjective is used only three times and it always appears in a formula of transition from one Odyssean adventure to another (cf. 9.63, after the Cicones' attack; 9.566, after the Cyclops episode; 10.134:, after Odysseus' meeting with the savage Laestrigonians). Since the present passage is at the beginning of a new scene, it is not impossible that Xen. was following Homer's technique: this hypothesis suits well the epic nature of the Corymbus' episode.

1.12.3-1.14.6: in Hägg's view, the pirates' attack on the protagonists' ship constitutes 'the third type of day-night-phase', which 'consists of a group of two days' (54): this pattern itself constitutes an exception in the Eph., where 'in a few cases the days are clearly marked as consecutive' (Morgan 2007a, 453).
While the first day is only briefly hinted at, the description of the second, which coincides with the scene of Corymbus' attack, is more articulated and includes an analepsis (1.13.1-1.13.4, n.: ἔτυχον). Although Xen.'s arrangement of the events does not become more sophisticated here, this interest in chronology is further proof of the turning of the action from an ideal to a real setting.

1.12.3: τὰ πρῶτα [...] κἀκείνην τε τὴν ἡμέραν καὶ τὴν ἐπιοῦσαν νύκτα ἐφέροντο: this sequence of temporal indicators seems to provide an acceleration of the rhythm comparable with that which emerged in κἀκείνην μὲν τὴν ἡμέραν and νυκτὸς ἐπιγινομένης in 1.11.2. Since Habrocomes' dream is introduced as a very important event in the plot, this passage with its simplicity seems to be used to relax the readers before that shocking event happens (1.12.4, n.: dream).

1.12.3: ἐπέπαυτο μὲν ὁ ἄνεμος, γαλήνη δὲ: the combination of ἄνεμος, γαλήνη and παύομαι is only used by Homer before Xen: it occurs twice in the *Odyssey* as part of the formula ἄνεμος μὲν ἐπαύσατο ἠδὲ γαλήνη ἔπλετο νηνεμίη (cf. *Od.* 5.391 and 12.168). In the first passage, the calm constitutes a partial respite for Odysseus during his shipwreck, while in the second it constitutes the negative circumstance through which the Sirens attract the hero and his companions.
Since Xen. uses both nouns and the same verb, I would conclude that he might be here intertexting with Homer. That said, there are three other occurrences in Greek literature of ἄνεμος and γαλήνη: the first is in Theocritus (see 22.19-20: αἶψα δ' ἀπολήγουσ' ἄνεμοι, λιπαρὴ δὲ γαλήνη ἂμ πέλαγος· νεφέλαι δὲ διέδραμον ἄλλυδις ἄλλαι·), the second in Aratus (see Phaenom. 1.814) and the third in the Gospel (see Marc. 4.39). In my opinion, while the last two texts are not close to our author, Theocritus' exploitation might be part of Xen.'s literary framework.
As a result, as with οὐρίῳ πνεύματι, we could be dealing with an Odyssean allusion, but it is not clear as other ones in the Eph.
Finally, it might also be interesting that Agathon in his praise of Eros in the Platonic *Symposium* quotes with a personal variation from the first of the two Odyssean passages (see 197c6: εἰρήνην

μὲν ἐν ἀνθρώποις, πελάγει δὲ γαλήνην νηνεμίαν, ἀνέμων κοίτην ὕπνον τ᾽ ἐνὶ κήδει) and he considers Eros as the origin of the calm. Since in the novel this god is the main actor of the plot and the readers expect him to be the origin of the couple's misadventures, I would speculate that through this Platonic intertext the calm might be considered a direct expedient employed by Eros against the couple. Although there is no proof that Xen. was aware of this connection, his knowledge of parts of the dialogue and this thematic similarity allow us not to exclude it.

1.12.3: τὴν Αἰγυπτίαν καλουμένην θάλατταν: in the ancient world the term "Egyptian sea" did not have anything to do with the Red Sea, but it designated that part of the Mediterranean lying off Egypt. This term is commonly used by Greek historians, with an oscillation between πέλαγος and θάλαττα. A case in point is Herodotus, who mentions the Αἰγυπτίον πέλαγος as the place where Alexander was forced to go with his Helen (Hdt. 2.113: ἐξῶσται ἄνεμοι ἐκβάλλουσι ἐς τὸ Αἰγύπτιον πέλαγος). In this passage there is the memory of the Odyssean account of Menelaus' story, which is set in the same part of the Mediterranean. Only a direct epithet is missing (Od. 4.354-5: νῆσος ἔπειτά τις ἔστι πολυκλύστῳ ἐνὶ πόντῳ Αἰγύπτου προπάροιθε, Φάρον δέ ἑ κικλήσκουσι).

An interesting witness is Flavius Josephus, because he clarifies the location of the sea. When he discusses how difficult it is to reach Egypt, he states that in the north the Egyptian Sea constitutes an obstacle, because it does not have good havens (BJ 4.609: βόρειον δὲ τεῖχος αὐτῇ ἥ τε μέχρι Συρίας γῆ καὶ τὸ καλούμενον Αἰγύπτιον πέλαγος, πᾶν ἄπορον ὅρμῳ; for other occurrences, see Str. 7.3.6 and App. Prooem. 6, 7).

Finally, it is interesting that Xen. is using here the participle καλουμένην. Since in the Greek tradition it was common to name a sea from the place which was beside of it (see e.g. Thuc. 4.53.3, where he mentions τὸ Σικελικὸν καὶ Κρητικὸν πέλαγος) and there are other occurrences where this sea is mentioned, Xen. might be using καλουμένην to present this sea as an exotic place. Since this perception was present in Homer and in the Classical Greece, as the popular legend of Menelaus proves, but then faded away with the conquest of Alexander the Great, we might read this expression as a confirmation that Xen. is representing an archaic or classical world and not the contemporary one.

1.12.3: ῥαθυμία καὶ πότος [...] καὶ μέθη: this list of three words is a crescendo which introduces and clarifies the sin committed by Habrocomes' sailors. While the first term means more generically 'relaxation' (LSJ), πότος refers to the concrete act of drinking that people do in carousal and then μέθη defines the effect of this behaviour, which is drunkenness. As a result, it is the last word which emphasises the immorality of the sailors' action.

Although this sequence occurs in its complete version only in the Eph. (cf. also 1.13.4 for the briefer variant ὑπὸ μέθης καὶ ῥαθυμίας), two of the three terms appear together in other passages of Greek literature where immoral behaviour is stressed (see esp. Isoc. *Antid.* 286, where the depravity of the youth is described, and Diod. Sic. 5.40, who describes the Thyrrhenians' loss of their old customs). Finally, in both Polybius 5.48.2 and Diodorus Siculus 2.26.4 the immorality of the characters is punished by an attack from enemies, as happens in Xen. (for further passages, cf. Philo

De ebriet 2 fr. 6, Plut. *Mor*. 594D, Dio Chrys. 70.1, Athen. 10.442f). This framework confirms that Xen. is emphasising the immorality of the protagonists' shipmen: for the importance of this element in the literary construction of the passage, see 1.12.3-1.14.1, n., an Odyssean interpretation).

Finally, this use of drunkenness as a sin which allows something bad to happen recalls Virgil's account of the last night of Troy, where the Trojans, after having welcomed the fatal horse (*Aen*. 2.237-9), celebrate this event with wine. The consequence of this is that 'sopor fessos complectitur artus (253) and the Acheans 'invadunt urbem somno vinoque sepultam' (265). Since this motif was commonly known as part of the story of Troy, it is not impossible that was in Xen.'s mind.

1.12.3: ἀρχὴ τῶν μεμαντευμένων: this is the only authorial statement about the interpretation of the oracle during the protagonists' journey and thus it merits special consideration. As I argue in the analysis of Apollo's response, this phrase does not only underline that something bad is going to happen, but it seems to be connected with the fourth verse of the oracle through the mediation of the Odyssean model (see 1.6.2, n.: oracle, 5).

Interestingly, the protagonists' first reference to the divine response occurs only at the beginning of the second book in Habrocomes' monologue (2.1.2: ἄρχεται τὰ μεμαντευμένα), where a very similar sentence is repeated. His late understanding of the oracle confirms that the protagonists' discovery of the real nature of their journey is not immediate, but begins after facing the first difficulties.

Finally, Xen.'s choice to use here ἀρχὴ recalls the traditional motif of Greek literature of the ἀρχή κακῶν. This theme first appears in the *Iliad*, where Patroclus' first involvement in the war is κακοῦ [...] ἀρχή (Il. 11.604). The same motif is used by Herodotus with reference to the Athenian decision to send ships in support of the Ionians during the Persian war (5.97.3: Αὗται δὲ αἱ νέες ἀρχὴ κακῶν ἐγένοντο Ἕλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροισι). Then, Isocrates relates this motif to the battle of Aegospotami in 405 BC (see Isocr. *Paneg.* 119: ἅμα γὰρ ἡμεῖς τε τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀπεστερούμεθα καὶ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἀρχὴ τῶν κακῶν ἐγίγνετο) and Aristotle to Mytilene's revolt in 427 BC, which are the events which start and conclude the Peloponnesian war (see Arist. *Politica* 1304a: καὶ περὶ Μυτιλήνην δὲ ἐξ ἐπικλήρων στάσεως γενομένης πολλῶν ἐγένετο ἀρχὴ κακῶν καὶ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους). As within this framework a passage particularly close to Xen. is missing, we should assume that our author is simply exploiting a cliché of Greek literature.

1.12.4: προσεδόκα τι δεινὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀνείρατος: as Morgan 2007a, 459 argues, this is an 'actorial prolepsis', which is followed by a 'narratorial prolepsis' (1.12.4, n.: καὶ τὸ δεινὸν ἐγίνετο). Interestingly, the verb προσδοκάω is significantly used by Xen. in two other passages, which perform the same function as the current one: in 1.16.1 a negative foreboding is attributed to Anthia and Habrocomes who ἔκειντο ἄθυμοι, πολλὰ προσδοκῶντες, while in 2.3.8 to Leucon (μεγάλας ἐκ τούτων συμφορὰς προσδοκῶν).

Overall, each of these passages constitutes a good example of the basic function of Xen's prolepses (NA 1.2) and also shows how their content has an emotional effect on the protagonists.

1.12.4: καὶ τὸ δεινὸν ἐγίνετο: this is one of 'very few prolepses' given by Xen's narrator, which 'simply confirms that a prophetic dream is in fact prophetic' (Morgan 2007a, 459). For the importance of this statement in Xen.'s overall system of prolepses, NA 1.2.

1.12.3-1.14.1: *an Odyssean interpretation of the whole scene*
While during the analysis of the twelfth chapter Odyssean echoes or allusions have already emerged, Xen. seems here to uses a clearer hypotext: in fact he relates the episode of the crew's drunkenness to the Odyssean misadventures of the cows of the Sun (this connection is stated by Bierl 2006, 83, who, however, does not add further details). These are arguments which demonstrate this parallel:

a) As Xen. shows at the beginning and the end of his novel, Rhodians worship Helios as their main god. This might recall the Homeric island, which is defined as νῆσον [...] Ἡελίοιο (*Od*. 12.269). Further, Tiresias (11.107) and Circe (12.127, 135) before and Odysseus afterwards (19.275) name it θρινακίη: according to Pliny, this was also one of the old name of Rhodes (see *NH* 5.36: 'Rhodes [...] vocitata est antea Ophiusa, Asteria, Aethria, Trinacrie, Corymbia, Poeeessa, Atabyria ab rege, dein Macaria et Oloessa'). Although the origin of these names is not mentioned, the presence of 'Trinacrie' is quite interesting: this city is shaped like a spearhead and, therefore, it is not impossible that this designation attested by Plinius is the reflection of a Homeric legend like that which Xen. is introducing.

b) Second, the reason for stopping at this island lies in the sailors' decision, as they want to use Rhodes to make provisions for the future long journey to Egypt (1.11.6: ἔδει καταχθῆναι πάντως· δεῖν γὰρ ἔφασκον οἱ ναῦται καὶ ὑδρεύσασθαι καὶ αὐτοὺς ἀναπαύσασθαι, μέλλοντας εἰς μακρὸν ἐμπεσεῖσθαι πλοῦν). Similarly, although Odysseus does not want to stop at the island of the cows, his companions force him to change his mind, because, as Eurylochus says, they want to rest (*Od*. 12.279-283: 'σχέτλιός εἰς, Ὀδυσεῦ, [...] ὅς ῥ' ἑτάρους καμάτῳ ἀδηκότας ἠδὲ καὶ ὕπνῳ οὐκ ἐάᾳς γαίης ἐπιβήμεναι, ἔνθα κεν αὖτε νήσῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ λαρὸν τετυκοίμεθα δόρπον), before entering the open sea (*Od*. 12.293: ἠῶθεν δ'ἀναβάντες ἐνήσομεν εὐρέϊ πόντῳ).

c) In Rhodes the protagonists visit Helios' temple (1.12.2); similarly, Odysseus goes to the island to to pray to gods (*Od*. 12.333-334).

d) One day after the departure from Rhodes, the sailors get drunk and this is the origin of their disgrace, since Corymbus' arrival causes the death of many (cf. 1.13.5 and 1.14.1) and the destruction of the ship. The companions' mistake as the origin of the misadventures might recall the Odyssean scene, where the hero's friends willingly disobey his warning and decide to kill the cows (*Od*. 12.339-365). As a result, the storm sent by Zeus kills each one of them (12.415-419) apart from Odysseus. In addition, the hero in his account emphasises the immorality and impiety of this act, as the following expressions show: cf. ἀτασθαλίῃσι κακῇσιν (300), κακῆς [...] βουλῆς (339), οἱ δ'ἔταροι μέγα ἔργον ἐμητίσαντο μένοντες (373). Similarly, Xen. refers twice to the sailors using a formula which clearly denotes immoral behaviour (1.12.3, n.: ῥαθυμία). Therefore, Xen. with his emphasis on the "sin" of drunkenness might be proposing in a different context the same ethical judgement which we find in Homer.

e) Finally, as I have shown in the analysis of the oracle, in the Eph. the Rhodian episode is followed by the scene where Corymbus falls in love with Habrocomes and becomes Calypso (1.16.4-5, n.: εὐδαιμοσύνην). Interestingly, in Odysseus' account the hero after the Sun's Isle arrives in Ogygia (Od. 12.447-450).

Having said that, there are two big differences between the two narratives: first, Xen. substitutes the killing of the Homeric cows with drunkenness. As I have already suggested in LI 6.2c, this shift can simply depend on the difference of genre between epic and novel. The second difference lies in the awareness of the oracle: while Odysseus is aware of the danger is going to face, because he has understood Tiresias' message, Xen.'s protagonists seem to ignore this. This fact, instead of constituting an objection to this parallel, is part of our author's focus on the progressive growth of Anthia and Habrocomes (1.16.2, n.: λέγει, d1 and d2).

1.12.4: τῷ δὲ Ἁβροκόμῃ <κοιμωμένῳ> ἐφίσταται γυνὴ [...]: *Habrocomes' first dream*
This is the first of the three dreams of the Eph. (for the analysis of the second, LI 4.5b, for that of the third 1.6.2, n.: oracle, 7). Unlike the other two, this passages has a clear connection with the upcoming episode. For this reason, there is no doubt that the appearance of the woman in the dream is an anticipation of the action that Corymbus is going to take against the protagonists.
The existence of this clear link opens the road for a simple identification of proleptic hints: to begin with, ἐσθῆτα ἔχουσα φοινικῆν is straightforward, since it 'punningly predicts the Phoenician nationality of the pirates' (Morgan 2007a, 462), which is expressed in 1.13.1 (Φοίκινες τὸ γένος). Similarly, the actions attributed to the woman have some correspondences with the narration of Corymbus' attack:
- cf. 1.12.4: τὸ μέγεθος ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον and 1.13.1: ἐν τριήρει μεγάλη (see Liatsi 2004 on for this link).
- cf. 1.12.4: ἐπιστᾶσαν δὲ τὴν ναῦν and 1.13.1: ἐπιθέμενοι + 1.13.4: ἐφίστανται + 1.13.5: ὡς δὲ πλησίον ἐγένοντο.
- cf. 1.12.4: ἐδόκει καίειν and 1.14.1: ἐνέπρησε τὴν ναῦν.
- cf. 1.12.4: καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους ἀπόλλυσθαι and 1.13.2: τοὺς μὲν ἀντιμαχομένους ἀποκτιννύειν + 1.14.1: οἱ λοιποὶ πάντες κατεφλέχθησαν.
Finally, also Corymbus can be included within this clear framework, as he is presented as νεανίας ὀφθῆναι μέγας, φοβερὸς τὸ βλέμμα (1.13.3): the narrator here seems to subtly invert the order of the adjectives attributed to the woman of the dream, without losing the general effect of a dangerous and unusual creature.
Having said that, however, there are two elements that lack a literal correspondence with the plot and that Fernàndez Garrido 2003, 361 calls 'allegorical': the introduction of a woman instead of a man and the protagonists' swimming. Both motifs have stimulated a great discussion among scholars, who offer different interpretations according to different approaches, moving from ancient or modern oneirocriticism to cultural patterns, intertextuality and intratextuality. Following the same approach adopted with the other dreams of the Eph., after a review of the most significant

theories, I will offer my personal theory, which is based on intratextuality and intertextuality. The result of this analysis will lead me to show that Xen. assign to this passage the same function and colour as Apollo's oracle.

a) A review of secondary bibliography: the presence of the woman

The unusual woman in the dream has been associated by scholars with five different characters:

- Kerényi 1927, 169, 202: Aphrodite;

- Weinstock 1934, 52: Tyche;

- Merkelbach 1962, 96: Isis;

- Laplace 1994: personification of Λύσσα;

- Fernàndez Garrido 2003, 361: personification of Phoenicia.

While Weinstock 1934 and Merkelbach do not offer any specific clue for their views and, for this reason, they cannot be assessed, the three other theories require our interpretation.

- Kerényi 1927 builds his association with Aphrodite on Ach.'s mention of purple as the color typical of Aphrodite's dress (see 2.11.4).

- Laplace 1994 explains that Λύσσα is a protagonist of the Eph.: she begins by showing how Xen introduces Platonic erotic μανία in different passages (cf. 1.4.4 and 1.11.5). Since in the *Phaedrus* the lover's μανία is also described as a man who λυσσᾷ (251d8-e2: ἀποροῦσα λυττᾷ, καὶ ἐμμανὴς οὖσα οὔτε νυκτὸς δύναται καθεύδειν οὔτε μεθ᾽ ἡμέραν οὗ ἂν ᾖ μένειν), she argues that the woman of the dream might be Λύσσα, since this figure exists in the Greek tradition, and this hypothesis is also supported by the adjective of the oracle λυσσωδίωκτοι (1.6.2, n.: oracle, 3). On the other hand, she compares details of Xen.'s description with previous literary passages: the Phoenician cloth might be compared with the εἷμα [...] δαφοινεὸν (Il. 18.538) of the Homeric ὀλοὴ Κήρ (Il. 18.535), since Lyssa, Erynnis and Kere are parallel figures. Then, she adds as another model the Lyssa of the Euripidean Heracles (see 843-4, 859-70, 883-4) and, after noting the similarity between the woman in the dream and Corymbus, she considers Manto, Cyno and the Egyptian dogs as other images of Lyssa (Laplace 1994, 458 ff.).

- Finally, Fernàndez Garrido 2003 considers the option of a personification of Phoenicia because of two literary precedents: the first is Aeschylus' *Persians*, in which Atossa dreams of two women who are symbols of Europe and Asia (see 181-199; this possible hypotext is noted by Plastira-Valkanou 2001, 139, n. 1). Interestingly, their provenance is considered only in relation to their clothes (182-3: ἡ μὲν πέπλοισι Περσικοῖς ἠσκημένη, ἡ δ᾽αὖτε Δωρικοῖσιν) and they are both defined as μεγέθει τε τῶν νῦν ἐκπρεπεστάτα πολύ (184). This feature and the size resemble Xen.'s woman, while the Aeschylean attribution of beauty marks a difference. The second model is Moschus' *Europa,* in which two women, one of whom looks foreign, struggled over possession of Europa (2.8-15).

Given the variety of these three proposals, I would like to assess them, in order to take the first step in my interpretation of the woman of the dream.

To begin with, Kerényi's (1927) view does not seem to work well, since Ach. mentions ἡ πορφύρα rather than φοινικήν and Aphrodite does not play a role in the Eph. The other two, instead, may be correct: Fernàndez Garrido's (1962) one is based on Xen.'s evident interest in puns and fits well into his overall description of the land as barbaric, which is marked from the beginning. Furthermore, the Aeschylean dream was very famous and its imitation by Moschus in the Hellenistic Era makes it possible that Xen. had read it. Finally, this hypothesis would provide literary proof of his interest in theatricality.

On the other hand, Laplace's (1994) theory is acceptable too, but I believe that her conclusion is stronger than the arguments she provides. In fact, while her point about Xen.'s interest in Plato is right and allows us to consider λύσσωδίωκτοι as part of the same framework, her literary comparisons with other Furies are weak, because our author does not seem to be interested in the physical description of a specific entity.

This conclusion can be drawn by looking at the the woman of the dream: Xen. attributes to her a simple and stereotyped portrait, which is composed of her terrible appearance (γυνή ὀφθῆναι φοβερά) and of a superhuman dimension (τὸ μέγεθος ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον).

These features follow a common literary pattern:

- superhuman size and fearful aspects are typical of descriptions of divine figures: see Lucian's Hecate in the *Lover of Lies* (22: γυναῖκα ὁρῶ προσιοῦσαν φοβερὰν ἡμισταδιαίαν σχεδὸν τὸ ὕψος).

- a huge size is typical of figures that appeared during sleep (see Hall 1996, 124: 'messengers in dreams were conceptualized by the Greek as extremely tall'

- fearfulness characterises the woman of Clitophon's dream: ἐφίσταται δή μοι γυνὴ φοβερά καὶ μεγάλη [...] (1.3.4);

As a result, Xen. seems here to produces a standard description of "powerful enemies". This conclusion is supported by his approach to the other dangerous characters of his novel, where a very similar portrait occurs: cf.

- fearfulness and superhuman dimension characterise the dogs of Anthia's ditch (4.6.4: τὰ ἄλλα μεγάλοι καὶ ὀφθῆναι φοβεροί);

- the first element is attributed to the ghost of the heroine's story (5.7.8: ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἦν μὲν ὀφθῆναι φοβερός).

In my opinion, this discovery does not allow us to use these descriptions to draw mutual parallels or parallels with other figures, because we are dealing with a sort of 'abstract' and repetitive pattern.

For this reason, I would not accept the core of Laplace's (1994) argumentation. In addition, on further examination, specific elements of her theory appear not correct:

- the Homeric Κήρ which she mentions lacks any connection with love;

- blood, which is the colour of her cloth, does not coincide with purple.

- Cyno in 3.12.3 (ὀφθῆναι μιαράν) and the Egyptian dogs in 4.6.4 (κύνες μεγάλοι καὶ ὀφθῆναι φοβεροί) do not constitute a parallel, because ὀφθῆναι is too common a verb to constitute a reason for intratextuality.

- Laplace's point that dogs are associated with the representation of Fury is too loose, because these animals had more than one connotation in the ancient poetry, as the four female Homeric "bitches" prove (on this, see <u>APP</u> 1.8).

That said, in my opinion a better foundation for Laplace 1994's theory lies more simply in Xen's construction of his proleptic apparatus: since the fourth verse of the oracle can be interpreted as proleptic toward the Corymbus episode (1.6.2, n.: oracle, 5), the readers are allowed to use its content to interpret the dream: ἀμφότεροι φεύξονται ὑπεὶρ ἅλα λυσσοδίωκτοι. More specifically, this adjective suggests that the woman in the dream might be λύσσα, if we accept this variant of the text.

Finally, Liatsi 2004, 157 limits her interpretation to the colour of the woman's clothes and she believes that there might be 'mehrere Ebenen' of comprehension. Along with the acknowledgment of the Phoenician pun, she notes that 'schon bei Homer begegnet "purpurn" als Beiwort des Todes' (ibid.). On the one hand, in ancient magic and medicine it was used 'sowohl als kathartisches als auch als apotropäisches Mittel zue Fernhaltung des Bosen' (ibid., 158): however, this meaning must be excluded because the dream lacks a positive background. Finally, it might represent blood or fire or recall the military dress φοινικίς.
Overall, the contribution of this scholar is not innovative, because the link with Phoenicians, which is repeated by her, is her only really persuasive point. However, her stress on the emotional emphasis created by Xen. through his use of colour has a value which cannot be ignored (see 159: 'Diese Farbe kann wegen ihrer besonderen Intensität eine drohende, Angst auslösende, erregende Wirkung haben'). Conversely, I would dismiss Plastira-Valkanou's (2001, 140) oneirocritic interpretation of purple as a bad omen, because in the corresponding passage in Artemidorus it is the dreamer and not another character who wears this colour (see 2.3).

<u>2) A review of secondary bibliography: swimming</u>
The second allegorical issue is easy to discuss, because the scholars explain it with reference to ancient oneirocriticism: as MacAlister 1996 argues, in Greek dreams διανήχεσθαι is a symbol of danger (see Artemid. 1.64: τὸ γε νήχεσθαι πᾶσι πονηρὸν καὶ κινδύνου [...] σύμβολον). This thesis is also developed by Plastira-Valkanou 2001, 140, who shows the proleptic value of this expression by saying: 'although Abrokomes and Anthia escaped death, nevertheless they were going soon to experience slavery at the hands of pirates (1.14.3)'.
In my opinion, however, this interpretation might be too sophisticated for this passage: in fact, Habrocomes' disturbance after the dream does not depend on his foreboding interpretation of swimming, but, in accordance with the general emotional reactions of Xen's characters, it refers more broadly to the fire of the ship. As a result, as Fernandez Garrido 2003, 361 argues, it is more likely that 'el nadar significa [...] escapar de ese terrible final'.

On theory, it is possible that this negative value of swimming was missed by Habrocomes but offered by Xen. to his readers; however, no further confirmation of this is available. As a result, it is not unlikely that the narrator is deliberately using swimming as a means for rescue.

3) A literary interpretation of the dream

To begin with, as I have already argued, I would accept a view of the woman of Habrocomes' dream both a personification of Phoenicia and an image of Lyssa.

In addition, I would introduce two further points: as the protagonists' journey has begun in a Homeric framework, with some references to perils undergone by Odysseus, I would speculate that the mention of swimming in the dream might be interpreted as an echo of Odysseus' escape from the storm in the fifth book (*Od*. 5.438-440), which leads him to Scheria. In this episode Odysseus makes also a praise of swimming (*Od*. 5.364: νήξομ᾽, ἐπεὶ οὐ μέν τι πάρα προνοῆσαι ἄμεινον).

Further, in the *Odyssey* the hero is never saved by another ship: this increases the likelihood of Xen's omission of it. Finally, if we read this link within the interpretation of the oracle, it might be not sheer coincidence that the protagonists, after the fire of their ship, are taken by Apsyrtus to Tyre, which is a new Scheria in Xenophon's mind. Although we are dealing with a hypothesis, this might work better than that provided by oneirocritic, because it follows the proleptic apparatus of the novel.

The second element is even more speculative: since with the description Xen. is referring to a stereotyped dangerous woman, it is not impossible that he is inviting his readers to look for a plausible hidden model. In my opinion, the existence of the Homeric background makes the hypothesis of a supernatural Odyssean enemy not unlikely.

Since, as Del Corno argues, 'la Scilla omerica [...] era tra i mostri più famosi accolti nel patrimonio leggendario greco' (325, n. 116) and in 1.14.2 the memory of Scylla seems to be directly activated by Xen. (1.14.2, n.: τὰς χειράς), I would propose that this character might be already present here in the background and other proofs can be offered.

To begin with, Scylla shares with Xen's woman a similar descriptive pattern: in fact, she is a πέλωρ κακόν οὐδέ κέ τίς μιν γηθήσειεν ἰδών (Od. 12.86-7) and has twelve feet, six necks and three rows of teeth (*Od*. 12.89-91). Second, Circe tells Odysseus that Scylla attacks ships as Corymbus does: τῇ δ᾽ οὔ πώ ποτε ναῦται ἀκήριοι εὐχετόωνται παρφυγέειν σὺν νηΐ· φέρει δέ τε κρατὶ ἑκάστῳ φῶτ᾽ ἐξαρπάξασα νεὸς κυανοπρῴροιο (Od. 12.98-100).

Finally, in the rationalistic interpretation of Homer (LI 6.6) Scylla is identified with a ναῦς τριήρης ταχεῖα (Palaephatus' *On Incredible Things,* 20), which often attacks other ships and gained provisions (see ibid.: αὕτη δ᾽ ἡ τριήρης τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν πλοίων συλλαμβάνουσα πολλάκις εἰργάζετο βρῶμα [...]). Only Odysseus manages to flee from it. In my opinion, this interpretation fits well into our framework, since the woman of the dream, in her attack on the protagonists, assumes the form of Corymbus and of a ship.

As a result, I would conclude that Xen. might be here subtly recalling Scylla. In this respect, it is interesting that in Heraclitus' *Homeric problems* Scylla is considered a courtesan: Σκύλλαν δὲ τὴν πολύμορφον ἀναίδειαν ἠλληγόρησε, διὸ δὴ κύνας οὐκ ἀλόγως ὑπέζωσται προτομαῖς ἁρπαγῇ, τόλμῃ

καὶ πλεονεξίᾳ πεφραγμέναις· (see 70.11). This identification clearly is based on an erotic interpretation of this monster, which would fit well into Xen.'s personal reading of Homer. As a result, it is not unthinkable that Xen. had this in mind: in this hypothesis the woman of the dream would subtly anticipate the erotic side of Corymbus' attack on the protagonists (for my interpretation of dogs and Cyno, see APP 1.8-10).

CHAPTER 13

1.13: AN INTRODUCTORY ANALYSIS OF XENOPHON'S PIRATES

The first enemies of the protagonists are Corymbus and Euxinus. Although their social position makes them close to the other brigands of the Eph. (LI 1.3), a distinction between these two and the others can be drawn: while these rivals are consistently named πειραταί (see also 1.13.3, 4; 1.14.6 (bis); 1.16.5; 2.2.2), an expression which does not occur elsewhere in the Eph. apart from two recapitulations (see 3.31, 5.14.1), the other brigands are always called λῃσταί. A confirmation of the specific use of πειραταί comes from Anthia's final dialogue in Rhodes, in which she starts the description of her trials by saying λῃστῶν ἀπειλὰς ἐκφυγοῦσα καὶ πειρατῶν ἐπιβουλὰς (5.14.1). Although the order differs from that of Xen.'s narration, it seems to me that ἀπειλὰς refers more clearly to Manto, who does not move on the sea and menaces Rhode (2.4.5) and Habrocomes (2.5.2), while the real pirates, Corymbus and Euxinus, limit themselves to ἐπιβουλαί.

This distinctive role played by pirates invites us to focus on them.

From a thematic point of view, in the Eph. these characters appear to be dangerous and with four main qualities:

- greed (1.13.1, n.: χρυσὸς);
- violence (1.13.5. n.: ὡπλισμένοι);
- erotic lust (1.14.7. n: ἐρᾷ);
- cunning (1.16.2, n: λέγει).

This collection makes their role as first enemies of the protagonists complete. The last element emerges clearly in the pirates' erotic strategy, since they introduce themselves as masters even though they are subject to Apsyrtus (1.16.4-5, n.: εὐδαιμοσύνην).

Interestingly, the coexistence of these four features is typical of the Homeric presentation of pirates, which occurs in passages where journeys are ascribed a realistic connotation. Thus, it is possible that Homer was influenced by an archaic or even earlier activity of the Greek sea. Above all, their dangerous nature emerges in the *Odyssey,* as Nestor's question to Telemachus and his companions shows:

ὦ ξεῖνοι, τίνες ἐστέ; πόθεν πλεῖθ' ὑγρὰ κέλευθα;

ἤ τι κατὰ πρῆξιν ἦ μαψιδίως ἀλάλησθε

οἷά τε λῃϊστῆρες ὑπεὶρ ἅλα, τοί τ' ἀλόωνται

ψυχὰς παρθέμενοι, κακὸν ἀλλοδαποῖσι φέροντες; (*Od*. 3.71-74; the same formula is adopted by Polyphemus, 9.252-5).

More specifically, the first two features - greed and violence - appear in Odysseus' false story to Antinoos (see *Od*. 17.431-434), in which the pirates' main goal is plundering and murder. Greed also appears in Odysseus' false tale to Athena in Ithaca, in which the Phoenicians steal all his goods at the end of their journey together (283-5). Finally, in two other Homeric secondary narratives the

Phoenicians are described as τρώκται, 'greedy knaves' (LSJ): in my opinion, this epithet justifies the inclusion of these sailors among the number of Homeric pirates, although the word ληϊστήρ is here missing (this possibility is also admitted by Aubet 2001, 127, who 'describes the Phoenicians in Homer as already dominant at sea, in conflict with the Greeks, and sees them as traders and pirates who appear much more frequently in Greek waters'). In the first of these narratives, it is Odysseus who tells Eumaeus how in Egypt he was kidnapped by a Phoenician man, ἀνὴρ ἀπατήλια εἰδώς, τρώκτης, ὃς δὴ πολλὰ κάκ' ἀνθρώπους ἐόργε (Od. 14.288-9). After one year spent with him, he is sent to Libya to be sold (14.297): this passage is very significant, because it shows how piracy and slavery were connected in Homer and it introduces cunning, the last feature of Xen's pirates.

In the second, Eumaeus tells Odysseus of how his life in Syria was changed by the arrival of famous navigators:

ἔνθα δὲ Φοίνικες ναυσικλυτοὶ ἤλυθον ἄνδρες,

τρῶκται, μυρί' ἄγοντες ἀθύρματα νηῒ μελαίνῃ (Od. 15.415-6).

Along with their typical greed, which makes them accumulate here a lot of money, these men seduce a Phoenician woman who was living in the palace (see esp. Od. 15.449-453 and 455-6): thus, also their erotic lust is here shown.

In my opinion, the existence of this articulated characterisation of Phoenician pirates in Homer is an interesting precedent of Xen.'s text: in fact, after Homer, pirates become a stereotype of Greek literature and, thus, their presentation lacks particular innovations: they are sometimes mentioned by historians with reference to plundering and trafficking. A case in point is constituted by Demosthenes' definition of Philip the king of Macedonia as 'the pirate of Greeks' (10.34), which finds its justification in his tendency to 'prey on commercial ships to provide himself with resources' (De Souza 1999, 36).

As a consequence, it is not surprising that no significant novelty is found in late literary representations of pirates: for instance, among Philostratus' letters there is one written by Eucolymbus to his wife Glauce: because of the poverty of their family, the husband is tempted to join a band of pirates, but at the same time it is worried about their immorality, because they are greedy and bloodthirsty (see 1.8 and esp. 1.8.3: ἀνδροφόνος οὐχ ὑπομένω γενέσθαι). While this portrait recalls the Homeric one and that of Corymbos and his friends, the issue of love is neglected. This omission is not surprising: lust is the only "quality" of pirates which is fictitious and, thus, it appears very rarely.

This pattern is confirmed by Seneca's *Controversies*, where pirates appear often: being outside the conventions of civilized law, in fact 'they can create unusually awkward situations, which the speakers try to solve using their rhetorical powers' (De Souza 1999, 215; 1.2, 1.6, 1.7. 3.3, 7.1 and 7.4). Having said that, the issue of love is addressed only once, when a virgin who is captured by pirates and then sold into slavery as a prostitute (1.2) and 'several of the speakers claim that it is unbelievable that she could have remained pure while among pirates' (esp. 1.2.8: 'non est credibile temperasse a libidine piratas omni crudelitate efferatos'). However, no description of these characters is given, apart from the indication of their erotic lust.

Overall, this framework suggests that Xen.'s presentation of Corymbus and Euxinus is exceptional for its complete obedience to Homer and for the clearly erotic mark: as our author is usually familiar with Homer, I would conclude that the extension of his debt to him here is not unlikely. In addition, as I have already stated in the introduction (GI 2.2), Phoenician pirates are attested in Ancient Greece until 332 BC and, thus, Xen. is not referring to a realistic contemporaneous activity: this further justifies the link with the Homeric representation.

A confirmation of this framework comes from Cicero: when in the Republic he speaks about the origin of the Roman people (see 2.3), he makes some references to Archaic Greeks and he mentions the advantages and disadvantages of their trade In addition, if we compare Xen's pirates to the other pirates within the genre, the originality of his representation is confirmed. In the novels, to begin with, pirates are 'a convenient and plausible device for disturbing stability and starting a narratable story' (Morgan, 2004, 172): this role emerges in Char., Xen. and Ach. and is subtly evoked by Longus. Having said that, only Xen. and Hld. introduce into the action of their novels a pirate who includes all the four aforementioned qualities. The controversial issue is erotic lust: while violence and greed are always mentioned, the erotic desire is missing in Char., while Ach. plays with this motif in a subtle way.

Since Hld.'s pirate lover occurs in a passage which might intertext with the Eph., I would conclude that Xen.'s presentation of Corymbus is the first narrative piece of Greek literature after Homer in which pirates suffer from love and elaborate a strategy to conquer their beloved: this confirms how in his text love is the only real topic and affects every pattern or character. Having launched this interpretation, I will develop now its main arguments.

1) Chariton's Theron: a non-lover pirate

Chariton's Theron is the pirate who deserves most attention in the corpus of the novels, since he performs an important function: like Xen's pirates, his kidnapping of Callirhoe is at the origin of the protagonists' separation, but, even more, his mischief causes their departure from Syracuse: thus, Theron's role can be compared with that of Apollo's oracle in the *Ephesiaca*.

If we turn to his personality, Theron is clearly characterised by greed and violence. His immorality is mentioned at his introduction in the novel (1.7.1: Θήρων γάρ τις ἦν, πανοῦργος ἄνθρωπος, ἐξ ἀδικίας πλέων τὴν θάλασσαν [...]) and confirmed by his band, which is composed of people who live in ἐν πορνείοις and ἐν καπηλείοις (1.7.3). In addition, the motivation of his action lies in his interest in Callirhoe's goods (see 1.7.6). Then, when Theron opens her sepulchre, he displays also his violence (1.9.3: σφοδρότερα πληγὴ πρὸς ἀνάρρηξιν τοῦ τάφου), which is accompanied by an astute intelligence: moved by his cupidity, he decides to go to Miletus to sell Callirhoe at a high price (1.11.8) and he manages to conclude a successful business with Leonas, Dionysius' servant (1.14.3-5). However, his achievement is not appreciated by Providence, who stops his flight to Crete with a shipwreck (3.3.10-12) and the following events lead him to be condemned to death on a cross (3.4.18).

As in this story Theron's characterisation is quite rich, it is strange that he his never moved to love Callirhoe: in Guez's (2001) acute interpretation, the reason for this lies in the whole structure of

Char.'s novel, which is based on the equal fight between Chaereas and the other erotic rivals Dionysios, Mithridates, Pharnaces et Artaxerxes (see esp. 103: 'Le groupe de rivaux chez Chariton se signale par son homogéneité'). The high status of these predators does not allow the pirates to perform the same erotic function. Although this view is quite interesting and fits well into a novel in which war and contest between equals are so important, I still wonder whether Char.'s omission of erotic lust might be simply a consequence of the absence of this feature in the literary characterisation of pirates. In this respect, the only brief allusion to this element in Theron's collection of colleagues from brothels might be the sign that we are dealing with a realistic and not with a literary model.

Finally, independently from the solution of this last point, the construction of this character is quite significant in relation to that of Corymbus: it is inevitable that either Char. or Xen. was drawing from the other - although no priority can be here clearly established - and from this comparison Xen.'s focus on love is further emphasised.

2) Achilles Tatius: the narrative pattern of pirates' attack on ships and more allusive references

Ach. is the novelist who introduces the highest number of references to pirates and he exploits these figures with a good deal of sophistication.

To begin with, there are three episodes in which these dangerous enemies enter the action of the novel. The protagonist of the first is the violent Zenon, who kidnaps Calligone on behalf of and in collaboration with Callisthenes, (2.17.2-18.5). This man has a strong body as Corymbus (see 2.17.3: ἦν γὰρ καὶ ἄλλως εὔρωστος τὸ σῶμα καὶ φύσει περιατικός), and he achieves his goal with swords (2.18.4: τὰ ξίφη γυμνώσαντες) and the collaboration of dangerous people. Violence occurs again in the third book of the novel, with an implied reference to greed: when Satyrus tries to save Leucippe from being sacrificed, he takes advantage of a fatal pirate attack on a ship (3.20.1-5). This episode is significant, because it is based, like Xen.'s, on a pursuit and the victims try in vain to resist. The difference lies in the outcome, since in Ach. nobody survives. Finally, in the fifth book Chaereas, who defines himself as ἅτε θαλάσσιος ὢν ἄνθρωπος (5.3.2), falls in love with Leucippe (see 5.3.1) and elaborates a plan to capture her which involves other pirates (5.3.2: λῃστῶν ὁμοτέχνων ὄχλον). Thus, he invites the protagonists to his home in Pharus, where he kidnaps Leucippe and flees with her on the sea (5.7.1-2). When Clitophon tries to pursue them, the pirates cast Leucippe's false body on the sea and, then, supported by fishermen πειρατικοί, completely disappear (5.7.3-7): violence is also alluded to here.

Overall, in the first and in the third of the mentioned episode love is addressed, even though it does not directly involve the pirates. Along with these scenes, Ach. introduces the issue of pirates' erotic lust in a subtler way: in the final book, in fact, the sexual intemperance of pirates is linked with the main characters' infidelity: Leucippe twice defines Melite's house as a πειρατήριον (see 6.13.1 and 6.22.2) and Clitophon imitates her later (see 7.5.3). Then, when Thersander wants to blame Leucippe for her false defence of her chastity, he says: ὢ τόλμης καὶ γέλωτος παρθένος τοσούτοις συννυκτερεύσασα πειραταῖς; (6.21.3). In addition, shortly before the end, Clitophon defines

Thersander as τὸν μέγαν λῃστήν (8.5.6). Finally, the immoral and lustful behaviour of pirates is stated by Leucippe in the author's final explanation of her second *Scheintod*, in which she refers to the existence of a prostitute on the pirates' ship: see γυναῖκα κακοδαίμονα (8.16.1).

Overall, these allusions seem to suggest something more than a reference to a realistic motif: as Guez 2001, 109 sharply notices, 'le terme de λῃστής, pirate ou brigand, déborde donc le cadre de son usage habituel' and it assumes an 'emploi métaphorique' in relation to sex. This acute statement helps us to interpret the relationship between love and the aforementioned scenes: as Guez 2001 again argues, Calligone and Cheareas 'ne sont pas caractérisés au départ comme des pirates, mais que l'amour oblige à se comporter comme tels' (108) and this priority of love to their piracy is established as a reformulation of Europa's kidnap by Eros in the initial *ekphrasis* of the novel. In other words, both scenes contain the same metaphorical transformation which emerges in the mythological episode, where Eros becomes a pirate.

This pattern is interesting and underlines how Ach. elaborates further than Xen. the literary portrait of the pirate. If this confirms the different level of sophistication which characterises the two authors, it also underlines how a pirate who bears all the traditional features still only appears in the Eph. As a result, our author retains his originality.

3) **Longus and his subtle evocation of pirates**

In Longus' first book the first steps of love between the protagonists are interrupted by the arrival of pirates, whose action is characterised by violence and greed, as they steal many goods and also Daphnis (1.28.1-2), but the hero manages to escape using the stratagem of the cows, which annihilates the pirates (1.30.1-31.1).

As Morgan 2004, 173 argues, here Longus evokes the expectation of the genre that the heroes will be separated, but he then reverses the motif. If this works as a confirmation of the narrative function shared by Xen. and Char., it is also significant that according to manuscript V these pirates might come from Tyre (Τύριοι λῃσταί). This passage is ambiguous, since the text says that these pirates use a Carian boat to appear barbarians and, for this reason, the editors introduce a negation: Τύριοι λῃσταὶ Καρικὴν ἔχοντες ἡμιολίαν, ὡς ἂν μὴ δοκοῖεν βάρβαροι. However, 'this is little help, since Carians were barbarians too' (Morgan, 173) and, thus, Reeve 1971 prefers as slight emendation of F, Πύρριοι. This makes the pirates hail from Pyrrha, a city on the southern side of Lesbos, but, as Morgan states, 'this is an unlikely location for piracy' (ibid.). This implausibility leaves the possibility of the Tyrian origin open: this link might either be coincidental or depend on Longus' reading of the Ep. Although the first option is the most likely, given the already Homeric pattern of the Phoenician pirates, the second cannot be completely excluded.

4) **Heliodorus and the suggestive episode of the fifth book**

In the *Aethiopica* the pirates enter the action of the novel in the last part of Calasiris' narration, which is focused on his journey from Delphi to Egypt. This is the part which interests us: after leaving Greece, the priest arrives with the protagonists at Zakynthos, where they spent the winter in the house of an old fisherman, Tyrrhenus. During this stay a Tyrian merchant who is part of their

crew and a local pirate fall in love with Charicleia. When Calasiris discovers this, he promises Charicleia to the first and he asks him to sail away as soon as possible. At dawn they move to Crete, but the local pirates follow them and, then, after an attack on the protagonists' ship, they lead them to Egypt (5.18-5.27).

As this summary already shows, Hld. introduces here an attack on the ship like that of Xen. (esp. 5.23.3-5.24.1) and the figure of a lustful pirate (5.20.6, where he declares: ἐρῶ μανικῶς ἅπαξ θεασάμενος), who, unlike in Ach.'s second episode, does not kill all the enemies because of his love.

The existence of this episode is in itself interesting, because it offers another example of an erotic pirate; furthermore, I would like to show how the Eph. and the *Aethiopica* share some similarities (GI 5.1):

a) 5.22.8: after a storm, the protagonists' ship sails with a propitious wind towards Libya: ἀναχθέντες ἤδη ζεφύρων ἐαρινῶν ὑπηχούντων ἐφερόμεθα νύκτα τε καὶ ἡμέραν ἐπὶ τὴν Λιβύων γῆν τοῦ κυβερνήτου τὴν ὁλκάδα χειραγωγοῦντος; this recalls the propitious wind of protagonists' ship in Eph. 1.12.3 (ἐφέροντο οὐρίῳ πνεύματι);

b) 5.23.2: in the evening the winds slow down and the calm conquers the sea: ὁ δὲ ἄνεμος τῆς ἄγαν φορᾶς ὤκλαζε καὶ [...] εἰς γαλήνην ἐξενικήθη; the same calm is at the origin of the misadventures of the Ephesian ship (see 1.12.3: γαλήνη δὲ [...]);

c) 5.23.3: the pirates take advantage of the calm and quickly reach the protagonists' ship: θᾶττον ἡμῖν ἢ ὥστε εἰπεῖν ἐπέστησαν; in Xen's account the pirates make their attack when there is calm. In fact, the narrator does not repeat it directly but he alludes to this (1.13.4);

d) 5.24.2: confusion and mixed reactions on the ship: some try to resist, while other to escape: τῶν μὲν εἰς τὰ κοῖλα τῆς νεὼς καταδυομένων τῶν δὲ προμαχεῖν ἐπὶ τῶν ἰκρίων ἀλλήλοις παρακελευομένων τῶν δὲ εἰς τὸ σκάφος τὸ ὑπηρετικὸν ἅλλεσθαι καὶ διαδρᾶναι βουλευομένων; mixed reactions, although more simple, concern also the Ephesian crew (1.13.5) and one decision is identical: οἱ δὲ ἀμύνεσθαι;

e) 5.26.1: the chief of the pirates, Trachinus, makes his love declaration to Charicleia, with the promise of sharing with her all his goods: θάρσει καὶ ἴσθι δέσποινα σὺν ἡμῖν τῶνδε ἁπάντων ἐσομένη; this passage is quite significant, because it recalls a part of Euxinus' proposal to Habrocomes: πάντων ἕτοιμός ἐστι δεσπότην ποιεῖν τῶν ἑαυτοῦ (1.16.4);

f) 5.26.3: Charicleia falls at Trachinus' knees and asks him to preserve Theagenes and Calasiris: ἀδελφὸν τουτονὶ τὸν ἐμὸν καὶ πατέρα περίσῳζε μηδὲ ἐπίτρεπε τὴν ναῦν ἀπολιπεῖν, ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως βιώσομαι τούτων χωριζομένων; similarly, in Xen. both protagonists clasp Corymbus' knees and beg for the possibility of living together (see 1.13.6).

Overall, I am not arguing that Heliodorus' scene is identical to that of Xen., because the former is more articulated and there are also differences between the two; for instance, Calasiris is aware of the pirates' attack and this introduces more tension to the scene. That said, the possibility of Hld.'s dependence on Xen. is supported by events in Zacynthos before the main characters of the *Aethiopica* begin their dangerous adventure.

In fact, their encounter with Tyrrhenus was included by Schnepf among the passages in which the two novelists seem to intertext, as the following connections will prove:

a) 5.18.3 and 4: Calasiris sees an old and poor fisherman, who lives near the sea: see καταγωγὴν σκεψόμενος αὐτοῦ που περὶ τὴν ἀκτὴν ἠρχόμην and Ὀλίγον οὖν ὅσον προήκων ὁρῶ πρεσβύτην ἁλιευτικὸν πρόσθεν τῶν θυρῶν αὐτοῦ καθήμενον καὶ δικτύου διερρωγότος βροχίδας ἀκεζόμενον; the figure of Tirrhenus easily recalls Aegialeus, who is poor like him (see 5.1.2: πένης μὲν ἦν) and lives near the sea ἐνοικίζεται μὲν πλησίον τῆς θαλάσσης (Eph. 5.1.2);

b) 5.18.7: Tyrrhenus' wife has recently died: ἡ γὰρ μήτηρ αὐτοῖς οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ τέθνηκεν; similarly, Thelxinoe τέθνηκεν ἐνταῦθα οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ Θελξινόη (Eph. 5.1.9);

c) 5.18.8: Tyrrhenus is happy to host the foreign visitors: μετ' οὐ πολὺ σὺν τῷ Θεαγένει καὶ τῇ Χαρικλείᾳ παρόντα με ἄσμενος ὁ πρεσβύτης ὑποδέχεται; similarly, Aegialeus ὑπεδέξατο δὲ τὸν Ἁβροκόμεν ἄσμενος;

d) 5.18.8: Calasiris and the protagonists sometimes join Tyrrhenus in fishing: τὰ μὲν καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἁλιεύοντος τὰ δὲ καὶ ἡμῶν ἔστιν; Habrocomes does likewise with Aegialeus: τῆς τέχνης Αἰγιαλεῖ κοινωνῶν (Eph. 5.2.1);

e) 5.21.1: after Tyrrhenus has informed Calasiris about the pirates, the old man decides to reveal partially the truth to the merchant, in order to leave with him. At this point of the narration, when the pirates' episode begins, Calasiris states that it is impossible to fight against the pursuer: ἁρπάσαι τις τῶν ἐγχωρίων διανοεῖται τὴν κόρην πρὸς ὃν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀξιόμαχος ἀντιτάξασθαι. Interestingly, the adjective ἀξιόμαχος has no other occurrences in the novel, but Xen. uses it once in Corymbus' episode, when the pirate reverses the same judgment about the protagonists' crew (see 1.13.2: κατεφρόνουν δὲ ὡς οὐκ ἀξιομάχων αὐτῶν); the possibility of subtle allusion is not unthinkable.

Overall, these connections - and especially the second and the third - prove that Hld. is drawing from this scene of Xen. This conclusion, which is in itself relevant, might also support our previous interpretation, since the reader, shortly before the pirates' attack, is reminded of the Eph.

Within this hypothesis, another element is worth mentioning: between Tyrrhenus' and the pirates' scene there is another episode, which sounds Xenophontic: a merchant from Tyre falls in love with Charicleia. In 5.19.1 he is called ὁ Τύριος, in 5.20.1 τὸν Φοίνικα: this falling in love seems to recall that of Corymbus: here the variations would be strong, as Phoenicians are at the protagonists' side, but it might be part of Hld's rich literary interplay which seems to characterise the whole passage.

SINGLE LEMMATA

1.13.1 - 1.13.4: ἔτυχον μὲν ἐν Ῥόδῳ [...] ὡς δὲ ταῦτα οἱ πειραταὶ ἐβουλεύσαντο: this passage constitutes an important exception in Xen.'s narrative, since it is entirely analeptic. Interestingly, the signpost of the flashback is not a chronological marker but ἐν Ῥόδῳ: this confirms the importance of space in the construction of Xen.'s scenes (NA 3.1). Conversely, Xen. is really attentive in establishing the connection between this episode and the main narration: along with a prolepsis (1.13.2, n: διέγνωσαν), it also introduces a unique marker of time (1.13.4, n.: ἦν).

If this device shows the rudiments of his narrative technique, the decision to introduce an analepsis is important in itself, because it allows Xen. to keep the readers in suspense about the punishment that will be inflicted on the protagonists' companions because of their drunkenness.

1.13.1: παρορμοῦντες: this verb belongs to technical naval language, since it means 'lie at anchor beside' (LSJ). Thus, it supports the realistic presentation of the episode and, interestingly, has no other occurrences in the entire corpus of the novels.

1.13.1: (παρώρμουν δὲ ὡς φορτίον ἔχοντες): as I have already suggested (GI 1), this parenthesis can be considered as an "unnecessary gloss", as it does not really fit into the context of Xen.'s description where the pirates are introduced as military warriors, because of their possession of a τριήρης (1.13.1, n.: ἐν τριήρει). In this sentence, along with the strange repetition of παρορμέω, the introduction of a φορτίον does not really make a sense, since it characterises the pirates as merchants: this goes against Xen.'s presentation of them (1.13.1 n.: ἐν τριήρει). In my opinion, it is not unlikely that a late copyist decided to introduce this sentence because he did not understand the author's interplay with τριήρης and, thus, he tried to make the pirates more like pirates through a reference to their more traditional activity as merchants.

1.13.1: ἐν τριήρει μεγάλῃ: if μεγάλῃ works as an analepsis to the first dream, the attribution of a trireme to the Phoenicians appears to be a realistic element of their characterisation. In fact, the Phoenicians and the Greeks had the merit to invent triremes in the seventh century BC (see, on this, Aubet 2001, 150: 'The invention of the trireme, around the year 670 BC, was attributed to Sidonians and Corinthians'). As a result, this mention can be interpreted as a homage to their tradition. At the same time, it does not seem to be part of the cultural differentiation between Greeks and barbarians, since the former invented and used the same kind of boat.

That being said, we are not dealing only with a "decorative" trait: if we look carefully, triremes are warships and merchants and pirates 'used ships with a small crew and cheap to run' (Aubet 2001, 150; see also Casson 1971, 161: the 'favourite of pirates was κέλης'). As a result, it seems to me that Xen. with this trireme is presenting the pirates as warriors. If we combine this element with the epic definition of pirates, we might conclude that this episode is presented more as a military attack than a pirate raid. Thus, we find here again the coexistence of a realistic and an epic feature, which has already emerged in the second part of the first book.

Finally, the originality of the appearance of this trireme is supported by three elements: first, in this episode, Xen. consistently calls the pirates' ship τριήρης while the protagonists' one is simply a ναῦς (cf. respectively 1.13.4, 1.14.2 and 1.14.4, and 1.13.4 (bis), 1.13.5, 1.14.1.2). Second, throughout the whole novel other boats are generally called ναῦς: Habrocomes (3.10.4, 3.12.1, 5.1.1, 5.10.1, 5.15.1) and Anthia (5.5.4 and 5.15.1) first of all, but also Cilician merchants (2.11.10), Hippothous and Hyperanthes (3.2.11 and 12), Euxinus (3.5.8.11) and Leucon and Rhode (5.6.4) are passengers on this kind of ship: this highlights the originality of the trireme. Third, only Char. among the other novelists uses the word τριήρης and he does it more than Xen., since triremes are the ships used by Syracusans for all their expeditions; then, Egyptians use the same kind of boat (7.5.8, 7.5.9 and 7.6.1) and we also once find a Milesian trireme (2.11.2 for the Syracusans, and *LRG* for all the other occurrences). Under the hypothesis that Xen. wrote after Char., the military use of τριήρης would be further marked. At the same time, it is interesting that the nature of the ship marks a difference between Habrocomes and Chaereas, especially during the departure scene and in the current episode (cf. Char. 3.5.3 and Xen. 1.10.4, and Char. 3.7.2.3 and Xen. 1.13.5). Since Chaereas' boat is defined as τὴν τριήρη τὴν στρατηγικήν, ἔχουσαν ἔτι τὰ σημεῖα τῆς νίκης proves, it emphasises the military glory of his character, which Habrocomes completely lacks.

1.13.1: ἔτυχον [...] γεννικοί: Xen. gives his pirates three main features in this context: to begin with, they are presented as real enemies, since they are πολλοί and they stay on a τριήρει μεγάλη. Second, their Phoenician origin is clearly stated (see 1.13.2, 1.14.6 and 2.4.3) and both terms μεγάλη and Φοίνικες confirm the proleptic nature of the dream. Third, they are presented as γεννικοί, which means' noble' (1.4.2, n.: οὐ μενῶ γεννικός). This definition is quite surprising, since it does not usually concern pirates. As a result, I would conclude that with this term Xen might want to represent them as Homeric heroes. In this respect, the two parallels with Hector and Achilles might be here anticipated (1.14.1, n.; ἐνέπρησε and 1.15.4, n.: μὴ ἐπὶ πλέον).
Finally, this interpretation finds a possible confirmation in the last occurrence of the adjective in the novel, where Polyidus is defined as δρᾶσαι γεννικόν (5.3.1): although the presence of the verb suggests that his nobility lies in his courage, it is interesting that Polyidus, who has a Homeric name (which designates both a Trojan warrior in Il. 5.148 and a Corinthian seer in *Il.* 13.663 and 666), will shortly fight, like the pirates. Thus, also in this passage there seems to be an epic colour.

1.13.1: χρυσὸς καὶ ἄργυρος καὶ ἀνδράποδα, πολλὰ καὶ τίμια: the description of the cargo of the Ephesian ship is focalised through the pirates and slightly differ from the narrator's presentation in the tenth chapter. During the departure scene, in fact, we are told that on the Ephesian ship there were πολλὴ μὲν ἐσθὴς καὶ ποικίλη, πολὺς δὲ ἄργυρος καὶ χρυσός, ἥ τε τῶν σιτίων ὑπερβάλλουσα ἀφθονία (1.10.4, n.). Shortly after, the narrator adds the presence of πολλοὶ μὲν οἰκέται, πολλαὶ δὲ θεράπαιναι (1.10.6, n.).
The difference between the two descriptions lies in the omission of clothes and in an emphasis on servants more than on goods. This selection, which is focalised on the pirates' main interest, sounds

like an anticipation of the protagonists' slavery and this is also emphasised by the use of τίμιος and by the only occurrence of ἀνδράποδον.

To begin with, τίμιος occurs in a very similar sense at the beginning of the following chapter to designate Corymbus' loot, τὰ τιμιώτερα τῶν φορτίων (1.14.1). Since this adjective means both 'valuable' and 'held in honour', Xen. might be not only exploiting the former connotation, which is the most suitable for slaves, but also the latter, reminding the readers of the epic τιμή which the pirates will receive as reward for their enterprise.

Second, since ἀνδράποδον usually designates a prisoner of war, it fits well into the warlike description of Corymbus' attack and, thus, it might be proleptic too.

1.13.2: διέγνωσαν οὖν ἐπιθέμενοι τοὺς μὲν ἀντιμαχομένους ἀποκτιννύειν [...]: this is the first and 'more complex and far-reaching' (Morgan 2007a, 463) of Xen.'s actorial prolepses. Like the other examples in the novel, it 'works over very short ranges' (ibid.) and it helps the chronological construction of the scene.

1.13.2: ἀντιμαχομένους: the verb ἀντιμάχομαι is used only by Xen. in the novelistic corpus and the following ἀποκτιννύειν and ἀξιομάχων are very rare too. The former, in fact, which is a variant of the more common ἀποκτείνω, has its only other use in Longus when Daphnis kills birds in Dryas' house (3.6.2), while the latter appears in a passage of Hld. which seems to intertext with the present one (1.13: introd., 4).

This framework suggests that Xen. is here adopting words which ordinarily belong to a non-novelistic vocabulary. In this case, the source seems to be historiography. ἀντιμάχομαι, in fact, is first introduced by Thuc. 4.68.2 to designate the traitors of the Megareans who fought against them (τῶν προδιδόντων Μεγαρέων ἀντιμαχομένων) and other occurrences are found in Diod. Sic. 22.10.7, D.H. *AR.* 11.48.1, Memnon fr. 47 and App. *BC* 1.6.52. The two only exceptions to this historiographic framework come from Theanus p. 196 and Plut. *de nobilit.* 17, in which, however, the military context of Xen.'s passage is missing. A similar framework concerns ἀποκτιννύειν, which has many occurrences in Xenophon of Athens (*Hell.* 4.4.2, 5.3.2, 7.4.26 and *Anab.* 6.3.5) and later historians (see DH *AR* 2.15.2, 2.26.4, 6.89.3, 8.59.1, 8.80.3, 10.60.2 and Joseph. *AJ* 15.92), as well as ἀξιομάχος (see, e.g., Hdt. 7.157, Thuc. 8.38 and Plu. *Cat. Ma.* 12).

Overall, since close connections between the Eph. and these writers are not established, I would conclude that this vocabulary simply confirms that Xen. is introducing a realistic marker in this episode.

1.13.3: νεανίας ὀφθῆναι μέγας, φοβερὸς τὸ βλέμμα· κόμη ἦν αὐτῷ αὐχμηρὰ καθειμένη: this description, which constitutes a parallel with the woman of Habrocomes' dream (1.12.4, n.: dream), reflects the literary 'distinctive appearance' (Hopwood 1998, 201) of pirates and brigands. I offer three examples:

- in *Leucippe* the Egyptian βούκολοι are described as φοβερῶν καὶ ἀγρίων ἀνθρώπων and μεγάλοι πάντες (3.9.2);

- Hld. attributes to them a long and unkempt hair, which makes them fearful (see 2.20.5: Βουκόλοι γὰρ ἄλλα τε πρὸς τὸ φοβερώτερον φαίνεσθαι καὶ δὴ καὶ τὴν κόμην εἰς ὀφρὺν ἕλκουσι καὶ σοβοῦσι τῶν ὤμων ἐπιβαίνουσαν).
- Finally, also the man who appears in Charicleia's first dream is τὴν κόμην αὐχμηρὸς (2.16.1). The existence of these parallels confirms the standard nature of descriptions like this.

1.13.4: (ἦν περὶ μέσον ἡμέρας: as Hägg 1971, 59 underlines, in the Eph. 'only once is a time between morning and evening specified': the reason for this originality is narratological, since Xen. uses this event to re-establish the connection with the main thread. Since in the twelfth chapter ναυτῶν ῥᾳθυμία καὶ πότος [...] καὶ μέθη (1.12.3, n.) started in the morning and here the crew is already paying the consequence for these actions (οἱ μὲν καθεύδοντες, οἱ δὲ ἀλύοντες), the narrator leaves a gap in the main narration of few hours, which the readers can easily fill. Finally, Xen. uses here the combination of τὰ μὲν πρῶτα and τελευταῖον δὲ: this confirms the extraordinary density of time-markers of this scene. In my opinion, the effect of this device on the narration is not positive, because it reduces the text's fluidity. To an extent, it seems that Xen. may be worried that his chronological apparatus might not work and he errs on the side of caution: a sophisticated author would have avoided this repetition.

This statement opens the possibility that the presence of a parenthesis here was not part of Xen's original text. However, the length of this passage, which is significantly greater than that of the other parentheses (GI 1), as well as its moral concern and unusual time reference, lead me to conclude that we are rather dealing with a "functional" parenthesis. This seems to confirm Xen.'s simplicity and might suggest something about our author's sense of his readers (see again GI 1).

1.13.4: ὑπὸ μέθης καὶ ῥᾳθυμίας: since these two words appear in the twelfth chapter (1.12.3, n.), they are part of the emphasis placed by Xen. on the narrative moment in which the analepsis finishes and the narrative turns to the present (1.13.1 - 1.13.4 n.: ἔτυχον).

1.13.4: ἐλαυνομένη τῇ νηὶ: this expression is Homeric: in Greek literature it appears in the *Odyssey* to indicate the movement of the Phaeacian ship when it is destroyed by Poseidon (*Od.* 13.168-9, where a Phaeacian after this event asks: ὤ μοι, τίς δὴ νῆα θοὴν ἐπέδησ'ἐνὶ πόντῳ οἴκαδ'ἐλαυνομένην;). Also ἐλαυνομένην in verse 155 refers to the same ship (149: περικαλλέα νῆα). After Homer, only Diodorus Siculus uses this formula twice, but, unlike the poet, he associates with this expression the agent of the ship's movement (14.72.5: αἱ πολέμιαι ναῦς ταῖς εἰρεσίαις ἐλαυνόμεναι and 20.51.3: ἀπὸ κράτους δὲ καὶ βίας ἐλαθεισῶν τῶν νεῶν αἱ μὲν). Since Xen. knew Homer, the reference to him here is likely: in this case, unlike in others, it would play the mere role of supporting the epic construction of the scene, because a precise connection between Corymbus' and the Phaeacian ship does not seem to be exploited.

1.13.4: (τριήρης <δὲ> ἦν): this parenthesis, unlike the previous one, appears to be a "gloss" to warn the reader that the previous τῇ νηὶ belongs to the pirates and is not that of the protagonists. In this

case, unlike the similar ones, there is a possible ambiguity, since two lines earlier the same dative has been used to refer to the protagonists' ship. However, it seems unlikely to me that the author would have introduced a clarification like this: first, because this parenthesis clearly interrupts the crucial description of the attack, which needs pathos. Second, because writing this would have implied a recognition of the existence of a repetition which appears to be a sign of bad writing. For this reason, in this case I would remove from my definition of the parenthesis "unnecessary" but I would keep "gloss" (GI 1).

1.13.5: ὡπλισμένοι: since ὡπλισμένοι has appeared before to describe Ares the lover in the wedding night (1.8.3: οὐχ ὡπλισμένος), the narrator might be here suggesting that the violent Ares is entering the action of the novel through the pirates. This hypothesis would suit well the first appearance of war in the novel. Two possible confirmations of this hypothesis are given: to begin with, in the following sentence Xen. adopts the expression ὑπ'ἐκπλήξεως to express the reaction of the crew: interestingly, the same reaction is attributed to the Ephesian crowd in response to the alleged divinity of Habrocomes (1.2.8, n.: οἷος). Thus, another crowd might here perceive the presence of a god in front of them.

Second, the same participle ὡπλισμένος occurs later in the novel only one other time to describe Hippothous (2.14.1) at his first meeting with Habrocomes. Since the brigand has just tried to make a barbaric sacrifice to Ares (2.13.1; for the connection between Ares and this sacrifice, see Laplace 1994, 457), Hippothous appears as another possible double of this god, like the pirates. Finally, this identification is dismissed in the fifth book, where the brigand throws away his weapons (see 5.1.3: ἀπορρίψας τὰ ὅπλα). Whatever interpretation we give to Hippothous' erotic behaviour in the last book (LI 4.5.c), this action indicates his decision to abandon his violence and start to cultivate affections and friendships. Thus, his previous parallel with Ares the warrior seems to work.

As a result, I would conclude that the present passage might establish the pattern, later expanded by Hippothous, that Ares is a divine enemy of the protagonists' journey who assumes different human forms (on this, see Laplace 1994, 457: 'La force meurtrière d'Ares apparaît durant le voyage qu' entreprennent, après leur mariage, Habrocomes and Antheia').

Into this pattern Cyno might also be included, since because of the murder of her husband she is defined as μιαίφονος, which in the *Iliad* is the exclusive epithet of Ares (*Il.* 5.31, 5.455, 5.844 and 21.402), while it is less likely that Xen. was aware of the following occurrences. The first, in fact, comes from Sophocles' *Electra* and is referred to Clytemnestra because of her union with Aegistus (*Electra* 492-3: μιαιφόνων γάμων) and the second from the Euripidean *Medea*, in relation to the murder of her children (*Medea* 266, Chorus: οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλη φρὴν μιαιφονωτέρα, and 1346, Jason: ἀισχροποιὲ καὶ τέκνων μιαιφόνε).

Overall, since the other god who does the same is Eros, it seems to me that Ares' submission to him on the wedding night might continue throughout the whole novel. This hypothesis is confirmed by the fact that in the central part of the novel Eros is violent like Ares and at the end they both become quiet. In addition, Corymbus' identification with both gods might further prove their closeness (for his connection with Eros, 1.16.2, n., λέγει, b).

1.13.5: τὰ ξίφη γυμνὰ: this expression usually occurs in the writings of the Greek historians or in descriptions which have a historical colour (e.g. DH. *AR* 12.2.10, Plut. *Aem. Paul* 32.6, *Caes*. 6.3, 67.3, *Brutus* 18.7, *Galba* 25.3, 4): thus, it confirms the realistic tone of this part of the novel.

1.13.5: οἱ μὲν ἐρρίπτουν ἑαυτοὺς [...] εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν: for the motif of suicide in the sea, see 1.14.5, n.: παραδοὺς.

1.13.6: ὁ δὲ Ἁβροκόμης καὶ ἡ Ἀνθία προστρέχουσι τῷ Κορύμβῳ: Schmeling 1980, 36 points out that here 'the protagonists forget about the duty owed to their comrades, servants or noble stations in life'. Conversely, it is 'grotesque' that these humble characters die 'concerned only for the fate of their masters' (ibid.). In his opinion, the apex of this strange representation would be the 'dialogue in movement' (see 1.14.3, n.: οἱ μὲν), where Schmeling 1980, 36 'cannot explain the heroine and hero's desire for slavery over death, while their servants pray for their masters' death before slavery'.
In my opinion, this interpretation cannot be fully accepted: if Schmeling 1980 is right about the passivity of the protagonists, I would not consider relevant how their behaviour affects the servants and the crew. Xen.'s main focus is the protagonists' love and in this respect it is easy to understand that Anthia and Habrocomes, being together, prefer slavery to death. Thus, the servants, as in other places in the novel, are used by Xen. merely to support the characterisation of Anthia and Habrocomes.

1.13.6: τὰ μὲν χρήματα [...] δεσπότῃ: this is the 'first prayer to human beings' which appear in the novel. Its structure is quite simple, since it is composed of paratactic clauses which contain five imperatives, with the only exception being the participle ἀγαγὼν.
As I have already noted in 1.4.5, this choice of moods and tenses resembles that of Habrocomes' prayer to Eros. This suggests that Xen. is following a common pattern for his prayers (NA 3.3) and that the protagonists' attitude toward Corymbus is completely reverential. Another feature which seems to recall Habrocomes' prayer is the introduction of expressions that belong to a linguistic register higher than usual: while Habrocomes uses literary and emphatic expressions in his prayer such as τὸν ἐπὶ σὲ καταπεφευγότα τὸν πάντων δεσπότην, τὸν θρασύν and πικρὸς), the protagonists seem to do the same here (1.13.6, n.: φεῖσαι δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς and ibid., n.: μὴ πρὸς θαλάσσης).
On the one hand, with these formal features Xen. might be suggesting to the readers the identification between Corymbus and Eros, thus recalling an association which has already been implied in the dream (1.12.4, n.: dream, 1 and 3) and which then will be clarified in Euxinus' proposal (1.16.2, n.: λέγει, b).
On the other hand, it is worth noticing that this prayer is answered by Corymbus: this is a one-off, since throughout the whole journey the protagonists approach their enemies in this way in only three other cases and are never successful: it is Anthia who does this with Lampo (2.11.5), with the brigands who enter her grave (3.8.4-5) and with Clytus, whom she asks to kill herself (on this, see

1.14.5). Conversely, no prayer to human beings is raised by Habrocomes during his misadventures in Egypt or by Anthia when she is with Anchialus, Amphinomus and Polyidus: in the fourth and fifth book the protagonists raise mostly divine prayers, which, unlike those directed to their enemies, are always successful. This distinction, as well as the progressive decision of the protagonists to invoke the gods more might fit into the *Bildung* of the novel, since it seems to indicate that there is an increase in the danger of the enemies which makes the protagonists look for other tactics.

1.13.6: λαβόμενοι τῶν γονάτων αὐτοῦ: clasping one's knees before an entreaty is a typical act of the Greek culture, whose origin is already Homeric: Priamus is advised to do this before leaving Achilles' tent (*Il.* 24.4645 and 478: λαβέ γούνατα Πηλεΐωνος), while Odysseus refrains himself to do this not to upset Nausicaa (*Od.* 6.147: μή οἱ γοῦνα λαβόντι χολώσαιτο φρένα κούρη). After Homer, Hdt. offers two examples where the exact Xenophontic formula occurs. In the first, Cambyses' desperate wife, before asking him not to expose his son, δακρύσασα καὶ λαβομένη τῶν γουνάτων (Hdt. 1.112). In the second, a Persian concubine asks the Greek Pausanias not to make her slave: λαβομένη τῶν γουνάτων ἔλεγε τάδε· "Ὦ βασιλεῦ Σπάρτης, ῥῦσαί με τὴν ἱκέτιν αἰχμαλώτου δουλοσύνης [...]" (Hdt. 9.76). Since the same formula occurs in a good number of authors (see Eur. *Med.* 497, And. *De myst.* 19, D.H. *AR* 4.66.2 and Plut. *Pomp.* 55), Xen. seems here to be following a common pattern, with no reference to any particular text.
The only exception might be constituted by Char., who adopts the same formula as Xen. in Plangon's request to Calliroe (2.7.2: λαβομένη δὲ τῶν γονάτων αὐτῆς "Δέομαί σου φησί κυρία, σῶσον ἡμᾶς; [...]) and in the farewell of Chareas' mother to her son during the departure scene (3.5.5: ἡ δε μήτηρ τῶν γονάτων αὐτοῦ λαβομένη). Although these two passages open the possibility that Xen. was drawing this formula from Char., the aforementioned rich framework makes the hypothesis of a more general origin more plausible.

1.13.6: φεῖσαι δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς: as Cummings 2009, 147 argues, in this passage we are dealing with 'a pervasive usage of ψυχή as a metonym for the life of a person when mortally threatened' (see n. 423 for paralles in the other novels). What seems to be more significant is the entire formula, as it is introduced for the first time in Euripides' *Heracles*, when the hero expresses his desire for suicide having killed his sons: τί δῆτα φείδομαι ψυχῆς ἐμῆς [...]; (1146). In addition, as Bond 1981, 358 argues, 'it probably has an archaic ring', as a slightly different passage from Tirteus suggests (see fr. 10.14 ψυχέων μηκέτι φειδόμενοι). Since after Euripides this formula is used by Hellenistic and Imperial historians (see Diod. Sic., *BH* 12.62.2 and 37.11.1, D.H. *AR* 5.10.7, Joseph. *AJ* 13.199 and 17.134) and by Iamblichus (see fr. 61, where Sidonis declares her will to risk her life by saying: "ὁρᾷς, - ἔφη, - τοῦτο, ὦ [...] ὁρᾷς, ὅτι τῆς ψυχῆς Σινωνὶς οὐ φείδεται·), it is not unthinkable that our author is intertexting with the tragedian, but no definite proof is available. That being said, we can more broadly accept that this expression bears a hint of emphasis which elevates the register of the speech.

1.13.6: μὴ πρὸς αὐτῆς θαλάσσης, μὴ πρὸς δεξιᾶς τῆς σῆς: this double invocation strengthens the nature of entreaty of the protagonists' speech. The mention of ἡ δεξιά as a symbol of assurance is an element typical of Greek society since Homer, as the following Iliadic formula shows: σπόνδαί τ'ἄκρητοι καὶ δεξιαί, ᾗς ἐπέπιθμεν· (Il. 2.341, 4.159 and 10.542; for later authors, see Xen. *An.* 7.3.1 and Eur. *Med.* 21). As a result, the protagonists' speech assumes here a serious tone, which confirms the 'elevation' noticed with φεῖσαι δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς.

This discovery leads us to a possible conclusion: since the addressee of this prayer is a pirate and not an educated man, Xen. might be playing with irony here and this contrast would be further emphasised by the association of Corymbus with Eros.

At the same time, the mention of the sea creates a parallel with Anthia's oath, where the same entity is invoked together with Eros and Artemis. In my opinion, the absence here of Greek gods might depend on the protagonists' consideration of Corymbus as uncivilised, since in the novel those who do not belong to the civilised society do not worship Greek gods (LI 1.3). If we accept this hypothesis, we would be dealing with a first sign of the maturation of the protagonists.

1.13.6: οἴκτειρον ἡμᾶς: compassion is a common topic in the Eph., as it represents the "good" side of the approach of the "enemies" to the protagonists and Xen. uses interchangeably both οἰκτείρω and ἐλεέω with their cognates to express it. This concerns first Lampo (2.9.4 and 2.11.4.7) and then Perilaus (2.13.5), Eudoxus (3.5.9), the Egyptian governor (4.4.1), Amphinomos (4.6.5 and 4.6.7), Polyidus (5.4.7), Clytus (5.5.6) and the people in the brothel (5.7.4). This pattern confirms that the protagonists' journey contains repetitive motifs (see LI 4.3 for other examples). Having said that, its role is twofold: in Lampo, Eudoxus and Amphinomus' cases it supports the construction of these good "enemies", who all have a literary foundation (APP 4.1, 1.2 and 1.9b). Conversely, in the other occurrences compassion implies a moral and unexpected conversion of the "enemies" and, thus, it plays a simpler narrative role of marking the end of an episode (see the Egyptian governor's case) or of making the readers believe that it is ended, while more suffering is going to come (see Polyidus' episode, which must be considered in continuity with Rhaenaea and Clytus' actions).

A confirmation of the typical use of this motif lies in the fact that only the Egyptian governor has compassion on Habrocomes, while all the other characters take piety on Anthia: this follows the general construction of the journey, in which Anthia meets more enemies than her husband (LI 4.1). In addition, it is interesting how in the last occurrence compassion is clearly the fruit of Anthia's clever approach to her enemies and is at the origin of her salvation (5.7.4): this exception highlights the value of this episode and emphasises the success of Anthia's ἀνδρεῖα.

Finally, it is interesting that οἴκτειρον is used in two other prayers in the novel, the one made by Manto to her father Apsyrtus (see 2.5.6) and the other by Habrocomes to Apollo (see 5.1.13), while ἐλέησον appears in that of Anthia to Api (see 5.4.10). This fact confirms that Xen. is following a typical pattern of prayer and that he is not really interested in drawing a formal distinction between prayers to gods and prayers to human beings.

CHAPTER 14

1.14.1: ἐνέπρησε τὴν ναῦν: Corymbus' fire on the ship is described by Xen with the formula ἐνέπρησε τὴν ναῦν. Since this formula can be interpreted as Iliadic, Xen. here clearly confirms the epic nature of this episode, which makes it heroic and serious.

The phrase composed of ἐμπίμπρημι and τὴν ναῦν is very "old", because it occurs repeatedly in the *Iliad* to designate Hector's fire on the Achaean ship. Overall, in the epic text it has eleven occurrences (*Il* 8.182-3: πυρὶ νῆας ἐνιπρήσω, κτείνω δὲ καὶ αὐτοὺς Ἀργείους παρὰ νηυσὶν ἀτυζομένους ὑπὸ καπνοῦ; 8.217, 8.235, 12.198, 13.319, 14.47, 15.417, 15.507, 15.702, 16.83, 22.374) and in the fifteenth book this fire enters the action of the poem: at the verse 346, in fact, Hector invites the Trojans to attack the ships and the reason for the success lies in Zeus' support (see 15.596-599). Ajax himself risks death (*Il*. 15.727-9) and the Achaeans decide to ask Achilles for help through Patroclus.

This discovery opens the possibility that Xen. is drawing this formula from Homer. Its literary history offers two contrasting points: since Thucydides (6.64.3 and 7.60.2) ἐμπίμπρημι τὴν ναῦν is often used by historians to describe normal warlike actions: Diodorus Siculus is especially fond of this (*BH* 11.22.1, 11.21.4.5, 11.77.3, 13.6.2, 13.13.6, 17.23.3, 17.48.3, 20.87.2, 20.107.4, 22.7.5 and 37.1.3), while more than one occurrence comes from Plutarch (*Alcib*. 37.5 and *Anton*. 64.1), Appianus (*BC* 5.14.139, 5.7.61, 5.14.142 and *Syr*. 240) and Polyaenus (*Strat*. 5.3.5 and *Excerpta* 5.3). If this list suggests that we might be dealing with the easiest way to say a fairly common thing, there are also late Hellenistic and Imperial prose authors who use this expression in reference to Hector's attack: a case in point is Dio Chrysostomus, who in his Trojan Discourse describes the epic event by saying: νὺξ δὲ ἐπιγενομένη ἀφείλετο μὴ πάσας ἐμπρῆσαι τὰς ναῦς (11.97). The same happens in his discourse on Beauty, where the subject is explicitly Hector (see 21.16: οὐ γὰρ μόνον ὡς περὶ ἀνδρείου τοῦ Ἕκτορος ὁ ποιητὴς διέξεισιν; Δ. Ὅπου γε τὰς ναῦς ἐμπίμπρησιν [...]; in 52.10 a slightly different expression describes the same concept: Ἕκτωρ [...] ἦλθεν ἐμπρῆσαι τὸν ναύσταθμον). Similarly, Aelius Aristides in his *Panathenaicos* uses our formula to describe the Trojan action against Protesilaus' Thessalian ship (see p. 179 Dind.: πῶς ἐνεπρήσθη ναῦς μία τῶν Θετταλῶν), while in the Embassy to Achilles he alludes to Hector's ταῖς ναυσὶν ἐμπιμπραμέναις (p. 435). Finally, even Clemens of Alexandria in his *Stromata* does the same, when discussing the allegation that failure to prevent a thing from happening is to be the cause of its happening: in his opinion, it is common belief that καὶ τὰς ναῦς τοίνυν τῶν Ἑλλήνων μὴ τὸν Ἕκτορα ἐμπρῆσαι [...], ἀλλὰ τὸν Ἀχιλλέα (1.17.83.1). Finally, three authors use the formula ἐμπίμπρημι τὴν ναῦν in a different epic context: the first is Aristotle, who in *On Marvellous things* recalls how the Trojan women captives in Daunia set fire to their ships in order to avoid the expected slavery (840b). In the aforementioned passage of Diodorus Siculus ἐμπίμπρημι τὴν ναῦν refers to Heracles' and Hesion's episode in 4.32.3, while Zenobius refers to Agamemnon's attack to Crete (*Parem*. 5.50). As a result,

we can say that this formula was still considered by Imperial writers as Homeric, despite the shift from poetry to prose.

This twofold framework invites our interpretation: in my opinion, the Homeric reading of this formula can be accepted, since it is supported by two other expressions of the Ephesiaca that intertext with Iliadic words which designate the same event: to begin with, as I have argued in the analysis of Xen.'s oracle (1.6.2, n.: oracle, 3), the expression πῦρ ἀΐδηλον, apart from a philosophical occurrence in Empedocles, appears only three times in the Iliad: while in two cases it belongs to similes about military actions, in the other it refers to an effective action of the poem. When Phoenix asks Achilles not to go home, he refers to this possibility with the following hypothetical period:

εἰ μὲν δὴ νόστόν γε μετὰ φρεσὶ φαίδιμ' Ἀχιλλεῦ

βάλλεαι, οὐδέ τι πάμπαν ἀμύνειν νηυσὶ θοῇσι

πῦρ ἐθέλεις ἀΐδηλον [...] (Il 9.434-6).

Since this fire is the one started by Hector, Xen. might be recalling this Iliadic episode with πῦρ ἐθέλεις ἀΐδηλον.

Second, in my interpretation of the oracle λυσσοδιώκτοι refers to Corymbus' fury (1.6.2, n: 3). In the *Iliad*, λύσσα appears three times and in two cases it refers to Hector's fury (see Odysseus in his speech to Achilles: cf. 9.239: κρατερὴ δέ ἑ λύσσα δέδυκεν, two verses after the mention of the hero's name, and 9.304-5: νῦν γάρ χ' Ἕκτορ' ἕλοις, ἐπεὶ ἂν μάλα τοι σχεδὸν ἔλθοι λύσσαν ἔχων ὀλοήν), while in the last to Achilles (*Il*. 21.542-3: ὁ δὲ σφεφανὸν ἔφεπ'ἔγχεϊ, λύσσα δέ οἱ κῆρ αἰὲν ἔχε κρατερή [...]). This discovery suggests that also λυσσοδιώκτοι might support Xen.'s allusion to Hector's fire.

As a result, I would conclude that these two links make the Homeric origin of ἐμπίμπρημι τὴν ναῦν acceptable. In addition, the interpretation of πῦρ ἀΐδηλον as a foreshadowing of the pirates' episode seems to be confirmed, since the real fire might be Iliadic too (see oracle).

Having said that, it is not clear how far Xen. is exploiting this comparison: it might be possible to interpret Corymbus as a double of Hector: within this parallel, Hector, being the leader of the Trojans, would appear to be an adequate enemy of the couple: since Xen. is insisting on their barbaric nature of the pirates, he might be emphasising it by exploiting the identification between Trojans and barbarians, which is not Homeric but becomes a common pattern in Greece from Herodotus onwards. The reason why this hypothesis remains highly speculative is that Xen. does not exploit this association further, as he does with Odyssean characters, and Habrocomes is not Achilles.

As a result, I would consider this and the following parallels which concern Iliadic figures as allusions that only the most attentive readers of the Eph. could recognise and that do not seem to last longer than the passage where they are introduced. Thus, Xen.'s use of this model is better interpreted in relation to the colour of this scene.

The consequence of this Iliadic connection: the tragic and comic reading of Corymbus' episode

If Xen. is deliberately referring to Homer at the beginning of the fourteenth chapter, this invites us to look for other epic traces in the construction of the rest of the episode. Interestingly, in the whole scene there seem to be five other epic motifs:

- 1.14.3: 'it is better to die than to become a slave';
- 1.14.4-5: the death of Habrocomes' old tutor: the futility of life without the beloved;
- 1.15.5: the pirates' desire for a γέρας;
- 1.16.3: the loss of freedom;
- 1.16.4-5: Calypso's promise of "immortality".

Within this list, Xen. seems not only to refer to epic models, but to approach them in two different ways: on the one hand, the presentation of the first, second and fourth motifs has a tragic colour, which owes a debt to Greek tragedy, while that of the others is comic and might be influenced in Calypso's case by the rationalistic interpretation of the Odyssey. The discovery of these patterns clarifies the nature of the protagonists' journey: both the Iliad and the tragedy underline the hardship of their νόστος.

1.14.1: οἱ λοιποὶ πάντες κατεφλέχθησαν: in the novelistic corpus καταφλέγομαι occurs only here in the third section of this chapter and in Char. 3.7.2: πῦρ ἐμβαλόντες τὴν μὲν τριήρη κατέφλεξαν. Since this sentence describes the fire which, in Phocas' mind, would make Chaereas' ship burn in order to eliminate a rival of Dionysius, it contains an image which is very similar to that of Xen. Thus, the possibility of an intertextual connection is likely. In addition, in Char. this episode of the burning of the ship is subjected to a multiplication: later in the novel it is recalled by seven analepses and five of these are characterised by the formula ἐμπίμπρημι τὴν τριήρη. Since Char. does not use the noun ναῦν as Homer and Xen. do, the epic origin of his passages is less likely and it cannot be proved by only the presence of ἐμπίμπρημι. However, the connection between the two novelists seems to continue: in the fifth analepsis, which is told by Polycharmus (4.3.3: ταύτην τὴν τριήρη νυκτὸς ὁρμοῦσαν ἐνέπρησαν βάρβαροι καὶ τοὺς μὲν πολλοὺς ἀπέσφαξαν, ἐμὲ δὲ καὶ τὸν φίλον δήσαντες ἐπώλησαν ἐνταῦθα), the verb ἀποσφάζω constitutes another possible parallel between Xen. and Char., since they are the only novelists who adopt this verb (see Xen. in 1.13.5, who uses ἀποσφάζω to describe Corymbus' action and in 4.1.1, where it designates Hippothous' killing of many people 1.13.5, while in Callirhoe in 4.2.5 it indicates the murder committed by the other prisoners in Caria). In addition, the fourth prolepsis supports this similarity, as Callirhoe dreams of the pirates' band which makes the ship burn: μικρὸν δὲ καταδραθεῖσα ὄναρ ἑώρα λῃστήριον βαρβάρων πῦρ ἐπιφέροντας, ἐμπιπραμένην δὲ τριήρη, Χαιρέα δὲ βοηθοῦσαν ἑαυτήν (4.1.1). Apart from the last phrase, this dream recalls the first of Habrocomes, with the different analeptic function (for the other analepses, see the first in 3.9.10, the second in 3.10.2, the third in 3.10.8, the sixth in 4.4.7 and the seventh in 8.8.1).

Finally, in Char's first narration, the burning of the ship is followed by the division of the slaves and Chaereas and Polycharmus successfully request to be assigned to the same master (see 3.7.3: ἱκέτευσαν Χαιρέας καὶ Πολύχαρμος ἑνὶ δεσπότῃ πραθῆναι) and, thus, they are sold to Mithiridates, the Carian satrap. This episode is very similar again to Anthia and Habrocomes' prayer to

Corymbus, in which they make the same request in direct speech: μόνον οἴκτειρον ἡμᾶς ὑφ᾽ἑνὶ ποιήσας δεσπότῃ (1.13.6, n.).

Overall, Xen. and Char. seem to use the fire on the ship with reference to each other. In this case, the hypothesis of Xen.'s debt to Char. is very likely (LI 1.5): as a result, Xen.'s substitution of τριήρη with ναῦν appears the fruit of his desire to introduce a Homeric allusion and this reinforces the plausibility of his epic intertextuality.

1.14.2: τὰς χεῖρὰς ἐκτεινόντων, ὀλοφυρομένων: this gesture made by some companions of Habrocomes before their death and the previous narratorial comment about the high pathos of the scene might recall the Odyssean episode of Scylla, in which six of Odysseus' friends are captured by the monster and before being eaten they stretch their arms toward him: χεῖρας ἐμοὶ ὀρέγοντας (Od. 12.257). Then, shortly after, the hero adds a significant comment: οἴκτιστον δὴ κεῖνο ἐμοῖς ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσι [...] (Od. 12.258-9). Finally, although a proper textual link is not present, Xen's use of ὀλοφυρομένων might serve this purpose, since ὀλοφύρομαι is often used both in the Iliad and in the Odyssey to express a desperate lament and it refers three times to the reaction of Odysseus' companions to Circe's terrible actions (see Od. 10.265, 409, 418). In addition, its only other occurrence in the novelistic corpus is in a passage of Ach. (see 3.5.6), where the protagonists' sorrow for the death of their companions Cleinias and Satyrus and their landing in Pelusius might have an epic colour too.

This hypothesis is very interesting, because it helps to interpret the woman of Habrocomes' dream as Scylla (1.12.4, n.: dream).

1.14.3: οἱ μὲν ἔλεγον [...] δουλείαν λῃστρικὴν ἰδεῖν: this 'second dialogue in movement' (NA 4.5) appears to be a collection of epic and tragic motifs, which focuses on the topic of slavery as the destiny to which the heroes are condemned (see Schmeling 1980, 35 on this: 'Xenophon narrates the episode with the intent to portray in graphic detail a scene which would remind the reader of a critical battle in epic or a moment of high drama in tragedy'). The importance of this topic is confirmed by the fact that our author explores this motif again in Euxinus' speech: this creates a development in its representation, which is composed of two acts: in the first, which is the present, Habrocomes and Anthia are still free, while in the second they are slaves.

The origin of this motif certainly lies in the Iliadic dialogue between Hector and Andromache, where the latter foretells her slavery (Il. 6.455: ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ ἀπούρας) and the same destiny is repeated by the heroine at the end of the poem (24.733-4: ἕψεαι, ἔνθα κεν ἔργα ἀεικέα ἐργάζοιο, ἀθλεύων πρὸ ἄνακτος ἀμειλίχου). That said, since Xen. does not explicitly recall this motif and in Homer it is Andromache's love for Hector rather than slavery that is the reason why she wants to die (Il. 6.410-3), I would again dismiss the presence of this model (LI 4.4 for a further critique of this intertext).

Conversely, it seems to me that Greek tragedy might be a more promising model, since it often expresses the τόπος of death as a remedy for slavery, and I would argue that Xen. might have here in his mind the *Trojan Women*. Although there is a possible intertextual hint (see 1.15.5 n,: καὶ γὰρ

σφόδρα), it seems to me that the nature of this connection is essentially focused on imitation of motifs and dramatic scenes. As a result, Xen. might have been simply inspired by the plot of this tragedy: his knowledge of this text was not necessarily very detailed.

To begin with, the tragedy evidently focuses on slavery, since shortly after the beginning Hecuba describes her new status as a slave (140-2: δούλα δ᾽ἄγομαι γραῦς ἐξ οἴκων πενθήρη κρᾶτ᾽ἐκπορθηθεῖσ᾽οἰκτρῶς) and the chorus extends it to all the Trojan women (156-8: φόβος ἀίσσει Τρωιάσιν, αἳ τῶνδ᾽οἴκων εἴσω δουλείαν αἰάζουσαν;). Finally, Hecuba expresses also her desire to die, when she wishes πεσοῦσ᾽ ἀποφθαρῶ δακρύοις καταξανθεῖσα (508-9). Along with these motifs, which are attested also in other tragedies (e.g. Soph. *Ph.* 995-6, Eur. *Andr.* 12-15, 25 and *Hec.* 420, 491-9), there are elements which refer directly to this tragedy: the end of Euripides' play is characterised by the dialogue between Hecuba and the chorus of Trojan women, which are going to leave Troy as slaves (1279-80: πιμπρᾶσί σ᾽, ἡμᾶς δ᾽ἐξάγουσ᾽ἤδη χθονὸς δούλας). During this dramatic scene, Hecuba transforms her desire to die, which will remain unfulfilled, into the wish to join the flames which are burning Troy: φέρ᾽ ἐς πυρὰν δράμωμεν· ὡς κάλλιστά μοι σὺν τῇδε πατρίδι κατθανεῖν πυρουμένη (1282-3). Since Xen. introduces a dramatic dialogue between the servants and the protagonists and the former are going to die in the fire, our author might here be thinking of this tragic representation of Troy[381]. The discovery of this possible link would offer a deeper interpretation of this passage: the protagonists' separation from the ship could be compared with Hecuba and Andromache's departure from Troy and this parallel would work well, since the ship, being Ephesian, is the last visible sign of their homeland. As a result, the fire would symbolise the final detachment of Anthia and Habrocomes from their homeland.

That being said, this hypothesis might appear implausible, because it contrasts with Corymbus' identification with Hector. However, the coherence and consistency of the literary framework is not a writer's duty: Xen. is evidently not interested in making Corymbus Hector for the whole episode.

1.14.3: τίς ὑμᾶς ὑποδέξεται γή: the same question will be raised by Anthia when she is carried by merchants to Alexandria (3.8.6-7 and esp. 7: τίς με ἄρα ὑποδέξεται γῆ). In that passage, her monologue is a clear expansion of these interrogatives: along with this repetition, there is also a similar question (τίνας δὲ ἀνθρώπους ὄψομαι;) and in her introductory exclamation Anthia refers to the present passage with: πάλιν [...] λῃσταὶ καὶ θάλασσα (3.8.6).

The existence of this parallel leads me to three conclusions: first, were are dealing with further proof that Xen. likes writing new parts of the novel starting from previous ones. Here, unlike the usual pattern, the passage in the first book is shorter than the following one. Second, in her monologue Anthia makes the comment: ἀλλὰ νῦν δυστυχέστερον, ὅτι μὴ μετὰ Ἀβροκόμου (3.8.6): this confirms that in the present passage the main focus of Xen.'s narration is the protagonists' desire to preserve their love and not their closeness to the servants. Finally, Anthia's transformation

---

[381] This image is only once alluded to in the *Iliad*, where the image of the burning fire is used as a simile for the Trojan desperation over the devastation of Hector's body: τῷ δὲ μάλιστ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἔην ἐναλίγκιον. ὡς εἰ ἅπασα Ἴλιος ὀφρυόεσσα πυρὶ σμύχοιτο κατ᾽ ἄκρης (Il. 22.410-11). For the connection between *Iliad* and Euripides' *Trojan Women*, see Poole 1976, 278, who argues how the Iliadic image of fire 'marches straight into Euripides' play'.

of πόλιν into ἀνθρώπους and her following mention of names and regions might work as a confirmation that Xen.'s uncivilised society is different from the Greek one. More interestingly, the importance of this passage is that Anthia would demonstrate the acquisition of this awareness, confirming her progressive *Bildung*.

1.14.3: πειραθῆναι δεσμῶν: the verb πειράομαι is often used in the Eph. and it is either accompanied by a verb (see 1.4.6, 2.5.7, where the form is exceptionally active, 2.11.1, 4.5.5, 5.4.5, 5.7.7) or by a genitive related to a specific thing. In the former case πειράομαι has the meaning of 'to try', in the latter 'to have experience of' (LSJ). Interestingly, in this second case the verb appears always focalised on different characters who refer to particular events that happened in their life. The first three occurrences occur in direct speeches. First, the present passage is echoed by Anthia in her lament after the erotic proposal, when she states: ταχέως τῆς δουλείας πειρώμεθα (2.1.5). Then, Manto in her threat to Rhode says: ἴσθι δὲ ὀργῆς πειρασομένη βαρβάρου (2.3.5). Finally, in her desperate monologue after the dream Anthia exclaims: ἐγὼ μὲν καὶ πόνους ὑπομένω πάντας καὶ ποικίλων πειρῶμαι δυστυχὴς συμφορῶν καὶ τέχνας σωφροσύνης ὑπὲρ γυναῖκας εὑρίσκω, Ἁβροκόμη (5.8.7). On the other hand, when the narrator tells about Leucon and Rhode's decision to go back to Ephesus, the reason is: ἱκανῶς δὲ τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἀποδημίαν συμφορᾶς πεπειραμένων (5.5.3).

Overall, the last two occurrences seem the most significant: since they are a synthesis of Anthia's and the servants' misadventures, I would conclude that πειράομαι συμφορῶν is used by Xen. as a marker of the journey which concerns all his main characters, like ὁδὸν δυστυχῆ μὲν ἀλλ'ἀναγκαίαν (see 1.10.10). In addition, since in the present and in the other occurrences this verb is accompanied by concrete examples of συμφοραί, πειράομαι seems to retain its special value here. That being said, one might also argue that πειράομαι recalls the Odyssean motif of the πεῖρα: in the poem the result of Odysseus' relationship with people and obstacles during his journey is presented as a personal experience of them. As part of this pattern, the hero has to test Penelope and Laertes in Ithaca (see Barnouw 2004, 259: 'Odysseus must regain his full identity through mutual recognition involving tests posed by signs or posed to elicit signs'). Although this connection appears promising, I would argue that the *Ephesiaca* holds no more than a pale echo of this. The reason for this scepticism is textual: when Homer, like Xen., uses πειράομαι with a genitive related to a specific thing, he describes Odysseus' involvement in the Phaeacian games (see, respectively, *Od.* 8.100: νῦν δὲ ἐξέλθωμεν καὶ ἀέθλων πειρηθέωμεν and 120, 126, 205, 377, and *Od.* 8.184 and 145.9). As a result, Xen. is not really imitating the Homeric use of this verb.

Conversely, it seems more clear that, from a rhetorical point of view, the choice of using πειράομαι in the form πειραθῆναι might be a subtle pun on the name πειρατής. This creates a sort of chiasmus with the rest of the sentence, where πειραθῆναι would correspond to ληστρικὴν, while δεσμῶν to δουλείαν: Xen.'s style seems to have here a hint of sophistication. Also Longus plays similarly with the same kind of words, when at the end of the first book he writes how Daphnis ἀγνοῶν τὸ Ἔρωτος ληστήριον (1.32.4). In this case, the erotic dimension is more explicitly stated than in Xen.

1.14.3: δεσμῶν: this mention of chains is part of the proleptic apparatus of the oracle: it recalls the fifth verse of Apollo's response and, at the same time, it foretells the δεσμά of 2.6.4, which are the tortures suffered by Habrocomes in Tyre. At the same time, it is questionable whether the protagonists are personally aware of this word of the oracle: since no other pieces of evidence are available, it is more likely that δεσμά is simply part of a generic description of slavery.

1.14.4-5: ὁ τροφεύς τοῦ Ἀβροκόμου [...] ἀπέθανε: the old tutor was a figure typical of Greek society, in which 'pedagogues were first entrusted with children's upbringing within the family when the children left the arms of their nurses' (Cribiore 2001, 47). Overall, 'their authority [...] was an extension of that of parents' (ibid.).
Some Greek texts, including this one, prove this social value: to begin with, in Parthenius' Erotica Pathemata ὁ τροφεὺς [...] πρεσβύτης helps Pallene to recognize her love. Then, in Apuleius' Metamorphosis, during the story of the stepmother, the young man, shocked by the revelation of her love, 'ad quendam compertae gravitatis educatorem senem protinus refert' (10.4). In both cases, the old tutor is an authority for young people and, since nothing more is said about them, as Zimmerman 2000, 99 argues for Apuleius, their introduction 'has been made solely for the sake of characterizing the young man'. In my opinion, the same pattern occurs in the Eph.: the only important difference lies in it being a different stage of life: Habrocomes is older and the disappearance of his old tutor marks the beginning of his adulthood (on this, see Alaux and Létoublon 2001, 80: 'la mort touchante, pathétique, du vieux serviteur manifeste par son caractère naïf et presque élémentaire que le rôle d'accompagnement de l'enfant mâle par le vieil homme se termine au seuil de l'âge adulte'). A confirmation of this is given by Pisias in Plutarch's *Amatorius*, when he expresses the immaturity of a young character by defining him as ἔτι παιδαγωγεῖσθαι δεόμενον (752f). Shortly afterwards, Plutarch himself reads the presence of a tutor for a young man as a sign of a lack of independence: εἰ δ᾽ ἄρχει βρέφους μὲν ἡ τίτθη καὶ παιδὸς ὁ διδάσκαλος ἐφήβου δὲ γυμνασίαρχος ἐραστὴς δὲ μειρακίου γενομένου δ᾽ ἐν ἡλικίᾳ νόμος καὶ στρατηγὸς οὐδεὶς δ᾽ ἄναρκτος οὐδ᾽ αὐτοτελής [...] (754d).
Overall, this interpretation is confirmed by the parallel that Xen. establishes between the tutor and the protagonists' parents: when in the fifth book the latter die, this clearly makes the protagonists the new adults of the novel, as proven by their final actions in the Eph. The extension of the same kind of the interpretation to the present passage, although at a earlier stage, is suggested by the parallel construction of the two scenes. First, both the tutor and the parents commit suicide 'for reasons of personal despair at the perceived loss of their charges' and the proof of this is that 'in the context of each episode the narrator stresses the social role of the victims' and 'emphasises the old age of the victim' (MacAlister 1996, 61). This element is particularly marked in this passage, where there are two occurrences of πρεσβύτης (1.14.4.6), one of τὸν γέροντα (1.14.4) and the adverbial expression διὰ τὸ γῆρας (1.14.4). A second connection between these deaths lies in the fact that these suicides are the only ones of the novel attributed to characters close to the protagonists: therefore, their similarity cannot be the casual repetition of a τόπος. Finally, also the text might support this link through the difference in length between the mention of the first and that of the

second: the parents' suicide, in fact, is described in 5.6.3 in only two sentences and in 5.15.3 in just one. In my opinion, rather than using these passages as a proof of an epitome, as Borgogno 2005, 494, n. 203 does, this reduction might suggest that in the fifth book Xen. is reminding his readers of the scene already introduced in the first book.

As a result, the death of the old tutor fits well into the construction of the novel, in which the departure from Ephesus means for the protagonists the detachment from their origin (see also 1.14.3 on this). This interest in social dynamics is confirmed by the contrast with Char., in which Chaereas' father, unlike Habrocomes' one, despite his old age is able to greet his son in Syracuse at the end of the novel (see 8.6.10)[382].

Finally, the analysis of the intertextuality between this present passage and *Callirhoe* suggests also something more (see departure scene). Since Xen is displacing Char's scene of departure, it is more likely that the former was reading the latter. In my opinion, this change confirms Xen's variation in the classical model of the journey: while Chaereas' hardship starts with his departure from Syracuse, since he must immediately face perils in Miletus, Xen. has delayed this process. For this reason, the same emotional character of this chapter would not have been appropriate in Ephesus, where the protagonists' farewell is not really tragic. In addition, Char.'s scene, being an explicit rewriting of Priam's and Hecuba's farewell to Hector (*Il.* 22.33-91), makes the Homeric colour of this passage more credible. As a result, the tutor's request to be buried, which is a very common topic, might preserve here its original epic connotation.

Finally, Alaux and Létoublon 2001, 82 also offer a purely literary interpretation of the novelistic figure of the old tutor: in their view his presence would be part of the novelistic type of the 'précepteur', which in Longus is 'noué à l'intrigue majeure du roman' (83), while in Hld. has three incarnations in the figures of Charicles, Calasiris and Sisimithres.

The discussion made by these scholars leads to this main point: although in Greek literature the foster mother has her most significant models in the Odyssean Eurycleia, in the old woman Kilissa in the Euripidean *Coephores* and in Phaedra's nurse in the *Hippolytus*, it is interesting that such a woman 'semble avoir disparu totalement dans le roman' (73). A partial exception to this might be considered Heliodorus' Cybele (see Hld. 7 and 8.5-8), who is evidently constructed to resemble Phaedra's nurse (74-78). However, in this revisitation we are dealing with a 'créature servile', whose role 'consiste à favoriser, part tous les moyens, ses amours illicites' (Alan and Létoublon 2001, 77). As a result, the positive role of these women is missing and is replaced by men: for this reason, Alaux and Létoublon conclude that this type 'a [...] subi une métamorphose et changé de sexe' (ibid., 78).

That being said, this transformation of gender is not completely innovative, because it already concerns tragic characters (see ibid., 78, when they refer to 'la médiation de la tragédie'): in fact, in Sophocles' Electra there is a παιδαγωγός who, at the beginning of the tragedy, encourages Orestes to act (15-28), while in the Euripidean Electra Agamemnon's tutor, introduced as πρεσβύς in 487

---

[382] A possible limitation to this might be that in Iamblichus the father of the hero Sinonis hangs himself in his belief that his son is dead (see 77a), but we are not certain that Xen. read the *Babyloniaca* and Iamblichus does not seem exploit the same connection between death of the father and maturity of the son.

(see also 555 for his link with Agamemnon), plays a very important role. First, he recognizes Orestes' scar and makes Electra meet again her brother (569-574). Then he invites the former to act for the recovery of Agamemnon's house (see 605-611) and helps him to plan the murder of Aegistus and Clitemnestra.

Although this analysis is quite accurate, in my opinion Alaux ad Létoublon 2001 do not emphasise enough the Homeric figure of Phoenix, who is Achilles' pedagogue and proves that the *Iliad* includes already a male tutor (they only allude to him very briefly: see ibid., 82). In addition, Phoenix seems to be the possible model of Xen.'s character: when during the embassy Phoenix thinks of Achilles' possible departure, he asks him: πῶς ἂν ἔπειτ'ἀπὸ σεῖο, φίλον τέκος, αὖθι λιποίμην οἶος; (*Od.* 9.437-8). This question is not really different from the first of Xen.'s old tutor. In addition, Phoenix clearly behaves as a "father" to Achilles (*Il.* 9.494-5: ἀλλὰ σὲ παῖδα, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ'Ἀχιλλεῦ, ποιεύμην). That being said, this parallel would not include the protagonists, since Achilles wants to leave Troy while Habrocomes is forced to leave Ephesus.

Overall, the hypothesis of this model also serves the purpose of confirming our "social" interpretation of the tutor.

1.14.5: τί με καταλείπεις, τέκνον [...];: following Fowler's (1987) study Xen. is here introducing a simple example of the 'desperation speech', which is well attested in the Greek literature, from Homer onwards and has a particular recurrence in Greek tragedy. According to this common pattern, some questions are asked in a situation of 'extreme crisis' (6) and the lack of answer makes 'the speaker lapse into a state of miserable helplessness, usually evident from an expressed wish for a speedy death; or, if he or she is of a more heroic bent, a decision follows that something truly dramatic is in order, suicide or murder being the commonest choices' (ibid.). In the Eph. a similar case is constituted by Anthia's monologue after her dream in the fifth book, where this accordance with the pattern of the 'desperation speech' is increased by the exploitation of a very common question and answer, such as τί οὖν ἔτι ζῶ; and κάλλιον οὖν ἀπολέσθαι (5.8.8). On the former Fowler 1987, 9 states: 'this question, or an equivalent of it, is typical in desperation speeches' and two close parallels come from the Euripidean *Helen*, where the same interrogative serves the purpose 'of jaring the audience' (Fowler 1987, 9; on the possible connection between the Helen and the Eph., <u>APP</u> 4.3): the same emotional feature seems to be exploited by Xen.

As a result, our author seems to be aware of a tragic style and this strengthens the emotionality of the present passage.

1.14.5: παραδοὺς ἑαυτὸν τοῖς κύμασιν ἀπέθανε: in Greek mythology sea-suicides are common, although hanging, casting down from a rock and self-killing are more attested. I here give just a few examples: Aegeus, king of Athens, threw himself into the sea, probably believing in Theseus' death (see Hyg. *Fab*. 43; Apollod. *Ep*. 1.11; Dio. 4.61.6) and the same was done by Aesacus, son of Priamus (see Apollod. 3.12.5; Ov. *Met*. 750ff.) and by Alcyone, who was then transformed into a halcyon or a kingfisher (see Apd.1.7.3-4; Hyg.Fab.65). This motif also has an erotic exploitation, as Theocritus shows in his third *Idyll* through the voice of the young goatherd (25: τὰν βαίταν

ἀποδὺς ἐς κύματα τηνῶ ἀλεῦμαι).

Although Xen. has already ascribed this motif to the crew of the ship (1.13.5, n: οἱ μὲν ἐρρίπτουν), this version is more dramatic. If this mythological background suggests that Xen. is using a general τόπος and no connection with the erotic tradition is here suggested, the literary context of this passage and the presence of the boat might also recall another epic motif: it is Odysseus himself who, after his companions open Eolus' goatskin bottle, thinks of this option: ἠὲ πεσὼν ἐκ νηὸς ἀποφθίμην ἐνὶ πόντῳ (Od. 10.51) and then he decides to save his life. That being said, however, Xen. is not exploiting further this parallel with Odysseus: he is simply imitating the method of suicide.

1.14.5: ἀποκτεινόν: the use of this imperative, which is followed by θάψον, gives to this speech the nature of a tragic prayer and makes it comparable with the other "prayers" of the novel, starting with that of Habrocomes to Eros (1.4.4-5, n.: H.'s prayer and NA 3.3).

The originality of this passage lies in the old tutor's request to Habrocomes to kill him. The same entreaty is made by Anthia to Clytus when they are going to Taras (5.5.6: ἀποκτεινόν με αὐτός). In both cases we might interpret this initiative as a method alternative to suicide, which is supported by 'the evidence that the Greeks have a particular horror of suicide directly caused by one's own hand (αὐτόχειρ)'. In addition, the particular context of these characters makes this solution plausible, as both the old tutor and Anthia are on a ship where hanging or killing with a weapon could be very difficult.

The introduction of this request is a clear exploitation of a tragic model, since in Homer this motif does not appear. In Greek tragedies, in fact, Heracles asks an indeterminate person to kill him (see Soph. Trach. 1015-7: οὐδ' ἀπαράξαι κρᾶτα βίου θέλει μολὼν τοῦ στυγεροῦ; φεῦ φεῦ), Oedipus the Tyrannus makes the same request to the chorus (1410-2: καλύψατ', ἢ φονεύσατ', ἢ θαλάσσιον ἐκρίψατ', ἔνθα μήποτ'εἰσόψεσθ'ἔτι), Antigone to Creon (497-9: θέλεις τι μεῖζον ἢ κατακτεῖναί μ'ἑλών; [...] τί δῆτα μέλλεις) and Electra to the angry people who live in the house (820-1: πρὸς ταῦτα καινέτω τις, εἰ βαρύνεται, τῶν ἔνδον ὄντων).

In the present passage, however, the fact that the "killer" is close to the petitioner makes the scene more dramatic and recalls even more tragic parallels, like Philoctetes, who makes his request to Neoptolemus (see Soph. *Ph.* 747-750: πρὸς θεῶν, πρόχειρον εἴ τί σοι, τέκνον, πάρα ξίφος χεροῖν, πάταξον εἰς ἄκρον πόδα·ἀπάμησον ὡς τάχιστα· μὴ φείσῃ βίου and 799-801: ὦ τέκνον, ὦ γενναῖον, ἀλλὰ συλλαβὼν τῷ Λημνίῳ τῷδ' ἀνακαλουμένῳ πυρὶ ἔμπρησον, ὦ γενναῖε), Electra to Orestes (see Eur. *El.* 1037: σύ νύν μ', ἀδελφέ, μή τις Ἀργείων κτάνῃ) and Andromache to Molossus (see Eur. *Andr.* 411-2: ἰδού, προλείπω βωμὸν ἥδε χειρία σφάζειν φονεύειν δεῖν ἀπαρτῆσαι δέρην). Finally, the singularity of Xen.'s scene is also proved by the comparison with the other novelists, where only Longus introduces a parallel in Chloe's invocation to Daphnis (2.39.4: ἀπόκτεινον ὥσπερ λύκον), while the other two requests are made to "enemies", namely the Egyptian soldier for Callirhoe (7.6.7: φόνευσόν) and Arsace for Charicleia (8.8.5: ἀπόσφαττε μὴ μελλήσασα).

Overall, this framework, confirms that the old tutor's wish, along with that of Chloe, is a general reference to a tragic motif, which fits well Xen's interest in theatricality.

1.14.5: τί γάρ ἐστί μοι ζῆν ἄνευ σοῦ: this question, which has a clear tragic connotation, is a key element of Xen's suicides. See LI 4.3.

1.14.6: τοῦτο δὲ [...] ἐλεεινότατον· [...] τὰς χεῖρας ἐξέτεινε: these two expressions, which recall those two used by Xen. in relation to the death of the protagonists' crew (1.14.2), confirm that the old tutor's scene is constructed as an emphatic expansion of that one. In this case, the abundance of repetitions gives evidence of Xen's lack of sophistication.

At the same time, the reaction of Habrocomes to his tutor's request appears to be a deviation from Char.: while in *Callirhoe* Chaereas tries to commit suicide in response to his parents' request (3.6.6), Habrocomes has a milder reaction. In addition, in Char.'s case this action gives his Chaereas an anti-epic quality, because Hector's parallel reaction has no second thought (*Il.* 22.96: Ἕκτωρ ἄσβεστον ἔχων μένος οὐχ ὑπεχώρει and Belfiore 2000, 106: 'In epic, suicide is clearly antiheroic'). That said, it is difficult to establish whether Habrocomes' behaviour should be interpreted as a suggestion of a spiritual growth or as evidence of a lack of courage. In my opinion, since Habrocomes' personality has not taken yet the final step towards maturity, the second interpretation is more adequate.

1.14.6: ὑπηρέτης: this word, which generally means 'servant', is used in tragedy and in Attic 'to express all kinds of subordinate relationship' (LSJ): thus, there is no doubt that Corymbus and Euxinus are servants of Apsyrtus and their future presentation as masters is tricky (1.16.4-5, n.: εὐδαιμοσύνην). At the same time, it is interesting that Apsyrtus appears here for the first time in the novel with the indication of his institutional role. Also in the second book 'l'auteur nous le présente comme un homme d'affaires uniquement préoccupé de son profit' (Cheyns 2005, 269), who, unlike the other rivals, does not fall in love with Anthia. As in the second book this figure is set in Scheria (see APP 1.1), the comparison with Alcinous appears to be a plausible explanation of this exception.

1.14.6: μέρει τῶν λαμβανομένων: given the epic presentation of the pirates, this expression might recall the Homeric concept of μοῖρα, which is the 'portion' or 'share' which falls to one in the distribution of booty (see, e.g., Achilles' lament in Il. 9.318 that ἴση μοῖρα μένοντι, καὶ εἰ μάλα τις πολεμίζοι). Although this hypothesis is speculative, it might be supported by the fact that μέρος is not a common word in the Ephesiaca: it designates in the singular only a part of the canopy (1.8.3) and a part of Polyidus' army (5.4.2).

1.14.6-1-16.7: in Hägg's (1971, 54) view, the pirates' erotic proposal is 'the first type of day-night phase, in which 'nearly half of the narrative time is taken up by the direct speech' (cf. also 2.7.4-2.8.2). Unlike Corymbus' attack, the chronological construction of this scene is more fluid, because it lacks flashbacks. This simplicity helps the readers to focus on the erotic topic and on the dialogues of the episode.

1.14.6-15.1: ἐν δὲ τῷ τοῦ πλοὸς διαστήματι ἐκ πολλῆς τῆς καθ'ἡμέραν ὄψεως [...] ἐν μὲν τῷ πλῷ: as in Corymbus' attack, Xen. introduces an analepsis, which describes the birth of Corymbus' love. In my opinion, the decision to use an unusual device like this for falling in love might be a way in which Xen. emphasises this topic.

1.14.7: ἐν δὲ τῷ τοῦ πλοὸς διαστήματι: the same formula, though in the plural, occurs in the Greek literature only in Strabo, when, discussing the *realia* of the Odyssey, he includes διαστήματα πλοῦ in Odysseus' adventures (1.2.11). In my opinion, this discovery opens the possibility of a connection between Xen. and travel literature, although more evidence would would be needed for this to be proven.

1.14.7: ἐρᾷ ὁ Κορύμβος τοῦ Ἀβροκόμου σφοδρὸν ἔρωτα: this is the first appearance in the novel of the formula σφοδρός ἔρως, which is part of the list of motifs shared by the protagonists' and the rivals' love (LI 3.1). Having said that, it is significant that Xen. introduces this expression three times in relation to Corymbus' and Euxinus' love (cf. also 1.15.4: ἤρα τῆς κόρης σφοδρὸν ἔρωτα, in which Euxinus is the lover, and 1.16.4: ἐρᾷ γάρ σου σφοδρὸν ἔρωτα καὶ πάντων ἕτοιμός ἐστι, in which Corymbus is the lover). This repetition might indicate that Xen. is offering a special interpretation of their passions: for this reason, I will begin the commentary of the following chapter with a detailed analysis of the pirates' love.

CHAPTER 15

Pirates' erotic strategy and erotic persuasion

After the attack on the ship, which is the 'military' section of the pirates' story, Xen. introduces the first erotic trial for the protagonists. This new event is divided into different parts, through which the pirates try to pursue their aim:

- 1.14.7-1.15.1: flashback on the birth of love: Corymbus' passivity;
- 1.15.2-1.15.6: Tyrus: the transformation of Corymbus' passivity into active behaviour;
- 1.16.1-1.16.2-1.16.7: direct and mutual proposal of love to the protagonists.

In the introduction to the rivals' love and to this episode I have already shown the special role played in the Eph. by brigands and pirates as part of Xen.'s uncivilised society (LI 3). Now I will reflect on how Corymbus and Euxinus deal with their erotic passion.

In the Eph. erotic lovers differ from the protagonists because of their active role (LI 3.2a). Although this behaviour leads some rivals later in the novel to violence and attempts at raping the protagonists, this does not happen in this episode: this proves the existence of a progression in the journey. Thus, Corymbus' behaviour is active but not violent: first, he develops a detailed strategy, in which he shows his awareness of several erotic motifs:

- 1.15.1: renounces the use of violence;
- 1.15.2: recognises the impossibility of resisting love, which leads to an active role;
- 1.15.2: first stage: care and encouragement of the beloved;
- 1.15.3: second stage: confession to a friend.

Second, the verb πείθω, 'to persuade', appears to be Corymbus' main worry, since it occurs repeatedly and in every different part of the text. Its first use is in 1.15.1, when Corymbus is sceptical about the possibility of conquering Habrocomes (οὔτε πεῖσαι δυνατὸν ἐδόκει εἶναι·). Then, the content of the dialogue with Euxinus coincides with Corymbus' question about τίνι τρόπῳ δυνήσεται πεῖσαι τὸ μειράκιον (1.15.3) and the narrator remarks how the former's answer persuades the latter (see 1.15.6: ῥαδίως ἔπειθεν αὐτὸν ἐρῶντα). Then, their common decision to address the protagonists is expressed with the following sentence: καὶ δὲ συντίθενται κατὰ ταῦτα [...] πείθειν οὗτος μὲν Ἁβροκόμην, Κόρυμβος δὲ Ἀνθίαν (1.15.6). Finally, after their effective dialogue with them, the narrator again comments: ἤλπιζον δὲ αὐτοὺς ῥαδίως πείσειν (1.16.7). As a result, it is evident that Xen. emphasises the importance of πείθω in this passage and a further hint at this is that it does not occur earlier in the novel. As I have already shown, from this point on this verb will constantly appears in relationship with the rivals' love and its last occurrence is in the Rhodian night, when Anthia exclaims: ἔπεισε δέ με ἁμαρτεῖν οὐδεῖς (5.14.2). Since her last speech is a summary of the novel, this appearance of πείθω here confirms its belonging to the lexicon typical of rivals. The last step of this erotic strategy lies in the simultaneous erotic proposal made by the two pirates: 1.16.2, n.: λέγει.

1.15.2: ἐθεράπευε τὸν Ἀβροκόμην: while the phrases θαρρεῖν παρεκάλει and πᾶσαν ἐπιμέλειαν προσέφερεν are used in the Eph. without a consistent erotic connotation, the verb θεραπεύω seems to bear it here and in the other appearances in the novel.

A positive proof of this special meaning is given in its only occurrence before this passage, which is part of the Ephesian canopy, where some Ἔρωτες Ἀφροδίτην θεραπεύοντες (1.8.2-3, n: the only ekphrasis, 2.1a3). Since this description offers one of the two images of love of the novel, the erotic value of θεραπεύω might be extended to the present passage where there is an ambiguity. In addition, in the following occurrence the same connotation is clearly introduced, since it is part of Perilaus' erotic strategy (2.13.6). Finally, the same evidence does not concern the behaviour of the Egyptian brigands who kidnap Anthia from her grave (3.8.5), nor that of the merchants in Alexandria who sell the heroine to Psammis (3.11.1). However, since, shortly after her abduction, Anthia exclaims: πάλιν […] λῃσταὶ καὶ θάλασσα, πάλιν αἰχμάλωτος ἐγώ (3.8.6), this comment establishes a link between that episode and Corymbus' one and, thus, the brigands' care can be interpreted from an erotic perspective too. If we accept this hypothesis, it becomes possible to extend it to the last occurrence: θεραπεύω seems to belong to Xen's erotic vocabulary.

1.15.3: ἀνακοινοῦται ὁ Κόρυμβος τὸν ἔρωτα [...] Εὐξείνῳ: in LI 3.2 I have shown that the motif "confession to a friend" marks a difference between the rivals' love and that of the protagonists. This difference seems to be also verbally signaled: ἀνακοινοῦμαι, in fact, might be related to Anthia's desperate question: τίνι πάντα κοινώσομαι (1.4.7). Κοινοῦμαι in fact has no other occurrences in the novel and ἀνακοινοῦμαι has only one after Corymbus' episode, where Rhode communicates her passion to Leucon (3.3.6).

1.15.4: μὴ ἐπὶ πλέον ἐπανιᾶσθαι, ἀλλὰ ἔργου ἔχεσθαι: in a Homeric context, this invitation to act see,s as a possible evocation of that received by Achilles in the *Iliad*, when the hero is repeatedly asked to forget his anger against Agamemnon and go to fight against the Trojans (for an occurrence of this theme, see Odysseus' invitation during the embassy in *Il.* 9.259-260: ἀλλ᾽ ἔτι καὶ νῦν παύε᾽, ἔα δὲ χόλον θυμαλγέα). In addition, Xen. might also be echoing the motif typical of the tragedies of revenge, where the time for action comes. A first example comes from Sophocles' *Electra*, where the pedagogue tells Orestes and Pylades: νῦν καιρὸς ἔρδειν (1368), while a second from Euripides' *Electra*, where the same young heroine, after the recognition of her brother, invites him to take his revenge: σὸν ἔργον ἤδη (668).

If the fame of this motif allows us to conclude that Xen. might have it in mind as both an epic and tragic theme, I would argue that his debt to the *Iliad* is larger. To begin with, while in the present passage a true revenge like those of the tragedies does not occur (for another revenge in the novel where the model of Electra seems to be echoed, APP 4.1), the connection with Achilles is suggested soon afterwards by Euxinus' mention of the deserved gift (1.15.5, n.: καὶ γάρ).

In addition, I would speculate that other times in the novel the verb ἐπανιάομαι is related to Achilles.

This speculative hypothesis starts from a philological issue. The manuscript reading, which is confirmed by O'Sullivan, has here ἐπανιᾶσθαι. This is a quite an unusual compound verb, whose first occurrence in Greek literature is found in the Eph. and which means, according to LSJ, 'to be annoyed at'. Conversely, Dalmeyda 1926 introduces ἔτι ἀνιᾶσθαι and in my opinion this correction should be accepted. To begin with, the resulting combination πλέον ἔτι is common in Classical Greece: since Homer, in fact, ἔτι 'often strengthens a comparative' and the same formula occurs in Herodotus (e.g. 5.51: οὐδέ οἱ ἐξεγένετο ἐπὶ πλέον ἔτι σημῆναι περὶ τῆς ἀνόδου τῆς παρὰ βασιλέα) and in Thucydides (e.g. 2.65.6-7: καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἀπέθανεν, ἐπὶ πλέον ἔτι ἐγνώσθη ἡ πρόνοια αὐτοῦ ἡ ἐς τὸν πόλεμον). Second, ἀνιάω, which in the medial form means 'to be grieved, distressed' (LSJ), is a more common word in the Greek literature, used since Homer and exploited by the other novelists (Ach. 2.10.4, Hld. 1.17.5, 3.15.3, 8.12.1 and 10.9.5). Its main meaning is 'being aggrieved or distress' (Cummings 2009, 45). Xen. himself employs it three times in his text: in the first two ἀνιάομαι describes Hippothous' sorrow: in 3.10.5 this reaction is shared with other brigands (ὁ περὶ τὸν Ἱππόθοον ἠνιῶντο μὲν ἐπὶ τῷ ἀπαλλαχθῆναι τοῦ Ἀβροκόμου), while in 4.6.3 is personal and concerns Anchialus' death (ὁ Ἱππόθοος ἠνιᾶτο μὲν ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀγχιάλῳ). The last occurrence is unrelated to these two, as it expresses the brothel-keeper's sorrow over Anthia's ghost story (5.7.9: ἀκούσας ὁ πορνοβοσκὸς ἠνιᾶτο μέν). In my opinion, this framework makes the appearance of this verb in the present passage of the first book possible.

That being said, it is interesting that the first two occurrences of ἀνιάω concern Hippothous' reaction to the "loss" of dear people: in my opinion, the memory of the Homeric friendship of Achilles and Patroclus might be here recalled, because Anchialus' episode appears a plausible echo of Patroclus' death. These are the elements that suggest this link:

a) Anchialus has an epic name (cf. the Achean Anchialus killed by Hector in *Il.* 5.609).

b) Hippothous' esteem for him is underlined at the beginning of the episode: ἐτιμᾶτο δὲ παρὰ τῷ Ἱπποθόῳ νεανικός τε καὶ μεγάλα ἐν τῷ λῃστηρίῳ δυνάμενος (4.5.1). This sentence contains two interesting words, τιμάω and νεανικός, which have their only occurrence in the Eph. and both bear an epic connotation: the former recalls the τιμή and the latter the vigour of the heroes. Similarly, in the *Iliad* Achilles clearly expresses his preference for Patroclus (*Il.* 18.80-2: φίλος ὤλεθ'ἑταῖρος, Πάτροκλος, τὸν ἐγὼ περὶ πάντων τῖον ἑταίρων, ἶσον ἐμῇ κεφαλῇ).

c) Anchialus' death is an unexpected murder which is caused by a Homeric weapon (see ξίφος in 4.5.5) and by Anthia's extreme ability (4.5.5: ἡ δὲ ὑπενεγκοῦσα τὸ ξίφος κατὰ τῶν στέρνων ἔπληξε), which resembles an Iliadic "aristeia". Also Patroclus' death is due to a sudden attack made by Hector (*Il.* 16.818-822): although the latter uses a spear, he hurts a similar part of the body, the lowest flank (*Il.* 16.820-1: οὖτα δὲ δουρὶ νείατον ἐς κενεῶνα).

d) When Hippothous discovers what has happened, he sees Anthia close to the corpse of his friend (4.6.1: ἧκον οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἱππόθοον καὶ ὁρῶσι τὸν Ἀγχίαλον ἀνῃρημένον καὶ τὴν Ἀνθίαν παρὰ τῷ σώματι). The presence of the σῶμα recalls Patroclus' one: when Achilles is informed about his death, he is also told that his friend's corpse still lies on the ground while the Achaeans and the Trojans keep fighting each other (*Il.* 18.20-21: κεῖται Πάτροκλος, νέκυος δὲ δὴ ἀμφιμάχονται γυμνοῦ).

e) Hippothous decides to punish Anthia as severely as he can (4.6.3: ἐβουλεύετο δὲ κατὰ Ἀνθίας μείζονα κόλασιν); this might recalls Achilles' strong desire for revenge (*Il.* 18.114-5: νῦν δ'εἶμ', ὄφρα φίλης κεφαλῆς ὀλετῆρα κιχείω, Ἕκτορα).

As a result, in this episode of the fourth book I would accept the identification between Hippothous and Achilles, and Anchialus and Patroclus: this gives ἀνιάομαι a Homeric value. This discovery leads me to speculate that Xen. might have used this verb also in the previous occurrences from this Homeric perspective, given our author's great interest in intratextuality. Finally, if in the present passage Corymbus is Achilles, Euxinus might also be Patroclus. This would follow the *Iliad*, where Patroclus decides to go to persuade him (*Il.* 15.399-404, where at the end the hero says: ἀγαθὴ δὲ παραίφασίς ἐστιν ἑταίρου) and, then criticises his anger by saying: μὴ ἐμέ γ'οὖν οὗτός γε λάβοι χόλος (*Il.* 16.30-1).

Overall, this interpretation shows how Xen. introduces here an erotic reading of the *Iliad* (LI 6.5): after the subtle parallel established at the beginning between Achilles' anger and Eros (1.2.1, n.: μηνιᾷ), the former would be identified with Corymbus and depicted as a lover. This suggests that Achilles' anger must be read from an erotic perspective. At the same time, it is still not clear how deeply the relationship between Achilles and Eros must be explored. Xen. is challenging his readers with an open interpretation, which will be solved in the following chapter with the identification between Corymbus and Eros (1.16.2, n.: λέγει, b).

1.15.5: καὶ γὰρ σφόδρα [...] δωρεάν: in my opinion, Euxinus' speech explores the epic ideal of the γέρας. To begin with, the participles κινδυνεύοντας καὶ παραβαλλομένους and the relative clause ὧν ἐκτησάμεθα πόνῳ offer a heroic definition of his life and that of Corymbus. Then, the possibility of not having a gift is introduced with the nominal sentence: ἀγεννές. This adjective, whose importance is signalled by its status as the only occurrence in the novel, indicates the lack of nobility and this meaning is confirmed by the novelistic parallels: οὐκ ἀγεννές is Polycharmus' display of friendship during the departure scene (3.5.7) and Callirhoe's behaviour, when the heroine has not been recognised by Chaereas (7.6.12). Then, in the *Aethiopica*, it is Charicleia who, when put in chain by Arsace, ἀγεννές τι παθοῦσα γελῶσα ἐφαίνετο (8.8.4). Finally, Cnemon accuses Theagenes of embracing Thisbe, whom he has exchanged with Charicleia (2.7.2: ἐθρήνεις ἀγεννῶς). As a result, Euxinus emphasises here the nobility of his and his colleague's aspiration.

Finally, both terms ἐξαιρέτους and δωρεάν are used here only by Xen. among the novelists and, although they are attested in late authors, it might be relevant that ἐξαίρετος is a Homeric word, which occurs once in the Iliad in a passage which has the same context as ours: when Thersites describes Agamemnon's numerous women who are part of their loot, he says: πολλαὶ δὲ γυναῖκες εἰσὶν ἐνὶ κλισίῃς ἐξαίρετοι, ἅς τοι Ἀχαιοὶ πρωτίστῳ δίδομεν (Il. 2.226-228). In addition, λαμβάνω with ἐξαίρετος is used for the first time by Euripides and in three of the four passages where he does so, it refers to a woman who is a heroic gift. The first passage is from the *Iphigenia in Aulis*, where Menelaus speaks about the possibility of finding a bride elsewhere, since, if Agamemnon does not sacrifice Iphigenia, he will not have Helen. These are his questions: τί βούλομαι γάρ; οὐ γάμους ἐξαιρέτους ἄλλους λάβοιμ' ἄν, εἰ γάμων ἱμείρομαι; (485-6). The second and the third passages

come from the *Trojan Women*, where Talthibius tells Hecuba about Cassandra and Andromache's destiny (249: ἐξαίρετόν νιν ἔλαβεν Ἀγαμέμνων ἄναξ and 274: καὶ τήνδ᾽ Ἀχιλλέως ἔλαβε παῖς ἐξαίρετον). The final occurrence instead lacks the epic background and it comes from *Ion* 1182. Since a thematic connection between the Eph. and the *Trojan Women* has already emerged (1.14.3, n.: οἱ μὲν), it is not unthinkable that Xen. is here intertexting with this tragedy: this would definitely confirm the epic origin of the theme and it might also make Anthia Andromache. However, this connection is still to loose to be proven with certainty (for another possible parallel between the two heroines, <u>LI</u> 4.4). That said, it is clear that in the present context the epic and tragic models, whose closeness to the Eph. is difficult to establish, assume here an ironical trait, since the pirates are claiming to do something which is not ἀγεννές, even though they are naturally ἀγεννεῖς.

Finally, since the Iliadic character which claims the γέρας is Achilles (for this association, see Schmeling, 39, who comments how this motif 'is strangely similar to Agamemnon's seizure of Achilles' booty of a young woman in the Iliad'), the association of Corymbus with Achilles is confirmed. That being said, the Homeric framework remains still incomplete, since the link between Achilles and Eros has not yet been clarified.

CHAPTER 16

1.16.1: <Ὁ δὲ Ἁβροκόμης καὶ ἡ Ἀνθία> [...] ἔκειντο: since in this period there is certainly a subject missing, the decision to introduce the names of the protagonists fits well with Xen.'s attitude in this first part of the novel (1.2.7 n.: διαβοήτος). Particularly significant is the parallel with the beginning of the eleventh chapter, where ἔκειντο similarly occurs and has for the first time a unique metaphorical meaning (1.5.9 n.: ἔκειντο).

1.16.1: ἄθυμοι: see 1.5.5 n.: ἐν πολλῇ ἀθυμίᾳ.

1.16.1: πολλὰ προσδοκῶντες, [...] ὀμνύοντες: although this description of the protagonists feelings and actions is brief, it would be wrong to consider it poor: Xen. introduces it to suggest the importance and the nature of the episode that is going to happen. The most important sign of this is given by the first mention of the oath, while a subtler one might lie in the verb προσδοκάω, which is in the active form used before by Habrocomes in his reaction to the dream. Because of this connection, it is not unthinkable that Xen. here is suggesting to his readers that what will shortly happen is still related with dream. This would confirm the inclusion of love in the scene and, thus of the interpretation of the woman as an erotic Λύσσα (1.12.4, n.: dream).

1.16.2: λέγει οὖν ὁ Εὔξεινος: *Euxinus' speech of entreaty and the parallel with Corymbus' one*
The distinctive feature of Corymbus' and Euxinus' speeches of entreaty is the identification between love and slavery. Although this topic is common in the Eph., Euxinus' speech introduces it in a subtler way: in fact, he does not draw any absolute distinction between the establishment of slavery and that of love, while Corymbus', Manto's and the other rivals' proposals focus only on the second element. This original mark, which seems to betray a comic influence (see below), is introduced with a certain amount of rhetorical ability: for this reason, Doulamis considers this speech an example of 'Amatory Persuasion'. To begin with, its request is 'carefully constructed' (ibid.): this is first proved by the sequence of parts of which this speech is composed:
  - 1.16.3: 'introduction';
  - 1.16.4: 'request';
  - 1.16.4-5: 'statement of reasons for which request should be granted';
  - 1.16.5: 'conclusion', which coincides with the last three imperatives, making Euxinus' claim 'more emphatic' (Doulamis 2003, 51).
Second, from a rhetorical point of view, this speech appears to be a synthesis of all the most rhetorical devices thus far noticed in the novel. The most significant elements are the presence of four impersonal constructions (see εἰκὸς μὲν, δεῖ δὲ, ἔνεστι, δεῖ), of a dependent hypothetic clause at the beginning of the fourth section and of four nominative phrases (see the sentence which starts with βοηθὸς οὐδείς). Finally, along with present indicatives Corymbus adopts also two future tenses (πείσῃ, ἐργάσῃ) and three imperatives (ἴσθι, ἐννόησον, ἀπόρριψον). On the one hand, it is

interesting how the first two elements mostly characterise the 'introduction' and the 'request', while the other two relate to the 'statement of reasons' and 'the conclusion'. Thus, style supports the structure of the speech and suggests a shift from a more reflexive and relaxed tone to a more immediate one, which forces Corymbus to meet the invitation received. On the other hand, it is interesting that the abundance of nominative phrases also characterises Habrocomes' first monologue, while that of impersonal constructions and hypothetical periods distinguishes the protagonists' oath. Since both these speeches are certainly well written, Xen. here is doing his best to makes Euxinus' proposal the most sophisticated of his text. In this respect, it is also interesting how the pirate highlights his main concepts with rhetorical features, like the initial antithesis (ee 1.16.3: οἰκέτην μὲν ἐξ ἐλευθέρου γενόμενον, πένητα δὲ ἀντ'εὐδαίμονος, n.), the repetition of the main concepts (see ἐλευθερός / ἐλευθερία, εὐδαίμων / εὐδαιμοσύνη, ἐρῶ / ἔρως and δεσπότης), two *hyperbata* (cf. 1.16.4: πάντων ἕτοιμος ἐστι δεσπότην ποιεῖν τῶν ἑαυτοῦ and εὐνούστερον δὲ σεαυτῷ τὸν δεσπότην ἐργάσῃ) and the use of rhetorical questions in the third part.

Finally, it is interesting how love is not explored in the introduction, because Corymbus' passion is introduced only in the relative clause, which contains the formula ἐρᾷ [...] σφοδρὸν ἔρωτα (1.16.4). This allows Euxinus to explore epic-tragic and philosophical topics like loss of freedom and fatalism. The way in which the pirate does this is rhetorically sophisticated, since he introduces the verbs στέργειν and ἀγαπᾶν in chiasmus. Both have to do with human affection: while the former can be translated as 'to be content with', the latter means 'show affection' and 'does not normally involve sexual desire and passion' (Doulamis 2003, 51, n. 144). Thus, it is typically used in subordinate relationships, like that of a son or of a slave. As a result, στέργειν and ἀγαπᾶν introduce a crescendo which has its apex in ἐρᾷ, which introduces real love. Thus, this delay appears to be a deliberate rhetorical choice, which is also suggested by the initial position in the sentence of the last verb.

Second, Xen. is exploiting here the identification between submission to love and slavery: along with the general tone of the speech, in the last sentence βλέπειν refers more to the former and ὑπακούειν to the latter, but a clear distinction cannot be drawn (see the entire sentence in 1.16.5: δεῖ σε τὸν δεσπότην βλέπειν, τούτῳ κελεύσαντι ὑπακούειν).

Third, it is also evident that Euxinus is offering a partial view of reality, since he calls Corymbus δεσπότης (1.16.4) and he promises Habrocomes to give him the power over his goods and that of the other pirates (ibid.). This element, which might appear a mere reflection of the pirates' power position, must be compared with the passage in 1.14.7, where the narrator clarifies Corymbus' social position by saying: ὁ Κόρυμβος ἦν ὑπηρέτης ἐπὶ μισθῷ καὶ μέρει τῶν λαμβανομένων. Consequently, he is not a real δεσπότης and he does not possess personal goods: Euxinus' speech is artfully invented. The same feature concerns Corymbus' proposal to Anthia on behalf of Habrocomes, since Euxinus is only τις τῶν συλληστῶν of Corymbus (1.14.3) and it is unlikely that the marriage to him would give the heroine χρήματα [...] καὶ περιουσίαν.

Overall, these traits and actions clearly demonstrate the cunning of Xen's pirates. While this element suits well the Homeric portrait of pirates, it is also true that the protagonists reject their invitation (2.1-6) and, moreover, Corymbus and Euxinus are forced to give Habrocomes and Anthia

to Apsyrtus (see 2.2.2). Although, to an extent, this "delibery" is requested by the need of moving the plot, it is significant that Xen. marks the end of the first book by describing the pirates as self-confident (1.16.7). This fact lead me to conclude that there is a trait of irony in their presentation: in fact, the expectation that their military success would be followed by erotic conquest is not met and this damages the pirates' credibility.

a) Doulamis and *Apheleia*

In his study of Xen's speech, Doulamis considers Euxinus' request as the clearest proof given by Xen. that 'what we encounter in Xen. is not artless plainness but contrived simplicity' (69-70). His analysis shows how Euxinus' stylistic devices satisfy the requirements for both Hermogenes' simplicity (ἀφέλεια) and Demetrius' plain style (ἰσχνὸς χαρακτήρ). The link with the former is established by the following elements: in fact, 'the ideas expressed are simple, the language used to convey it common, the rhetorical figures not extravagant and the rhythmical arrangement of the sentence reinforces the simple character of the text' (51-2). On the other hand, Demetrius' precepts which appear in this speech are 'lucidity, vividness and persuasiveness' (56).

Personally, I think that Doulamis' demonstration is correct and his conclusion supports our overall interpretation of the whole text as the fruit of a deliberate simplicity. Then, among his more specific points, it is interesting that he argues that 'the word-arrangement is simple and straightforward, [...] with no synctatical complexities' (54). This fact marks a difference between Euxinus' request and Habrocomes and Anthia's oaths, in which the syntax is more complex: this further underlines the originality of that passage and makes the protagonists' silence even more significant, since their rhetorical ability would have equipped them to answer properly.

b) The apex of Euxinus' erotic persuasion: Corymbus is Eros

In Euxinus' speech there is a last point which must be considered: Corymbus' love for Habrocomes is here introduced as a re-elaboration of the main topic of the novel, which lies in Eros' revenge against the protagonists' arrogance. As a result, the pirate is presented as an instrument used by this god and this role suggests to the readers that the divine pattern that started at the beginning of the novel is continuing.

This idea is suggested by the appearance of two significant words: to begin with, Euxinus uses the word τιμωρία to allude to Corymbus' possible revenge against Habrocomes. The same topic is introduced in the fourth chapter with reference to Eros' initial and future revenge (cf. 1.4.5: μή με περιίδῃς μηδὲ ἐπὶ πολὺ τιμωρήσῃ τὸν θρασὺν and 1.4.5: ὁ δὲ Ἔρως [...] μεγάλην τῆς ὑπεροψίας ἐνενοεῖτο τιμωρίαν [τὸ] πράξασθαι τὸν Ἀβροκόμην). Neither the verb τιμωρέομαι, which belongs to Habrocomes' prayer to Eros, nor the noun τιμωρία have other occurrences in the first book.

Second, Euxinus describes Habrocomes' possible refusal with the words ὑπερηφανήσαντι Κόρυμβον. The verb ὑπερηφανέω is used by the hero in the same aforementioned speech in which he confesses to Eros: ἄπειρος ὤν, Ἔρως, ἔτι τῶν σῶν ὑπερηφάνουν· (1.4.5) and other cognate words are attributed to Habrocomes (see above 1.2.1).

To an extent, this hypothesis is simple, since Xen. builds his whole text on Eros' revenge against his male protagonist and confirmation of this is found in Habrocomes' lament, in which he states: τιμωρίαν ἤδη με ὁ θεὸς τῆς ὑπερηφανίας εἰσπράττει· ἐρᾷ Κόρυμβος ἐμοῦ, σοῦ δὲ Εὔξεινος (2.1.3), in which both concepts of revenge and arrogance occur again.

Having said that, there is a distinction between the way in which Habrocomes and Euxinus speak about this divine action: while the former attributes the origin of the possible revenge to the god, Euxinus to Corymbus himself: in this respect, it is significant that the object of the aforementioned ὑπερηφανήσαντι is Κόρυμβον. As a result, I would conclude that Euxinus is identifying Corymbus with Eros.

This fact is subtly suggested by Xen.: since Euxinus cannot know what happened to the protagonists, only the readers are in the position to recognise this identification.

In this respect, there is another expression which is part of this game, τὸν κατεχόντα δαίμονα. In Euxinus' mind, this epithet identifies Corymbus as an omnipotent god, whom Habrocomes must obey. This use of δαίμων, which seems to have a Stoic colour, has two other parallels in the novel: when Anthia refers to τὸν ἀμφοτέρων δαίμονα visiting Habrocomes in prison (2.7.5) and then in the ditch she accepts ὅ τι ἂν τῷ δαίμονι δοκῇ (4.5.6). The latter example is more significant, since the heroine expresses an acceptance of fate which recalls that suggested by Euxinus to Habrocomes.

At the same time, if we look at this expression from the perspective of the omniscient author and of the readers, another interpretation can be given of this δαίμων. From the moment the protagonists fall in love, Habrocomes cannot avoid looking at Anthia, because κατεῖχε δὲ αὐτὸν ἐγκείμενος ὁ θεός (1.3.1), who is clearly Eros. Since δαίμων has no other occurrences in the first book in the singular and κατέχω appears only in 1.5.4 to designate Anthia's submission to erotic jealousy, I would speculate that Euxinus' expression might sound to the readers like another allusion to Eros. This association between this god and δαίμων seems to be continued by Hippothous in his love story: the brigand, in fact, names with this term a god who, although is anonymous, is at the origin of his erotic misadventures (cf. 3.2.4: δαίμων τις and 13: ποτε δαίμων).

As a result, τὸν κατέχοντα δαίμονα seems to be another way in which Xen. subtly reminds the readers that Eros' revenge is still at work. In addition, this identification between Corymbus and Eros adds a further element in the interpretation of the whole episode: the correspondence between πῦρ ἀίδηλον and λυσσοδίωκτοι of the oracle and Hector, which thus far had a merely epic colour, assumes here an erotic connotation. This supports the interpretation of the woman of the dream as Λύσσα, since it definitely allows us to accept Laplace's (1994) conclusion about the Platonic Λύσσα (1.12.4, n.: dream, 1).

c) The emergence of a comic mark

Another important theme of Euxinus' speech is manumission because of love.

The same proposal is made by Longus' Gnathon to Daphnis in order to seduce him (4.11.3: ἔφη ταχέως ἐλεύθερον θήσειν τὸ πᾶν δυνάμενος). This fact is interesting, because Gnathon's erotic seduction is the only other novelistic case of homosexual attraction to a protagonist (on this, see Morgan 2004, 230) and it shares with Xen.'s episode motifs and a possible textual allusion.

Although the parasite is more violent and immoral than Corymbus - and, thus, he does not need the help of a friend to become an active lover - his social status is comparable with that of our pirates, since he is subject to Astylus as our characters are to Apsyrtus (see 4.10.1). Then, he falls in love with Daphnis: we are dealing with another homosexual relationship.

More precisely, Gnathon starts his erotic pursuit with the awareness that he will easily persuade Daphnis, as his words πείσειν ᾤετο ῥᾳδίως ὡς αἰπόλον show (4.11.2). Interestingly, the combination of πείθω and ῥᾳδίως, which has no other occurrence in *Daphnis and Chloe*, is a formula in the Eph., as it occurs twice in Corymbus' episode (1.15.6 and 1.16.7) and at the end of the last dialogue in Rhodes (5.15.1). Conversely, in the other novelists only Hld. uses it once in 2.18.1, when Cnemon and the protagonists persuade Thermutis to go away under a false pretext (ῥᾳδίως ὑπόκουφον ἄνδρα πείσαντες). Since only Ach.'s case and the second of Xen. are set in an erotic context and in a similar situation, the former might here be drawing from the latter.

Further connections concern narrative motifs: Gnathon, after Daphnis' resistance, wants his master to give him Daphnis as a gift (4.12.4: ἤλπιζε δῶρον αὐτὸν ἕξειν παρὰ τοῦ νεανίσκου): the same motif is introduced by Xen's Euxinus (1.15.5). Finally, Gnathon shows his rhetorical ability in his speech (see 4.16.2-4), as Euxinus does, although with a different sophistication (1.16.3-5). After this similar beginning, the two episodes then have a varied development, which depends on different choices made by the authors.

The reason why this parallel is interesting is not only that it might suggest Longus' debt to Xen. The real point of interest is that in *Daphnis and Chloe* Gnathon is clearly 'la figura comica del parassita' (Pattoni 2005, 451, n. 40), which is already introduced by Menander in his Κόλαξ. Further, 'this conventional name marks the generic territory in which the plot is now operating' (Morgan 2004, 229): since Longus makes him fall in love like the protagonists, the effect is 'un processo di distanziazione ironica nei confronti dei τόποι tradizionali, già avviato da Teocrito' and an emphasis on 'l'aspetto parodistico mediante il ricorso a una maschera comica' (104; see Pattoni 2005, 462-3, n. 64-7 for specific examples).

In my opinion, Xen. is doing something similar with his pirates, but the τόποι which he reverses are not erotic, but epic. In this respect, it is interesting that Corymbus' proposal seems like Calypso's epic promise which is, however, made not by a god but by a slave pirate. As a result, the divine love of the Nymph is transformed into a violent and comic one. The same "operation" concerns the Manto episode, in which Apsyrtus actually frees Habrocomes from slavery (2.10.2: δίδωμι δέ σοι τῆς οἰκίας ἄρχειν τῆς ἐμῆς). In this situation, his promise realizes what Alcinous offered to Odysseus (APP 1.1): however, his new role of administrator of a brigand's house appears to be a realistic and comic version of Alcinous' reign in Scheria.

Having said that, it is more difficult to find models which might have been Xen.'s source of inspiration for this episode. The same motif of manumission appears in Plautus. As with Roman Elegy (LI 2.3), it is very difficult that Xen. was drawing from him, but Xen.'s sharing of motifs with this comedian could easily depend on the common exploitation of a Greek lost author.

To begin with, in Plautus' *Pseudolus* 'a slave feels humiliated by the implication that he had serviced his master when he was a boy' (Hubbard 2003, 13; see 1177-82). On the other hand, in the

Persians 'a favorite slave hopes to obtain freedom as a result of his relationship with his master' (14). In fact, Paegnium, the slave boy, declares: 'nam ego me confido liberum fore' (v. 286). Finally, the two motifs are linked when it is a free man who speaks: in the *Captives*, for instance, two men agree that in the past they were passive lovers of their masters (v. 867).

After Plautus, the same motifs are exploited by other Latin authors. An interesting passage comes from Senec the Elder's *Controversiae*, in which Haterius, a famous orator of the Augustan period, pronounces the much-derided locution: 'impudicitia in ingenuo crimen est, in servo necessitas, in liberto officium' (4, Pref. 10). As Hubbard 2003 states, 'that sexual submission was a "necessity" for a slave and a "duty" for a freeman implies that many freedmen attained their status precisely through submitting to their master's attentions' (14).

Then, the same combination of themes is part of Trimalchio's boast in the *Satyricon*: his starting point is his long status as erotic slave: 'ad delicias [femina] ipsimi [domini] annos quattordecim fui' and he adds this positive comment: 'nec turpe est, quod dominus iubet' (75). Shortly after, Trimalchio describes how he managed to become a freeman ('ceterum, quemadmodum di volunt, dominus in domo factus sum', 76) and rich ('coheredem me Caesari fecit', ibid.).

Finally, also Martial plays with these motifs: in fact, he subverts the first theme of submission and freedom 'praising as his ideal boy slave one who takes the initiative in lovemaking' (Hubbard 2003, 13 and see epigr. 4.42). In verse 12 the traditional balance of the couple is evidently subverted: 'liberior domino saepe sit ille suo'.

The existence of this Latin literary framework confirms the comic nature of Xen.'s motif. Having said that, it is not likely that Xen. drew this motif from Latin sources, also because Plautus is not an author usually known by Greek novelists. As a result, the origin of Xen's operation remains unclear.

d) The shared lament of the beginning of the second book: the maturity of the protagonists

After a rich characterisation of pirates, Xen. dedicates the entire first chapter of the second book to express the protagonists' reaction to the Corymbus episode. Since Anthia and Habrocomes have already made their promise of fidelity in their common oath, the introduction of this shared lament appears purposely chosen by Xen. to relate fidelity to their first erotic peril.

If we look at the content of both monologues, they contain a clear condemnation of the pirates' erotic seduction, which seems to clarify the existence of Eros' negative side. To begin with, both protagonists demonstrate here the acquisition of a deeper awareness of their love and their life: for the first time in the novel Habrocomes reminds himself of Apollo's oracle and refers to Eros' revenge (2.1.2). Similarly, Anthia recalls the fidelity oath, as she will constantly do in the novel.

Having said that, as Cheyns 2003, 268 argues, the two speeches are not identical. Habrocomes' words reflect deeply on his situation and on his virtue: this personal touch has its only antecedents in his two monologues of the fourth chapter, since in both the wedding night and in the oath the hero, unlike Anthia, says only very few words about himself. As a result, the characterisation of Habrocomes is here clearly emphasised.

Conversely, Anthia's speech is more standard, as she makes a summary of the previous episode and she recalls the tragic motif of dying for love which has already appeared in the oath. For this reason,

I would take issue with Konstan 1994, 25 who use the shared lament to prove 'the symmetry of the situation'.

1) Habrocomes' view of the episode

Habrocomes defines Corymbus' love for him as τὴν αἰσχρὰν ἐπιθυμίαν (2.1.3) and he refuses it because of his old σωφροσύνη (2.1.4). This suggests that the first value which Habrocomes is emphasising is chastity in marriage. More precisely, the first formula, ἡ αἰσχρὰ ἐπιθυμία, is always used by Greek authors to denote a failure in the control of instinctive desires (see Xen. Ap. Socr. 30, Acta Joannis 33, Epict. Diss. 2.1.10, Asp. In Eth. Nicom. 134). The erotic meaning is less common, but it appears in Aesop's fable of Xanthippe to describe the love between a young man and an old woman (*Fab*. 54: αἰσχρᾶς ἐπιθυμίας δεινῶς ἐταράττετο) and then twice by Hld. In the first occurrence Calasiris, in his relevation of lovesickness to Charicleia, opposes the slighty varied expression τὸ μὲν ἐπιθυμίας αἰσχρὸν ὄνομα to τὸ δὲ συναφείας ἔννομον συνάλλαγμα, which is marriage (4.10.6). Then, in 7.3.5, Arsace relates παρανόμου καὶ αἰσχρᾶς ἐπιθυμίας to her passion for Thyamis. Given this framework, I would conclude that Habrocomes, like Calasiris in the aforementioned episode, is condemning Corymbus' love because of its extramarital status and this makes him mention his σωφροσύνη: this is the first sign that fidelity is tested by the hardships of the journey (LI 4).

Second, it is significant that Habrocomes stresses the barbaric origin of his suitors and their piratical activity (cf. the phrases ὕβρει παραδοθέντες πειρατῶν in 2.1.2 and ἵνα ἐμαυτὸν ὑποθῶ λῃστῇ [...] and in 2.1.3). This suggests that Habrocomes is criticising Corymbus' proposal also because of the low social status of the pirate.

Overall, these two accusations show how this speech has an emphasis which seems an appropriate answer to the offensive tone of Euxinus' speech (see esp. 1.16.5: τί δὲ ἐρωμένης τηλικῷδε ὄντι;) and proves Habrocomes' maturity. This possibility is confirmed by the fact that at the beginning of Corymbus' attack on Habrocomes the protagonist is cheated, and wrongly interprets the pirate's attention towards him as a sign of compassion (see 1.15.3: ὁ δὲ ἐλεοῦντα). Conversely. here he is aware of all the risks he is taking. As a result, if Corymbus and Euxinus constitute the first enemies of the couple, I would conclude that their hostility is used by Xen. to increase Habrocomes' experience: this pattern works well in the Odyssean reading of the novel, since Odysseus increases his knowledge and ability to suffer during his journey (LI 6.3).

Finally, Habrocomes' speech has its apex in the mention of πορνή. With this word, the hero defines his possible erotic relationship with Corymbus as prostitution. As Dover 1978, 20, in fact, argues, 'πορνή, cognate with πέρνημι, "sell", was the normal Greek word (first attested in the seventh century BC, see Arch. Fr. 302) for a woman who takes money (if a slave, on her owner's behalf) in return for the sexual use of her body, i.e. "prostitute"'. The other term was ἑταῖρα, the feminine form of ἑταῖρος, which often denoted a woman who was maintained by a man, at a level acceptable

to her, for the purpose of a sexual relationship without formal process of marriage, […] but not without hope on the man's part that she might love him' (20-21).

Although the difference between the two denominations is not always clear, πορνεῖα usually indicated a more temporary and less noble relationship, in which 'the mental image of a δουλή was evoked' (Faraone - McClure 2006, 103). A case in point is constituted by the women in the brothel, who were always called πορναί, and this is confirmed by Anthia too, who in Taras will state: ἔτι καὶ πορνεύειν ἀναγκάζομαι (5.7.1). Further, in Greek literature many writers underline the immorality of πορνεῖα: while Xenophon of Athens in his *Memorabilia* considers it as αἰσχρόν (1.6.13), Aeschines in his *Against Timarchus* 21 shows how a male prostitute must be punished by exclusion from society. Finally, in Greek comedy ἡ πορνή is a typical libidinous character: this emerges, for example, in a fragment from Menander, where we read: χαλεπόν, Παμφίλη, ἐλευθέραι γυναικὶ πρὸς πόρνην μάχη· πλείονα κακουργεῖ, πλείον' οἶδ', αἰσχύνεται οὐδέν, κολακεύει μᾶλλον [...] (*Epitrepontes*, fr. 7). As a result, Habrocomes here is referring to the less noble type of Greek prostitution and he is rejecting the inferior status to which he would be condemned.

A second point which Habrocomes is making here depends on his adoption of the feminine term πορνή instead of the masculine πορνός. Although these two terms have the same meaning, in Greek literature πορνή is never attributed to male characters. The only exception appears in a letter from Epicurus, in which the philosopher tells how Nausiphanes, philosopher from Mytilene, used to accuse him: ταῦτα ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς ἔκστασιν τοιαύτην, ὥστε μοι λοιδορεῖσθαι καὶ ἀποκαλεῖν διδάσκαλον. Πλεύμονά τε αὐτὸν ἐκάλει καὶ ἀγράμματον καὶ ἀπατεῶνα καὶ πόρνην· (fr. 101). The lack of context, however, makes the interpretation of this passage not opaque.

As a result, I would argue that Habrocomes here is purposely using πορνή to show his fear of becoming feminised. A feeling like this is not uncommon in Greek society, where there are other examples in which prostituted men were accused of acting like women (see Dover 1978, 104). The reason for this assimilation lies in the passivity and penetrability 'which normatively characterize the female in sexual relationship' (Dover 1978, 104, n.1) and that in prostitution concerns men too. For this reason, Cantarella 2006[5] states: 'ecco l'infamia commessa da chi si prostituiva: egli si faceva donna' (77). Interestingly, this judgement is underlined by Ach. too: after his only mention of πορνός, which refers to Cleitophon, Thersander's lawyer accuses him of becoming a woman in order to love men (8.10.9: τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ μεῖζον ἀτύχημα, ὅτι τοιοῦτον ηὗρε τὸν ἐρώμενον, ὃς πρὸς μὲν γυναῖκας ἄνδρας μιμεῖται, γυνὴ δὲ γίνεται πρὸς ἄνδρας). Similarly, also Astylus considers Daphnis' possible relationship with Gnathon as γυναικῶν ἔργα (4.19.5). As a result, Habrocomes is rejecting here the passivity in love which his submission to Corymbus would require.

Although this pattern seems to explain Xen.'s attitude, there is a further issue which must be addressed: at the beginning of the novel Habrocomes is introduced as an ἐρώμενος. Since, as Cantarella 2006[5], 78 argues, 'la passività non si addiceva al maschio adulto', his rejection of being a πορνή suggests that Habrocomes now considers himself an adult male and the clearest sign of this is his description as an ἀνήρ, which occurs in the same sentence (2.1.3: τίς ἐμοὶ βίος περιλείπεται πόρνη μὲν ἀντὶ ἀνδρὸς γενομένῳ [...];) Further, the use of γίγνομαι proves the existence of a

progression in his personality, which appears here closer than before to the Classical conception of masculinity, where male lovers and husbands play an active and not a passive role.

This conclusion is supported by the novelistic use of πορνή and πορνός: these adjectives and their cognates, in fact, always appear in passages in which a particular characterisation of a protagonist occurs. A case in point is Ach.'s text, in which πορνή is used four times by Thersander in relation to Leucippe (see 8.8.3, in the plural form, 8.8.11, 8.10.3, where Thersander's lawyer is speaking, and 8.11.2). Similarly, in 6.20.2 Thersander tells Leucippe: ἐγὼ μέν σε καὶ πεπορνεῦσθαι δοκῶ. At the same time, Cleitophon deserves the same title in the aforementioned passage in which Thersander's lawyer describes Melite's relationship with the protagonist as adultery (see 8.10.9: καιρὸν τοῦτον ἐνόμισεν εὔκαιρον μοιχείας [καὶ αὔχημα] καὶ νεανίσκον εὑροῦσα πόρνον). Finally, πορνεία is also the definition given by the Ephesian priest of Thersander's conduct (8.9.1). Since the same phenomenon occurs once in *Callirhoe*, where Theron denigrates Chaereas by naming him πόρνος (see 1.2.3: Ὁ δὲ πόρνος καὶ πένης [...]), it is likely that Xen.'s passage has also the same emphasis. Furthermore, the originality of our case is that it is the only novelistic one in which prostitution is treated as a real condition of a protagonist: this makes the use of πορνή even more provocative for the readers.

Having said that, it is difficult to assess whether this use of πορνή would imply Habrocomes' criticism of homosexuality: this possibility might be another reason why the protagonist is speaking so angrily. Although scholars such as Borgogno 2005, firmly believe this (see 416, n. 73: 'Non mi par dubbio che ci sia una condanna di fondo dell'omosessualità da parte dell'autore'), in my opinion it is important to draw a clear distinction between the protagonist and the narrator's view. On the one hand, as I argued in LI 5.6b, Xen, with his parallel construction of Euxinus' and Corymbus' love seems to be interested in a positive comparison between the two kinds of love, which then I explore later in the text. On the other hand, I would speculate that Habrocomes' reaction has a hint of criticism: when faced with Manto's proposal, our hero will offer a strong "no" but without demonstrating such discomfort on immoral issues as in this case (2.5.4). That said, since later in the novel Habrocomes never makes negative allusions to homosexuality and becomes friend of Hippothous, I would conclude that Xen. might be using this criticism here to emphasise the characterisation and the growth of his protagonist, but not to introduce a value which lies at the core of his erotic message.

2) Anthia's view of the episode

Anthia's description of the pirates' attack clearly marks Euxinus' erotic attempt as aiming at sex. In fact, elsewhere in the novel the formula ἐλεύσομαι εἰς εὐνήν refers to similar requests made by Manto (2.5.4) and Perilaus (3.5.3, in which ἀφικνέομαι substitutes ἐλεύσομαι. Similarly, συγκατακλιθήσεσθαι is used in reference to Anthia's wedding night in 1.7.3 and to Cyno's desire (see 3.12.5). Finally, the heroine adopts the verb ὑβρίζω (2.1.6), which alludes to a physical outrage. Overall, the difference between her speech and that of Habrocomes lies only in the more emphatic tone of the latter, and this depends on a gender issue: for Anthia is less shameful to submit to

another's love, being a woman. This confirms that Xen. from this point onwards is introducing a more traditional balance in the couple.

Having said that, her "negative" use of συγκατακλίνομαι, which intertexts with her relationship in Ephesus, offers further proof that the protagonists seem now to despise sex. Further, since Anthia expands here the motif of the priority of love to life, including the sharing of death, I would conclude that also her conscience makes a progression and, thus, the internal dimension of the Odyssean journey is true also for her.

e) Parallel with Manto: the "programmatic" value of Euxinus' and Manto's episodes for the whole novel and the evolutionary character of the protagonists' journey

In his analysis of Euxinus' episode, Konstan 1994 suggests: 'Manto's emotion is exactly comparable to that of Corymbus and Euxinus, and so too is her strategy of using blandishments, promises and threats' (42-3). This statement must be carefully analysed, because its acceptance would definitely prove the aforementioned suggestion idea that Euxinus' episode is a model for the rest of the novel.

To begin with, both episodes belong to the same Phoenician environment and include obviously Phoenician characters. Second, the identification between Eros and Corymbus might be extended by Xen. to both Manto and Apsyrtus: the noun τιμωρία and the verb τιμωρέομαι, in fact, are attributed altogether five times to them and in these passages they are presented as the perpetrators of this action (cf. 2.5.5 and 2.9.2 in relation to the former and 2.5.7, 2.6.1 and 2.10.1 with the latter). In addition, Manto refers twice to Habrocomes' possible refusal as an arrogant act towards her (see 2.5.2: τῆς σῆς ὑπερηφανίας and 2.5.5: τιμωρήσαιτο τὸν ὑπερηφανοῦντα, where both key words are close to each other). In this respect, it is interesting that later in the novel τιμωρία and τιμωρέομαι are mentioned in relation to Habrocomes' crucifixion (4.2.4 and 4.2.7), Anthia's imprisonment in the ditch (4.6.6), Anthia's imprisonment by Rhaenea (5.5.1) and Anthia's service in the brothel (5.5.6). Although these are probably the most grim trials in the novel, the association between Eros and the rivals is there no longer involved, since the perpetrator of τιμωρία never coincides with the lover. Further, ὑπερηφανέω is missing. As a result, I would suggest that Manto might share with Corymbus the role of establishing the rivals' pattern in such a complete way that later in the text Xen. might be allowed to refer to it more briefly.

More deeply, if we revisit the erotic list included in LI 3.2 , it is interesting to note that the two episodes share five motifs:

- increase of love through living together: Corymbus (1.14.7), Manto (2.3.2);
- vehemence of love (σφοδρὸν ἔρωτα): Corymbus (1.14.7 and 1.16.4), Manto (2.3.7);
- potential erotic persuasion: Corymbus (1.15.1 and 1.15.3), Manto (2.3.2);
- impossibility of resisting love (οὐκέτι καρτερῶν): Corymbus (1.15.2), Manto (2.3.3 and 2.5.1).
- confession to a friend: Corymbus (1.15.3), Manto (2.3.3-5).

The link in the first motif is even closer, since both characters are unsure of their persuasive attempts because of the presence of Anthia.

Finally, while Corymbus "uses" Euxinus to communicate his love, Manto also adopts an indirect

instrument, a letter (see 2.5.1-2), which is similar to Euxinus' speech. As Doulamis 2003 has clearly argued, this piece is composed of the same first three parts as the pirates' one (see introduction, request and statements of reasons) and it is characterised by simplicity. Moreover, Manto 'already in the introductory part of the letter emphasises her power by introducing herself as Habrocomes' mistress (2.5.1: δεσποῖνα ἡ σή): this is precisely Manto's strongest argument in the main body of her letter' (59). As a result, as in the pirates' words, slavery and love are still connected here. Then, like Euxinus and Corymbus, Manto offers to Habrocomes manumission and wealth (see 2.5.2: πλουτήσεις δὲ καὶ μακάριος ἔσῃ) as a reward of his acceptance of marriage; this possibility, as in Euxinus' case, is expressed with πείθομαι (see 2.5.2: ἐὰν γὰρ πεισθῇς), and like Euxinus, Manto mentions Habrocomes' γυναῖκα.

The same topicis then explored by Habrocomes in his responding letter (2.5.4), in which he draws a distinction between his submission to slavery and that to love. Although this piece is briefer, the hero uses the expressions ἕτοιμος, εἰς εὐνὴν δὲ τὴν σὴν οὐκ ἂν ἔλθοιμι and οὔτε ἂν τοιαῦτα πεισθείην κελευούσῃ which are in parallel with Corymbus' episode: the first adjective, in fact, is used previously in the *Ephesiaca* in the singular only by Euxinus with reference to Corymbus (see 1.16.4). Then, the second sentence is used by Anthia to explain the nature of Euxinus' desire (see 2.1.5) and, surprisingly, Habrocomes' refusal seems to answer Euxinus' speech rather than Manto's one. The pirate, in fact, concludes his proposal by saying: τούτῳ κελεύσαντι ὑπακούειν (1.16.5).

Overall, the existence of these parallels, as well as the textual closeness in the novel itself, allows me to argue that there is an intratextuality between these two episodes. The first fruit of this analysis is the confirmation that Corymbus' episode is echoed in the rest of the novel: this might allow us to consider the protagonists' judgement about it as valid also for the following episodes, which lack a similar reflection.

This discovery also invites us to observe their differences carefully: Manto is more instinctive and uncontrolled than the pirates and this clearly emerges in her letter, in which, unlike Euxinus, she explicitly alludes to the negative consequences of Habrocomes' refusal (see 2.5.2: ἐὰν δὲ ἀντείπῃς [...]). At the same time, the same increase of strength concerns also Habrocomes: the existence of his aforementioned letter of response (see 2.6.4) marks a contrast with his previous silence (see 1.16.6). Finally, a change in tactics also characterises the action of both characters: first, Manto persuades his father to torture Habrocomes, and the hero suffers a great deal and is imprisoned. Second, although without the fulfilment of the erotic relationship, Habrocomes obtains the promised manumission and goods from Apsyrtus (see 2.10.2) and then expresses a criticism about this acquisition of wealth (2.10.3).. As a result, from Corymbus to Manto there is an increase in the danger of the enemies and in the ability of the protagonist involved to react more skilfully.

This pattern gives more proof to the aforementioned inclusion of the Odyssean journey into a *Bildungroman*.

1.16.3: οἰκέτην μὲν ἐξ ἐλευθέρου γενόμενον, πένητα δὲ ἀντ'εὐδαίμονος: for the epic and tragic colour and origin of this passage, see 1.14.3. Here, unlike earlier in the novel, the relationship between Xen. and his possible models does not seem to go beyond a sharing of topics.

Having said that, the existence in the background of this dialogue of a Homeric heroine confirms its paradoxical nature, where the master is a servant and the servant a master. For this reason, in this case the epic model seems to be used with irony.

Before the end of the novel Xen. introduces two other formulae similar to the present one: the first marks a shift from slavery to freedom, since it occurs when Apsyrtus frees Habrocomes (see 2.10.2: ἀλλὰ νῦν μέν σε ἐλεύθερον ἀντὶ δούλου ποιήσω). Conversely, Anthia, in her apostrophe to Helios in Rhodes, exploits the same connotation of the present passage, when she defines herself as νυνὶ δὲ δούλη μὲν ἀντ'ἐλευθέρας, αἰχμάλωτος δὲ ἡ δυστυχὴς ἀντὶ τῆς μακαρίας (5.11.4). While in the first passage there is an epic apparatus which suggests a comic mark, in the second a clear epic and tragic apparatus is missing and, thus, I would conclude that there the topicality of the motif is more stressed.

1.16.3: τύχῃ πάντα λογίσασθαι: as O'Sullivan 2005 shows in his apparatus, the manuscript reading ψυχῇ was here substituted with τύχῃ by Hemsterhuius, following two novelistic passages. This correction is certainly good, since in his first sentence Euxinus is referring to the instability of fate. The first parallel is in Ach., where Leucippe tells Sosthenes to stop talking about Thersander, as she does not want him: Ἔα με, ἄνθρωπε, μετὰ τῆς ἐμαυτῆς συντρίβεσθαι τύχης καὶ τοῦ κατέχοντός με δαίμονος· (6.13.1). Interestingly, we find here Euxinus' same use of δαίμων and this allows us to accept the new reading. The second passage is from Heliodorus, when Thysbe decides to play a trick on Demeneta and she starts by saying: εἰ δέ τι τῶν μὴ κατὰ γνώμην ἐκβέβηκεν, ἐκεῖνα μὲν τῇ τύχῃ λογιστέον· (1.15.2).

Having said that, it is interesting to note the originality of this appearance of τύχη in the Eph. In fact, unlike the other novelists, Xen. uses τύχη to refer to the result on the protagonists of the action of destiny, rather than crediting the divine agent (see 3.2.15, 4.4.1, 4.6.6, 4.6.7, 5.4.7 and 5.8.3). For this reason, this term can be translated as both 'ill fortune' and 'fortune'. The only exception lies in Leucon's and Rhode's speech to Anthia, in which they ask her: ἀλλὰ τίς ἐνταῦθα ἄγει σε τύχη; (5.12.5). However, this use of τύχη as 'fate' does not have any serious connotation and, thus, it cannot be compared with that of Euxinus. As a result, Euxinus' mention of divine providence is unexpected and it certainly increases the ironical construction of the pirate.

Finally, it is interesting to notice how λογίζομαι and τύχη are not a common formula in Greek literature. It appears in fact only in two orations of Aelius Aristides (cf. On sending help in Sicily, Jebb 373: οὐ γὰρ ἐξαρκέσει Συρακοσίοις, εἴ γε μηδὲν πεπόνθασιν, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν τῇ τύχῃ καὶ Λακεδαιμονίοις λογιοῦνται τοῖς ἀφηρημένοις and *To Plato: on defence of the four,* Jebb 159: κἀκεῖνο μὲν ἂν τῇ τύχῃ τις εἶχε λογίζεσθαι, τοῦτο δὲ τῷ κρείττονα ἢ κατὰ τοὺς ἄλλους ὄντα γιγνώσκεσθαι).

This rarity leads me to conclude that Hld.'s passage might be intertexting with that of Xen. In addition, Xen.'s and Ach.'s expression ὁ κατέχων δαίμων has no other occurrences in the text. As a result, Leucippe's words might also be intertexting with those of Euxinus. It is interesting how in both passages a servant is speaking to another servant (real or false, like Leucippe). This might support the hypothesis of a reciprocal link. Finally, it might not be sheer coincidence that Leucippe,

shortly after this reference, says: οἶδα γὰρ οὖσα ἐν πειρατηρίῳ. This reference might work also as an allusion to Xen..

1.16.3: ἀγαπᾶν: the aforementioned lack of sexual desire in the meaning of this verb is confirmed by the other passages in which it appears in the novel: ἀγαπάω, in fact, designates Araxus' and Aegialeus' loves for Habrocomes which seems like that of adopted parents (cf. 3.12.4: ὁ μὲν δὴ Ἄραξος ἠγάπα τὸν Ἁβροκόμην καὶ παῖδα ἐποιεῖτο and 5.1.2: παῖδα ἐνόμιζεν αὑτοῦ καὶ ἠγάπα διαφερόντως; see, on this, "adoption"). This lack of sexual connotation is confirmed by the fact that Araxus' behaviour contrasts overtly with Cyno's wantonness (see 3.12.4: ὁ μὲν δὴ Ἄραξος ἠγάπα [...], ἡ δὲ Κυνὼ προσφέρει λόγον περὶ συνουσίας [...]) and Aegialeus is still in love with his wife Telxinoe.

1.16.4-5: εὐδαιμοσύνην καὶ ἐλευθερίαν: in this part Euxinus' proposal might recall the promise of made by Calypso to Odysseus. The starting point of this comparison is given by the Homeric background of every novel, according to which Habrocomes is Odysseus and, like him, is here far from home, as Euxinus repeats (see 1.16.5: γῆ δὲ αὕτη ξένη).
More precisely, Calypso, similarly to Euxinus, offers Odysseus the possession of her house and immortality (see Od. 5.208-9: ἐνθάδε κ'αὖθι μένων σὺν ἐμοί τόδε δῶμα φυλάσσοις ἀθανατός τ'εἴης). In addition, she mentions Odysseus' wife, describing how she is more beautiful than her (see 5.211-4) , thus trying to convince him that she can live without her.
In my opinion, since Xen. clearly places his episode in the context of an Odyssean journey, this parallel can be accepted. At the same time, it is evident that our author adapts his model here to the different tone of Euxinus' speech. Interestingly, this transformation of immortality into material happiness and freedom was part of the rationalistic interpretation of Homer, as the chapter Περὶ Καλυψοῦς καὶ Ὀδυσσέως from Heraclitus' *On incredible things* clearly proves: Ἄλογον θνητὸν ὄντα Ὀδυσσέα αὐτὴν ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι ποιήσειν ἀθάνατον, ἀλλὰ τὸ τὰ πρὸς τροφὴν καὶ πρὸς βίου ἀπόλαυσιν ἄφθονα καὶ λαμπρὰ ἕξειν. Since Xen. seems to acknowledge this tradition in more than one passage (see "Introduction"), he might also be following this here. In addition, the word ἀπόλαυσις seems to have a negative immoral connotation and this subtle criticism can be extended to this present passage, since wealth without the beloved does not bring happiness.
If this connection highlights the existence here of a moral concern, this transformation of the model has also an ironical effect, which is particularly underlined by the offensive reference to Anthia made by Euxinus (τί δὲ ἐρωμένης τηλικῷδε ὄντι;). Interestingly, the same pattern will occur in Manto's episode, where both readings can be accepted too.

1.16.5: τί δὲ ἐρωμένης τηλικῷδε ὄντι: with this rhetorical question Euxinus is suggesting that Habrocomes is too young to have a wife and that it is better at his age to play a passive role in the relationship. In this respect, as the mention of ἐρωμένης suggests, Euxinus is referring to the Classical balance of erotic relationships, where the women are subject to men. Since Habrocomes is

married, this sentence is a clear offence to him: this justifies the strong reaction of his lament, in which the protagonist will demonstrate his maturity.

1.16.6: ἀχανὴς ἦν καὶ οὐδὲ τι ἀποκρίνεσθαι ηὕρισκεν: given this Homeric interpretation of Euxinus' proposal, it is striking how different Habrocomes' reaction is to that of the Homeric hero: rather than announcing his refusal (see Od. 5.215-224), ἀκούσας ὁ Ἁβροκόμης εὐθὺς μὲν ἀχανὴς ἦν καὶ οὐδέ τι ἀποκρίνεσθαι ηὕρισκεν, ἐδάκρυσε δὲ καὶ ἀνέστενε [...]. καὶ δὴ λέγει πρὸς τὸν Εὔξεινον· "ἐπίτρεψον, δέσποτα, βουλεύσασθαι βραχύ, καὶ πρὸς πάντα ἀποκρινοῦμαι σοι τὰ ῥηθέντα" (1.16.6). This lack of initiative shows that Habrocomes is no Odysseus.
Interestingly, in the second book, as I will show in <u>APP</u> 1.1, the memory of the same episode is invoked, with a different development: Habrocomes strenuously opposes Manto's invitation and he is not happy about becoming Apsyrtus' administrator, since his only desire is for Anthia. Thus, Habrocomes here loses his passivity and becomes an "Odyssean lover".

1.16.7: ὁ δὲ Κόρυμβος τῇ Ἀνθίᾳ διείλεκτο: Corymbus' proposal to Anthia is introduced by Xen. in indirect speech. The distinctive feature of this piece is its nature of "summary", which emerges from the great number of actions described, its briefness and its use of a recapitulation.
On the one hand, the presence of these features suggests that this passage might share with the "summary" in 1.11.2 the function of breaking the tension between the two scenes. In fact, this speech follows Euxinus' proposal and precedes the protagonists' lamentation of the second book.
On the other hand, it is striking that Corymbus' summary follows Euxinus' speech and shares with it the content but not the form. The textual closeness of these passages suggests that Xen. is here emphasising the distinction between direct and indirect speech, pointing out length, literary quality and emotionality as the main differences. The effect of this "game" is that the readers use Euxinus' words also to imagine how Corymbus reacted.
In my opinion, the transparency of this comparison and its location at the end of the first book might contain a metaliterary value too. Since in the following books indirect speeches prevail over the direct ones and summaries outnumber scenes (<u>NA</u> 3.1), it is not unlikely that Xen. is using this passage to increase his readers' sensitivity to these two forms of speech, so that they will know how to enrich the indirect speeches with their imagination (see also <u>NA</u> 2.4).

.

APPENDIX 1: HOMERIC PARALLELS

1) Tyre like a "half-Scheria"

After the double parallel of Scheria with Ephesus and Rhodes, the same island is exploited by Xen. in the description of Tyre. The first hint of this is given by the Tyrians' reaction to the arrival of the protagonists (2.2.4: ἄνθρωποι βάρβαροι μήπω πρότερον τοσαύτην ἰδόντες εὐμορφίαν θεοὺς ἐνόμιζον εἶναι τοὺς βλεπομένους), which recalls the motif of the Phaecian divine visit, which appears Rhodes (1.12.1, n.: ἐπιδημίαν).

Shortly after, Manto is introduced on the scene and the Homeric comparison is focused on her. Her portrait recalls Alcinous' daughter: like Nausicaa,

a) she is ready for marriage (cf. 2.3.1 ἦν δὲ καλὴ καὶ ὡραία γάμων ἤδη and *Od*. 6.27: σοὶ δὲ γάμος σχεδόν ἐστιν).

b) She does not want to speak with his father (cf. 2.3.3: οὔτε γὰρ πρὸς Ἀβροκόμην εἰπεῖν ἐτόλμα, [...] οὔτε ἄλλῳ τινὶ τῶν ἑαυτῆς δέει τοῦ πατρὸς and *Od*. 6.66-7: αἴδετο γὰρ θαλερὸν γάμον ἐξονομῆναι πατρὶ φίλῳ).

c) She finally speaks with a girl, Rhode, who is described as τὴν σύντροφον τῆς Ἀνθίας, οὖσαν ἡλικιῶτιν καὶ κόρην (2.3.3). Similarly, Nausicaa receives the visit of Athena, who appears as a girl with the same age as her: (*Od*. 6.22-23: εἰδομένη κούρῃ ναυσικλειτοῖο Δύμαντος, ἥ οἱ ὁμηλικίη μὲν ἔην, κεχάριστο δὲ θυμῷ.

d) Manto does not immediately fall in love with Habrocomes, but after having spent some time with him; likewise, Nausicaa is captured by Odysseus when she sees him clean (cf. 2.3.2: αὕτη ἡ Μαντὼ ἐκ τῆς συνήθους μετὰ τοῦ Ἀβροκόμου διαίτης ἁλίσκεται and *Od*. 6.244-5: αἲ γὰρ ἐμοὶ τοιόσδε πόσις κεκλημένος εἴη).

Overall, the model of Nausicaa is part of Manto's construction.

In addition, the Homeric colour does not seem to be dismissed by Xen. even when Manto becomes angry and violent: in this shift Xen. seem to use the model of Calypso, which he has earlier adopted in the first book (1.16.4-5, εὐδαιμοσύνην): when Manto offers Habrocomes wealth in case of marriage: ἐὰν γὰρ πεισθῇς, πατέρα τὸν ἐμὸν Ἄψυρτον ἐγὼ πείσω σοί με συνοικίσαι, καὶ τὴν νῦν σοι φυναῖκα ἀποσκευασόμεθα, πλουτήσεις δὲ καὶ μακάριος ἔσῃ (2.5.2), the heroine rephrases the Nymph's offer to Odysseus (*Od*. 5.203-213). As in the first book, there is a comic reading of the model: immortality is substituted with possession of material goods (2.5.2: πλουτήσεις δὲ καὶ μακάριος ἔσῃ), Manto expresses her will to eliminate Anthia (ibid.: τὴν νῦν σοι γυναῖκα ἀποσκευασόμεθα) and then menaces Habrocomes in case of refusal.

Finally, when Manto's trick is discovered and Habrocomes is freed, the Phaecian model comes back, as Apsyrtus becomes Alcinous: νῦν μέν σε ἐλεύθερον ἀντὶ δούλου ποιήσω, δίδωμι δέ σοι τῆς οἰκίας ἄρχειν τῆς ἐμῆς καὶ γυναῖκα ἄξομαι τῶν πολιτῶν τινος θυγατέρα (2.10.2). This promise recalls that made by the Phaecian king to Odysseus:

αἲ γὰρ, Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναίη καὶ Ἄπολλον,
τοῖος ἐὼν οἷός ἐσσι, τά τε φρονέων ἅ τ᾽ἐγώ περ,
παῖδά τ᾽ἐμὴν ἐχέμεν καὶ ἐμὸς γαμβρὸς καλέεσθαι
αὖθι μένων· οἶκον δέ κ᾽ἐγὼ καὶ κτήματα δοίην,
εἴ κ᾽ἐθέλων γε μένοις (*Od.* 7.311-315).

2) Tarsus like a "half-Scheria"

In the second and third book (2.13.3) Xen. introduces the Perilaus episode, which is set in Tarsus. After the first meeting between Anthia and Perilaus (2.13.8), a new event enters the action of the novel: the strange visit of Eudoxus. His introduction recalls Odysseus' arrival at Scheria:

a) Eudoxus ἧκε δὲ ναυαγίῳ περιπεσὼν εἰς Αἴγυπτον πλέων (3.4.1): this recalls Odysseus' shipwreck in *Od.* 5.368-376.

b) The doctor is a beggar: Οὗτος ὁ Εὔδοξος περιῄει μὲν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἄνδρας, ὅσοι Ταρσέων εὐδοκιμώτατοι, οὓς μὲν ἐσθῆτας, οὓς δὲ ἀργύριον αἰτῶν. Similarly, in Scheria Odysseus is looking for clothes and money: cf. *Od.* 6.135-136:

ὣς Ὀδυσεὺς κούρῃσιν ἐϋπλοκάμοισιν ἔμελλε
μίξεσθαι, γυμνός περ ἐών· χρειὼ γὰρ ἵκανε

and *Od.* 6.214, when the hero receives clothes:

πὰρ δ᾽ἄρα οἱ φᾶρός τε χιτῶνά τε εἵματ᾽ἔθηκαν [...];

c) In Tarsus Eudoxus is storyteller: διηγούμενος ἑκάστῳ τὴν συμφοράν (3.4.2), like Odysseus at the Phaecian court (*Od.* 14.367-369).

d) The doctor declares to have been far from his home for a long time: Xen.'s genitive absolute τῆς ἀποδημίας τῆς ἀπὸ Ἐφέσου γεγενημένης (3.4.3) recalls Odysseus' self-definition: δηθὰ φίλων ἄπο πήματα πάσχω (*Od.* 7.152).

e) Eudoxus asks Anthia to be accompanied home, where his wife and children live: ἀεὶ <δὲ> δεόμενος αὐτῆς εἰς Ἔφεσον παραπεμφθῆναι· καὶ ἄρα καὶ παῖδες ἦσαν αὐτῷ καὶ γυνή (3.4.4). This coincides with Odysseus' request to Arete, Alcinous' wife:

Ἀρήτη, θύγατερ Ῥηξήνορος ἀντιθέοιο,
σόν τε πόσιν σά τε γούναθ᾽ ἱκάνω πολλὰ μογήσας,
τούσδε τε δαιτυμόνας, τοῖσιν θεοὶ ὄλβια δοῖεν,
ζωέμεναι, καὶ παισὶν ἐπιτρέψειεν ἕκαστος
κτήματ᾽ ἐνὶ μεγάροισι γέρας θ᾽, ὅ τι δῆμος ἔδωκεν.
αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ πομπὴν ὀτρύνετε πατρίδ᾽ ἱκέσθαι
θᾶσσον, ἐπεὶ δὴ δηθὰ φίλων ἄπο πήματα πάσχω" (*Od* 7.146-152).

f) Eudoxus receives a positive answer from Anthia: 3.5.8: [...] αὐτὴ δέ σοι καὶ ἀργύριον δώσω καὶ τὴν παραπομπὴν ἐπισκευάσω, δυνήσῃ δὲ πρὸ τοῦ πυθέσθαι τινά ἐπιβὰς νεὼς τὴν ἐπ᾽Ἐφέσου πλεῖν. The same offering is made by Alcinous to Odysseus (*Od.* 7.317: πομπὴν δ᾽ἐς τόδ᾽ἐγὼ τεκμαίρομαι) and Arete gives him clothes and gold (see Od. 8.438-441:

τόφρα δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ Ἀρήτη ξείνῳ περικαλλέα χηλὸν
ἐξέφερεν θαλάμοιο, τίθει δ᾽ ἐνὶ κάλλιμα δῶρα,

ἐσθῆτα χρυσόν τε, τά οἱ Φαίηκες ἔδωκαν·
ἐν δ' αὐτῇ φᾶρος θῆκεν καλόν τε χιτῶνα [...]).

In addition, Anthia's answer seems to contain a textual allusion to the *Odyssey*: the word παραπομπή used by Anthia has only other two occurrences in the Greek novels, in which it designates specific groups of people.[383] Since in both cases the meaning of 'transport' (LSJ), which is shared by the Homeric and Xenophontic passages, is missing, παραπομπή might echo the Homeric πομπή, which occurs fifteen times in Alcinous' episode out of its twenty-five occurrences in the whole *Odyssey*. Furthermore, Xen.'s addition of παρα- does not seem to constitute an objection to this hypothesis, because in the Imperial Era πομπή means only 'solemn processions', 'parade' or, in Rome, 'triumphal procession' (LSJ). As a result, the simple noun could not fit into this context.

Overall, Xen. introduces such a good number of echoes of the Odyssean visit to Scheria that the whole Perilaus episode can be interpreted as new version of this scene. Within this framework, the parallels which are easy to dray concern Tarsus and Scheria and Eudoxus and Odysseus. In addition, the second leads to an identification between Ephesus and Ithaca, since Eudoxus / Odysseus comes from the former city. Although the association between homeland of the protagonists and Ithaca is typical of every novel, this scene makes it active, because it is in Ephesus where παῖδες ἦσαν αὐτῷ καὶ γυνή (3.4.4), and it will become very important at the end of the novel (LI 6.2c).

On the other hand, the figures of Anthia and Perilaus requires detailed analysis: since at the beginning of Eudoxus' visit Xen. mentions that Anthia belongs to Perilaus' οἶκος[384] and that she is going to marry him, the heroine seems to be associated with Arete and this is confirmed by her positive reception of Eudoxus' proposal (see above, e-f). In addition, since Anthia asks Perilaus to delay their marriage, she is also Penelope and this parallel becomes more evident when she desperately asks Eudoxus the poison (3.5.7-8 and APP 1.3).

This rich construction of the heroine affects also that of Perilaus. This man, because of his violent approach to Anthia (2.13.6-8), cannot be compared to Alcinous and this makes Tarsus, like Tyre (APP 1.1), a different version of Scheria. As a result, a deviation from the Homeric model again introduces a trait typical of the uncivilised society (LI 6.2c). That being said, it is surprising that, as in the Manto episode, the *Odyssey* is not forgotten by Xen.: since Anthia is Penelope, Perilaus is portrayed as one of her suitors. This proves how much our author is keen on Homer.

Finally, when Anthia asks Eudoxus news about her parents, she echoes Odysseus' double request made to her mother (*Od.* 11.164-179) and to Eumaeus (*Od.* 15.346-350): thus, this episode is one in which the multiple Odyssean personality of the heroine clearly emerges.

---

[383] See Hippothous' slaves again in Xen. 5.9.1 and a group of athletes in Char. 6.2.1.

[384] 3.4.1: Ἐν δὲ τῷ χρόνῳ ὃν ἡ Ἀνθία ληφθεῖσα ἐκ τοῦ ληστηρίου <διῆγεν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ Περιλάου>.

3) Anthia like Penelope

The parallel between the female protagonist of a Greek novel and Penelope is proper of the genre and it is focused on her active fidelity.[385] In the Eph. there are some passages in which this identification is highlighted by Xen. to support the progressive maturation of Anthia's σωφροσύνη and ἀνδρεῖα:

a) When Perilaus forces Anthia to marry her, Anthia accepts but asks for a delay (2.13.8: ἱκετεύει δὲ αὐτὸν ἀναμεῖναι χρόνον ὀλίγον ὅσον ἡμερῶν τριάκοντα καὶ ἄχραντον τηρῆσαι). This stratagem appears a variant the Odyssean loom, which is used by Penelope to postpone her union with the suitors (*Od*. 2.96-8). This connection is strengthened by the memory of the oracle's expression ἀνήνυτα ἔργα, which seems to exactly recall Penelope's loom (1.6.2, n.: oracle, 4).

b) In the dialogue with Eudoxus, Anthia asks the fatal poison because Habrocomes has died and she says: φυγεῖν δὲ ἀδύνατον καὶ τὸν μέλλοντα ἀμήχανον ὑπομεῖναι γάμον (3.5.7). This entreaty recalls the Odyssean passage where Penelope asks Artemis to be killed: as she also thinks that Odysseus is dead, she cannot accept a suitor as a new husband: μηδέ τι χείρονος ἀνδρὸς ἐϋφραίνοιμι νόημα (Od. 20.82). In addition, the presence of Penelope is supported by Anthia's clear allusion to the oath of fidelity (LI 2.5).

c) Anthia's "fear of losing chastity" in the brothel (5.5.5: τὴν μέχρι νῦν Ἀβροκόμῃ τηρουμένην σωφροσύνην πορνοβοσκὸς ἀναγκάσει με λύειν;) appears another expression of Penelope's worry about being forced to marry a suitor.

d) The first part of Anthia's nightmare has more than one echo of Penelope (1.6.2, n.: oracle, 7n).

4) Habrocomes like a lover Odysseus

Similarly to Anthia and Penelope, Xen. highlights the comparison between Habrocomes and Odysseus:

a) Habrocomes' unfortunate meeting with Corymbus recalls that with Scylla (1.12.4, n.: dream, b);

b) Since Corymbus' proposal to Habrocomes resembles that of Calypso (1.16.4-5, n.: εὐδαιμοσύνην), Xen. establishes here the comparison between his male protagonist and Odysseus. However, Habrocomes' reaction contrasts with that of Odysseus (1.16.6, n.: ἀχανής): he is no Odysseus.

c) In the second book, the same scene happens in front of Manto / Calypso (APP 1.1), but here Habrocomes reacts like Odysseus, because his letter to Manto is a clear refusal (2.5.4).

---

[385] On Penelope's fidelity in the Odyssey, see Od 11.445-446 and 24.192-202 and Bettini - Franco 2010, 204: 'la celebrata fedeltà di Penelope al marito non è affatto rappresentata nel poema come supina passività, ma è piuttosto espressione di volontà, ingegnosità e capacità di azione e non solo per il trucco della tela [...]').

e) After Habrocomes' liberation from prison the hero's pursuit of Anthia assumes an Odyssean colour, as his second dream suggests (LI 4.5.b1-2).

f) Habrocomes' unfortunate meeting with Cyno recalls that of Odysseus with Circe: see below, APP 1.7.

g) Habrocomes' search for Anthia is emphasised by Xen. at the beginning of the fifth book, when ὁ Ἁβροκόμης γενόμενος ἔγνω περιιέναι τὴν νῆσον καὶ ἀναζητεῖν εἴ τι περί Ἀνθίας [εἴ τι] πύθοιτο (5.1.1). In the *Odyssey* the same desire of exploration characterises Odysseus at the beginning of the Cyclops' episode: see *Od*. 9.172-176:

"ἄλλοι μὲν νῦν μίμνετ', ἐμοὶ ἐρίηρες ἑταῖροι·
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ σὺν νηΐ τ' ἐμῇ καὶ ἐμοῖσ' ἑτάροισιν
ἐλθὼν τῶνδ' ἀνδρῶν πειρήσομαι [...]".

Overall, Habrocomes seems to be associated with Odysseus from the erotic perspective which is typical of Xen. This mark particularly emerges in the parallels with Scylla, Calypso and Circe: Habrocomes' reaction to these "enemies" proves how he progressively becomes stronger throughout his journey, as does Odysseus.

Having said that, however, this trajectory is interrupted in the last book, when Habrocomes is not able to deal with the job in the quarry: his lack of physical and spiritual energy (5.8.3) leads him to leave the job (5.10.1: Ὁ δὲ Ἁβροκόμης τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ἐπιπόνως ἐν τῷ Νουκερίῳ εἰργάζετο, τελευταῖον δὲ οὐκέτι φέρων τοὺς πόνους διέγνω νεὼς ἐπιβὰς εἰς Ἔφεσον ἀνάγεσθαι). This is significant: since the quarry is a possible reminder of Polyphemus' cave (APP 1.10), where Odysseus gives one of his best performances in the poem, Xen. seems to introduce a reminder of this episode (see above, g) and then to produce a contrast with the epic model, which makes Habrocomes no Odysseus. A similar lack of heroism is confirmed by the final night in Rhodes (APP 1.5), in which Habrocomes says only a few words and, thus, does not behave as Odysseus: this double deviation makes the association between Habrocomes and Odysseus incomplete and opens the space for the special final focus on the parallel between Penelope and Anthia.

5) Anthia like Odysseus

The unexpected association between Anthia and Odysseus is based on numerous connections which appear in the last part of the novel. Since they mostly occur in direct speech delivered by the heroine, they demonstrate that Anthia becomes progressively aware of her literary model. Since this characteristic seems to concern also Habrocomes at the beginning of the fifth book (LI 6.3), this pattern increases the identification between the protagonists' *Bildung* and the *Odyssey*.

a) When the heroine is asked about her origin by Hippothous (4.3.6) and by Polyidus (5.4.4), she pretends to have a foreign origin. This stratagem is typical of Odysseus.[386] The only difference lies in the origin, since Odysseus, unlike Anthia, declares to come from Crete. Finally, the existence of this parallel is supported by Xen.'s introduction of the "epic formula" ἥτις τε εἴη καὶ πόθεν (LI 6.4).

---

[386] Cf. his false tales to Athena in *Od*. 13.256-286, to Eumaeus in 14.192-359, to Antinous in 17.415-444 and to Penelope in 19.165-202.

b) The brothel episode is a possible echo of Odysseus' meeting with Circe (see below, APP 1.11).

c) When Anthia describes her expedients to preserve chastity, she adopts words which seem typical of Odysseus: in 5.7.2 she uses μηχανή and in 5.14.2 the expression πᾶσαν σωφροσύνης μηχανήν (5.14.2). Since in the *Odyssey* πολυμήχανος is a recurrent epithet of the hero[387] and no other author apart from Xen. connects μηχανή with σωφροσύνης, I would speculate that μηχανή might recall this epic adjective. As a result, since in these monologues Anthia is displaying her virtues, she might have in mind Odysseus' model. In this respect, the substitution of πολὺν with πᾶσαν could reflect the desire of placing a major emphasis on Anthia's virtue.

d) In the monologue after her nightmare, whose Homeric nature has already been stressed (1.6.2, n.: oracle, 7b), Anthia says: ἐγὼ μὲν καί πονούς ὑπομένω πάντας καὶ ποικίλων πειρῶμαι συμφορῶν καὶ τέχνας σωφροσύνης ὑπὲρ γυναῖκας εὑρίσκω, Ἀβροκόμη (5.8.7). Similarly to the previous passages, it is not impossible to see in ποικίλων πειρῶμαι συμφορῶν one an echo of the Odyssean epithet ποικιλομήτης.

e) When, shortly after, Anthia meets Hippothous without recognising him, she tells him: πέπονθα μέν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ πολλά [....] καὶ δεινά [...]. Then she adds: διαβόητα μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἔνδοξα πεπόνθαμεν [...] (5.9.8). The first formula is significant: in his dialogue with Eumaeus Odysseus explicitly defines himself as the man who κακὰ πολλὰ πέπονθα (*Od*. 17.284) and a similar expression is referred to him by Alcinous: μάλα πολλὰ πέπονθας (*Od*. 13.6). Although πάσχειν πολλά καὶ δεινά is popular in Greek literature, the situation and the first person, which is only used by Homer and our novelist, make the connection between the two authors plausible.

Similarly, the second formula, which starts with διαβόητα, has no precedent in the Greek literature. As a result, it might hint at Odysseus too, as this hero defines himself as famous for his misadventures:

οὕς τινας ὑμεῖς ἴστε μάλιστ᾽ὀχέοντας ὀϊζὺν
ἀνθρώπων, τοῖσίν κεν ἐν ἄλγεσιν ἰσωσαίμην.
καὶ δ᾽ἔτι κεν καὶ πλείον᾽ἐγὼ κακὰ μυθησαίμην,
ὅσσα γε δὴ ξύμπαντα θεῶν ἰότητι μόγησα (*Od*. 7.211-4).

As a result, I would conclude that Anthia's growth and ἀνδρεῖα in the last part of the Eph. is constructed by Xen. through her identification with Odysseus. However, on further inspection, the result of this "operation" is not perfect: Anthia does not leave her status as Penelope, but the figure of Odysseus strengthens the association with her and makes fidelity the epic virtue of the Eph.

6) The last night in Rhodes

This conclusion is confirmed by the last night in Rhodes, the passage which, as I have already suggested, is intertexting with the last night of the *Odyssey* (LI 6.2a).

To begin with, reunion and of the sharing of misadventures during the night are evidently Odyssean motifs. Further, also the moment in which the protagonists go to bed is the same: both in the

---

[387] See Od 1.205; 5.203; 10.401, 456, 488, 504; 11.60, 11.92, 11.405, 11.473, 11.617; 13.375; 14.486; 16.167; 22.164; 24.192, 24.542.

Odyssey and in the Eph. all the other characters are sleeping (cf. Eph. 5.14.1: Ὡς δὲ οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι πάντες κατεκοιμήθησαν, ἡσυχία δὲ ἦν ἀκριβής [...] and *Od*. 23.297-299: αὐτὰρ Τηλέμαχος καὶ βουκόλος ἠδὲ συβώτης παῦσαν ἄρ᾽ ὀρχηθμοῖο πόδας, παῦσαν δὲ γυναῖκας, αὐτοὶ δ᾽ εὐνάζοντο κατὰ μέγαρα σκιόεντα).

Given this framework, our author makes a significant deviation from the model: while in the *Odyssey* Penelope's account precedes that of Odysseus (*Od*. 23.302-5) but the quantity of the latter's misadventures is incomparably greater (*Od*. 310-341), in the Eph. it is the female protagonists who provides us with a long list of trials. Thus, this passage confirms that in our novel Anthia, which is Penelope, also plays the role of Odysseus. Second, it shows how the Odyssean heroic adventures, which include wars (e.g. against the Cicons), punishments (e.g. that inflicted by Poliphemus), natural calamities and tricks (e.g. those made by Circe), are transformed by Xen. into fights against erotic suitors, which multiply Penelope's battle in Ithaca against the Procians. As a result, while in the Homeric poem Odysseus' account represents the *Odyssey* itself, in the Eph. the same role is performed by Anthia's adventures, which are Xen's *Odyssey*. This gender shift is further stressed by Habrocomes' omission of the Manto and Cyno episodes: only the heroine's deeds are evoked in the dialogue. In my opinion, the reason for this subtle "operation" coincides with what underlies the parallel between Anthia and Odysseus in the last part of the novel (see above, APP 1.6): through Odysseus Xen. is here emphasising the association between Anthia and Penelope and, thus, confirming that conjugal fidelity is the new heroism of the Eph.

7) Cyno like Circe

As the previous appearance of Calypso makes us expect, also Circe enters the action of the Eph.: Cyno seems to be her double and the brothel in Taras might echo her palace. Unlike the previous parallels, the influence on Xen. of the rationalistic interpretation of Homer (LI 6.6) appears here greater, since it focuses on the identification of Circe with a courtesan and of her palace as a brothel, which both seem to be exploited by our author. Given this framework, in this section I will focus on the first parallel, while in APP 1.11 on the second.

To begin with, Cyno explicitly asks Habrocomes to have sex with her: in the *Odyssey* Circe makes the same request (Od. 10.333-5). Although in the novel a similar proposal is made by Manto, in that case the barbaric heroine does not mention the erotic consummation (2.5.1-2). Thus, Cyno is definitely closer to Circe than any other character of the Eph.

Given this parallel based on the narrative situation, it is surprising how much Xen. emphasises the immorality of Cyno.

a) This is evident in the expression ἅπασαν ἀκρασίαν ὑπερβεβλημένην (3.12.3): the word ἀκρασία, which has a philosophical origin,[388] traditionally designates the lack of self-restraint.[389] The same

---

[388] See Ocellus in *De Universi Natura*, 4.4.

[389] See, e.g., Xenophon of Athens 4.5.7: αὐτὰ γὰρ δήπου τὰ ἐναντία σωφροσύνης καὶ ἀκρασίας ἔργα ἐστίν.

immoral connotation also seems to concern other phrases which are part of Cyno's portrait, such as γυναῖκα ὀφθῆναι μιαράν, ἀπολαύειν τῆς ἐπιθυμίας and ἀκουσθῆναι πολὺ χείρω.

b) Although the LSJ translates μιαράν as 'physically ugly', this adjective also means 'lustful' and 'wanton' and Alciphron attributes it to a courtesan.[390] In my opinion, the context of the passage makes the second interpretation more plausible and confirmation of this is also provided by the two other occurrences of this word in the novelistic corpus. First, Char. defines Theron as μιαρός (1.4.4: ὁ μιαρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἄνθρωπος) and the immorality of this character is clearly emphasised (1.7.1: πανοῦργος ἄνθρωπος, ἐξ ἀδικίας πλέων τὴν θάλασσαν). Similarly, in *Daphnis and Chloe* Gnathon is μιαρός (4.18.3) and his lack of self-restraint is evident (4.11.2: μαθὼν ἐσθίειν ἄνθρωπος καὶ πίνειν εἰς μέθην καὶ λαγνεύειν μετὰ τὴν μέθην [...]).

c) The expression ἀπολαύειν τῆς ἐπιθυμίας describes the physical side of love and it is part of the erotic vocabulary which in the Eph. progressively becomes a trait of the uncivilised world (LI 3.2b). More precisely, In addition, since Aristotle the phrase ἀπολαύειν τῆς ἐπιθυμίας implies the lack of self-control[391] and Plutarch in his *Amatorius* shows clearly how this meaning was still present in the Imperial Literature. In his dialogue Protogene draws a distinction between noble love (Ἔρως) and erotic desires (οἱ ἐπιθυμίαι): while the former terminates in virtue, the aim of the latter is ἡδονὴν καρποῦσθαι καὶ ἀπόλαυσιν ὥρας καὶ σώματος.[392]

d) Given the previous examples, the ambiguous phrase ἀκουσθῆναι πολὺ χείρω might suggest that Cyno is saying obscene things: this would confirm her lack of shame.

In conclusion, Cyno is clearly the most immoral rival of the Eph. and she appears a possible representation of a whore: only her desire for money is omitted.

Having analysed Xen.'s portrait, the study of the Homeric interpretations of Circe offers a representation of this character which appears very similar to that of Cyno. As a result, I would conclude that Cyno is a plausible double of Circe.

To begin with, in the allegorical approach Circe is a symbol of intemperance and pleasure[393] and special attention is paid to her gluttony (ἡ μαστριμαργία). This interpretation closely follows the Homeric texts, where Odysseus' companions are transformed into pigs because they eat food mixed with poison (*Od*.10. 233-6). In addition, it was quite widespread in the Greek society.[394]

If this focus on Circe's pleasure accords with the lack of self-restraint which emerges in the Eph., the rationalistic interpretation of the same character fits even better Cyno's presentation: since

---

[390] Alciph. 3.26.4: ἡ μιαρὰ δὲ γυνὴ τίσει τὴν ἀξίαν τῆς ἀκολασίας δίκην.

[391] Arist. *VV* 1250b12-4: ἐγκρατείας δ' ἐστὶ τὸ δύνασθαι κατασχεῖν τῷ λογισμῷ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ὁρμῶσαν ἐπὶ φαύλας ἀπολαύσεις καὶ ἡδονάς, καὶ τὸ καρτερεῖν.

[392] Plut. *Mor*. 750d.

[393] See Heraclitus' *Homeric problems* 72: κυκεὼν ἡδονῆς ἐστιν ἀγγεῖον, ὃ πίνοντες οἱ ἀκόλαστοι διὰ τῆς ἐφημέρον πλησμονῆς συῶν ἀθλιώτερον βίον ζῶσι.

[394] On this, see Bettini - Franco 2010, 96: 'la visione moraleggiante - Circe tentatrice, che avvelena l'uomo di piacere offuscandone le capacità di pianificazione e autocontrollo [...], doveva essere la più diffusa' (96; see also Dio 8.20.5, who reflects how this interpretation was also supported by Cynics).

Aristophanes Circe has been seen as a courtesan, who attracts Odysseus' companions with her lust.[395] This association is particularly clear in the pseudo-Heraclitus, who defines Circe as an ἑταίρα[396]: after having seduced Odysseus' companions, γενομένους δὲ ἐν προσπαθείᾳ κατεῖχε ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις ἀλογίστως φερομένους πρὸς τὰς ἡδονάς[397]; only Odysseus was not defeated by her.[398] Three elements are here combined: the definition of Circe as a courtesan, her attractive lust and Odysseus' exemplary resistance. The same representation was also popular in Latin literature: in Horace Circe is a whore and in his view Odysseus' submission to her would constitute an act of profound immorality.[399]

Given this framework, I would speculate that with his Cyno Xen. might be here following this interpretation of the Odyssean character.

This hypothesis seems to be supported by the name of Cyno. His story is not complicated: it is first introduced by Herodotus (cf. 1.110 and 1.122) and is the 'traduzione della parola Meda Spako, che significa appunto "cane", che era un animale sacro nella religione iranica' (Borgogno 2005, 464, n. 145). The reason why an immoral character like her deserves this name is that in the Greek world, unlike the contemporaneous one, dogs were not symbols of loyalty and intelligence, but 'sont traditionellement associées à la fois à la representation de la furie et à celle de l'impudence' (Laplace 1994, 458). Within this pattern, dogs were more precisely symbol of sexual incontinence (see Phidalios of Corinth 30 F 2 Jacoby). As a result, this name further emphasises Cyno's lustfulness. In addition, the adoption of the name of an animal might recall Circe's power of dehumanising human beings. Finally, in two other novels there are two characters whose names have a connection with dogs and are compared to Circe too, namely Longus' Licenius and Ach.' Melite. Licenius' name is a 'prostitute name'[400] and this is the only character in the novel who has sex with Daphnis apart from Chloe (3.18.4), while Melite's name comes from μέλι, which means "honey" (LSJ) and thus "sweet", but also "Cyprian dog", and she makes sex with Cleithophon (5.27.3).

In conclusion, I would accept the subtle presence of Circe in the Cyno episode.

8) <u>Cyno like Clytemnestra</u>

At the same time, Xen. seems to associate Cyno with another Homeric character, who is Clytemnestra.

The origin of this interpretation again in the name of this character: although its first attestation is in Herodotus (1.12.4, n.: dream, b), in the Homeric poems similar nouns such as κυνῶπις and κύων,

---

[395] See Ar. *Pl.* 302-308. On this passage, see Bettini - Franco 2010, 94-5.

[396] [Heraclit.] *Incred.* 16

[397] Ibid.

[398] See ibid.: ἥττησε δὲ καὶ ταύτην Ὀδυσσεύς.

[399] Hor. *Ep.* 1.2.25: sub domina meretrice fuisset turpis et excors [...].

[400] Morgan 2004, 208-9.

"dog" and "bitch", are given to "immoral" characters. Since our author is keen on Homer and on names, I would speculate that he might be subtly using Κυνώ to allude to one of these figures.

Since Cyno is a woman, I would exclude the men and, thus, there are three heroines who Xen. might here have in mind:

a) Helen (*Il*. 3.180: κυνώπιδος, 6.344: κυνὸς κακομηχάνου ὀκρυοέσσης and 356: κυνὸς, *Od*. 4.145);

b) Clytemnestra (*Od*. 11.424: ἡ κυνῶπις and 11.427: οὐκ [...] κύντερον ἄλλο γυναικὸς [...]);

c) Melantho, a servant of Penelope (*Od*. 18.338: κύον and 19.21: κύον ἀδεές).

As I will shortly demonstrate, the second heroine is the most plausible and this perfectly fits into the ideological framework of the Eph.: in the *Odyssey* Clytemnestra is twice mentioned by Agamemnon as the opposite to Penelope (cf. *Od*. 11.444-446 and *Od*. 24.192-202). As a result, Xen.'s choice to introduce an echo of Clytemnestra would further emphasise the distance which the rivals of the Eph. maintain from conjugal fidelity and, by contrast, the importance which this virtue has for the protagonists.

While in the *Odyssey* only Helen calls herself "bitch", Clytemnestra receives this label by Agamemnon, who accuses his wife of having plotted his death (*Od*. 11.430: κουριδίῳ τεύξασα πόσει φόνον) and Melantho by both Penelope and Odysseus, because she twice addresses the latter with arrogant and injurious words.

a) Since Cyno kills her husband Araxus (3.12.5) and wants to have a relationship with a new partner, this character seems to recall Clytemnestra among the three Homeric figures.

b) Araxus' definition as a πρεσβύτης στρατιώτης (ἦν δὲ πεπαυμένος) (3.12.3) might be an echo of Agamemnon, who is killed by Clytemnestra when he has just return home after the Trojan war. In the *Odyssey* this cruel act is recalled by Agamemnon through expressions like ἔργον ἀεικές (*Od*. 11.429) and ἡ δ'ἔξοχα λυγρὰ ἰδυῖα (*Od*. 11.432).

c) While Cyno's immorality seems to have a focus on her lustfulness (see above, <u>APP</u> 1.7), Xen.'s definition of her as μιαιφόνος, which is focused on Habrocomes (3.12.5), might link her with other famous killers of the Greek tradition (1.13.5, n.: ὡπλισμένοι). As a result, the immoral portrait of Cyno goes beyond her lustfulness and this strengthens the hypothesis of her parallel with Clytemnestra.

Finally, this possibility is also supported by the fact that in the *Odyssey* Helen has a positive characterization, as it emerges in the fourth book; thus, she is not really comparable with Cyno. The same conclusion can be extended to Melantho: although she shares an erotic lust with Xen.'s character, as she makes sex with Eurimachus (see Od. 18.325), she does not commit any shameful act and her status as a servant lacks any connection with Cyno's social condition.

As a result, since Xen. is keen on Odyssean figures, the identification of Clytemnestra as a double of Cyno appears very plausible.

9) The *katabasis* of Anthia in the pit and Amphinomus, the good "suitor"

Anchialus's punishment against Anthia consists of a τάφρος μεγάλη καὶ βαθεῖα (4.6.3), in which the heroine is forced to live with δύο κύνες (ibid.), which are Αἰγύπτιοι, μεγάλοι καὶ ὀφθῆναι φοβεροί (4.6.4). Although this situation appears the end of the heroine's life, Amphinomus, who is the guardian of this pit, gives the dogs ἄρτους ἐνέβαλ<λ>ε καὶ ὕδωρ παρεῖχε to them, so that they αὐτῇ μηδὲν ἐνοχλήσωσι (4.6.5). This action has a positive effect: οἱ κύνες τρεφόμενοι [...] ἤδὴ τιθασοὶ ἐγίνοντο καὶ ἥμεροι (4.6.6).

In my opinion, this scene might have two different epic echoes, which might work together in Xen.'s mind: the whole episode would recall the meeting with Cerberus in the Underworld, while Amphinomus the homonymous suitor of the *Odyssey*.

a) The unexpected meeting with Cerberus in the Underworld

The first echo is first suggested by the pit, because its underground location recalls the Underworld and this connection is commonly recognised in ancient society: for instance, the Bible acknowledges this in the story of Joseph, which is "buried" in a pit by his brothers.[401]

Accepted this general link, I would argue that the presence of dogs might convey further meanings.[402]

Although Homer does not mention these animals in the Hades, since Hesiod the Greek world has considered Cerberus, the multi-headed hound, the guardian of this dark kingdom. The description made by Hesiod offers an interesting portrait: Cerberus is δεινὸς δὲ κύων [...] νηλειής,[403] whose τέχνη κακὴ[404] consist of attracting people and then devouring them.[405] As a result, fearfulness, lack of pity, cunningness and hunger characterise this monster.

Later on, in Virgil Cerberus constitutes an obstacle to Aeneas in his journey through the Underworld.[406] Luckily, the Sybil helps the hero to overcome this cruel guardian with the offering of a soporific cake.[407]

---

[401] See *Genesis* 37.24 and Doody 1996, 338-9 for the parallel.

[402] Strangely, the Egyptian origin of the dogs does not seem to be source of further nuances. We are rather dealing with a a simply exotic element, which depends on the setting of the scene in Egypt: Egyptian dogs, in fact, were quite famous in the antiquity, since they were worshipped as gods and were not considered cruel (see, e.g., Diod. Sic. BH 20.58.4: θεοί παρ'αὐτοῖς νομιζόμενοι καθάπερ παρ'Αἰγυπτίοις οἱ κύνες and Plut. *Mor.* 703A: ὥσπερ Αἰγυπτίων ἐνίους μὲν τὸν κυνῶν γένος ἅπαν σέβεσθαι καὶ τιμᾶν).

[403] *Theog.* 769-770.

[404] Ibid., 770.

[405] See 773-4: δοκεύων ἐσθίει, ὅν τε λάβῃσι πυλέων ἔκτοσθεν ἰόντα.

[406] This is the description of the monster: 'haec ingens latratu regna trifauci personat aduerso recubans immanis in antro' (*Aen.* 6.417-8).

[407] See Aen. 6.419-423: 'cui uates horrere uidens iam colla colubris melle soporatam et medicatis frugibus offam obicit. ille fame rabida tria guttura pandens corripit obiectam, atque immania terga resoluit fusus humi totoque ingens extenditur antro'.

In my opinion, the fearful portrait of Cerberus, his location in front of the cave and the interplay between his hunger and the Sybil's action suggest that Xen. might have here this episode in mind. That said, the element which apparently does not fit into this comparison is the absence in the Eph. of a monster like Cerberus. However, on further examination, how, the representation of the dogs suggests a possible connection with him: as with Scylla and other supernatural beings (1.12.4, n.: dream, 2), Xen. might be transforming Cerberus into creatures which belong to the real world. Interestingly, this hypothesis is part of the rationalistic interpretation of Cerberus' episode: according to this theory, this guardian was no longer considered a monster, but a man who had two dogs.[408] In my opinion, this humanised portrait seems to accord with Xen.'s scene, where Amphinomus is accompanied by two dogs. In addition, the same representation of Cerberus appears in Palephatus' *On incredible things*: this author offers a new version of Heracles' capture of this monster in the Underworld, in which real dogs substitute the original Cerberus. More precisely, Euristheus decides to hide in a cave one of Cerberus' dogs, named Cerberus from his master, and after his long search Heracles finds him in the pit and he brings it back to the earth. This action makes the people say: διὰ τοῦ ἄντρου καταβὰς εἰς Ἅιδου Ἡρακλῆς ἀνήγαγε τὸν κύνα.[409] This short tale seems to confirm the association between Xen.'s dogs and to strengthen the plausibility of the identification of the cave with the Underworld.

Finally, Petronius' novel might also support our interpretation, since at the end of the *Cena Trimalchionis* 'Trimalchio's house is connected with the Underworld'[410] through the mention of the same action made by Amphinomus, which consists of Giton's feeding of scraps to the watchdog.[411] Accepted this association, also the figure of Amphinomus is difficult to fit into it, since his benign behaviour reveals produces an evident contrast with that of the Cerberus. In my opinion, two interpretation of him can be offered. On the one hand, since in the rationalistic interpretation Cerberus has emerged as a master of two dogs, Xen. might be introducing a deviation from the model, making Amphinomus a sort of anti-Cerberus and leaving the fearful trait only to the dogs. On the other hand, Amphinomus can be also interpreted as a double of the Sybil, since this figure is the one who in Virgil gives the food to the animals. A support to this association comes from the fact that the brigand hides later himself in another cave to avoid the departure of his band (5.2.3: ἀποκρύπτεται ἐν ἄντρῳ) and Xen. might be subtly playing this place, which is the home typical of brigands' homes but also the place where the Sybil lives. That said, in my opinion it is difficult to choose between these two options, because we cannot be sure whether and how Xen. was aware of the Virgilian version of the Cerberus episode.

---

[408] This piece of information comes from the Pseudo-Heraclitus, 33, who states that Cerberus is a man who εἶχε δύο σκύμνους, ὧν ἀεὶ συμβαδιζόντων τῷ πατρὶ ἐφαίνετο εἶναι τρικέφαλος.

[409] Paleph. 39.

[410] Morgan 2009, 35.

[411] See Petron. *Sat*. 72.9 and Morgan 2009, 35 for other secondary bibliography on this episode. The presence of the hunger in Xen's passage might also suggest a connection with the Cyclops' episode, since Polyphemus eats Odysseus' companions (see Od. 9.291-3). However, it is difficult to find a connection between the dogs and Polyphemus and, thus, I would conclude that this passage is not in Xen.'s mind.

As a result, I would argue that, as in the Cyno episode, Xen. might be here following the rationalistic interpretation of ancient epic, which made Anthia's pit a realistic image of the Underworld. However, unlike that episode, Xen.'s model does not come from the *Odyssey* and it is not easy to understand from which author he is drawing this story. Given this impasse, I would speculate that, since the Homeric poem is so important for the Eph., Xen. might have decided to use this monster in relationship with the *Odyssey*. As it was probably well-known in the Imperial world, as his attestation in the rationalistic interpretations proves, the adapted version of Cerberus probably evoked in the readers the image of the Underworld. Then, since most of the previous episodes of the Eph. are constructed as Odyssean scenes, one could easily connect this setting with Odysseus' visit to Hades, although Cerberus is absent in the *Odyssey*. That said, in the second part of this section I will offer more reasons for including this parallel in Xen.'s Homeric framework.

b) <u>Amphinomus as the Odyssean good suitor</u>

While the relationship between Amphinomus and Cerberus is difficult to establish, there is another Odyssean model which Xen. is clearly exploiting here: Amphinomus is a suitor in the *Odyssey*, where he constitutes the only positive fellow among them. Since the construction of this figure is carefully made by Homer, it is very plausible that Xen. had this model in his mind.[412]

The first episode of the episode in which this character is introduced is the sixteenth book of the *Odyssey*: when Telemachus comes home, Amphinomus is the only suitor who does not want to kill him (Od. 16.400-405). Before speaking, the narrator says that he μάλιστα δὲ Πηνελοπείῃ ἥνδανε μύθοισι· φρεσὶ γὰρ κέχρητ᾽ἀγαθῆσιν (*Od*. 16.397-398) and, shortly after, the other suitors appreciate his words (*Od*. 16.406-8). Then, in the eighteenth book Amphinomus speaks directly with Odysseus. The former starts wishing him a happy destiny (*Od*. 18.122-123) and then the latter praises his wisdom (see Od.18.125: Ἀμφίνομ᾽, ἦ μάλα μοι δοκέεις πεπνυμένος εἶναι) and affability (see Od. 18.128: ἐπητῇ δ᾽ἀνδρὶ ἔοικας). Then, after a tense debate with suitors, Odysseus Ἀμφινόμου πρὸς γοῦνα καθέζετο Δουλιχιῆος, Εὐρύμαχον δείσας· (Od. 18.394-6) and Amphinomus invites the other companions not to lose their temper, playing the role of a peacemaker (Od. 18.414-421). Finally, in the twentieth book Amphinomus' interpretation of the eagle's omen is accepted by the other suitors (Od.20.244-246). This is his last wise action, before his death caused by Telemachus during the final fight (Od. 22.91-94).

In my opinion, this summary confirms the plausibility of our association and suggests an alternative interpretation of the dogs of the pit. Although Cerberus does not appear in the Homeric poems, these animals are quite present in the *Odyssey* and, as Faust 1970 clearly shows, they perform four different functions: they are not only domestic animals, but they also play the role of "Leichenfresser" and, finally, they appears in similes and in metaphors. The first three categories are not really interesting for us, since in the first and in the third dogs are usually depicted as quiet

---

[412] This connection is already suggested by Bierl 2006, 91, while Hägg 2004b, 213 is more sceptic: 'there is a vague correspondence in the moral qualities of the two characters, the noble suitor and the noble robber; but it is by no means sufficiently marked to be called an allusion'.

animals, while in the second their mention is brief and lacks any characterization.[413] In this respect, I would exclude that Xen. is referring in the present passage to the famous dog Argos, given his mild character. On the other hand, in metaphors Penelope and Euricleia compare twice their servants to bitches,[414] while Odysseus during his fight against the suitors addresses them as ὦ κύνες.[415] Since the Odyssean apostrophe is the only passage in which Homeric characters are compared to dogs, I would suggest that Xen. might have the suitors in mind when he introduces these animals[416]. This hypothesis would allows us to interpret Amphinomous' action of feeding the dogs as a parallel of his control over the suitors in the *Odyssey*.

Overall, the discovery of these two parallels invites our interpretation. First, if the dogs and Amphinomous are the suitors, the latter's mild and inspiring behaviour would also make this episode a prolepsis of the end of the novel, where the protagonists will end their fight against their enemies. This would introduce a further element which confirms the basic nature of Xen.'s proleptic apparatus (NA 1.2). Second, it is not unthinkable that this subtle reference to the suitors was deliberately mixed by Xen. with the motif of the visit to the Hades. In this respect, I would speculate that our author might be using this clear Odyssean parallel to clarify to his readers that Cerberus' scene must be read as an Odyssean scene, despite the different origin of the monster.

c) Further meanings of the Amphinomus episode

Having offered this hypothesis, I would like to look again at the parallel between this episode and Odysseus' visit to the Hades: interestingly, a closer link seems to concern the two, which confirms the correctness of the connection. In the Odyssean Underworld the hero undergoes 'quella fatica che consentirà all'eroe di conseguire ciò che desidera',[417] since he discovers from Tiresias his ὁδὸν καὶ μέτρα κελεύθου νόστον.[418] After the previous demonstration, the same value can be extended to the Xenophontic episode: the pit seems to constitute the most dangerous of her trials for Anthia but, at the same time, the first step towards her final reunion with the beloved.

At the same time, following Dowden's suggestion, I wonder whether in the mind of Xen's readers the pit would have also evoked the Platonic image of the cave too.[419] In my opinion, the possible

---

[413] See Faust 1970 for all the Homeric references to dogs.

[414] Cf. respectively *Od*. 19.154: κύνας οὐκ ἀλεγούσας and 19.372: αἱ κύνες.

[415] *Od*. 22.35. In the *Iliad* the metaphor twice concerns also the Achaians and the Trojans, but in a context which does not have connection with ours: cf. *Il*. 8.527 and Il. 13.623.

[416] In theory, another possible parallel might concern Eumaeus' dogs, who attack Odysseus and are stopped by their master (*Od*. 14.21-36). In addition, they are interestingly described as κύνες θήρεσσιν ἐοικότες (21) and without Eumaeus' intervention Odysseus ἀεικέλιον πάθεν ἄλγος (Od. 14.32). However, since the presence of the swineherd is not recalled later and Xen's Amphinomus, despite his positive behaviour, is killed by Polyidus, his parallel with Eumaeus does not have a good foundation and cannot be accepted.

[417] Bettini - Franco 2010, 302, 67.

[418] *Od*. 11.539-540.

[419] See Dowden 2007, 144: 'there is also an obvious philosophic reference: a prisoner in a pit, cut off from a real world, is not far from a prisoner in Plato's *Cave*'.

acceptance of this hypothesis would suggest two conclusions: to begin with, since the men in the cave are those who are detached from a philosophical knowledge, this definition would portray the bandits not only as uncivilised people, but also as uneducated people. This would draw a further distinction between the Xen.'s civilised and uncivilised worlds.

In addition, if we look at the whole scene of the cave within the Platonic perspective, we could also reverse the interpretation of Amphinomus' conversion: Xen. might be suggesting that we are dealing with an illusion of liberation given to Anthia instead of an authentic prolepsis. In my opinion, this reading would play at two different levels. First, it would fit well into the incomplete status of Anthia's journey, in which more sufferings are still to come. Second, 'the cave is also the place of storytelling, of the poetic art':[420] this emerges clearly in Apuleius, whose story of Cupid and Psyche is told by an old woman in a bandits' cave. Given this value, I would speculate that this scene might also imply that Amphinomus' compassion and love, which is symbol for human affects, can defeat the enemies only in fiction, but not in reality. This statement would be a further metaliterary reflection on the Eph., whose existence I leave as a speculative hypothesis.

10) Habrocomes in the quarry like Odysseus in Polyphemus' cave

The episode which involves Habrocomes in the quarry reveals the apex of the hero's weakness. In my opinion, this episode might recall Odysseus' meeting with Polyphemus and emphasise the anti-heroic nature of Habrocomes, who would be constructed here as no Odysseus (see above, <u>APP</u> 1.4).

A first hint is suggested by Xen. himself, who starts the episode by describing how Habrocomes us losing courage in his search for Anthia and then in Italy he is characterised by ἀπορίᾳ δὲ τῶν ἐπιτηδείων ἀμηχανῶν ὅ τι ποιήσει (5.8.1). Similarly, Odysseus and his companions express the same feeling - ἀμηχανία - when they Polyphemus performs his act of cannibalism in front of them:

ἡμεῖς δὲ κλαίοντες ἀνεσχέθομεν Διὶ χεῖρας,

σχέτλια ἔργ'ὁρόωντες· ἀμηχανίη δ'ἔχε θυμόν (Od. 9.294-5).

Given this introduction, I would like to focus on the location of Xen.'s episode. To begin with, the quarries are a place familiar with the Cyclops[421]. In Greek mythology these supernatural beings were used to work with metals: to begin with, 'les K. bâtisseurs, déjà évoqués apr Pindare (frg. 169 A7 Snell/Maehler), Bacchylide (11.67) et Phérécyde (FGrH3 F12) se retrouvent dans le fonds légendaire de maintes cités pourvues de remparts "cyclopéens", mais nont pas été représentés dans

---

[420] Doody 1996, 345.

[421] The place itself chosen by Xen., Nucerium, does not seem to have any connection with Polyphemus. Following Scarcella's identification of this city with Nocera Terinese, its location in the hilly country would 'fit Habrocomes' employment in a quarry' (Elpiniki 2010, 178). Perhaps, the choice instead of Nuceria Altaferna, 'which used Pompeii a its port' (ibid., 177) would be the most Homeric between those available (for a complete list, see ibid. 177-8), since from The House of the Ancient Hunt in Pompei a Fresco about Polyphemus and Galatea comes and this makes the presence of this hero closer than in the other cities.

l'Antiquité'.[422] At the same time, in Hesiod's *Theogony* the Cyclops are three gods, named Arges, Brontes and Steropes, whose main function is 'de forger objects d'investiture'.[423]

Later on, in the Hellenistic Era they started to forge iron for Vulcan, who habitually worked in quarries, and they joined him in his cave in Sicily. The first text which attests this tradition is Callimachus' *Hymn to Artemis*, in which Artemis goes to Lipari's Island to receive her weapons from Hephaestus and he finds there the Cyclops who are working with him.[424] Interestingly, although in this situation the Cyclops are hard workers and not wild creatures as in the *Odyssey*, they still frighten people, as it happens with Artemis' Nymphs.[425] Then, the same representation of the Cyclops occurs in Virgil's *Aeneid*, when Venus asks Vulcan weapons for Aeneas.[426] Finally, in the Imperial Era "Hephaestus and the Cyclops" became a common theme in Roman artistic representations (see LIMC Kyklops 32-41).

In my opinion, this framework can help to interpret the present passage of the Eph.: the existence in Xen.'s time of a well-known tradition of the Cyclops collaborators with Hephaestus suggests that their original caves were transformed into quarries. As a result, it is not unlikely that with his quarry Xen. might be subtly alluding to the Cyclops' cave.

That said, it is difficult to understand what role Odysseus could play within this association. A possible answer comes from Philoxenus, an ancient Greek author who wrote a lyric poem about Polyphemus' love for Galatea in 400 BC ca. The origin of this text seems to coincide with a personal event of the author's life: as Hopkinson argues, 'it was widely believed that Philoxenus had an affair with a certain Galatea, mistress of Dionysius tyrant of Syracuse, that he had been punished by imprisonment in the stone quarries, and that he had composed his poem as an allegory'.[427] As a result, following the two preserved summaries of this work,[428] in this text

---

[422] LIMC, Kyklops, 154.

[423] Ibid. and see Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.2.1.

[424] See Call. *Dian.* 46-86 and esp. 46-49: αὖθι δὲ Κύκλωπας μετεκίαθε· τοὺς μὲν ἔτετμε νήσῳ ἐνὶ Λιπάρῃ […] ἐπ᾽ἄκμοσιν Ἡφαίστοιο ἑσταότας περὶ μύδρον·.

[425] Ibid, 51: αἱ νύμφαι δ᾽ἔδδεισαν.

[426] See Verg. *Aen.* 8.416-453 and esp. 418-9: "quam subter specus et Cyclopum exesa caminis antra Aetnaea tonant and 424: ferrum exercebant vasto Cyclopes in antro".

[427] Hopkinson 2000, 36. Plutarch in *Nicias' Life*, 29.1 provides confirmation of the existence in Syracuse of this stone quarry which functioned as a prison: the Athenians were there taken after their defeat.

[428] The first comes from Phaenias (see fr. 13 = Ath. 1.7a): συνεμέθυε δὲ τῷ Φιλοξένῳ ἡδέως ὁ Διονύσιος. ἐπεὶ δὲ τὴν ἐρωμένην Γαλάτειαν ἐφωράθη διαφθείρων, εἰς τὰς λατομίας ἐνεβλήθη· ἐν αἷς ποιῶν τὸν Κύκλωπα συνέθηκε τὸν μῦθον εἰς τὸ περὶ αὐτὸν γενόμενον πάθος, τὸν μὲν Διονύσιον Κύκλωπα ὑποστησάμενος, τὴν δ᾽ αὐλητρίδα Γαλάτειαν, ἑαυτὸν δ᾽ Ὀδυσσέα.
The second testimony comes from Tzetzes in the Scholia at Aristophanes' Plutus, which contained a parody of this text:
Φιλόξενον τὸν διθυραμβοποιὸν ἢ τραγῳδοδιδάσκαλον διασύρει, ὅστις ἐν Σικελίᾳ ἦν παρὰ Δωριεῦσι· λέγεται δὲ ὅτι ποτὲ Γαλατείᾳ τινὶ παλλακίδι Διονυσίου προσέβαλε, καὶ μαθὼν Διονύσιος ἐξώρισεν αὐτὸν εἰς λατομίαν. φεύγων δ᾽ ἐκεῖθεν εἰς <τὰ> μέρη τῶν Κυθήρων ἦλθε καὶ ἐκεῖ δρᾶμα τὴν Γαλάτειαν ἐποίησεν, ἐν ᾧ εἰσήγαγε τὸν Κύκλωπα ἐρῶντα τῆς Γαλατείας (Sch. ad 290).

Philoxenus was presenting himself as an Odysseus imprisoned in the cave, while Dionysius was the Cyclop and this transformation suggests the existence of 'a comic treatment of his subject'.[429]

Since unfortunately only a few fragments survive'[430] of this text, we do not know how this story was developed. Among the few extant fragments, a passage from Zenobius suggests that Odysseus was lamenting about his imprisonment.[431]

In my opinion, the existence of this poem is interesting for two reasons: first, it confirms the association between Cyclops' cave and quarries and it suggests that in the Hellenistic Era the former was seen as the allegorical version of the latter. Second, Philoxenus' identification of himself with Odysseus the desperate lover and of Polyphemus with his erotic rival offer a patter which is similar to that of the Eph.: it is not unthinkable that Xen. might be exploiting the same framework as Philoxenus, placing Habrocomes, who is double of Odysseus, in a quarry which alludes to the Cyclops' cave. Finally, Habrocomes is desperate for Anthia as Philoxenus was for his beloved. The only difference would be that Xen. would have preferred the realistic quarry to the allegorical cave, leaving to the readers to establish the comparison.

Having proposed this parallel, it is difficult to understand whether our author might have been aware of Philoxenus' story. Although definite answer cannot be given, as the circulation of Philoxenus' work is difficult to establish, this hypothesis is not unlikely, since 'Philoxenus seems to have been popular well into the Hellenistic period and his work may easily have survived in performance until a much later date'.[432] In addition, this poem was the model of Theocritus' *Idyllia* 6 and 11, which both address Polyphemus' love for Galatea and start a new important tradition on this hero. As a result, this allegory of the quarry might have become part of the common knowledge of educated Imperial readers. Having said that, the picture is not completely clear, since in all the later versions 'Odysseus completely disappears from the narrative'.[433]

In conclusion, I would argue that the existence in Xen.'s quarry of an allusion to Cyclops' cave was easy to detect by the readers of the Eph. Since Odysseus is introduced as a double of Habrocomes in this episode, they could also be able to see in this scene the image of the epic hero imprisoned by Polyphemus, even without the help of Philoxenus.

In addition, if Philoxenus was part of Xen.'s library, the role of Odysseus in the episode would become clearer: his presence in the quarry could be interpreted not as a mere physical suffering, but as a description of his desperation for the apparent loss of Anthia. As a result, the erotic connotation of this episode would be subtly explained, while without this model it can be interpreted as an separated from the reference to the Cyclops' cave and, thus, as an element typical of the plot of the Eph.

---

[429] Hordern 1999, 445.

[430] Hordern 1999, 446.

[431] See PMG 824 = Zenob. 5.45: Κύκλωψ γάρ ἐστι δρᾶμα Φιλοξένου τοῦ ποιητοῦ, ἐν ᾧ ὁ Ὀδυσσεὺς περισχεθεὶς τῷ τοῦ Κύκλωπος σπηλαίῳ λέγει, Οἵῳ μ' ὁ δαίμων τέρατι συγκαθεῖρξεν.

[432] Hordern 1999, 287.

[433] Ibid., 248.

Having offered these speculative hypotheses, I would conclude with a certainty: unlike Odysseus in the Polyphemus episode, in which the hero uses all his intelligence to defeat the Cyclop,[434] in the quarry Habrocomes has a very different passive reaction. As a result, while Odysseus at the end of the episode becomes Οὖτις to cheat Polyphemus (*Od.* 9.366-7), Habrocomes is literally οὖτις. For this reason, I have argued that this episode is used by Xen. to place a special emphasis on Anthia.

11) The brothel in Taras as Circe's house

Within the rationalistic interpretation of Circe, which supports the parallel between Cyno and Circe (see above, APP 1.7), the Byzantine scholar Tzetzes suggests that Circe's palace was a brothel.[435] This hypothesis is not very different from what Pallada writes in an epigram, when he defines Circe as an ἑταίρα [...] πανοῦργος τοὺς δελεασθέντας πτωχοτάτους ἐποίει·.[436] This emphasis on money demonstrates that 'Circe poteva infatti diventare il prototipo della cupidigia delle cortigiane'[437] and this makes her connection with the brothel plausible, as it was attended by people who paid for having sex.

In my opinion, the existence of this tradition can shed new light on the passage of the Eph.: although in Taras Xen. does not introduce a female figure which might recall Circe, our author mentions that the visitors to the brothel ἕτοιμοι ἀργύριον κατατίθεσται τῆς ἐπιθυμίας (5.7.3). Since no other Homeric model is introduced in this passage, I would speculate that Circe might again be in Xen.'s mind. Since this episode constitutes the apex of Anthia' trials, it would be strange that our author decided to omit here his main hypotext. Conversely, the presence of Circe, which is so dangerous for Odysseus, would further emphasise the importance of the Odyssey for the *Bildung* of Anthia.

12) Achilles and Patroclus

This last parallel constitutes an exception in this sequence of Homeric parallels, because it concerns the *Iliad*. As I suggested in LI 4.3-4, throughout their journey the protagonists often alludes at the burial with the beloved and the origin of this motif has been defined as epic-tragic, since no precise intertext seems to emerge.

That said, however, there are two passages of this group in which Xen. seems to allude to Achilles and Patroclus, who, as Fusillo argues, 'costituiscono il modello più illustre della poesia antica [...] per dare un forte rilievo alla fase cruciale della separazione tra i due protagonisti, in cui entrambi credono alla morte o all'infedeltà del partner'.[438]

---

[434] See esp. 9.422-3 on his ability: πάντας δὲ δόλους καὶ μῆτιν ὕφαινον, ὥς τε περὶ ψυχῆς.

[435] See *Allegoriae in Odyssaea libros X 108*.

[436] *AP* 10.50.4-5.

[437] Bettini - Franco 2010, 102.

[438] Fusillo 1989, 37.

To begin with, in the third book, when Habrocomes wants to find Anthia's body, he expresses his desire to bury himself with it: τὰ πρῶτα καρτερήσω, μέχρι που τὸ σῶμα εὕρω τὸ σὸν καὶ περιβαλὼν ἐμαυτὸν ἐκείνῳ συγκαταθάψω (3.10.3). This shared sepulture recalls what Patroclus asks Achilles:

μὴ ἐμὰ σῶν ἀπάνευθε τιθήμεναι ὀστέ᾽, Ἀχιλλεῦ,

ἀλλ᾽ ὁμοῦ, ὡς τράφομέν περ ἐν ὑμετέροισι δόμοισιν (*Il* 23.83-84).[439]

The plausibility of this connection is supported by the fact that also the *Odyssey*, which is well known by Xen., mentions this shared sepulture. (*Od*. 24.76-7: ἐν τῷ τοι κεῖται λεύκ᾽ὀστέα, φαίδιμ᾽Ἀχιλλεῦ, μίγδα δὲ Πατρόκλοιο Μενοιτιάδαο θανόντος). This supports the likeness of this Homeric exploitation.

Then, in the fifth book, Habrocomes' desperation in the quarry is mitigated by the certainty that his beloved will never forget him, even when she is dead: πέπεισμαι γάρ, φιλτάτη, ὡς οὐκ ἄν ποτε οὔτε <ζῶσα οὔτε> ἀποθανοῦσα ἐκλάθοιό μου (5.8.4).

This motif has its first attestation in the *Iliad*, when Achilles says about Patroclus:

κεῖται πὰρ νήεσσι νέκυς ἄκλαυτος ἄθαπτος,

Πάτροκλος· τοῦ δ᾽οὐκ ἐπιλήσομαι, ὄφρ᾽ἂν ἐγώ γε

ζωοῖσιν μετέω καί μοι φίλα γούνατ᾽ὀρώρῃ·

εἰ δὲ θανόντων περ καταλήθοντ᾽εἰν Ἀΐδαο,

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ κεῖθι φίλου μεμνήσομ᾽ἑταίρου (*Il*. 22.386-390).

Since these two themes are explored only once each in the Eph, Xen. might be here suggesting a more direct connection with Homer. In addition, if Xen. wrote after Char., since in the latter these last two lines of the *Iliad* are mentioned when Chaereas is certain to remember Callirhoe in the Underworld, the parallel with Patroclus would find here further confirmation (Char. 5.10.9).

---

[439] For this connection, see also Letoublon 1994, 265.

APPENDIX 2: XENOPHON'S HOMER
AND THE OTHER NOVELISTS

1) Introduction

The analysis of Homeric parallels has further proved that the *Odyssey* is the main hypotext of the Eph. In this chapter I would like to compare Xen.'s approach to Homer with the exploitation of this author made by the other novelists. Since a topic like this could require another dissertation, I would here outline only the main issues.

To begin with, Xen.'s paraphrasis of the *Odyssey* is original in the corpus. As is commonly known, the *Odyssey* is the main model of the whole genre and every author follows the Homeric plot, introduces parallels between his own characters and the Odyssean ones and more specific allusions. In this respect, the creativity and sophistication of these "operations" is often richer in the other authors than in Xen.

That said, the "coincidence" between the novel and the *Odyssey* at every level seems to concern only Xen., since he is the only one who includes in this parallel each element of his text, with the inclusion of the style. In this respect, the author who is closer to the Eph. is Hld., as he introduces a clear Odyssean mark in both his plot and his characters.

A second element of originality of the Eph. lies in Xen.'s moral focus on fidelity. While the erotic reading of the *Odyssey* characterises each novelist and, more widely, the erotic literature, only Xen. and Hld. highlight the importance of conjugal fidelity. Conversely, the other novelists are less radical: Longus places more emphasis on love, while Char. and especially Ach. subtly subvert this ideal introducing infidelity. On further inspection, Xen. is also slightly different from Hld.: while the latter, as also Char. does, focus on fidelity but, at the same time, attributes to his male protagonist the traditional epic ideal based on physical strength and military virtue, the former seems to deconstruct it to focus only on Odysseus the lover and on Penelope's conjugal fidelity. As a result, love becomes the new and only source of heroism. Also Ach. seems to adopt the same technique, as he emphasises the association between Leucippe and Odysseus and he makes Clitophon Odysseus the lover. However, his aim is different from that of Xen., since he subverts the importance of fidelity.

As a result, Xen.'s elaboration of an exclusive epic ideal is a distinctive feature in the whole novelistic corpus. This novelty appears to be even greater if we accept that *Callirhoe* was written before the Eph.: Char.'s focus on Chaeares' epic glory produces an evident contrast with Xen.'s construction of Habrocomes (APP 1.4). Finally, the discovery of a similar approach to the *Odyssey* in Xen. and in Hld. works as a confirmation of their closeness. (GI 5.1). In addition, the inclusion of Homer in this parallel might support our hypothesis of Xen.'s acquaintance of interpreters of Homer (LI 6.6), since Hld.'s knowledge of them is commonly accepted by scholars.

Given this framework, in the following analysis, I will focus on how each novelist approaches Homer, in order to demonstrate the truth of these general conclusions.

1) Chariton

a) Structural role

The identification between Miletus and Scheria suggests that in *Callirhoe* the protagonists move from Ithaca to Scheria and then, after their journey to Babylon and the war, they return to Ithaca. This pattern suggests two differences between Char. and Xen. The first concerns the Syracuse and the Ephesus of the beginning of their novels (1.1.1, n.: ἀνὴρ): Char.'s novel starts in a real city, which has just touched by the military victory of Hermocrates, while the Eph. is set in an ideal Ephesus. The second lies concerns war, which appears only in *Callirhoe*: although Char.'s characters fight for love, the military performance 'è anche l'occasione per un omaggio all'eroismo epico'.[440] As a result, in Char. the *Iliad* becomes a significant intertext in the last books of the novel. This exploitation of the *Iliad* is missing in the Eph.

b) Parallels with characters

1) Callirhoe
a) Helen
- Char. 2.6.1: Callirhoe is more than Helen for Dionysius.
- Char. 5.5.9: Callirhoe is Helen in the Babylonian court.

b) Nausicaa
- Char. 6.4.6: Callirhoe is Nausicaa in Artaxerxes' mind.

c) Penelope
- Char. 1.1.14: Callirhoe reacts to her marriage as Penelope does to Telemachus' departure.
- Char. 1.2.1: Callirhoe's marriage provokes the suitors' revenge.
- Char. 4.4.5: Chaereas is encouraged by Mithridates to test whether Callirhoe is enjoying her stay with Dionysius.
- Char. 4.7.5: Callirhoe is compared like Penelope to Artemis and Aphrodite.
- Char. 5.5.9: in the Babylonian court Callirhoe attracts the suitors as Penelope.

d) Odysseus
- Char. 2.2.2: Callirhoe is bathed in Miletus, a new Scheria.
- Char. 2.3.7: in Ithaca Callirhoe is identified with a hidden god, following a metaphor attributed by a suitor to Odysseus;
- 2.5.11-12: Callirhoe is Odysseus who addresses Dionysius as Alcinous.

---

[440] Fusillo 1990, 38.

2) Chaereas

a) Achilles

- Char. 1.1.3: Chaerea's beauty is compared to that of Achilles.
- Char. 1.4.6: Chaereas is desperate like Achilles for Callirhoe's adultery and then he becomes angry like him.
- Char. 1.5.2: Polycharmus, Chaereas' special friend, is Patroclus;
- Char. 4.1.5: Dionysius wants to build a tomb for Chaereas which resembles that of Achilles.
- Char. 5.2.4: Chaereas is again desperate like Achilles for his missed encounter with Callirhoe in Babylonia.
- Char. 5.10.9: Chaereas, after his suicide, will never forget Callirhoe, as Achilles does with Patroclus.

b) Odysseus

- Char. 7.4.6: Chaereas kills the enemies like Odysseus eliminates the suitors.
- Char. 8.6.4: Chaereas tells the Siracusans a false Egyptian tale.

c) Agamemnon

- Char. 8.2.13: Chaereas' false disagreement about the idea to go to Syracuse recalls Agamemnon's tactic of testing his troops (*Il*. 2.73-5).

d) Hector

- Char. 7.2.4: before fighting against Artaxerxes, Chaereas compares himself with Hector before his fatal duel with Achilles.

e) Diomedes

- Char. 7.3.5: in his an answer to the Egyptian king Chaereas uses the same words said by Diomedes to Agamemnon when he proposes to flee from Troy.

f) Patroclus

- Char. 2.9.6: Chaereas appears to Callirhoe as Patroclus and suggests her to raise their child.
- Char. 4.1.3: Dionysius tells Callirhoe to imagine that Chaereas is asking her to bury him.

Like Xen., Chaereas compares his protagonists to different Homeric characters: the result of this "game" is more sophisticated than that of our author. On the one hand, Char. makes his Callirhoe not only Penelope but also an Iliadic and tragic Helen, who uses her beauty to attract men. The introduction of the latter is significant, because it gives to Callirhoe a malicious and wanton trait which Anthia lacks in her purity. In addition, the presence of Helen also affect the nature of the

parallel with Penelope: Callirhoe is Penelope because she is pursued by suitors and not, as in Xen., also because she strenuously fights to preserve her fidelity.

On the other hand, Chaereas assumes the Iliadic status of epic warrior, as the numerous parallels with Achilles, Agamemnon, Hector, Diomedes and Patroclus prove. This is clear in his conquer of Tyre, where 'Chaereas exhibits a traditional martial aristeia'[441] and his troops' movements are featured with an typical Iliadic action (Char., 7.4.3, with a quotation from *Il*. 13.131 = 16.215). This draws a remarkable difference from the Eph., where Habrocomes lacks any desire for military glory. In addition, as with Penelope the association between Chaereas and Iliadic warriors also affects Char.'s use of Odysseus. Before being Odysseus the deceiver, Chaereas is Odysseus the killer: we are very far from Xen.'s erotic exploitation of the same hero, which appears in the novel only through Dionysius (Char. 3.2.9).

Finally, this web of associations culminates in the last scene of the novel, where Char., like Xen., makes the protagonists spend together the last Odyssean night (Char. 8.1.14-17), as the quotation of an Odyssean verse clearly establishes (*Od*. 23.296).

Although Fusillo 1990, 42 argues that 'il rapporto tra Caritone ed Omero è qui di imitazione fedele e dichiarata', there is a difference in the former which confirms the previous consideration of the protagonists: Callirhoe does not appear as a faithful wife, since she cannot tell her whole story. Then, she is not Penelope, but Helen or Odysseus himself.[442] Similarly, Cheareas appears an Iliadic warrior who focuses on his military glory: πεπλήρωκα γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν τροπαίων". καὶ πάντα ἀκριβῶς διηγήσατο, ἐναβρυνόμενος τοῖς κατορθώμασιν (8.1.17). As a result, as Smith states, 'victory in marriage can be joined by victory in war'[443] and this proves the coexistence in *Callirhoe* of Iliadic and Odyssean models.

If we compare this event with Xen's final night,[444] the aforementioned differences between the two authors become more evident: unlike our author, Char. does not focus on fidelity and includes the traditional epic heroism. As a result, this passage is one in which the difference between the two authors emerge very clearly.

2) **Longus**

a) Structural role

Since Longus does not develop his novel through a journey, the comparison with the *Odyssey* does not concern the core of its structure, as it happens in the other works of the genre. Having said that, Homer is still important for this author. First, Longus introduces some connections between his episodes and those of the Homeric poems. Second, as Pattoni argues, this author 'trasferisce nel suo

---

[441] Smith 2007, 93.

[442] On this, see Smith 2007, 161: 'Callirhoe's silence about her sexual life with Dionysius places her in the role of the cunning Odysseus'.

[443] Smith 2007, 95.

[444] See LI 5.4c for a first comparison which concerns the role played by sex.

romanzo bucolico uno degli aspetti più tipici e caratterizzanti dell'epica arcaica, quello della ripetizione',[445] which affects the construction of the novel.[446]

b) Parallels with characters
1) Chloe
a) Nausicaa
- Longus 1.13.2, 5: Chloe watch Daphnis' bath as Nausicaa does in Scheria with Odysseus.

b) Penelope
- Longus 3.25.1: Chloe is pursued by many erotic suitors.

2) Daphnis
a) Odysseus
- Longus 1.13.1-5: Daphnis is bathed by Chloe like Odysseus in Scheria.
- Longus 3.26.1: Daphnis decides to become a suitor in order to marry Chloe.
- Longus 4.17.5: Gnathon gives to Daphnis a physical trait of Odysseus (cf. Ὁρᾷς ὡς ὑακίνθῳ μὲν τὴν κόμην ὁμοίαν ἔχει [...] and *Od*. 6.229-231).[447]

2) Penelope
- Longus 4.17.5: Gnatus defines Daphnis' teeth as white like ivory. The same colour characterises Penelope's appearance after Athena's divine touch (*Od*. 18.196).

The reason why these Homeric parallels are important is that they show how Longus gives systematically an erotic reading of Odyssean motifs.[448]

The most significant example of this technique is Daphnis' bath, whose erotic interpretation is realised through its inclusion in the protagonists' falling in love. This approach to Homer concerns also Odysseus: the comparison between Daphnis' beauty and that of the Homeric hero and the former's fight for Anthia makes Longus' protagonist Odysseus the lover like Habrocomes. Finally, the same transformation also concerns Dorcon, who is compared with Dolon and with Agamemnon, but in a new erotic context (cf. Longus 1.20-21 and 1.29.1).[449] These two parallels are interesting, because they demonstrate that the erotic reading of Homer also included the *Iliad*.

As a result, this framework demonstrates that the erotic reading of Homer is a τόπος of the novelistic genre which occurs also in the Eph.

---

[445] Pattoni 2005, 116.

[446] See, e.g., Longus' oaths in 1.11.3-5, n.: oath of fidelity, e.

[447] See on this Pattoni 2005, 90.

[448] See Pattoni 2005, 83 on this: Longus looks at Homer and 'ne accentua i risvolti erotici, sulla scorta dell'esperienza della letteratura d'amore'.

[449] On these parallels, see Pattoni 2005 33-44.

That being said, in his approach to Homer Longus includes sophistication and irony. This particularly emerges in the Lycaenion episode (3.16.2-4), in which this erotic suitor tells Daphnis a false story about an eagle which kidnaps a goose. This cruel act recalls Penelope's dream of the eagle (Odysseus) which kills twenty geese (the suitors) (*Od*. 19.536-543). Within this parallel, Longus is clearly making a variation to accomodate the Odyssean story in his novel: he introduces only a goose and 'the eagle is now Lykainion herself, who will take him into the wood and do her worst'.[450] (ibid.). This transformation provides confirmation of Longus' erotic approach to Homer and adds an ironical trait, since 'a dream of the archetypal chaste wife is transposed into an instrument of seduction by a promiscuous and predatory female'.[451]

Finally, the sophistication of this passage is also proven by the fact that Longus associates with Lycaenion other homeric characters:

- Longus' variation in the dream appears the fruit of his contamination of another Odyssean passage, where in Sparta a real eagle catches a goose (*Od*. 15. 160-163). Since in this episode it is Helen who interprets this omen, Lycaenion is subtly compared to this heroine.[452]

- Since Lycaenion's speech is a lie, she also recalls Odysseus the deceiver;

- At the end of the episode, when Lycaenion greets Daphnis, her farewell recalls that of Nausicaa to Odysseus (cf. Longus 3.19.3: μέμνησο ὅτι σε ἐγὼ ἄνδρα πρὸ Χλόης πεποίηκα and *Od*. 8.462 μνήσῃ ἐμεῖ᾿, ὅτι μοι πρώτη ζωάγρι᾿ὀφέλλεις).

Although this sequence of parallels appears similar to that of Xen., it is evident how Longus is using this expedient in a subversive way: to begin with, Lykainion is no Penelope, because she violates Daphnis' chastity. Then, she is no Nausicaa, since in her farewell she refers to a sexual intercourse that Alcinous' daughter does not have with Odysseus. This contrast confirms the existence of an 'effetto ironico'[453] and makes her more a Calypso or a Circe. This proves how subtle can be Longus' erotic interpretation of Homer.

3) Achilles Tatius

a) Structural role

As Repath forth. argues in his dissertation, Ach.'s debt to Homer is significant, as his name already suggests, and clear proof of this is the introduction in the novel of two first-person narrators, who inevitably activate the comparison with Odysseus the storyteller. The Homeric mark of this

---

[450] Morgan 2004, 211.

[451] Ibid.

[452] On this comparison, see Pattoni 2005, 21, n. 23.

[453] Pattoni 2005, 27.

narratological expedient is widely recognised in the Imperial Era: Lucian proves this at the beginning of his *Historia Vera*, where the first-narrator explicitly declares this parallel.[454]

In addition, Ach. like Xen. uses the *Odyssey* to construct some scenes of his novel. To begin with, the identification between Sidon and Scheria, which is suggested by the early appearance of Clitophon the narrator, makes the novel start from the same Homeric land as the *Eph*. Then, since Melite is Penelope and comes from Ephesus, the last chapters of the novel are set in Ithaca. Thus, although at the very end of the story Clitophon move to Byzantium, Ach. places his story in an Odyssean trajectory which is very similar to that of Xen. (LI 6.2c). In addition, in the first part of the text there is a narrative sequence which appears to be drawn from the epic poem: while 'in the *Odyssey* we have the Cyclops, escape, Eolus and the storm, and then the Laestrygonians; in Achilles Tatius we find the evasion of Conops, Clitophon's escape, the eloping of the protagonists, a storm, and death and destruction at sea'.[455]

As this sequence of event does not have the same positive effect on Clitophon as on Odysseus, we are dealing here with a first sign of Ach.'s sophisticated approach to Homer, which will emerge more clearly in the following section.

b) Parallels with characters

1) Leucippe

a) Helen

- Ach. 5.17.5: Leucippe's name as a slave is Λάκαινα, which recalls Helen.
- Ach. 6.16.5-6: Leucippe decides to remain Λάκαινα to defend Clitophon's destiny.

b) Penelope

- Ach. 7.16.3: Leucippe strongly believes in Clitophon's virginity.
- Ach. 8.7.1: Leucippe's σωφροσύνη is appreciated by the Ephesian priest.

c) Odysseus

- Ach. 1.3.6: the heroine is described as a fugitive since her first presentation.
- Ach. 5.17.3-6; 10: Leucippe addresses Melite as a beggar and she is bathed by her servants. like Odysseus in Scheria.
- Ach. 5. 18.3-6: in her letter to Clitophon Leucippe presents herself as a wanderer who has undergone many sufferings for him.
- Ach. 8.13: Leucippe's virginity test recalls Odysseus' trial of the bow.
- Ach. 8.15.3: Leucippe's long account of misadventures to Clitophon makes her more Odysseus than Penelope.

---

[454] See 1.2: ἀρχηγὸς δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ διδάσκαλος τῆς τοιαύτης βωμολοχίας ὁ τοῦ Ὁμήρου Ὀδυσσεύς.

[455] Repath, forth.

2) Clitophon

a) Achilles

- Ach. 6.1.3: Melite defines the feminised Clitophon as Achilles in Scyrus.

b) Odysseus

- Ach. 1.3.1: from this passage onwards Clitophon is Odysseus the storyteller and Sidon can be compared with Scheria.
- Ach. 2.23.3: Satyrus compares Clitophon's fight against Conops to have sex with Leucippe with Odysseus' battle against Polyphemus.
- Ach. 3.4.6 and 3.5.1: the storm of the third book recalls the Odyssean one of the fifth book, as is attested by the presence of a trunk of the boat; further, the death of Clitophon's companions recalls that of Odysseus' ones provoked by the Lestrigonians (*Od*. 10.124).[456]
- Ach. 5.7.2: Clitophon has been wounded at his thigh: this recalls Odysseus' scar.
- Ach. 7.4.4: Clitophon alludes to the origin of Odysseus' scar (*Od*. 19. 392-394).
- Ach 8.5.1-8: Clitophon's account of misadventures recalls both Odysseus and Penelope's stories. Conversely, his lie about the relationship with Melite makes him Odysseus the deceiver.
- Ach. 8.15.3: Clitophon shares his misadventures with Leucippe: he is again Odysseus the storyteller.

Overall, with these associations Ach. confirms how the novelists approach Homer from an erotic perspective. This is particularly clear in the construction of Clitophon, since he is Odysseus the lover. In addition, the balance of the protagonists' couple is very close to that of the Eph. and Homer seems to be part of this parallel. On the one hand, Leucippe in the second part of the novel becomes a paladin of conjugal fidelity like Penelope and Anthia. At the same time, she also 'reminds the reader of Odysseus'.[457] On the other hand, in some passages Clitophon becomes no Odysseus (Repath forth.),[458] especially when he loses the battle against Conops and he lacks courage during the storm. As in the Eph., this loss of authentic epic heroism leaves more space to the erotic interpretation of the *Odyssey* and to Leucippe's "epic" fidelity. In this respect, further confirmation of this is provided by the parallel with the feminised Achilles in Scyrus.

That being said, unlike Xen., Ach.'s reason for choosing this approach to Homer is not to highlight the importance of fidelity: as the presence of Helen suggests, Ach. enjoys opposing infidelity to fidelity and the peak of this interest occurs when Clitophon has sex with Melite (5.27.3). Further, unlike the other novelistic betrayals which involve Callirhoe and Daphnis, 'Clitophon's attitude

---

[456] On this parallel, and Ciccolella 1999, 155, n. 2.

[457] Dümmler 2008, 6.

[458] Repath, forth.

here is quite different from the former's desperation and the latter's ignorant innocence',[459] because it is the fruit of a 'conscious and knowing lapse'.[460]

Finally, this subtle play with this theme is enriched by Ach. through the creation of another Odyssean couple, namely Melite and Thersander.

3) Melite

a) Nausicaa

- Ach. 5.17.3, 10: Melite is Nausicaa when Leucippe is a beggar.

b) Penelope

- Ach. 5.11.6: Melite, like Penelope, has lost his husband Thersandros in the sea.
- Ach. 27.3-4: Melite is no Penelope when she has sex with Clitophon, but she can compared with Circe, as she explicitly asks Odysseus to have sex as does the Homeric witch.
- Ach. 6.1.2 and 6.2.1: Melite has the servant Melantho with her, whose name and social position coincide with that of the Odyssean' Melantho, who works for Penelope. The difference between the two lies in the behavior: Ach.'s Melantho, unlike the Homeric one, is a faithful person.

4) Thersander

a) Odysseus

- Ach. 8.10.9: his lawyer compares Thersander with Odysseus as he mentions his journey away from Ephesus.

The introduction of this second couple is significant, because it further proves that Ach. exploits the Odyssean model in order to reverse it: since Melite has sex with Clitophon, our author could have chosen to compare her only with Circe or Calypso, but he enriches these "obvious" parallels with the subversive one with Penelope. In addition, this status of Melite as anti-Penelope is paradoxically emphasised through her battle against Leucippe, who is Penelope.

As a result, at the end Ach.'s exploration of conjugal fidelity appears more a game than a serious issue: this author lacks Xen.'s moral concern.

4) Heliodorus

a) Structural role

The *Aethiopica* is the novel in which, according to the scholarly consensus, Homer exerts the most significant influence and this is proved first by the trajectory of the protagonists' journey, which is

---

[459] Repath 2009, 258, n. 46.

[460] Ibid.

no longer circular like in the other novels, but a real νόστος which Charicleia makes to her homeland.

In addition, some sequences of the journey activate 'meaningful resonances of Odyssean scenes':[461]

- 'Charicleia's 10-year stay at Delphi [...] echoes Odysseus's 10-year detention by Calypso'.[462]
- The protagonists' sojourn in Zakynthos in Nausicles' house corresponds to the Phaeacian episode.
- 'Charicleia's encounter with an Egyptian necromancer (Hld. 6.14-15) is linked by precise allusion to Odysseus's meeting with the dead (*Od*. 11.13-640);
- the protagonists' tribulations in the luxurious but brutal Persian palace (Hld. 7.12-8.13) correspond to the Cyclops episode (*Od*. 9.105-566);
- at the very end of the novel, like Odysseus, the heroine is united with her father and her true-beloved'.[463]

The existence of this framework recalls that of the Eph.: the *Odyssey* lies at the core of the structure of the *Aethiopica* and strengthens the closeness between Xen. and Hld.

Along with this structural role, it must be said that Hld. is the novelist who adopts the widest range of approaches to Homer: besides quotations, episodes and paralles with characters, we find in him 'la tendenza [...] a presupporre nel riuso del testo omerico la mediazione della lunga tradizione critico-retorica, formatasi a partire dall'età ellenistica e testimoniata principalmente dalla letteratura scoliastica'.[464] This clearly emerges in the passage where Homer is used to interpret the gods' epiphany (3.12.2) and in two metaliterary parenthesis, where Hld. introduces the technical terms προαναφώνησις (8.17.5) and ἐπεισόδιον (1.8.7 and 2.24.4). Interesting, both expressions belong to the Homeric critical literature and, therefore, 'ancora una volta il narratore non nasconde di trattare la sua opera come un nuovo poema omerico, per la lettura del quale propone linee interpretative, chiaramente derivate dal lungo lavoro critico di commento ai testi epici'.[465]

Finally, Morgan highlights a passage of the *Aethiopica* in which Hld. uses the rhetorical interpretation of Homer: the Homeric quotation made by Hydaspe in his speech in the tenth book (10.16), which would precede Charicleia's religious murder, 'est une communication adressée au lecteur à l'insu, pour ainsi dire, du personnage'[466] to reveal the value of his words as a λόγος ἐσχηματισμένος.

Overall, Hld.'s clear exploitation of secondary readings of Homer might support our hypothesis of Xen.'s knowledge of moral interpretations, although the difference in time and in length makes this parallel a mere speculation.

---

[461] Morgan 2009, 25.

[462] Morgan 2009, 35.

[463] Morgan 2009, 35.

[464] Telò 1999, 71.

[465] Telò 1999, 85.

[466] Morgan 2006, 55.

<u>b) Parallels with characters</u>

1) Charicleia

a) Penelope

- Hld. 1.21.3: Charicleia answers Thyamis' proposal of marriage with a false Ephesian story and a request for delay.
- Hld. 5.22.2-3: in a dream Odysseus tells Calasiris that Penelope wishes Charicleia every best, because of her σωφροσύνη.
- Hld. 6.8-9: in Nausicles' palace Charicleia is desperate for Theagenes' loss, like Penelope mourning for Odysseus.
- Hld. 7.21: Charicleia suggests Theagenes to accept Arsace's love and delay the consummation, as Penelope does with the suitors.

b) Odysseus

- Hld. 1.22: Charicleia is Odysseus the deceiver in her false story told to Thyamis.
- Hld. 2.31.3: Charicleia in Delphi is like Odysseus in Calypso's cave, since this city is the last trap before starting her journey home.
- Hld. 6.11.3-4: Charicleia and Calasiris become beggars after having left Nausicles' house.
- Hld. 6.15.4: in the episode which Hld. clearly calls νέκυια, the corpse of the witch's son gives a prophecy about Charicleia, which recalls that of Odysseus made by Tiresias (*Od*. 11. 100-137).
- Hld. 7.7.6: when Charicleia receives a slap from Theagenes, who has not recognised her, she recalls Odysseus beaten on a shoulder by Antinous (*Od*. 17. 462-465).
- Hld. 7.7.7: Charicleia is finally identified by Theagenes, after his strategic delay which recalls that adopted by Penelope with Odysseus.
- Hld. 10.15.2: Charicleia shows her spot on her body and helps the other to recognise her: this echoes Odysseus' scar (*Od*. 19.467-475).
- Hld. 10.16: Persinna's recognition of Charicleia recalls that of Laertes' towards Odysseus (*Od*. 24.331-348).

2) Theagenes

a) Achilles

- Hld. 2.34.4: Theagenes is proud to be a descendant from Achilles.
- Hld. 2.35.1: Calasiris admits that Theagenes is similar to Achilles.
- Hld. 4.3.1: Theagenes is compared to Achilles during the games in Delphi.
- Hld. 4.7.4: Charicleia invokes Theagenes as Achilles, using Patroclus' words (*Il*. 16.21).

b) Odysseus

- Hld. 2.19.1: Theagenes has the plan to disguise himself and Charicleia as beggars, as Odysseus does in Ithaca (*Od*. 17.222).
- Hld. 5.5.2: Theagenes shows Charicleia the wound on his knee: this recalls Odysseus' scar.

Overall, Charicleia seems to be strongly associated with both the protagonists of the *Odyssey*: while Odysseus' dream clearly establishes Charicleia's σωφροσύνη as her main virtue, Hld. attributes to her all the most traditional elements of Odysseus' personality: she is Odysseus the deceiver, the beggar, the sufferer; further, she receives a similar prophecy and she has an important token on her body. As a result, this frame of associations makes Charicleia both Penelope and Odysseus, like Anthia.

On the other hand, Theagenes is both an Iliadic and an Odyssean character, who in Delphi displays an epic traditional heroism: thus, he recalls more Chaereas than Habrocomes. This, however, does not reduce the importance of Odysseus' model for male figures, since this hero is the model of two other characters, like Calasiris and Cnemon.

Finally, Hld.'s interest in parallels with Odysseus is enriched by the involvement of other two characters.

3) Calasiris

a) Odysseus

- Hld. 2.21.5: Calasiris is introduced as a wanderer and a storyteller and his words Ἰλιόθεν με φέρεις recall those used by Odysseus in his account of his visit to the Cicones (*Od*. 9.39).
- Hld. 2.22.1: Calasiris is hosted in Nausicles' house in a scene that recalls the Scheria episode.
- Hld. 5.16.1-2: Calasiris is again the Odysseus storyteller.
- Hld. 5.22.3: Odysseus prophesies to Calasiris that he will undergo his same misadventures.
- Hld. 5.33.4: Nausicles makes a wish to Calasiris which recalls that made by Alcinous to Odysseus;
- Hld. 6.11.3-4: Calasiris becomes a beggar like Charickleia after having left Nausicles' house.
- Hld. 7.7.2-3: Thyamis and Petosiris recognise their father Calasiris: this scene constitutes a parallel with Telemachus' recognition of Odysseus (*Od*. 16.172-219).

4) Cnemon

a) Odysseus

- Hld. 2.20.3: Cnemon spends the night hidden under a pile of leaves, like Odysseus in Scheria.
- Hld. 2.22.1: Calasiris is hosted with Cnemon in Nausicles' house.
- Hld. 6.2.2: Cnemon becomes Odysseus the storyteller in Nausicles' house.

Overall, both Calasiris and Cnemon prove that Hld. is very interested in Odysseus' figure and in his traditional features. His subtle construction of these parallels particularly emerges in Nausicles' episode: as Dowden argues, in this episode 'Odysseus undergoes a sort of Freudian fragmentation or segmentation. Cnemon is the Odysseus who stays; Charicleia is the true Odysseus who goes on. Presently Charicleia and Calasiris will both be Odysseus disguised as a beggar'.[467] This framework has a sophistication which is unknown to Xen.

---

[467] Dowden 2007, 147.

Despite this stylistic difference, however, Hld. seems to share the authentic and comprehensive exploitation of Homer which characterises the Eph.. The only main difference is the preservation in Theagenes of an authentic epic dimension.

5) Brief analysis of Homer in the Roman novels: introduction

The results of this study of the relationship between the Greek novel and Homer can be also tested by a brief analysis of the Roman novels. To begin with, Petronius' and Apuleius' works share with the Greek "cousins" the structural use of the *Odyssey* and the erotic reading of epic.

At the same time, two main differences emerge from the comparison: first, unlike the Greek authors, the Latin novelists are keen on a comic and often ironical reading of the *Odyssey*. A possible echo of this attitude seems to appear in Xen's association of Corymbus with Calypso[468] and in other few passages of Greek texts, but Petronius' and Apuleius' emphasis on this aspect is clearly original. Second, these writers do not focus their attention on Penelope: this omission makes their study less interesting from the specific perspective of Xen.

6) Petronius

a) The structural role

As Jensson argues, the Satyricon 'can be thought of as a complicated literary game, informed by a sophistic reading of the Homeric *Odyssey*'.[469]   The truth of this assessment can be widely demonstrated. To begin with, this model concerns the structure of the extant work: along with the first-person narrator, 'the anger of Priapus, which overhangs the hero throughout the extant novel, is clearly a comic evocation of the wrath of Poseidon against Odysseus in Homer's *Odyssey*'.[470] Second, Homer is evoked through characters whom Encolpius meets during his journey: two are even called Agamemnon and Menelaus. Third, in the relationship with the *Odyssey* Petronius uses subtle intertextuality which performs a threefold function: while sometimes 'the epic allusions are at the service of the characterization',[471] as the characters are aware of them, 'at other times the reference seems to be the property of Encolpius the narrator'.[472] Finally, 'the third layer of epic reference resides with the author'[473] and remains 'a tool in the communication between author and reader'.[474]

---

[468] See 1.16.2, n.: λέγει, c.

[469] Jensson 2004, X.

[470] Walsh 1970, XXV.

[471] Morgan 2009, 37.

[472] Ibid.

[473] Ibid., 38.

[474] Ibid.

Finally, clear confirmation of Petronius' intense approach to Homer comes from the famous episode of the *Cena Trimalchionis*: to begin with, 'the Cena recalls the Cyclops episode of *Odyssey* 9. Like Polyphemus, Trimalchio is a monster baited in his lair, whose guests are destroyed be eating'.[475] In addition, 'a cluster of images towards the end of the episode connect Trimalchio's house with the Underworld'[476] of Virgil, which is directly connected with Homer. The same link with death is suggested by the parallel between Trimalchio and the Minotaur. Finally, in Harrison's interpretation 'the Cena Trimalchionis, as an extensive entertainment offered to the protagonist, has a clear epic ancestor in the entertainment of Odysseus in Phaeacia'.[477] As a result, this preserved scene of the *Satyricon* can be considered as 'a parodic version of epic poetry'.[478]

This discovery is significant and opens a question about what exploitation of Homer Petronius introduced in his whole novel. In Morgan's view, the framework thus far provided suggests that the whole text might have been conceived as a 'comic rewriting of the *Odyssey* on an epic scale'.[479] Within this hypothesis, 'it would be surprising if there were not macro-structural correspondences to the Homeric epics as well as allusive details' (ibid.).

Since this speculative hypothesis appears plausible, it might introduce an interesting parallel with Xen.: in Morgan's view, the deep way in which the *Odyssey* would affect the structure of the *Satyricon* recalls the paraphrasis that Xen. is writing of the Homeric poem. Although Petronius' "operation" would certainly imply more sophisticated devices, it is not unthinkable that his approach to Homer was comparable to that of our author. This hypothesis is definitely interesting, because it could make us rethink the relationship between Greek and Roman novels.

<u>b) Parallels with characters</u>

1) Encolpius
a) Achilles
- *Sat*. 81.1-3: Encolpius broods morosely by the shore when robbed of Giton by Ascyltus, and he promises revenge, like Achilles robbed by Agamemnon of Briseid (*Il*. 1.348 ff.).
- *Sat*. 129: when Encolpius speaks with Giton, he compares himself with Achilles.

b) Odysseus
- *Sat*. 103: 'the disguise adopted by Encolpius and Giton recalls Athene's transformation of Odysseus into an old man when he returns to Ithaca (*Od*. 13.392-438)'.[480]

---

[475] Morgan 2009, 36.

[476] Ibid., 35.

[477] Harrison 1998a, 583.

[478] Morgan 2009, 37.

[479] Morgan 2009, 34.

[480] Ibid., 36.

- *Sat*. 105: Lichas easily recognises Encolpius from touching his groin. This action is compared by Encolpius to Eurycleia's recognition of Odysseus' scar. As a result, Encolpius here identifies himself with the Homeric hero.
- *Sat*. 126 ff.: when Encolpius meets Circe, this beautiful woman calls him "Polyaenus" (127), which is the Latin transliteration of the epithet πολύαινος (*Od*. 12.184) given by the Sirens to Odysseus. After this meeting, they try in vain to have sex together.
- *Sat*. 139: Encolpius complains that he is hounded by the wrath of Priapus, which he compares to Poseidon's anger against Poseidon.

2) Giton
a) Odysseus
- *Sat*. 98.5: Giton hides himself from Ascyltos using a stratagem which recalls what Odysseus does in Cyclops' cave and Encolpius notes this.

Overall, these passages show how far Petronius exploits both the erotic and the comic reading of Homer. This particularly emerges in the "Circe" episode: while in the epic model Odysseus is not defeated by the witch, 'Encolpius is likewise immune to Circe's spell, but only in the sense that he is repeatedly impotent with her'.[481] As a result, 'here it is not the companions but the hero himself who is metaphorically dehumanized'.[482]   At the same time, the same double reading is evident in the first passage where Encolpius / Achilles describes his rival: his Agamemnon is a man 'qui die togae virilis stolam sumpsit, qui ne vir esset a matre persuasus est' (*Sat*. 81). Thus, Encolpius is not a traditional Achilles, but a special Achilles the lover.
In conclusion, Petronius shares with Greek novelists the erotic reading of Homer, while he originally introduces the comic one.

7) **Apuleius**

a) The structural role
The plot of this novel has a clearly Odyssean foundation: 'somewhat similarly to Odysseus in the *Odyssey*, Lucius is on a quest for homecoming that pits him against a wide variety of challenges before he can come home to his human form'.[483] Further, in Svenden view, the Homeric poems have a wider influence on Apuleius' narratological technique, as the the 'use of the interpolated (or inserted) tale-within-a-tale'[484] and the presence of a 'highly dramatic narrative'[485] prove.

---

[481] Morgan 2009, 33.

[482] Ibid.

[483] Adlington 1996, X.

[484] Svenden 1983, 23.

[485] Ibid.

That said, the extensive exploitation of the Odyssey which is proper of Xen. and Hld. and probably of Petronius does not concern Apuleius: as a result, his study is less interesting for us than that of the *Satyricon*.

b) Parallels with characters

1) LUCIUS

a) Odysseus

- *Met.* 2.7: in the liaison between Lucius and Photis 'the stupefaction of the hero at the sight of her attractions, and his rhetorical congratulations to the one who is to enjoy them, recall and invert Odysseus' and Nausicaa's meeting on the beach'.[486]

- *Met.* 9.13.4: in the ninth book the protagonist describes himself as a wanderer Odysseus, whose key feature is curiosity: 'Nec ullum uspiam cruciabilis vitae solacium aderat, nisi quod ingenita mihi curiositate recreabar'. Further, shortly after this sentence, Lucius compares directly himself with the epic hero, making an authorial side: 'Nec immerito priscae poeticae divinus auctor apud Graios summae prudentiae virum monstrare cupiens, multarum civitatium obitu et variorum populorum cognitu summas adeptum virtutes cecinit' (ibid.). This sentence clarifies his parallel with Odysseus;

- *Met.* 11.14.3-5: when in the eleventh book Lucius returns again to be a man, Isis' priest, like Nausicaa, gives him a piece of linen cloth to cover himself.

b) Telemachus

- *Met.* 2.2.5: in the market in Hypata Lucius is hailed by an old woman, who compares him with his mother. This scene recalls Telemachus's appearance in Sparta, where Menelaus identifies in him the physical traits of his father.[487]

Overal, Lucius seems to be both Odysseus the adventurer and Odysseus the lover. The first identification is stressed with the introduction of a formula - multarum civitatium obitu et variorum populorum cognitu summas adeptum - which recalls Xen.'s epic formulae (LI 6.6). The second parallel, instead, is based on a comic and erotic reading of epic, which coincides with Petronius'

---

[486] Harrison 1990, 197.

[487] On this, see Harrison 1990, 195-197.

technique. This is clear in Lucius' meeting with Photis, where the former is identified with Nausicaa but is 'a slave of low origins, low activities and low desires, [...] a sexual athlete of a high order' (Harrison 1990, 198). Then, the comic colour also appears in the parallel with Telemachus, since Lucius with his youthful ignorance ignores the good manners of Odysseus' child.

Finally, also other characters reflect a Homeric inspiration: since they are connected with the main protagonist by the multiple structure of the novel, Apuleius seems here to follow the Odyssean technique of building parallels within its characters. In this respect, this author seems to constitute a possible parallel with Xen.'s construction of Anthia (LI 6.3).

2) Socrates

- Odysseus

- *Met*. 1.5-1.19: In her inn Meroe tries to tempt the guest Socrates into her bed and to steal all his money. After the failure of her attempt, she manages to transform Socrates' heart into a sponge. As a result, Meroe is Circe and Socrated Odysseus.

3) Psyche

- Odysseus

- *Met*. 5.1.1: after Apollo's oracle, Psyche's arrival in Cupid's palace can be seen as a version of Odysseus' arrival in Phaeacia. More specifically, 'Cupid's realm shares with Alcinous' domain the combination of an outstanding garden and a superhuman architecture'.[488] Finally, in both cases 'the protagonist receives a pleasant surprise',[489] since both Odysseus and Psyche avoid the danger that they were expecting (cf. *Met*. 5.1.1 and *Od*. 6.119-120).

4) Tlepolemus

- Odysseus

In the seventh book Tlepolemus deceives the robbers in the cave to rescue his beloved Charite: this operation recalls Odysseus' successful battle against the suitors, as the disguise, the false-tale, the robbers' punishment and the etymology of Tlepolemus prove. Here Apuleius does not seem to vary Odysseus' model: 'Apuleius invokes him [...] in order to stress the high qualities of this attractive young man'.[490]

These three parallels confirm the double nature of Apuleius' Odysseus and they also suggest that the existence of a shift from a passive hero like Socrates, who is won by Meroe, to the active and

---

[488] Harrison 1998b, 59.

[489] Ibid.

[490] Harrison 1990, 200.

honest Tlepolemus. As a result, the use of Odysseus seems to support the *Bildung* of the protagonist, as each of these secondary characters is associated with him. At the same time, Circe's appearance is interesting too: it definitely confirms the comic reading of epic, which appears the most peculiar feature of the Roman novelistic approach to Homer.

APPENDIX 3: THE TRADITIONAL CONSIDERATION OF ARETE AND PENELOPE AS IDEAL WIWES

While in <u>LI</u> 6.6, during the commentary and in <u>APP</u> 1 I demonstrated that Xen.'s in his approach to the *Odyssey* is influenced by moral interpretations of this text, I would like to focus now on the most important Homeric theme of the novel, Penelope's conjugal fidelity. While the Imperial literary texts often play ironically with this theme [491] - and thus, they are comparable with Char. and, especially, with Ach., the following data prove that the symbolic positive interpretation of this heroine was widespread in other kinds of sources. This variety makes it difficult to identify the source of Xen.'s approach. As a result, I would conclude with Penelope our author is following a common pattern of Greek culture. Finally, in this section I am including also Arete, because she is clearly linked with Penelope both in Homer and in Xen.

That said, the existence of a good number of Imperial writers who allude to Penelope's infidelity also suggests that, from a literary point of view, Xen. appears innovative: this confirms our hypothesis that his focus on fidelity is original (<u>APP</u> 2.1).

1) Arete in Greek literature and iconography: a conservative character

In the Greek world the reception of Arete is simple to reconstruct, since she is not very popular.

After her definition as the most honoured wife given by Athena in the *Odyssey* (*Od*. 7.66-72), the only extant text where Arete appears is the *Argonautica*. As in Homer, Arete offers her hospitality to Medea as soon as the heroine arrives at Scheria (4.1014-1028). In addition, Arete suggests Jason to marry her, in order to stop Colchians' pretences. As a result, Medea and Jason celebrate their wedding in Scheria (4.1164) and they depart together (4.1219-1225).

Although we do not know whether Xen. read Apollonius, I would use the *Argonautica* to prove that in the Hellenistic Era Arete was still considered as a positive and virtuous woman, as she is both the *Odyssey* and the Eph.

That said, scholars infer that 'le côté insolite de l'autorité d'Arété n'a sans doute pas échappé à la satire des comiques' (LIMC Alkinoos, 545). However, no preserved fragment offers us a comic reading of Arete. The only testimony of this is the early Hellenistic representation of a grotesque meeting between Arete, Alkinoos and Odysseus (LIMC Alkinoos 1). However, as this scene

---

[491] While in Classical Greece Penelope the symbolic wife is a popular theme, as Euripides' *Helen* and Xenophon of Athens' *Cyropedia* prove with their "Penelope" Helen (<u>APP</u> 4.3) and Panthea (GI 1.4), in the Imperial Era a good number of Imperial writers attribute to Penelope 'the scandalous story of a a shameless woman' (Mactoux 1975, 97). While Dio raises suspicions about Penelope's integrity (see Mactoux 1975, 156 and Dio 7.83-86), Lucian in his *Historia vera* makes Calypso ask ironically whether Penelope is really prudent or not (see 2.36). Finally, a similar connotation characterises a passage from Athenaeus on Demetrius' life, when he says: 'Any whore at my court lives more chastely than any Penelope at his' (615 A; see also Plut. *Demetr*. 25.6).
The existence of this negative interpretation of Penelope is already attested in the Hellenistic Era, and it is likely that Duris of Samos was his inventor, as he created the new version of Penelope mother of Pan with a suitor (see Duris in Tzetzes, *Schol. on Lycophron* 772 and Verg. *Aen*. 2.44, but also Lycophron and Dicearchus adopted the same approach to the heroine). However, the sophisticated use of this tradition in fiction is an original fruit of the Imperial Era.

involves three Homeric characters, the comic transformation seems to be attributed to the whole episode and this weakens its influence on Arete.

As a result, I would conclude that, unlike Nausicaa, Xen. was drawing this character from Homer.

2) The symbolic value of Penelope as a faithful bride

Unlike Arete, Penelope as a symbol of fidelity is addressed by the moral interpreters of Xen. as well as by sources which express the common thought of Ancient Greeks, such as epitaphs and iconography. This confirms how Xen.'s interest in this heroine reflects a cornerstone of the Greek tradition. At the same time, the evidence provided in this section might also support the hypothesis of Xen.'s acquaintance of the Ephesian statue of Penelope (GI 3), since the positive fame of the heroine was widely recognised in the Imperial Era.

a) Moral interpretations of Homer: Penelope is the faithful wife

The moral focus on Penelope is clearly proved by Heraclitus: in his *Homeric Allegories*, he first stresses that Homer, unlike Plato, is keen on marriage: τῷ δ'ἄμφω τὰ σωμάτια γάμοις σώφροσι καθωσίωται· διὰ μὲν γὰρ Ἑλένην ἐστρατεύκασιν Ἕλληνες, διὰ Πηνελόπην δ'Ὀδυσσεὺς πλανᾶται (76.12-13). Then, his list of the virtues of the Homeric characters, he includes Penelope's σωφροσύνη: πάντα τὰ παρ'Ὁμήρῳ γεννικῆς ἀρετῆς γέμει· σώφρων Πηνελόπη· (78.2-3).

Similarly, Maximus Tyrius defines Penelope as γυνὴ σώφρων, ἀντιταττομένη ὑβρισταῖς νεανίαις (26-9a).

b) Greek epitaphs

This symbolic value of Penelope appears also in the Greek sepulchral poetry: although epitaphs often allude to mythological figures[492], the high number of references to Penelope is comparable only with that of Alcestis.

1) List of epitaphs with quotations

- Peek 693: stele, Naxos, III century AD: the young dead wife is σωφροσύνης δ'ἀρετῇ παρισουμένην Πηνελοπείη (v. 3).
- Peek 727: stele, Syria, II / III century AD: the dead wife was σώφρων ἀγαθὴ (v. 1), ὑπερέσχεν Πηνελόπην ἔργοις (3-4) and was characterised by τὸ φίλανδρον (7).
- Peek 848: stele, Panticapaeum, I century AD: the dead woman is celebrated for ἀρετᾶς ἵνεκα Πανελόπα[ν].
- Peek 885: V century AD = AP 7.557 (Cyrus): the dead woman was πάντ'ἀπομαξαμένην ἔργα τὰ Πηνελόπης.
- Peek 1115: Amorgos, Late Antiquity: the dead woman is speaking in the first person and she compares herself with both Penelope and Alcestis: νικ]ῶ γὰρ πάσας τὰς σώ[φρονας οὔσας] [κλεινήν τ' Ἄλκησ]τιν και Πηνελόπε[ιαν [...] (vv. 3-4).

---

[492] See Maffei 1987, 152: 'la poesia sepolcrale greca e latina mostra una simile ricchezza di paragoni [...] mitologici'.

- Peek 1735: Stele, Cleonae, II / I century BC: the dead woman is identified with Penelope: Ἰκαρίου μὲν παῖδα πολυζήλωτον Ὅμηρος ἥιν[η]σ' ἐν δέλτοις ἔξοχα Πηνελόπην· σὴν δ'ἀρετὴν καὶ κῦδος ὑπέρτατον οὔτις ἐπαρ[κῶς] ἰς[χύει] λιγυρῶν ᾆσαι ἀπὸ στο[μάτων] (vv. 1-4).

- Peek 1736: Roman sarcophagus, II century AD: the dead wife is compared with Penelope at the beginning of the epitaph (see 1-2: σεμνὴν Πηνελόπην ὁ πάλαι βίος, ἔσχε δὲ καὶ νῦν σεμνὴν Φηλικίταν οὐ τάχα μιοτέρην) and at the end she is interestingly defined as μάρτυς σωφροσύνης (9);

Peek 1737: Relief, Rhossos (Syria), III century AD: the dead wife's virtue is bigger than that of Penelope, because it is proved by facts and not only by words: ἁ μὲν Ὀδύσσειος γαμετὰ μύθοισιν Ὁμήρου τὰν ὕμνοις ἀρετὰν ἔσχεν αἰὲς κλυμέναν· ἁ δὲ τρόποις σεμνὴ βερεῦς πατρὸς Χρυσίππου ἔργοις, οὐ μύθοις Πηνελόπα γέγονεν, σώφρων ἐν γαμότητι, περίφρων δ'ἐν βιότητι, οἰκουρὸς δ'ἀγαθὴ καὶ βίου ἡνίοχος (1-6).

- Peek 1999: Nicaea, end IV century AD: the dead wife, after a long piece, highlights her prfound union with her partner (see 31-32: εἷς γάμος ἀμφοτέρων, ξυνὸς βίος, οὐδὲ θανόντες λήσμονες ἀλλήλων ἔσχον ἀποικεσίην) and then she compares herself with Penelope (see 35-36: αὐτὰρ ἐμὲ Σευουήραν ἀνήρ, τέκος, ἤθεα, κάλλος τῆς πρὶν Πηνελόπης, θήσει ἀοιδοτέρην).

- Peek 2005: Inscription on a rock, Sardinia, I / II century AD: the dead woman outdoes Penelope, Evadne and Alcestis (cf 22: μηκέτ[ι Πηνελ[όπη[ν] μηδ'Εὐάδνην [κελαδεῖτε] and 26: σιγάσθ[ω] δ' Ἄλκη[σ]τις).

- Peek 2031: the dead woman is first defined as ἀγνή (v. 1) and then compared with Penelope: ἥτις ἐν ἀνθρώποις κλέος ἤρατο Πηνελοπείης σωφροσύνῃ (9-10).

2) Analysis

To begin with, these inscriptions were part of a private production and they all date in the Hellenistic and Imperial Era, with a recurrent provenance from the East or Rome: this proves that we are dealing with a phenomenon which happened after the Classical Era.

The main reason why their collection is significant is that Penelope is used 'per esaltare [...] le doti morali di donne o fanciulle morte nelle più diverse età'[493] and, therefore, 'per l'espressione di valori individuali'.[494] Conversely, physical details are not described. As a result, Penelope's σωφροσύνη is mentioned six times, while her ἀρετή four. A case in point is the inscription 1736, where the dead woman, after her comparison with Penelope, is defined as μάρτυς σωφροσύνης. In addition, the virtue of the mourned people is three times emphasised with the word ἔργα. This is striking in the epitaph 1737, where there is the opposition between facts and words: ἔργοις, οὐ μύθοις Πηνελόπα γέγονεν.

Finally, it is significant that, as Lattimore argues, these epitaphs usually targeted 'people of inferior education'.[495]

---

[493] Maffei 1987, 154.

[494] Ibid.

[495] Lattimore 1962, 290.

As a result, the moral use of Penelope appears to be a popular element of the Greek Imperial tradition. A similar conclusion can be drawn by the analysis of the iconography.

c) Iconography

Also on the iconographic tradition Penelope is a very popular figure and she is subjected to an interesting evolution: since the middle of the fifth century BC 'she is no more considered as the cunning woman, but as the symbol of the conjugal faithfulness and of the virtuous wife'.[496] For this reason, it is very difficult to find Penelope depicted with her loom[497] or the old type of her as 'trauernden', which would have characterised her original image.[498] Moreover, the artistic objects in which Penelope became a recurrent motif were essentially gold rings and glass gems, which were commonly used by the whole population.

As a result, as with epitaphs, the artistic representations of Penelope seemed to fulfil the desire of ancient population for expressing personal feelings. This conclusion is suggestive: since Xen. shares with both media this emphasis on Penelope's virtue and his work belongs to the era when these other sources very popular, I would speculate that his moral focus on this heroine might be interpreted as a traditional element of the post-Classical Greek way of thought.

A hypothesis like this would strengthen the possibility that Xen. was aware of the Ephesian statue of Penelope, since Thrason's work is clearly a product of the post-Classical Era too.

_____

[496] LIMC Penelope, 295.

[497] (cf. ibid. 14, 16, 19; it is once substituted by a spindle, see 29)

[498] (see ibid. 18, 2 and Palagia 2008

APPENDIX 4: TRAGIC ECHOES IN THE *EPHESIACA*

Although Xen. is keen on a theatrical style (<u>NA</u> 5) and many of his monologues contain tragic motifs (<u>NA</u> 4), the presence of tragic intertexts is more difficult to detect. For this reason, I already argued that Xen. owes a debt to an epic-tragic tradition (<u>LI</u> 4.3-4) which is mostly based on simple echoes of motifs. That said, there are three tragic models which seem to be exploited by Xen. Interestingly, they all come from Euripides and this makes Xen.'s use of them more plausible, since his tragedies were commonly known by educated readers of the Imperial Era.[499] More precisely, possible intertexts concerns only the *Helen*, while Xen. recalls motifs of both the *Electra* and *Alcestis*. Overall, the main aim of this exploitation sees to be the association of tragic figures with Anthia: Electra, Alcestis and Helen share with her a profound and tragic commitment to love. For this reason, these parallels might play a role similar to that of Panthea (<u>GI</u> 4).

That being said, however, our author gives the impression of using these models without a deep and detailed awareness of their content. This seems to be part of Xen.'s cautious approach to tragedy, which is further suggested by the exclusion of a direct debt to Euripides' *Hippolytus* (<u>LI</u> 2.1), which I will broadly discuss at the end of this chapter. For this reason, I would conclude that it is not from these texts that the main interpretation of the Eph. passes.

1) Euripides' *Electra*: Lampo as the Euripidean peasant, Anthia as Electra and Habrocomes as Orestes

The first tragic model of Xen. is Euripides' *Electra*. At the beginning of this tragedy, the protagonist has already married off to a farmer. If we compare this text with our novel, we find some similarities with Anthia's experience with Lampo: as a result, I would conclude that in the second book of the Eph. Anthia is Electra and Lampo the tragic peasant. These are the parallel motifs:

a) Manto's decision that Anthia will become the wife of a goatherd is her personal revenge against the heroine (2.9.2: τὴν δὲ Ἀνθίαν οἰκέτῃ συνουσιάζειν ἐνενόει [...] αἰπόλῳ τινὶ ἀγροίκῳ). In Euripides, Aegisthus gives Electra as a wife to the Macedonian peasant. He is worried with Clytemnestra that Electra could wed a nobleman in the royal household and that the children born from this relationship could try to avenge Agamemnon's death (34-35, as the peasant himself says in the prologue: ἡμῖν δὲ δὴ δίδωσιν Ἠλέκτραν ἔχειν δάμαρτα).

b) Lampo the goatherd is the most miserable of Manto's servants (2.9.2: τῶν ἀτιμοτάτων). In *Electra* the peasant, despite his noble Macedonian origin, has lost this status and has become poor (38: ηὐγένει' ἀπόλλυται).

---

[499] To begin with as Morgan 1998, table 15, 313 proves, Euripides follows only Homer in the hierarchy of the most common authors in Imperial schooltexts. Similarly, in Cribiore's (2001, 198) analysis of the papyri - both the scholastic and the literary ones - 'an absolute preference for Euripides emerges' (Cribiore 2001, 198). As 'a good knowledge of his work [...] was fundamental for the student who continued to rhetorical education, as Quintilian and Libanius testify' (ibid.), Xen.'s knowledge of Euripides is very likely.

c) Anthia informs Lampo about her story and her noble birth. As a result, the goatherd takes pity on her and promises to preserve her pure. As I argued in NA 1.1a, this is the only mention of nobility made by the heroine. Similarly, in the *Electra* the difference in status is the reason why the peasant does not have sex with Electra (43-46: ἦν οὔποθ' ἀνὴρ ὅδε [...] ᾔσχυν' ἐν εὐνῇ· παρθένος δ' ἔτ' ἐστὶ δή. αἰσχύνομαι γὰρ ὀλβίων ἀνδρῶν τέκνα λαβὼν ὑβρίζειν, οὐ κατάξιος γεγώς).

4) Anthia implicitly praises Lampo's pity and, because of his benign attitude (2.11.4: ὡς μέχρι νῦν εὐσέβησας), she asks him to remember Habrocomes during her burial. In his answer, Lampo mentions his devotion to gods (2.11.7: ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ θεοὺς δεδιὼς [...]) and promises to spare her life. Interestingly, the Euripidean *Electra* defines the peasant as equal to gods, because of his respect toward her (67-8: ἐγώ σ' ἴσον θεοῖσιν ἡγοῦμαι φίλον· ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς γὰρ οὐκ ἐνύβρισας κακοῖς).

The discovery of this link is significant for two reasons. First, it confirms that the few good people whom the protagonists encounter during their journey have a clear literary characterisation (cf. Eudoxus in <u>APP</u> 1.2 and Amphinomus in <u>APP</u> 1.9). Second, it opens the possibility that the story of Electra might have further resonances in the novel. At a first glance, this hypothesis does not seem to be acceptable, since Anthia's story is not focused on a revenge as that of Electra. Later in the text, however, the parallel with this tragedy seems to be activated other two times. To begin with, after Manto is sold by Lampo to Cilician merchants, the goatherd receives the unexpected visit of Habrocomes, who asks him news about Anthia (2.12.2: ἐδεῖτο δὲ τοῦ Λάμπωνος εἰπεῖν αὐτῷ εἴ τι οἶδε περὶ κόρης ἐκ Τύρου) without revealing his name (2.12.3: ὁ δὲ αὐτὸν ὅστις ἦν οὐ λέγει). Although Anthia is no longer with Lampo, this visit recalls that of Orestes and Pylades to the peasant's house, in which they conceal their identity in order to get information. The real difference is that Habrocomes is not accompanied as Orestes by a friend. In my opinion, this parallel might suggest that Habrocomes is Orestes and, thus, this tragic model would involve both protagonists, making Lampo episode a tragic scene.

This leads us back to the possibility of a connection between their story and that of revenge which characterises Electra. A positive answer comes in the fourth book: when Anthia kills Anchialus, her reaction of shame is not epic (4.5.6: ἡ δὲ Ἀνθία εἰς φόβον μὲν τῶν δεδραμένων ἔρχεται) and she also thinks to commit suicide, because of the impossibility of fleeing away. Personally, this behaviour might recall that of Electra in the same tragedy: shortly after Clytemnestra's murder, which is not described on the scene, Electra first a sense of guilt (1182: αἰτία δ'ἐγὼ) and she expresses it with a sequence of rhetorical questions: ἰὼ ἰώ μοι. ποῖ δ' ἐγώ, τίν' ἐς χορόν, τίνα γάμον εἶμι; τίς πόσις με δέξεται νυμφικὰς ἐς εὐνάς; (1198-1200). Then, in the subsequent description of the homicide, her role of murderess becomes clear: we discover that, after the sword fell from her brother's hands, she took the courage to kill her mother (1224-6). As a result, the existence of this parallel suggests that Anthia becomes again Electra with the inclusion of the revenge.

In conclusion, the hypothesis of this intertext can be accepted and this fits well into the construction of Anthia. since through Electra Xen. seems to strengthen her personality. Conversely, the parallel between Habrocomes and Orestes is no longer exploited and, thus, it seems to be only functional to that of Anthia.

2) Alcestis

The second plausible tragic intertext in the Eph. is Euripides' *Alcestis,* since Xen. recall a good number of motifs of this tragedy:

a) In Xen.'s oracle there is the famous expression τάφος θάλαμος (1.6.2, n.: oracle, 3). See ibid. for the parallel with *Alcestis*.

b) A common theme of the protagonists' dialogues in the Eph. is "fidelity in life as well as in death" (LI 5). In *Alcestis* this theme is often repeated by Admetus it in a way that especially recalls Habrocomes' invitation to Anthia in the wedding night. Cf. Xen. 1.9.4 : τὸν ἐραστὴν ἔχεις ἄνδρα, μεθ᾽οὗ ζῆν καὶ ἀποθανεῖν ὑπάρξαι γυναικὶ σώφρονι; and *Alc*. 367-368: μηδὲ γὰρ θανών ποτε σοῦ χωρὶς εἴην τῆς μόνης πιστῆς ἐμοί.

c) In the *Eph*. Xen. twice introduces the motif of "death as a display of virtue". The first is in Habrocomes' lament at the beginning of the second book, when he states: τεθνήξομαι δὲ πρότερον καὶ φανοῦμαι νεκρὸς σώφρων (2.1.4). Then, Anthia after her nightmare states: ἐμοῖ δὲ ἀποθανεῖν καλῶς ἔχει σωφρονούσῃ (5.8.9). The same motif has an occurrence in *Alcestis*, when the chorus speaks of the heroine's death: ἴστω νυν εὐκλεής γε κατθανουμένη γυνή τ᾽ἀρίστη τῶν ὑφ᾽ἡλίῳ μάκρῳ (150-1).

d) In the Eph. Anthia expresses to Habrocomes her desire to die with him: ἀποθνήσκωμεν, Ἁβροκόμη. Ἕξομεν ἀλλήλους μετὰ θάνατον, ὑπ᾽οὐδενὸς ἐνοχλούμενοι. Similarly, Admetus expresses his desire of share death with his wife: τί μ᾽ ἐκώλυσας ῥῖψαι τύμβου τάφρον ἐς κοίλην καὶ μετ᾽ ἐκείνης τῆς μέγ᾽ ἀρίστης κεῖσθαι φθίμενον; (*Alc*. 897-9).

e) In the *Eph*. Anthia describes her path toward death as a journey. Alcestis does the same: cf. Eph. 3.6.5: ὁδὸν ἔρχομαι τὴν παρὰ σέ and also 3.8.1 and *Alc*. 262-263: οἵαν ὁδὸν ἁ δειλαιοτάτα προβαίνω);

f) In Aegialeus' story the fisherman tells Habrocomes about his physical relationship with his wife after death: ταύτῃ [...] ἀεί τε ὡς ζώσῃ λαλῶ καὶ συγκατάκειμαι καὶ συνευωχοῦμαι (5.1.11). Likewise, Admetus, as Borgogno 2005, 483, n. 186 states, would like to have an image of her dead wife shaped by skilled craftsmen, so that he could προσπεσοῦμαι καὶ περιπτύσσων χέρας ὄνομα καλῶν σὸν τὴν φίλην ἐν ἀγκάλαις δόξω γυναῖκα καίπερ οὐκ ἔχων ἔχειν (350-352).

In my opinion, this list of parallel motifs makes the hypothesis of Xen.'s use of this tragedy very plausible.

3) Helen

To begin with, it is important to remind not only that 'l'opera di Euripide è una presenza incisiva per il romanzo antico' (Fusillo 1989, 33), but that, in particular, 'l'*Elena* è stata considerata un prototipo del romanzo: basta pensare alla coppia che si riconosce e si riunifica, all'ambientazione

esotica e al tema del doppio' (ibid., 34[500]). Finally, his two protagonists, Menelaus and Helen, aim to go back to Sparta: as a consequence, they share also the novelistic motif of the return home.

Given this framework, there are two passages where a textual connection might be established between Xen. and Euripides.

a) When Anthia pronounces her desperate monologue after her nightmare, she states: τί οὖν ἔτι ζῶ; (5.8.8) and then she expresses her desire for suicide (5.8.9). In the tragedy, shortly after the beginning, when Helen is desperate for being falsely considered guilty of the burst of the Trojan war, she asks the same question (56: τί οὖν ἔτι ζῶ;). Then, shortly after, she reinforces the idea by saying: τί δῆτ' ἔτι ζῶ; τίν' ὑπολείπομαι τύχην; (293). The first of these two interrogatives is still very close to Xen's one. Finally, in the same monologue Helen also mentions her loss of status (275: δούλη καθέστηκ' οὖσ' ἐλευθέρων ἄπο·) and her desire of a noble death (298: θανεῖν κράτιστον· πῶς θάνοιμ' ἂν οὖν καλῶς;). Since in the whole Greek literature the question τί οὖν ἔτι ζῶ; occurs only in this tragedy and in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazuse*, 868, which makes a parody of this work, an intertextual relationship here between Euripides and Xen. is not impossible.

b) When Habrocomes starts his speech in the last night of the novel he exclaims: τὴν μόγις ἡμῖν ἡμέραν ποθεινὴν εὑρημένην (5.14.4). The combination of the adjective ποθεινός and the noun ἡμέρα occurs only twice in Greek texts prior to the *Eph.*: first, in Aristophanes' *Peace*, where the leader of the Chorus reacts to Hermes' invitation to the farmers to go home with the following sentence: ὦ ποθεινὴ τοῖς δικαίοις καὶ γεωργοῖς ἡμέρα (556). Second, in the *Helen*, where it is pronounced by Menelaus in the recognition scene with Helen (623: ὦ ποθεινὸς ἡμέρα). Since the context of the former reference is quite distant from that of our novel while the second is identical, I would argue that Xen. might be also here intertexting with the tragedy.

c) Οὐρίον πνεῦμα, an expression adopted by Xen. in the description of the journey (1.11.2: οὐρίῳ χρησάμενοι πνεύματι, n.), is invented by Euripides who twice adopts it in his *Helen*. In the first passage Menelaus remembers how the lack of an οὐρίον πνεῦμα made his return home impossible, while in the second the *Diouskoroi* wish Helen to have it in her journey back to Sparta with her husband (cf. 406 and 1663). Later, in the Imperial Era, οὐρίον πνεῦμα is adopted by many prose writers in relation to a naval context[501] and Xen. himself uses it again in 1.12.3. As a result, in this case the connection between Xen. and Eur. is not impossible, but less convincing.

d) After her nightmare Anthia describes her battle to preserve her σωφροσύνη: τέχνας σωφροσύνης ὑπὲρ γυναῖκας εὑρίσκω (5.8.7 and <u>LI</u> 4.2a). Later in the tragedy, the "enemy" of Helen Theoclymenos describes himself as γυναικείαις τέχναισιν αἱρεθείς (1621).

Overall, Xen. seems to have in his mind the text of Euripides' *Helen*. Similarly with the *Alcestis*, the reason why this intertext is interesting is that it introduces a character extremely devoted to her husband, like Anthia, in a tragic light: as the Panthea of Xenophon of Athens, Xen. might have been helped by Euripides to model his Anthia. The Euripidean Helen, in fact, is no longer 'il paradigma

[500] For the presence of Helen in Char., see Marini 1993.

[501] See, e.g., Plut. *Mar.* 8.9, *Pomp.* 32.4; App. *BC* 2.6.40, D. Chr. 68.7, Luc. *Herm.* 28 and *Nav.* 13; Ach. 2.32.1, 3.1.2 and 8.19.2.

della seduzione, dell'adulterio, di un eros funesto e distruttivo, mentre qui diventa una sposa fedele e innamorata' (Fusillo 1997, 6). This virtue of Helen is often emphasised in the tragedy: in the aforementioned monologue (255-305), where the same question as Xen's one appears, she wants to commit suicide to avoid marrying another suitor (296-7: ὅταν πόσις πικρὸς ξυνῇι γυναικί, καὶ τὸ σῶμ' ἐστὶν πικρόν) and she thinks that her husband has died (308: καὶ μὴν σαφῶς γ'ἐλεξ'ὀλωλέναι πόσιν). In this passage, it is also evident Euripides' debt to Homer, as the former recalls Penelope's desire of suicide in the twelfth book (see *Od*. 20.79-82) and the mention of the ξύμβολα is another Homeric theme (*Od*. 23.110: σήματα). As a result, Helen is a tragic Penelope and this might have influenced Anthia, since this protagonist sometimes has her same tragic approach to fidelity (LI 4.3-4). Finally, in the tragedy 'Helen's intervention is illustrated by constant reference to the female ability for plotting and deception' (Holmberg 1995, 36): also this aspect makes her similar to Anthia.

4) Habrocomes as Hippolytus

Giovannelli 2008, 277 suggests that 'a suggerire l'esistenza di una connessione fra i due testi è la confluenza, nelle *Efesiache*, di due filoni tematici molto differenti, accomunati soltanto dall'essere entrambi presenti nell'*Ippolito*: un giovane che si crede immune dall'influenza di una divinità e la reazione ineluttabile della divinità stessa; la ricorrenza del *Potiphar motif*[502]. In my opinion, however, the existence of these two themes does not lead to the conclusion that Xen. is drawing on Euripides. On the one hand, Habrocomes' story has three important differences from that of Hippolytus:

a) the former's contempt concerns Eros, while that of the latter Aphrodite (cf. Xen. 1.1.5: Ἔρωτά γε μὴν οὐδὲ ἐνόμιζεν εἶναι θεόν and *Hipp*. 15-16: Φοίβου δ'ἀδελφὴν Ἄρτεμιν Διὸς κόρην τιμᾷ, μεγίστην δαίμόνων ἡγούμενος).

b) In his impious attitude towards Eros Habrocomes lacks any explicit hostility to marriage, while Hippolytus has it (see 14: ἀναίνεται δὲ λέκτρα κοὐ ψαύει γάμων).

c) Habrocomes is proud of his beauty and of the praises he receive and he deemphasises his intellectual achievements: this suggests that his behaviour is not completely moral (1.1.2, n.: παιδείαν, d). Conversely, Hippolytus is essentially proud of his virtues (cf. *Hipp*. 73-87).

As a result, only two motifs seem to be really shared: the divine revenge against hostile men (cf. Xen. 1.2.1: ὁ Ἔρως [...] ἐζήτει δὲ τέχνην and *Hipp*. 21-22: ἃ δ'εἰς ἔμ'ἡμάρτηκε τιμωρήσομαι Ἱππόλυτον ἐν τῇδ'ἡμέρᾳ) and the falling in love in a religious procession (cf. Xen. 1.2 and *Hipp*. 24-28). However, both motifs are so widespread that Xen. was certainly aware of these without Euripides' mediation (for the former, see "Eros' revenge against the arrogant lovers" in table 2 and 3, LI 2.3). Finally, both texts lack textual connections: they only share the common combination between φρονέω and the adverbs μέγα and μέγαλα (cf. Xen. 1.1.4: ἐφρόνει [...] μεγάλα, n. and 3.2.5 : μέγα φρονῶν and *Hipp*. 6: φρονοῦσι [...] μέγα and 444: φρονοῦνθ' εὕρη μέγα). As a result, it

---

[502] On this connection, cf. also Dalmeyda 1926, XVIII and Cueva 2004, 39.

is unlikely that Xenophon is building his character by looking at the Euripidean text. That being said, since the Euripidean *Hippolytus* was very famous in the Imperial Era, it is very plausible that both he and his readers were aware of the story of Hippolytus and could associate Habrocomes with him, but this would work only on a generic scale.

The same conclusion concerns the issue of the Potiphar motif. To begin with, it is too widespread to constitute an element of intertextuality[503]. That said, Giovannelli 2008, 283 argues that Manto might be a double of Phaedra: in her view 'molte sono le analogie [...]: Mantò, come Fedra, percepisce il suo amore come impossibile da corrispondere, ma si mostra incapace di nasconderlo'[504]; other shared elements are the presence of an intermediary (the nurse in the tragedy and Rhode in the novel), their beloved' strong reactions (cf. Xen. 2.4.3-4 and *Hipp*. 616-668) and the use of a written word (Xen. 2.5.1-2 and 2.10.1 and *Hipp*. 856-865). Although these similarities can be accepted, Manto's love is not immoral as that of Phaedra: this marks an important difference between the two and suggests that Nausicaa's model, with the birth of her genuine love, is the model here (1.2, n.: introd., 3). In addition, unlike Giovannelli 2008, Cheyns 2005, 271 argues that 'Xénophon d'Ephèse est plus proche d'Homère que d'Euripide dans al mesure où son héros, comme Bellérophon, voit son innocence reconnue avant de trouver la mort' and the reason for this statement is that, at the end of the Potiphar Motif, Habrocomes' special consideration by the Egyptian governor seems to be comparable with that given by Bellerophon in Homer. In the Eph. the Egyptian governor, after Habrocomes' overcoming of both crucifixion and pyre, gives the order to keep him in prison, ἕως μάθωμεν ὅστις ὁ ἄνθρωπός ἐστι καὶ ὅ τι οὕτως αὐτοῦ μέλει θεοῖς (4.2.10). Similarly, in the *Iliad* the Lycian king Proitos after Bellerophon's successful enterprises recognises him as θεοῦ γόνον ἠὺν ἐόντα (*Il*. 6.191). Since Xen. is keen on Homer, the hypothesis of this connection is not unlikely and, thus, the significance of Euripides' for our text would be again deemphasised. As a result, I would conclude that, as in Hippolytus' case, the memory of Phaedra would be probably recalled by the readers only in a generic way.

---

[503] See, e.g., Parth. 5.2; 13.1; 16.1; 17.1-2; 36.3, Luc. *Syr. D.* 17-18 and 21-22.

[504] See on this also Schmeling 1980, 42: 'We see here shades of the Potiphar's wife and Phaedra'.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1) Editions of Xenophon of Ephesus consulted

Cocchi, A. 1726, London.

Salvini, A. 1793, Vienna.

Locella, A.E.L.B. 1796, Vindobonae.

Mitscherlich, C.W. 1797/8, Zweibrücken.

Peerlkamp, P.H. 1818, Amsterdam.

Hirschig, W.A. 1856, Paris.

Hercher, R. 1858, Leipzig.

Dalmeyda, G. 1962, Paris.

Papanikolau A.D. 1973, Leipzig.

O'Sullivan, J.N. 2005, Xenophon Ephesius, *De Anthia et Habrocome Ephesiacorum Libri V*, Munich and Leipzig.

Henderson, J. 2009, *Daphnis and Chloe. Anthia and Habrocomes*, Harvard.

2) Translations of Xenophon of Ephesus consulted

- English

Anderson, G. 1989, "Xenophon of Ephesus: An Ephesian Tale", in Reardon, B.P. 1989, *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, 125-169.

Hadas, M. 1998, "Xenophon of Ephesus, An Ephesian Tale", in Hansen, W. (ed.), *Anthology of Ancient Greek Popular Literature*, Bloomington and Indianapolis (1998), 3-49.

Trzaskoma, S.M. 2010, *Two novels from Ancient Greece. Callirhoe and An Ephesian Story*, Indianapolis and Cambridge.

- French

Dalmeyda, G. 1926, *Xénophon d'Ephèse. Les Ephésiaques*, Paris.

Kirsch, W. 1981, *Xenophon von Ephesos, Habrokomes und Anthia. Epilog*, Leipzig.

Kytzler, B. 1968, Xenophon von Ephesus. Die Waffen des Eros oder Anthia und Habrocomes, Berlin.

- Italian

Annibaldis, G. 1987, "Senofonte Efesio. Anzia e Abrocome", in Annibaldis, G., Monteleone, C. e Vox, O., *Storie d'amore antiche*, Bari.

Zanetto, G. (ed.) 2009, *Il romanzo antico*, Milano.

Borgogno, A. 2005, *Romanzi greci: Caritone d'Afrodisia, Senofonte Efesio, Longo Sofista*, Torino.

- Portoguese

Ruas, V. 2000, *As Efesíacas Ánthia E Habrócomes*, Lisbon.

3) <u>Other Greek texts</u>

Adlington, W. 1996, *The Golden Ass*, Ware.

Asheri, D. 1988, *Traduzione e commento di Erodoto, Storie: I libro: La Lidia e la Persia,* Milano.

Behr, C.A., 1968, *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales*, Amsterdam.

Beschi, L. and Musti, D. 1982, *Traduzione e commento di Pausania,* Guida della Grecia*, Libro I: l'Attica,* Milano.

Bonazzi, M., Capra, A., Martinelli Tempesta, S. and Trabattoni, F. 2003, *Platone, Liside, 1, Edizione critica, traduzione e commento filologico, (Biblioteca Classica, 4)*, Milano.

Bond, G. W. 1981, *Heracles of Euripides; with introduction and commentary*, Oxford.

Ciccolella, F., 1999, *Leucippe e Clitofonte. Introduzione, traduzione e note*, Torino.

Colonna, A., 1987, *Eliodoro. Le Etiopiche*, Torino.

Consonni, C., 2000, "Aconzio e Cidippe", in Stramaglia, A. (ed.), *Ἔρως. Antiche trame greche d'amore*, Bari.

D'Alessio, G.B. 1996, *Callimaco, Aitia – Giambi e altri fr.*, vol. 2, Milano.

Del Corno, D. 1975, *Artemidoro. Il libro dei sogni*, Milano.

Del Corno, D. 1986, *Sull'amore. Plutarco*, Milano.

Di Benedetto, V. 1987, *Poesie di Saffo,* translation and notes by F. Ferrari, Milano.

Dillon, J.M. 1993, *Alcinous: The Handbook of Platonism*, Oxford.

Domingo-Forasté, D. 1994, *Claudii Aeliani epistulae et fragmenta*, Stuttgart and Leipzig.

Dobbin, R.F. 1998, *Discourses: Book 1, translated with an introduction and commentary,* Oxford.

Düring, I. 1951, *Chion of Heraclea. A Novel in Letters*, Göteborg.

Ferrari, F. 1995, *Ciropedia*, Milano.

Gomme, A.W. and Sandbach, F.H. 1973, *Menander. A Commentary*, Oxford.

Harmon, A.M. 1925, *The works of Lucian*, vol. 4, Harvard, 193-201.

Hall, E. 1996, *Persians. Aeschylus; edited with an introduction, translation and commentary*, Warsminster.

Hollis, A.S. 1970, *Metamorphoses Book 8, Ovid*, Oxford.

Hollis, A.S. 1977, *Ars amatoria, Book 1, Ovid*, Oxford.

Hopkinson, N. 2000, *Ovid: Metamorphoses Book 13*, Cambridge.

Lightfoot, J.L. 1999, *Parthenius of Nicaea: the poetical fragments and the Erotika Pathemata*, Oxford.

Mayer, R. 2001, *Tacitus: Dialogus de Oratoribus*, Cambridge.

Mayor, J.E.B. 1889, *Thirteen Satires of Juvenal*, London, New York.

Mazal, O. 1971, *Epistularum libri II, Aristaenetus*, Stuttgart.

McKeown, J.C. 1989, *Ovid: Amores: text, prolegomena and commentary in four volumes*, vol. 2, *A commentary on book one*, Leeds, 1989.

Meineke, A. 1904, *Strabonis Geographica 3*, Leipzig.

Morgan, J.R. 2004, *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe*, Oxford.

Müller, C. and Dübner, F. 1853-8, *Strabonis Geographica graece cum versione reficta. Books 1-17,* Paris.

Oikonomou, M. 2010, *A commentary on Xenophon of Ephesos' Ephesiaka Book V*, Swansea.

Olson. S.D. 1998, *Aristophanes: Peace, with introduction and commentary*, Oxford.

Page, T.E. 1950, *The Geography of Strabo, 6*, London.

Paduano, G. 2000, *Euripide, Ippolito*, Milano.

Pattoni, M.P. 2005, *Dafni e Cloe. Longo Sofista. Introduzione, traduzione e note*, Milano.

Pavese, C.O. 1992, *Il grande Partenio di Alcmane*, Amsterdam.

Plepelits, K. 1976. *Chariton von Aphrodisias, Kallirhoe: eingeleitet, übersetzt und erläutert, Bibliothek der griechiscen Literatur*, 6, Stuttgart.

Radt, S. 2002, *Strabons Geographika, Prolegomena, Buch 1.-4: Text und Übersetzung*, Göttingen, 2002.

Radt, S. 2005, *Strabons Geographika, Buch XIV-XVII: Text and Übersetzung*, Göttingen.

Roncali, R. 1996, *Caritone di Afrodisia, Il romanzo di Calliroe*, Milano.

Rosati, G. 1996, *Heroidum epistulae xviii-xix: Leander Heroni, Hero Leandro*, Firenze.

Savino, E. 1991*, Platone: Simposio, Apologia di Socrate, Critone, Fedone*, Milano.

Taylor, T. 1994, *The dissertations of Maximus Tyrius*, London.

Tozer, H.F. 1893, *Selections from Strabo, with an Introduction on Strabo's Life and Works*, Oxford.

Trapp, M.B. 1997, *The Philosophical Orations, Maximus of Tyre*, Oxford.

Walsh, P.G., 1970, *The Roman novel: the* Satyricon *of Petronius and the* Metamorphoses *of Apuleius*, London.

Woodruff, P. 1983, *Two comic dialogues: Ion, Hippias major, Plato*, Indianapolis.

4) <u>Lexica and encyclopaedic works</u>

ANRW = Temporini, H. and Hasse, W. (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, 3 vol., Berlin 1972-1997.

EAG = Wilson, N.G. 2006, *Encyclopaedia of Ancient Greece*, London.

LDJ = Liddell, H.G. and Scott, R., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1996.

LIMC = *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae,* 16 vol., Zurigo – Monaco, 1981-.

LRG = Conca, F., De Carli, E., Zanetto, G., Beta, S. 1983-1997, *Lessico dei romanzieri greci*, 4 vol, Milano: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino (I vol.), Hildesheim, Zürich, New York. Olms-Weidmann (II-IV vol.).

Sm. Anth. = Smith, W., Wayte, W. and Marindin, G.E. 1890 (eds.), *A dictionary of Greek and Roman antiquities*, London.

WGEN Pape, W. and Benseler, G.E. (eds.), *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, 2 vol., Graz, 2 vol, 1959.

5) Secondary bibliography

Amundsen, D. W. 1974, "Romanticizing the Ancient Medical Profession: the Characterization of the Physician in the Graeco-Roman Novel", *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 48:3, 320-337.

Alaux, J. and Létoublon, F. 2001, "La nourrice et le pédagogue", in Pouderon, B. (ed.), *Les personnages du roman grec*, Lyons, 73-86.

Albiani, M.G. 1980, "Xenoph. Eph. I 8,3", *MCr* 15-17, 197-198.

Alderink, L.J and Marthin L.H. 1997, *Prayer in Graeco-Roman religions*, in Kiley, M. (ed.) et al., 123-127.

Alexiou, M. 1974, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, Cambridge.

Alperowitz, M. 1992, *Das Wirken und Walten der Götter in griechischen Roman*, Heidelberg.

Alvares, J. 1995, "*The Drama of Hippothous in Xenophon of Ephesus'* Ephesiaca", *CJ* 90, 393-404.

Amundsen, D.W. 1974, "Romanticizing the ancient medical profession: the characterization of the Physician in the Graeco-Roman Novel", *BHM* 484, 320 -337.

Anderson, J.K. 1985, *Hunting in the Ancient World*, London.

Anderson, M.J. 1997, "The ΣΩΦΡΟΣΥΝΗ of Persinna and the Romantic Strategy of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*", *CPh* 92.4, 303-322.

Anderson, M.J. 2009, "The silence of Semiramis: shame and desire in the Greek Novels", *AN* 7, 1-28.

Arnold, I. R., 1936, "Festivals of Rhodes", *AJA* 48, 432-436.

Arnold, I. R. 1972, "Festivals of Ephesus", *AJA* 76, 17-22.

Arnold, C.E. 1989, *Ephesians, power and magic: the concept of power in Ephesians in light of its historical setting*, Cambridge.

Artés Hernández, J. A.1996, "Las «Efesíacas» de Jenofonte de Éfeso y los Hechos apócrifos de Pedro y Pablo : estudio lingüístico. 1", *Minerva* 10, 51-57.

Artés Hernández, J.A. 1997, "Las «Efesíacas» de Jenofonte de Éfeso y los Hechos apócrifos de Pedro y Pablo : estudio lingüístico. 2", *Minerva* 11 , 33-53.

Athanassaki, L. 1992, "The Triumph of Love and Elegy in Ovid's *Amores* 1, 2", *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 28, 125-141.

Aubet, M.G. 2001, *The Phoenicians and the West: politics, colonies and trade*, Cambridge.

Aurenhammer, M. 1995, *Sculptures of gods and heroes from Ephesus*, in Koester, H. (ed.) 1995, 251-280.

Austin, N. 1994, *Helen of Troy and her Shameless Phantom*, Ithaca.

Avaert, P. 1948, *Elements de realite chez Xenophon d'Ephese, These de licence*, Louvain.

Back, F. 1993, *De Graecorum Caerimoniis in quibus Homines Deorum vice fungebantur,* Diss. Berlin.

Bagnell Bury, J. 1889, *A history of the Late Roman Empire. From Arcadius to Irene (395 A.D. to 800 A.D.), I*, London.

Baker, H.S. 1966, *Furniture in the ancient world: origins & evolution, 3100-475 BC*, New York.

Bakker, W.F. 1966, *The Greek Imperative. An investigation into the aspectual differences between the present and aorist imperatives in Greek prayer from Homer up to the present day,* Amsterdam.

Ballabriga, A. 1989, "La prophétie de Tirésias", *Metis* 4.2, 291-304.

Barnouw, J. 2004, *Odysseus, Hero of Practical Intelligence. Deliberation and Signs in Homer's* Odyssey*,* Lanham.

Barron, J. 1965, *Greek sculpture*, London.

Bartsch, S. 1989, *Decoding the ancient novel: the reader and the role of description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius*, Princeton.

Baslez, M.F., 1990, "L'idée de noblesse dans les Romans Grecs", *DHA* 16, 115-128.

Bauer, J.B. 1987, "In Xenophontis Ephesii quem vocant fabellam commentariola", *Gb* 14, 229-238.

Baumgarten, R. 2009, "Dangerous Tears? Platonic Provocations and Aristotelic Answers", in Fögen, T. (ed.), *Tears in the Graeco-Roman World,* Berlin and New York, 85-104.

Belfiore, E.S. 2000, *Murder among friends: violations of philia in Greek tragedy*, New York.

Bellucci, E. 2000, *Semeia tes alloethnias: l'ottica regionale di Strabone*, in Biraschi, A.M., and Salmeri, G. (eds.), 237-260.

Bettini, M. and Brillante, C. 2002, *Il mito di Elena. Immagini e racconti dalla Grecia ad oggi*, Torino.

Bettini, M. and Franco, C. 2010, *Il mito di Circe. Immagini e racconti dalla Grecia ad oggi,* Torino.

Bianchi, N. 2003, "Note al primo libro del romanzo di Senofonte Efesio", *AFLB* 46, 171-18.

Bianchi, N. 2004, *Caritone e Senofonte Efesio: inediti di Giovanni Lami,* Bari.

Bianchi Bandinelli, R. 1960, *L'origine del ritratto in Grecia e in Roma: dalle lezioni del corso di archeologia del prof. R. Bianchi Bandinelli riprese al registratore*, Roma.

Bierl, A. 2006, "Räume im Anderen und der griechische Liebesroman des Xenophon von Ephesos. Träume?", *Coll. Raur*. 9, 71–103.

Billault, A. 1996, "Characterization in the Ancient Novel", in Schmeling, G., *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden, 115-129.

Billault, A. 1977, "Les Lettres de Chion d'Heraclea", *Revue des Etudes Grecques* 90, 29-37.

Biraschi, A.M. and Salmeri, G. (eds.) 2000, *Strabone e l'Asia Minore, Incontri perugini di storia della storiografia antica e sul mondo antico, X (Perugia, 25-28 Maggio 1997),* Napoli.

Biraschi, A.M. 2000, *Omero e aspetti della tradizione omerica nei libri straboniani sull'Asia Minore*, in Biraschi, A.M. and Salmeri, G. (eds.), 45-72.

Biraschi, A.M. 2005, "Strabo and Homer", in Dueck, D., Lindsay, H. and Pothecary, S. (eds.), *Strabo's Cultural Geography*, Cambridge, 73-85.

Birchall, J. 1996, "Laments as a Rhetorical Feature in the Greek Novel", *GCN* 7, 1-17.

Blundell, S. 2002, "Clutching at clothes", in Llewellyn-Jones, L., 143-169.

Boardman, J. 1973, *Greek Art*, London.

Bol, P.C. 2007, "Die Geschichte der Antiken Bildauerkunst", vol. 3, *Hellenistische Plastik*, Mainz am Rhein.

Bonanno, M.G. 2002, "Per una grammatica del coup de foudre (da Saffo a Virgilio, e oltre)", in Lelli, E. (ed.), *Arma Virumque… Studi di poesia e storiografia in onore di Luca Canali*, Pisa, 5-17.

Borbein, A.H. 1968, *Campanareliefs: typologische und stilkritische Untersuchungen*, Heidelberg.

Borgogno, A. 1971, "In difesa di alcune lezioni del codice Laurenziano", *Conv. Soppr. 627 (a proposito di Senofonte Efesio), PP* 26, 38-43.

Borgogno, A. 1971a, "Menandro in Caritone", RFIC 99, 257-263.

Borgogno, A. 1979, "Due note ai romanzieri greci", *Hermes* 107, 257-258.

Borgogno, A. 1980, "Su Senofonte Efesio 3.9.1", *RhM* 123, 190-192.

Borgogno, A. 1985, "Senofonte Efesio e Teodoro Prodromo", *AFLS* 6 , 221-226.

Borgogno, A. 2003a, "Restauri testuali a tre romanzi greci", *Orpheus* 24 / 1-2 , 7-13.

Borgogno, A. 2003b, "Contributi per un'edizione degli «Ephesiaca» di Senofonte Efesio", *InvLuc* 25, 31-47.

Borgogno, A. 2004, "Indice critico per gli «*Erotici Graeci*» (su Caritone, Senofonte Efesio e Longo Sofista)", *GIF* 56 / 1 , 23-41.

Borgogno, A. 2005b, "Note critiche al testo di Caritone e Senofonte romanzieri", *Sileno* 31 / 1-2, 239-252.

Bourriot, F. 1996, "Kaloi kagathoi, kalokagathia à Sparte aux époques archaïque et classique", *Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, 45 (2), 129-140.

Bowersock, G.W. 2000, *La patria di Strabone*, in Biraschi, A.M. and Salmeri, G. (eds.), 13-24.

Bowie E.L. 1974, *Greeks and their past in the second sophistic*, in Finley, M. I. (ed.), *Studies in ancient society,* 166-209.

Bowie, E.L. 1977, "The Novels and the Real World," in Reardon, B.P. (ed.), *Erotica Antica: Acta of the International Conference on the Ancient Novel*, Bangor, 91-6.

Bowie, E.L. 1999, "The Greek novel", in Swain, S., (ed.), *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, Oxford, 39-59.

Bowie, E.L. 2002, "The chronology of the earlier Greek novels since B.E. Perry: revisions and precisions", A*N* 2, 47-63.

Bowie, E.L. 2006, "Choral performances", in Konstan, D. and Saïd, S. (eds.), *Greeks on Greekness: viewing the Greek past under the Roman empire,* Cambridge.

Brioso Sánchez, M. 1988, "Una incongruencia narrativa en Jenofonte de Éfeso?", in Codoñer C. et al. (eds.), *Giner-Stephanion*, Salamanca, 79-82.

Brioso Sanchez, M. 1989, "El personaje del 'amigo' en la novela griega antigua. De Jenofonte de Efeso a Aquiles Tacio", *Philologia Hispalensis* 4, 599-610.

Brunn, H. 1889, *Geschichte der griechischen Künstler, vol. 2: Die Bildhauer*, Stuttgart.

Bürger, K. 1892, "Zu Xenophon von Ephesus", in *Hermes* 27, 36-67.

Burkert, W. 1985, *Greek religion: archaic and classical* (translated by Raffan, J.), Oxford.

Burkert, W. 1999, "Die Artemis der Epheser: Wirkungsmacht und Gestalt einer grossen Göttin: Festvortrag im Rahmen des Symposions in der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften am 14. November 1995", in Friesinger, H. and Krinzinger, F. (eds.), 59-70.

Bychkov, O. 1999, "ἡ τοῦ κάλλους ἀπορροή: A Note on Achilles Tatius 1.9.4-5, 5.13.4", *CQ* 49 (1), 339-341.

Cairns, D.L. 2002, "The meaning of the veil in ancient Greek culture", in Llewellyn-Jones, L., 73-93.

Calame, C. 1997, *Chorus of Young Women in Ancient Greece: their morphology, religious role and social function*, Lanham.

Calderini, A. 1987, "Gli elementi costitutivi del romanzo greco di prosa", in Janni, P. (ed.), *Il romanzo greco. Guida storica e critica*, Bari, 27-77.

Cantarella, E. 2006[5], *Secondo natura. La bisessualità nel mondo antico,* Milano.

Capra, A. 2004, "Poeti, eristi e innamorati: il Liside nel suo contesto", in Trabattoni, F. (ed.), *Platone, Liside, 2 (Biblioteca Classica, 4),* Milano.

Capra, A. 2007/2008, *Senofonte Efesio e il romanzo greco*, module of Giuseppe Zanetto's class of Greek Literature, Milano, online version with restricted access.

Capra, A. 2008a, "'The (un)happy romance of 'Curleo and Liliet'. Xenophon of Ephesus, the *Cyropaedia* and the birth of the 'anti-tragic' novel'", *AN* 7, 29-50.

Capra, A. 2008b, "L'efebo divino e l'incarnato della bella: Due note al testo di Senofonte Efesio (1.2.8 e 5.12.3) ", in *Acme* 61 (1), 277-282.

Capra A. forth., "Xenophon's 'Round Trip': geography and narrative technique in the *Ephesiaka*", *International Conference on the Ancient Novel* IV, Lisbon.

Carrara, P. 2009, *Il testo di Euripide nell'antichità. Ricerche sulla tradizione testuale euripidea antica (sec. IV a.C. - sec. VIII d.C.)*, Firenze.

Carrière, J.C. 1992, "La réponse de Tirésias: le dernier voyage et la mort d'Ulysse selon l'*Odyssée*", in *Mélanges Pierre Léveque*, 6, *Religion*, Paris, 17-42.

Carson, A. 1998, *Eros the Bittersweet*, London.

Casson, L. 1971, *Ships and seamanship in the ancient world*, Princeton.

Castoldi, M. *Discovering ancient bronzes. The great bronzes, technique and experimentation*, available online.

Cataudella, Q. 1957, *La novella greca: prolegomeni e testi in traduzioni originali*, Napoli.

Cataudella, Q, 1958, "Note critiche al testo di Senofonte Efesio", *RIL* 42, 648-654.

Centrone, B. 2009, *Platone. Teage, Carmide, Lachete, Liside*, Milano.

Chew, K. 1997-1998, "Inconsistency and Creativity in Xenophon's *Ephesiaka*", in *CW* 91, 203-231.

Chew, K. 1998, "Focalization in Xenophon of Ephesos' *Ephesiaka*", in Hock, R.F. et al. (eds.), 47-60.

Cheyns, A. 2005, "Prisons et cavernes dans les romans d' amour grecs. Remarques sur un stéréotype et ses variantes", in Pouderon, B. and Crismani, D. (eds.), *Lieux, décors et paysages de l' ancien roman des origines à Byzance. Actes du 2e colloque de Tours, 24–26 October 2002*, Lyon, 265–287.

Chew, K. and Morgan, J.R. (eds.) forth., *The Greek Novel and the Second Sophistic*, Groningen.

Connelly, J.B. 2007, *Portrait of a priestess: women and ritual in ancient Greece*, Princeton.

Coulson, W.D.E. 1980, "Menestratos", *CJ* 75.3, 200-203.

Craig Williams, A. 1999, *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity*. Oxford.

Cresci, L.R. 1981, "Il romanzo di Longo sofista e la tradizione bucolica", *A&R* 26, 1-25.

Cribiore, R. 2001, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, Princeton.

Crismani, D. 1997, *Il teatro nel romanzo ellenistico d'amore e di avventure*, Alessandria.

Cummings, M. 2009, "Metaphor and Emotion: Eros in the Greek Novel*"*, diss. Edinburgh.

Dalby, A. 2002, "Levels of concealment: the dress of 'Hetairai' and 'Pornai' in Greek texts", in Llewellyn-Jones, L., 111-124.

Dalmeyda, G. 1926b, "Autour de Xenophon d'Ephese", *BAGB* 13, 18-28.

Davidson, J. 1999-2000, "Euripides, Homer and Sophocles", *Illinois Classical Studies* 24–25, 117–28.

Davidson, J. 2007, *The Greeks and Greek Love: A Radical Reappraisal of Homosexuality in Ancient Greece*, New York.

Dawe, R.D. 2001, "Some erotic suggestions. Notes on Achilles Tatius, Eustathius Macrembolites, Xenophon of Ephesus and Charito", *Philologus* 145 / 2 , 291-311.

De Jong, I. 2001, *A Narratological commentary on the* Odyssey, Cambridge.

De Jong, I.J.F. 2007, "Homer", in De Jong, I.J.F. and Nünlist, R. (eds.), *Time in Ancient Greek Literature, Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative*, vol. 2, 17-38.

De Jong, I.J.F. 2007, "Introduction. Narratological theory on time", in De Jong, I.J.F. and Nünlist, R. (eds.), *Time in Ancient Greek Literature, Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative*, vol. 2, 1-16.

De Lacy, P. 1974, "Plato and the intellectual life of the second century AD", in Bowersock, G.W., (ed.), *Approaches to the Second Sophistic*, University Park, 4–10.

De Souza. P. 1999, *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman World*, Cambridge.

De Temmerman, K. 2007, "Where Philosophy and Rhetoric Meet: Character Typification in the Greek Novel", in Morgan, J.R. and Jones, M., 85-110.

De Temmerman, K. forth., *Heroes in Love. Characterization in the Ancient Greek Nove*l, Oxford.

Del Corno, D. 1988, "Anzia e le altre", in *Atti del II Convegno nazionale di studi sulla donna nel mondo antico, Torino 18-20 Aprile,* 75-84.

Delbridge, M.L. 1997, "Prayer in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*", in Kiley, M. (ed.) et al. 1997, 171-175.

Dettori, E. 2001, "Su alcune iscrizioni vascolari (SEG XXXIX 501 e XLIV 30)", *Eirene* 36, 54-62.

Di Benedetto, V. 1985, "Intorno al linguaggio erotico di Saffo", *Hermes* 113, 145-156.

Dillon, J.M. 1996, *The Middle Platonists*, London.

Dillon, M. 2002, *Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion,* London and New York.

Doody, M.A. 1996, *The True Story of the Novel,* New York.

Doulamis, K. 2003, *The Rhetoric of Eros in Xenophon of Ephesus and Chariton: a Stylistic and Interpretative Study*, diss. Exeter.

Doulamis, K. 2007, "Stoic Echoes and Style in Xenophon of Ephesus", in Morgan, J.R. and Jones, M. (eds.), 151-176.

Dover, K.J. 1974, *Greek popular morality in the time of Plato and Aristotle*, Oxford.

Dover, K.J. 1978, *Greek homosexuality*, London.

Dowden, K. 1989, *Death and maiden: girls' initiation rites in Greek mythology*, London and New York.

Dowden, K. 1999, "Fluctuating Meanings: 'Passage Rites' in Ritual, Myth, *Odyssey*, and the Greek Romance", in Padilla, M.W. (ed.), *Rites of Passage in ancient Greece: literature, religion and society*, London, Toronto, 221-246.

Dowden, K. 2007, "Novel Ways of Being Philosophical Or A Tale of Two Dogs and a Phoenix", in Morgan, J.R. and Jones, M. (eds.), 137-150.

Dubel, S. 2001, "La beauté romanesque ou le refus du portrait dans le roman grec d'époque impériale", in Pouderon, B. (ed.), *Les personnages du roman grec. Actes du colloque de Tours, 18-20 novembre 1999 (Lyon)*, 29-58.

Dueck, D. 2000, *Strabo of Amasia: a Greek man of letters in Augustan Rome,* London and New York.

Dueck, D. Lindsay, H. and Pothecary, S. 2005, *Strabo's cultural geography: the making of a kolossourgia*, Cambridge.

Dümmler, N. forth., "Constructing Self: Leucippe's personae in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*", in *International Conference on the Ancient Novel IV; Crossroads in the Ancient Novel: Spaces, Frontiers, Intersections*, Lisbon.

Edmunds, L., 2002, "Mars as a Hellenistic lover: Lucretius, *De rerum natura* 1.29-40 and its Hellenistic Subtexts", *IJCT* 8.3, 343-358.

Effe, B. 1987, "Der griechische Liebesroman und die Homoerotik. Ursprung und Entwicklung einer epischen Gattungskonvention", *Philologus* 131, 95-108.

Egger, B. 1994, "Women and marriage in the Greek Novels: the boundaries of romance", in Tatum, J. (ed.), *The search for the ancient novel*, 260-80.

Eide, T and Mortensen, L.B. 2004, (eds.), *Parthenope: Selected Studies in Ancient Greek Fiction (1969–2004)*, Copenhagen.

Eisner, R. 1980, "Echoes of the *Odyssey* in Euripides' *Helen*", *Maia* 32, 31-37.

Elliger, W. 1985, *Ephesos. Geschichte einer antiken Weltstadt*, Kohlhammer and Stuttgart.

Emlyn-Jones, C. 1984, "The Reunion of Penelope and Odysseus", *Greece and Rome* 31, 1 -18.

Enermalm, A. 1997, "An Ephesian Tale: prayers to Isis and other gods", in Kiley, M. (ed.) et al., 176-180.

Faraone, C.A. and McClure, L. (eds.) 2006, *Prostitutes and Courtesans in the ancient world*, Madison.

Faust, M. 1970, "Die kunstlerische Verwendung von 'Hund' in den homerischen Epen", *Glotta* 48, 8-31.

Fernandez Garrido, M.R. 2003, "Los Sueños en la Novela Griega: Caritón de Afrodisias y Jenofonte de Éfeso", *Habis* 34, 345-364.

Ferrini, M.F. 1990, "Le parole e il personaggio: monologhi nel romanzo greco", *GIF* 42, 1, 45-85.

Feuillatre, E. 1966, *Études sur les Éthiopiques d'Héliodore. Contribution à la connaissance du roman grec*, Paris.

Finley, M.I. and Knox, B. 2002, *The world of Odysseus*, New York.

Fleischer, R. 1973, *Artemis von Ephesos und verwandte Kultstatuen aus Anatolien und Syrien*, Leiden.

Florencis, G. and Gianotti, G.F. 1990, "Fedra e Ippolito in provincia", *MD* 25, 71-114.

Flower, H.I. 1996, *Ancestor masks and aristocratic power in Roman culture*, Oxford.

Fögen, T. 2009a, "Tears and Crying in Graeco-Roman Antiquity: An Introduction", in T. Fögen (ed.), *Tears in the Graeco-Roman World,* Berlin and New York, 1-16.

Fögen, T. 2009b, "Tears in Propertius, Ovid and Greek Epistolographers", in T. Fögen (ed.), *Tears in the Graeco-Roman World,* Berlin and New York, 179-208.

Föllinger, S. 2009, "Tears and Crying in Archaic Greek Poetry", in T. Fögen (ed.), *Tears in the Graeco-Roman World,* Berlin and New York, 17-36.

Fontenrose, J.E. 1978, *The Delphic Oracle*, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Fowler, R.L. 1987, "The Rhetoric of Desperation", *HSCPh* 91, 5-38.

Frazer, J.G. 1957, *The golden bough: a study in magic and religion,* London.

Friedman, N. 1967, "Point of View in Fiction: the Development of a Critical Concept", in Stevick, P. (ed.), *The Theory of Novel*, New York, 108-137.

Friesinger, H. and Krinzinger. F. 1999, *100 Jahreösterreichische Forschungen in Ephesos. Akten des Symposions, Wien*.

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

Fusillo, M. 1990, "Il testo nel testo: la citazione nel romanzo greco", *Studi sul romanzo antico* 25, 27-48.

Fusillo, M. 1996, "Il Romanzo Antico come Paraletteratura? Il Topos del Racconto di Ricapitolazione", in Pecere, O. and Stramaglia, A. (eds.), *La Letteratura di Consumo nel Mondo Greco-Latino. Atti del Convegno Internazionale* 14-17 settembre 1994, Cassino, 47-67.

Fusillo, M. 1999, "The Conflict of Emotions: A *Topos* in the Greek Erotic Novel", in Swain, S. (ed.), *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, Oxford, 60-82.

Gallop, D. 1996, *Aristotle. Aristotle on Sleep and Dreams*, Warminster.

Garin, F. 1909, "Su i Romanzi Greci," *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 17, 423-460.

Garlan, Y. 1988*, Slavery in Ancient Greece,* Ithaca and New York.

Garson, R.W. 1981, "The Faces of Love in *Ephesiaca* or *Anthia or Habrocomes* by Xenophon of Ephesus", in *Museum Africum* 7, 47-55.

Garrett Winter, J. 1936, *Papyri in the University of Michigan collection: miscellaneous papyri*, Ann Arbor.

Gärtner, H. 1969, "Xenophon of Ephesus", *Paulys Realencyclopadie*, 9, 2055-89, Stuttgart.

Garzón Díaz, J. 1986, "Notas críticas al texto de Jenofonte de Efeso", *Habis* 7, 97-108.

Gera, D.L. 1993, *Xenophon's Cyropaedia: style, genre and literary technique*, Oxford.

Giangrande, G. 1964, "Konjekturen zu Longos, Xenophon Ephesios und Achilleus Tatios", in Irmscher, J., (ed.), *Miscellanea critica, Teil I. Aus Anlaß des 150jährigen Bestehens der Verlagsgeselleschaft*, Leipzig, 97-118.

Giangrande, G. 1981, "Helenisticos Los Topicos en la Elegia Latina, *Scripta Minora Alexandrina D*, (*Classical and Byzantine Monographs 8*), Amsterdam 1981, 347-362.

Giangrande, G. 2002, "A dream in Xenophon Ephesius", *Orpheus* 23.1-2, 29-31.

Gibson, R.K and Kraus (eds.), C.S. 2002, *The classical commentary: histories, practices, theory (Mnemosyne Supplement 232)*, Leiden and Boston.

Giovannelli, M. 2008, "Echi euripidei nel romanzo di Senofonte Efesio", *Acme* 61.2, 273-290.

Goldhill, S. 1995, *Foucault's virginity: ancient erotic fiction and the history of sexuality*, Cambridge 1995.

Goldhill, S. 2001a, *Introduction. Setting an agenda: Everything is Greece to the wise,* in Goldhill, S. (ed.), *Being Greek under Rome: cultural identity, the Second Sophistic and the development of empire*, Cambridge, 1-25.

Goldhill, S. 2001b, "The Erotic Eye: Visual Stimulation and Cultural Conflict", in Goldhill, S. (ed.), *Being Greek under Rome: cultural identity, the Second Sophistic and the development of empire*, Cambridge, 154-194.

Goldhill, S. 2002, "The erotic experience of looking: cultural conflict and the gaze in empire culture", in Nussbaum, M.C. and Sihvola, J. (eds.) 2002, *The Sleep of Reason: Erotic Experience and Sexual Ethics in Ancient Greece and Rome*, 374-399.

Gonzalez Garcia, C. 1989, *Los conceptos retöricos de ἀφέλεια y γλυκύτης en Jenofonte de Efeso,* in *Actas del VII Congreso espaniol de Estudios Classicos*, vol. II, Madrid, 225- 31.

Goodwin, W.W. 1984, *A Greek Grammar*, London.

Graf, F. 1991, "Prayer in Magic and Religious Ritual", in Faraone, C.A. and Obbink., D. (eds.), *Magica Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*, New York & Oxford.

Graverini, L. 2006, "Una visione d'insieme", in Graverini, L., Keulen, W. and Barchiesi, A. (eds.), *Il romanzo antico*, Roma, 15-60.

Graziosi, B. 2002, *Inventing Homer: the early reception of epic*, Cambridge.

Griffiths, J.G. 1978, "Xenophon of Ephesus on Isis and Alexandria", in Boer, M.B. and Edridge, T.A. (eds.), *Hommages a M.. J. Vermaseren*, Leiden, 409-437.

Guez, J.Ph. 2001, "Pourquoi Théron n'est-il pas amoureux?", in Pouderon, N. (ed.), *Les personnages du roman grec: actes du colloque de Tours, 18-20 novembre 1999,* Lione, 101-110.

Guida, A. 1975, "Una nuova collazione del codice di Senofonte Efesio", in *Prometheus* 1, 65-79.

Guida, A. 1978, "Nota al testo di Caritone e di Senofonte Efesio", *RhM* 121, 195-196.

Hägg, T. 1971, *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances*, Stockholm.

Hägg, T. 1983, *Novel in Antiquity*, Oxford.

Hägg, T. 2004a, "The *Ephesiakà* of Xenophon Ephesius – original or epitome?", in Eide, T. and Mortensen, L.B. (eds.), 159–198.

Hägg, T. 2004b, "The naming of the characters in the Romance of Xenophon of Ephesus", in Eide, T. and Mortensen, L.B. (eds.), 199-232.

Hägg, T. 2004c, "Orality, literacy, and the readership of the early Greek novel", in Eide, T. and Mortensen, L.B. (eds.), 109-140.

Harrison, S.J. 1990, "Some Odyssean Scenes in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*", *MD* 25, 193-201.

Harrison, S.J. 1998a, "Dividing the Dinner: Book Divisions in Petronius' *Cena Trimalchionis*", *CQ* 48.2, 580-585.

Harrison, S.J. 1998b, "Some epic Structures in *Cupid and Psyche*", in Zimmerman et al. (eds.), *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass II: Cupid and Psyche*, Groningen, 51-68.

Haynes, K. 2003, *Fashioning the feminine in the Greek novel*, London and New York.

Heath, M. 1998, "Was Homer a Roman?", in *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 10, 23-56.

Heberdey, R. 1904, "Daitis. Ein Beitrag zum ephesischen Artemiskult", *JOAI* 7, 210-215.

Heinemann, W. 1960, *The Geography of Strabo: book 13-14,* vol. 6, Cambridge.

Hemsterhusius, T. 1733, "Notae et emendationes ad Xenophontem Ephesium", Lib. I, MO vol. III, tom. I, 402-422.

Henne, H. 1936, "La géographie de l'Égypte dans Xénophon d'Ephèse", *Revue d'Histoire de la Philosophie et d'Histoire générale de la Civilisation* 4 , 97-106.

Herrmann, F.G. 2007, "Longus' Imitation: Mimēsis in the Education of *Daphnis and Chloe*", in Morgan, J.R. and Jones, M. (eds.), 205-230.

Hiller, H. 1972, "Penelope und Eurykleia? Vorbemerkungen zur Rekonstruktion einer Statuengruppe", *AA* 87, 47-67.

Hirschberger, M. 2001, "Epos und Tragödie in Charitons *Kallirhoe*. Ein Beitrag zum Intertextualität des griechiscen Romans", *WJA* 25, 157-186.

Hirschig, G.A. 1855, "Novarum lectionum et emendationum Specimen, in [Parthenio, Longo,] Xenophonte Ephesio, Charitone, Heliodoro, Achille Tatio", *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology* 2, [92-96,] 206-215.

Hock, R.F., Chance, J.B. and Perkins, J. 1998 (eds.), *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium, Series No. 6*, Atlanta.

Holderman, E.S. 1913, *A study of the Greek priestess*, Chicago.

Hölscher, T. 2000, *Il linguaggio dell'arte romana. Un sistema semantico,* Torino.

Hölscher, T. 2008, *Il mondo dell'arte greca*, Torino.

Hoppin, J.C. 1919, *A handbook of Attic red-figured vases*, Cambridge and London.

Hopwood, K. 1998, "All That May Become a Man: the Bandit in the Ancient Novel", in Foxhall, L. and Salmon. J. (eds.), *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power and Identity in Classical Antiquity*, London, 195-204.

Hordern, H. 1999, "The *Cyclops* of Philoxenus", *CQ* 49, 445-55.

Hordern, H. 2004, "Cyclopea: Philoxenus, Theocritus, Callimcahus, Bion", *CQ* 54 (1), 285-292.

Hornblower, S. 2008, *A commentary on Thucydides. Vol. 3, Books 5.25-8.109*, Oxford.

Hubbard, T.K. 2003, *Homosexuality in Greece and Rome, a Sourcebook of Basic Documents*, Los Angeles and London.

Hunter, R. 1983, *A study of Daphnis and Chloe*, Cambridge.

Hunter, R. 1994, "History and historicity in the romance of Chariton", in Haase, W. and Temporini, H., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römische Welt,* II.34.2, Berlin and New York, 1055-1086.

Hunter, R. 1997, 'Response to Morgan', in A.M. Sommerstein and C. Atherton (eds.), *Education in Greek Fiction* (Bari, 1997), 191–205.

Hunter, R. 2008, "Generic consciousness in the Orphic *Argonautica*?", in Hunter, R., *On Coming after. Studies in Post-Classical Greek Literature and its Reception*, vol. 2, Berlin, 681-699.

Hunter, R. 2009, *Critical moments in classical literature: studies in the ancient view of literature and its uses,* Cambridge.

Hutchinson, G.O. 2001, *Greek lyric poetry: a commentary on selected larger pieces: Alcman, Stesichorus, Sappho, Alcaeus, Ibycus, Anacreon, Simonides, Bacchylides, Pindar, Sophocles, Euripides*, Oxford and New York.

Ingalls, W. B. 2000, "Nausikaa, Penelope and Initiation", *EMC* 44, 19, 1-18.

Jaeger, W. 1939, *Paideia: the ideals of Greek culture, vol. 1, Archaic Greece. The mind of Athens*, Oxford.

Jaeger, W. 1944, *Paideia: the ideals of Greek culture*, *In search of the divine centre*, vol. 2, Oxford.

Jax, K. 1936, "Zur literarischen und amtlichen Personenbeschreibung", *Klio* 29 (1936), 151-163.

Jelf, W.E. 1842, *A grammar of the Greek language: chiefly from the German of Raphael Kühner.* vol. 2, Syntax, Oxford.

Jensson, G. 2004, "The Recollections of Encolpius. The *Satyrica* of Petronius as Milesian Fiction", *AN* Suppl. 2, Groningen.

Jones, M. 2007a, "Andreia and Gender in the Greek Novels", in Morgan, J.R. and Jones, M. (eds.), 111-136.

Jones, M. 2007b, "Playing the man: performing masculinities in the Greek novel"*,* diss. Swansea.

Jouanno, C. 1994, "L'oeil fatal. Réflexions sur le rôle du regard dans le roman grec et byzantin", *PRIS-MA* 10.2, 149-164.

Kader, I. 2006, *Penelope rekonstruiert. Geschichte und Deutung einer Frauenfigur*, *Exhibition Catalogue*, Museum für Abgüsse Klassischer Bildwerke, Munich.

Kasprzyk, D. 2003, *Les récits secondaires dans le roman grec: Chariton, Xénophon d'Éphèse, Héliodore*, Rouen.

Kerényi, K., 1971, *Der antike Roman. Einfuhrung und textauswahl*, Darmstadt.

Keyes, C.W. 1922, "The Structure of Heliodorus' 'Aethiopica'", *Studies in Philology*, 19.1, 42-51.

Kiley, M. et al. eds., 1997, *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine : A critical anthology,* London.

Kim, L. 2007, "The portrait of Homer in Strabo's *Geography*", *CPh* 102, 363-389.

Kitts, M. 2005, *Sanctified Violence in Homeric Society: Oath-Making Rituals and Narratives in the Iliad*, Cambridge.

Knibbe, D., 1995, "Via Sacra Ephesiaca. New Aspects of the Cult of Artemis Ephesia", in Koester, H. (ed.), 141-155.

Koester, H. (ed.), 1995, *Ephesos: Metropolis of Asia. An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaelogy, Religion, and Culture*, Valley Forge.

König, J., 2005, *Athletics and Literature in the Roman Empire*, Cambridge University Press.

König, J. 2007,"Orality and Authority in Xenophon Of Ephesus", in Rimell, V. (ed.), *Seeing Tongues, Hearing Scripts: Representation and the Modernity of the Ancient Novel*, *Ancient Narrative* Suppl. 7, 1-22.

Konstan, D. and Mitzis, P. 1990, "Chion of Heraclea: A Philosophical Novel in Letters", in Nussbaum, M.C. (ed.), *The Poetics of Therapy: Hellenistic Ethics in its Rhetorical and Literary Context*, *Apeiron* 23.4, 257-279.

Konstan, D. 1994, *Sexual symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, Princeton.

Konstan, D. 1994a, "Eros in Ephesus: the nature of love in Xenophon's Ephesian tale", *Classicum* 17,26-33.

Konstan, D. 1994b, "Xenophon of Ephesus: eros and narrative in the novel", in Morgan, J.R., Stoneman, R. (eds.), *Greek fiction: the Greek novel in context*, London, 49-63.

Konstan, D. 1997, *Friendship in the Classical World*, Cambridge.

Konstan, D. 2002, "Narrative Spaces", in Paschalis, M. and Frangoulidis, S. (eds.), *Space in the Ancient Novel. Ancient Narrative, Supplementum* 1, Groningen, 1-11.

Konstan, D. 2008, "Le courage dans le roman grec: de Chariton a Xenophon d'Ephesem avec reference a Philon d'Alexandrie", in Pouderon (ed.), *Roman IV: Vertus, passions et vices dans le Roman grec,* Lyon, 117-126.

Konstan, D. 2009, 'Meleager's Sweet Tears: Observations on Weeping and Pleasure', in T. Fögen (ed.), *Tears in the Graeco-Roman World,* Berlin and New York, 311-334.

Konstan, D. 2010, "Perpetua's Martyrdom and the Metamorphosis of Narrative", in Bremmer, J. and Formisano, M., (eds.), *Perpetua's Passions*, Oxford.

Kotansky, R. 1991, "Incantations and Prayers for Salvation on Inscribed Greek Amulets", in Faraone, C.A. and Obbink, D. (eds.), 107-137.

Kozlova, G.G. 1957, "L'époque du haut empire dans le roman de Xénophon d'Éphèse", *VDI* 60, 159-168.

Kuch, H. 1996, "A study on the Margin of the Ancient Novel: 'Barbarians' and others", in Schmeling, G., *The novel in the ancient world*, Brill, 209-220.

Kühner, R. 1904, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, Bern.

Kytzler, B. 1996, "Xenophon of Ephesus", in Schmeling, G. (ed.), *The novel in the ancient world*, Leiden – New York , 336-59.

Kytzler, B. 2003, "Der Regenbogen der Gefühle", *Scholia* 12, 69-81.

Lalanne, S. 1998, "Théâtralité et dramatisation rituelle dans le roman grec", *GCN* 9, 1-16.

Lamberton, R. 2002, "Homeric allegory and Homeric rhetoric in ancient pedagogy", in Montanari (ed.), 185-205.

Lanata, G. 1996, "Sul linguaggio amoroso di Saffo", in *QUCC* 2, 63-79.

Laplace, M.M.J. 1992, "Les *Éthiopiques* d'Héliodore, ou la Genèse d'un Panégyrique de l'Amour", *Revue des Études Anciennes* 94, 199-230.

Laplace, M.M.J. 1994, "Récit d'une éducation amoureuse et discours panégyrique dans les *Éphésiaques* de Xénophon d'Éphèse: le romanesque antitragique et l'art de l'amour", *REG* 107, 440-479.

Laplace, M.M.J. 1997, "Le roman de Chariton et la tradition de l'éloquence et de la rhétorique: constitution d'un discours politique", *RhM* 140, 38-71.

Larson, J., 1995, *Greek heroine cults*, Madison.

Lateiner, D. 1998, "Blushes and Pallor in Ancient Fiction", *Helios* 25, 163-89.

Lattimore, R. 1962, *Themes in Greek and Latin epitaphs*, Urbana.

Lavagnini, B. 1950², *"La patria di Senofonte Efesio"*, in *Studi sul romanzo greco*, Messina-Firenze, 156 ff..

Leiwo, M. 1994, *Neapolitana: A Study of Population in Greco-Roman Naples*, Helsinki.

Letoublon, F. 1993, *Les lieux communs du roma. Stéréotypes grecs d'aventure & d'amour*, Leiden.

Levene, D.S. 2004, "Tacitus. Dialogus as Literary History", *TAPA* 134, 157–200.

Levi, D. 1971, *Antioch mosaic pavements*, Roma.

Liatsi, M. 2004, "Die Träume des Habrokomes bei Xenophon of Ephesus", *RhM* 147, 151-171.

LiDonnici, L.R. 1992, "The Images of Artemis Ephesia and Greco-Roman Worship: A Reconsideration", *The Harvard Theological Review* 85.4, 389-415.

Lier, B. 1914, *Ad topica carminum amatorium symbolae*, Stettin.

Lilja, S. 1983, *Homosexuality in Republican and Augustan Rome*, Helsinki.

Lindsay, H. 2009, *Adoption in the Roman World*, Cambridge and New York.

Lissarrague, F. 1999, "Publicity and Performance: Kalos Inscriptions in Attic Vase-Painting", in Goldhill, S. and Osborne, R. (eds.), *Performance culture and Athenian democracy*, Cambridge.

Liviabella Furiani, P. 2001, "Il corpo nel romanzo di Achille Tazio", *AN* 1, 134-151.

Llewellyn-Jones, L. 2002, "A woman's view? Dress, eroticism, and the ideal female body in Athenian Art", in Llewellyn-Jones, L., 171-202.

Llewellyn-Jones, L. 2002, *Women's dress in the ancient Greek world, woman's view?,* London, Swansea and Oakville.

Long, A.A. 2002, *Epictetus: a Stoic and Socratic guide to life,* Oxford.

Lowenstam, S., 1992, "The uses of vase-depictions in Homeric Studies", *TAPhA* 122, 165-198.

Luraghi, N. 2000, "Appunti sulla Ionia nella Geografia di Strabone", in Biraschi, A.M. and Salmeri (eds.), G., 357-372.

MacAlister, S. 1996, *Dreams and Suicides. The Greek Novel in Antiquity and the Byzantine Empire*, London.

Maclean, J.K.B. and Aitken, E.B. (eds.) 2001, *Heroikos, Flavius Philostratus*, Atlanta.

Mactoux, M.M. 1975, *Penelope, legende et mythe*, Paris.

Maehler, H. 1990, "Symptome der Liebe im Roman und in der griechischen *Anthologie*", in *GCN* 3, 1-12.

Maffei, S. 1987, "Le *Imagines* di Luciano. Un patchwork di capolavori antichi. Il problema di un metodo combinatorio", *Studi Classici e Orientali* 36, 147-164.

Mann, E. 1896, *Uber den Sprachgebrauch des Xenophon Ephesius*, Kaiserslautern.

Manuwald, G. 2000, "Zitate als Mittel des Erzählens: Zur Darstellungstechnik Charitons in seinem Roman *Kallirhoe*", *WJA* 24, 97-122.

Marini, N. 1993, "Il personaggio di Calliroe come 'nuova Elena' e la mediazione comica di un passo euripideo (Charito III 10-IV 1 = *Hel*. 1165-1330)", *Stud. Ital.* 11, 205-215.

Martin, H.L. 1995, *Gods or ambassadors of God? Barnabas and Paul in Lystra*, *New Testament Studies* 41, 152-156.

Mastromarco, G. 2003, "L'incontro di Odisseo e Nausicaa tra epos ed eros", in Nicosia, S. (ed.), *Ulisse nel tempo: la metafora infinita*, Venezia, 107-126.

Mcgill, S. C. 2000, "The literary lives of a Scheintod: *Clitophon and Leucippe* 5.7 and Greek Epigram", *CQ* 50, 323-326.

Merkelbach, R. 1962, *Roman und Mysterium in der Antike,* Munich and Berlin.

Mesk, J. 1913, "Antiochos und Stratonike", *RhM* 68, 366-394.

Meyers, E.M. 1997*, The Oxford encyclopedia of archaeology in the Near East*, 5 vol, New York.

Misener, G. 1924, "Iconistic Portraits", *CPh* 19, 97-123.

Mitchell, L.G. 1997, *Greeks bearing gifts: the public use of private relationships in the Greek world*, 435-323 B.C, Cambridge.

Montanari, F. 2002, *Omero tremila anni dopo. Atti del congresso di Genova 6-8 Luglio 2000*, Rome.

Morales, H. 2004, *Vision and narrative in Achilles' Tatius Leucippe and Cleitophon*, Cambridge.

Moreschini, C. 1971, "Un'ipotesi per la datazione del romanzo di Senofonte Efesio", *SCO* 19-20, 73-75.

Morgan, J.R. 1991, "Reader and Audiences in the Aithiopika of Heliodoros", *GCN* 4, 85-103.

Morgan, J.R. 1993, "Make-believe and make believe: the fictionality of the Greek novels", in Gill, C. and Wiseman, T.P. (eds.), *Lies and fiction in the ancient world*, Exeter.

Morgan, J.R. 1994, "The *Aithiopika* of Heliodoros: narrative as riddle", in Morgan, J.R. and Stoneman, R., (eds.), *Greek fiction: the Greek novel in context,* London and New York, 97-113.

Morgan, J.R. 1996, "Erotika *mathemata*: Greek romance as sentimental education", in Sommerstein, A.H. and Atherton, C., *Education in Greek fiction*, Notthingham classical literature seminars 4, Bari, 163-189.

Morgan, J.R. 2004a, "Xenophon of Ephesus", in De Jong, J.F., Nünlist, R. and Bowie, A., (eds.), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative. Volume One, Mnemosyne Supplement* 257, Leiden, 489-93.

Morgan, J.R. 2004b, "Chariton", in De Jong, J.F., Nünlist, R. and Bowie, A., (eds.), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative. Volume One, Mnemosyne Supplement 257*, Leiden, 479-488.

Morgan, J.R. 2006, "Un discours figure chez Heliodore: 'Comment, en disant l'inverse de ce qu'on veut, on peut accomplir ce qu'on veut sans sembler dire l'inverse de ce qu'on veut'", in Pouderon, B. and Peigney, J., (eds.), *Discours et debats dans l'ancien roman: Actes du Colloque de Tours, 21-23 octobre 2004, Collection de la Maison de l'Orient et de la Mediterranee 36, Serie litteraire et philosophique 10*, Lyon, 51-62.

Morgan, J.R. 2007a, *Xenophon of Ephesus*, in de Jong, I.J.F., Nünlist, R. , *Time in Ancient Greek Literature, Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative*, volume 2, 453-466

Morgan, J.R. 2007b, *Chariton*, in de Jong, I.J.F., Nünlist, R. , *Time in Ancient Greek Literature, Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative*, volume 2, 433-452.

Morgan, J.R. 2007c, *Heliodorus*, in de Jong, I.J.F., Nünlist, R. *, Time in Ancient Greek Literature, Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative*, volume 2, 483-504.

Morgan, J. R. 2007d, "Travel in the Greek novels: function and interpretation", in Adams, C., Roy, J. (eds.), *Travel, Geography and Culture in Ancient Greece*, Egypt and the Near East (Leicester-Nottingham Studies in Ancient Society 10), Oxbow Books, 139-60.

Morgan, J.R. 2007e, "The Representation of Philosophers in Greek Fiction", in Morgan, J.R. and Jones, M., (eds.), 23-52.

Morgan, J.R. and Jones, M. (eds.), *Philosophical Presences in the Ancient Novel, AN Supplementum 10*, Groningen.

Morgan, J. R. 2009, "Petronius and Greek Literature", in Prag, J. and Repath, I (eds.), *Petronius: A Handbook,* Oxford, 32-48.

Morgan, K. 1991, "*Odyssey* 23.218-224: Adultery, Shame, and Marriage", *AJP* 112, 1-3.

Morgan, T. 1998, *Literate education in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds*, Cambridge.

Morris, S.P. 2001, "The Prehistoric Background of Artemis Ephesia: a solution to the enigma of her breasts?", in Muss, U. (ed.), *Der Kosmos der Artemis von Ephesos*, Wien, 135-151.

Morwood, J. 2010, "'Cupid Grows Up' (on Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*)", *Greece and Rome* 57.1, 107-116.

Most, G.W. 1999 (ed.), *Commentaries - Kommentare. Aporemata: Kritische Studien zur Philologiegeschichte, Band 4*, Göttingen.

Muchow, D. 1988, "Passionate Love and Respectable. Society in Three Greek Novels", diss. Johns Hopkins.

Nicolai, R. 2000, *Problemi di tradizione testuale nei libri XI-XIV di Strabone*, in Biraschi, A.M. and Salmeri, G. (eds.), 209-229.

Nilsson, M.P. 1957, *Griechische Feste von religioser Bedeutung mit Ausschluss der attischen*, Darmstadt.

Nobili, C. 2006, "Motivi della poesia nuziale in *Odissea VI* 149-185", in *Rendiconti Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere. Accademia di Scienze e Lettere. Classe di Lettere e Scienze Morali e Storiche*, 140, 59-74.

Nobili, C. forth., "'Similar to Artemis or to the Golden Aphrodite'. *Topoi* of Nuptial Poetry and Rhetoric in the Greek Novel", *International Conference on the Ancient Novel* IV, Lisbon.

North, H. 1966, *Sophrosyne: Self-Knowledge and Self-Restraint in Greek Culture*, Ithaca.

Nuti, R. 1958, "Nota a Senofonte Efesio, *Abrocome e Anzia* (*i racconti Efesii*)", in Cataudella, Q (ed.), *Il romanzo classico*, Roma, 181-249.

O'Sullivan, J.N. 1980, "Notes on Xenophon of Ephesus Book V", *JHS* 100, 201

O'Sullivan, J.N. 1982, "Notes on Xenophon of Ephesus Book I", *RhM* 125, 54-58.

O'Sullivan, J.N. 1994, *Xenophon of Ephesus: his compositional technique and the birth of the novel*, Berlin.

Oesterheld, C. 2008, *Göttliche Botschaften für zweifelnde Menschen: Pragmatik und Orientierungsleistung der Apollon-Orakel von Klaros und Didyma in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*, Göttingen.

Oliensis, E. 1997, "Sons and lovers: sexuality and gender in Virgil's poetry", in Martindale, C. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, Cambridge, 294-311.

Oliver, J.H. 1979, *Xenophon of Ephesus and the antithesis historia-philosophia*, in Bowersock, G.W., Burkert W. and Putnam C.J. (eds.)*, Arktouros. Hellenic studies presented to Bernard M. W. Knox on the occasion of his 65th birthday*, Berlin, 401-6.

Oster, R.E. 1990, "Ephesus as a religious center under the Principate. I. Paganism before Constantine", *ANRW* II 18.3, 1661–1728.

Overbeck, J. 1972, *Sources écrites anciennes pour l'histoire des arts figuratifs chez les Grecs*, Cd-Rom, Leipzig.

Palagia, O., 2008, "The Marble of the Penelope from Persepolis and Its Historical Implications", in Resa Darbandi, S.D. and Zournatzi, A. (eds.) 2006, *Ancient Greece and Ancient Iran, Cross-Cultural Encounters, First International Conference*, Athens, 223-237.

Papanikolau, A.D. 1964, *Chariton und Xenophon von Ephesos. Zur Frage der Abhängigkeit*, in *Festschrift K.I. Vourveris*, Athen, 305-320.

Papanikolaou, A. D. 1973b, *Chariton-Studien: Untersuchungen zur Sprache und Chronologie der griechischen Romane*, Gottingen.

Parke, H.W. 1985, *The oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor*, London.

Parke, H.W. and Wormell, D.E.W. 1956, *The Delphic Oracle, vol. 2: The oracular responses*, Oxford.

Parker, R. 2005, *Polytheism and society at Athens*, Oxford and New York.

Parsons, P. 1971, "A Greek *Satyricon*?", *BICS* 18, 53–68.

Pasquali,G. 1942, "Omero, il brutto e il ritratto", in Pasquali, G., *Terze pagine stravaganti*, Firenze 139-166.

Pauly, A.F., Wissowa, G. 1894, *Pauly's Realencyclopadie der classischen Altertums-wissenschaft: neue Bearberitung*, Stuttgart.

Peek, W. 1955, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften, 1. Grab-Epigramme*, Berlin.

Pérez Benito, E. 2005, "Personajes femeninos en la novela griega: las « Efesíacas » de Jenofonte de Éfeso", in Calero Secall, I. and Alfaro Bech, V. (eds.), *Las hijas de Pandora: historia, tradición y simbología*, Málaga, 135-153.

Perkins, J. 1995, *The Suffering Self: Pain and Narrative Representation in the Early Christian Era,* London.

Perry, B.E. 1967, *The ancient romances: a literary-historical account of their origins*, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Pfeiffer, R. 1968, *History of classical scholarship: from the beginnings to the end of the Hellenistic age*, Oxford.

Picard, C. 1922, *Éphèse et Claros*, Paris

Plastira-Valkanou, M. 2001, "Dreams in Xenophon Ephesius", *Symbolae Osloenses* 76.1, 137-149.

Pollard, J. 1977, *Birds in Greek life and myth*, London.

Pomeroy, S.B. 1990, *Women in Hellenistic Egypt: from Alexander to Cleopatra*, Detroit.

Pontani, F. 2005, *Eraclito. Questioni omeriche sulle allegorie di Omero in merito agli dei,* Pisa.

Poole, A. 1976, "Total Disaster: Euripides' *The Trojan Women*", *Arion* 3, 257-87.

Portefaix, L. 1999, "The image of Artemis Ephesia. A Symbolic Configuration Related to Her Mysteries?", in Friesinger, H. and Krinzinger, F. (eds.), 611-615.

Poilloux, J. 1983, "Delphes dans les Ethiopiques d'Heliodore: la realite dans la fiction", *Journal des Savants*, 259-286.

Pouilloux, J. 1984, "Roman Grec et Réalité: un Episode Delphique des *Éthiopiques* d'Héliodore", in Walter, H. (ed.), *Hommages à Lucien Lerat*, vol. 2, Paris, 691-703.

Rademaker, A. 2005, " Sophrosyne and the Rhetoric of Self-Restraint: Polysemy & Persuasive Use of an Ancient Greek Value Term", *Mnemos. Suppl. 259.*, Leiden.

Ramelli, I., Lucchetta, G. (eds.) 2004, *Allegoria. L'età classica*, Milano.

Ramsay, W.M. 1890, *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, London.

Reardon, B.P. 1982, "Review of Molinie, G. 1979 (ed.), *Chariton*", *REG* 157-173.

Reardon, B.P. 2004, "Variation on a theme: reflections on Xenophon Ephesius", in Janka, M. (ed.), *Enkuklion kepion (Rundgärtchen): zu Poesie, Historie und Fachliteratur der Antike, Festschrift für Hans Gärtner zum 70. Geburtstag*, Munchen, 183-193.

Reeve, M.D. 1971, "Hiatus in Greek Novelists", *CQ* 21, 514-539.

Reinach, A. 1985, *La peinture ancienne. Textes grecs et latins*, Macula.

Repath, I. 2007, "Emotional Conflict and Platonic Psychology in the Greek novel", in Morgan, J.R. and Jones, M. (eds.), 53-84.

Repath, I. 2011, "Platonic Love and Erotic Ignorance in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*", in Doulamis, K., *The Ancient Novel and its Reception of Earlier Literature*. AN Supplementum, Groningen.

Repath, I. forth., "Playing with Plato: Platonic Allusion in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Cleitophon", Oxford.

Richter, G.M.A. 1966, *The furniture of the Greeks, Etruscans and Romans*, London.

Ridgway, B.S. 2002, *Hellenistic sculpture, vol. III. The styles of ca. 100 -31 B.C.*, Madison.

Rife, J.L. 2002, "Officials of the Roman Provinces in Xenophon's *Ephesiaca*", *ZPE* 138 , 93-108.

Robb, K. 1994, *Literacy and Paideia in Ancient Greece*, New York and Oxford.

Robiano, P. 2000, "La citation poétique dans le roman érotique grec," *REA* 102, 509-529.

Rocca, R. 1976, "Eliodoro e i Due Ippoliti Euripidei", *MCSN* 1, 25-31.

Rocca, S. 1976, "Il motivo dell'innamoramento a prima vista nell'apuleiana 'Amore e Psiche' ed il romanzo Greco", in *MCSN* 1, 33-47.

Rogers, G.M. 1991, *The sacred identity of Ephesos: foundation myths of a Roman city*, London.

Rogers, G.M. 1999, *The mysteries of Artemis at Ephesos,* in Friesinger, H. and Krinzinger, F. (eds.), 241-250.

Rohde, E. 1960[4], *Der Griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, Darmstadt.

Roisman, H. 1987, "Penelope's Indignation", *TAPA* 117, 59-68.

Rolley, C. 1994, *La sculpture grecque, vol 1. Des origines au milieu du 5. siècle*, Paris.

Romani, S. 2000, "Stratonice e Antioco, 'malato d'amore'", in Stramaglia, A. (ed.), *Eros, antiche trame d'amore*, Bari, 271-282.

Ross, S. A. 2005, "Barbarophonos: Language and Panhellenism in the *Iliad*", *Classical Philology* 100, 299–316.

Rousselle, A. 1988, *Porneia. On Desire and the Body in Antiquity,* Blackwell.

Ruiz Montero, C. 1981a, "Senofonte de Éfeso: ¿ Abrokomes o Habrocomes?", *Faventia* 3 , 83-88.

Ruiz Montero, C. 1981b, "The structural pattern of the ancient Greek romances and the Morphology of the Folktale of V. Propp", *Fabula* 22, 228-238.

Ruiz Montero, C. 1982, "Una interpretación del estilo KAI de Jenofonte de Éfeso", *Emerita* 50, 305-323.

Ruiz Montero, C. 1988, *La Estructura de la Novela Griega. Análisis Funcional*, Salamanca.

Ruiz Montero, C. 1994, "Xenophon von Ephesus: ein Überblick", in *ANRW* II.34.2*,* 1088-1138.

Ruiz Montero, C. 2003, "Aspetti dello stile nella narrativa popolare greca", *Lexis* 21, 81-99.

Ruiz Montero, C. 2003a, "El mito en Caritón de Afrodisias y Jenofonte de Éfeso", in López Férez, J. F. (eds.), *Mitos en la literatura griega helenística e imperial*, Madrid, 345-359.

Ruiz Montero, C. 2003b, "Text and context in Plutarch's «Amatoriae narrationes» and Xenophon of Ephesus's «Ephesiaca»", *InvLuc* 25, 221-233.

Ruiz Montero, C. 2003c, "Xenophon of Ephesus and orality in the Roman Empire", *AN* 3, 43-62.

Ruiz Montero, C. 2007*,* "L'Asia Minore nel romanzo Greco"*,* in Urso, G. (ed.)*, Tra Oriente ed Occidente. Indigeni, Greci e Romani in Asia Minore, Atti del Convegno Internazionale Cividale del Friuli, 28-30 settembre 2006*, Pisa, 259-270.

Rutherford, I. 1997, *Canons of style in the Antonine age: idea-theory in its literary context*, Oxford.

Saïd, S. 1977, "Oracles et devins dans le roman grec", in Heintz , J.G. (ed.), *Oracles et prophéties dans l'antiquité,* Paris, 367-403.

Saïd, S. 1994, "The City in the Greek Novel", in Tatum, J. (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore and London.

Saïd, S. 1999, "Rural Society in Greek novel"*,* in Swain, S. (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Greek Novel*, Oxford, 83-107.

Sanz Morales, M. 2006, "The copyist as novelist. Multiple versions in the ancient Greek novel", in Giuliani, Giuliani, Brinkman, H., Lernout, G. and Mathijsen, M. (eds.), *Variants: the Journal of the European Society for Textual Scholarship* 5, Amsterdam and New York, 129-146.

Sartori, F. 1985, "Italie et Sicilie dans le roman de Xenophon d'Ephese", *JS* 161-186.

Sartori, F. 1990, "L'Egitto di Senofonte Efesio", in Criscuolo, L. and Geraci, G. (eds.)*, Egitto e Storia antica dall'ellenismo all'età araba. Bilancio di un confronto. Atti del colloquio internazionale, Bologna 31 Agosto – 2 Settembre*, 657-669.

Scarcella, A.M. 1977, "Noterelle al romanzo di Senofonte Efesio", *Prometheus* 3, 79-86.

Scarcella, A.M. 1979, "La struttura del romanzo di Senofonte Efesio", in Scarcella, A.M., *La struttura della fabulazione antica*, Genova, 89-113.

Scarcella, A.M. 1993[2]*,* "Les Structures Socio-économiques du Roman de Xénophon d'Éphèse", in Scarcella. A.M. (ed.), *Romanzo e Romanzieri. Note di Narratologia Greca.* Perugia, 185-197.

Scarcella, A.M. 1996, "The Social and Economic Structures of the Ancient Novels", in Schmeling, G. (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden, 221-276.

Schilardi, G. 1993, *Amori infelici: alle radici del romanzo*, Lecce.

Schmeling, G.L. 1980, *Xenophon of Ephesus*, Boston.

Schmeling, G.L. 2005, "Callirhoe: God-Like Beauty and the Making of a Celebrity", in Harrison, S., Paschalis, M., Frangoulidis, S. (eds.), *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel*, *AN Supplementum* 4, Groningen, 36-49.

Schmidt, F.W. 1882, "Kritische Studien zu den griechischen Erotikern", *Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie* 28, 1882, 185-204 (194-200).

Schmidt, M. 2002, "The Homer of the *Scholia*: what is explained to the reader?", in Montanari, F. 2002, 159-183.

Schnepf, M. 1887, *Imitationis Ratione: Quae Intercedit Inter Heliodorum Et Xenophontem Ephesium*, Commentatio, Kempten.

Schwartz, J. 1985, "Quelques remarques sur les *Ephesiaques*", *AC* 54, 197-204.

Scobie, A. 1979, "Storytellers, storytelling and the novel in Graeco-Roman Antiquity", *RhM* 122, 229-259.

Seaton, R.C. 1889, "The Iterative Use of ἄν with the *Imperf.* and aor. Indic.", *The Classical Review*, 3.8, 343-345.

Segal, C. 1971, "The Two Worlds of Euripides' *Helen*", *TAPA* 102, 553- 614.

Seiterle, G. 1979, "Artemis, die Große göttin von Ephesos", *AW* 10 , 3-16.

Shaw, B. 1984, " Bandits in the Roman Empire," *P&P* 105, 5-52.

Shea, C. 1998, "Setting the Stage for Romances: Xenophon of Ephesus and the *Ecphrasis*", in Hock, R.F. et al., 61-76.

Sironen, E. 2002, "The Role of Inscriptions in Greco-Roman Novels", in Zimmerman, M., Panayotakis, S. and Keulen, W. (eds.), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, Leiden, 289-300.

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

Smith, W. 1848, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman antiquities*, London.

Snodgrass, A. 1998, *Homer and the Artists: Text and Picture in Early Greek Art*, Cambridge.

Sokolowski, S. 1965, "A New Testimony on the Cult of Artemis of Ephesus", *HThR* 58, 427–31.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1978, "Persephone and Aphrodite at Locri: A Model for Personality Definitions in Greek Religion", *JHS* 98, 101–21.

Spanoudakis, K. 1999, "*Terpsicles" (RE 1)*, *CQ* 49.2, 637-9.

Spence, I. G. 1993, *The cavalry of classical Greece : a social and military history with particular reference to Athens*, Oxford.

Stark, R. 1957, "Sapphoreminiszenzen", *Hermes* 85, 325-35.

Stephens, S.A. and Winkler, J.J. (eds.) 1995, *Ancient Greek novels: the fragments: introduction, text, translation, and commentary*, Princeton.

Stewart, A. 1977, "To Entertain an Emperor: Sperlonga, Laokoon, and Tiberius at the Dinner-Table", *JRS* 67, 76-90.

Sullivan, J.P, 1968, *The* Satyricon *of Petronius: a literary study*, London.

Susanetti, D. 1999, "Amori tra fantasmi, mummie e lenoni: Sicilia e Magna Grecia nel romanzo di Senofonte Efesio", in Avezzù, G. and Pianezzola E. (eds.), *Sicilia e Magna Grecia: spazio reale e spazio immaginario nella letteratura greca e latina,* Padova, 127-169.

Svenden, J.T., 1983, "Narrative Techniques in Apuleius' *Golden Ass",* Pacific Coast Philology, 18.1/2, 23-29.

Syme, R. 1995, *Anatolica: studies in Strabo,* Oxford.

Tarrant, H. 2000, *Plato's first interpreters*, London.

Tatum, J. 1994, "The Education of Cyrus", in Morgan, J.R., Stoneman, R. (eds.), *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, London and New York.

Telò, M., 1999, *"Eliodoro e la critica omerica antica"*, *SIFC* 17.1, 71-87.

Thieme, U., Becker, F. 1907, *Allgemeines Lexicon der Bildenden Künstler*, Leipzig.

Thomas, C.M. 1995, "At home in the City of Artemis. Religion in Ephesos in the Literary Imagination of the Period", in Koester, H. (ed.), 81-117.

Thomas, C. M. 1995b, "Stories without texts and without authors: the problem of fluidity in ancient novelistic texts and early Christian literature", in Hock, R.F. et al., 273-292.

Thomas, C.M. 2004, "The 'Mountain Mother': The Other Anatolian Goddess at Ephesos", in Labarre, G. (eds.), *Les cultes locaux dans les mondes grec et romain*, Paris, 249-62.

Thompson, C. D.W. 1895, *A glossary of Greek birds*, Oxford.

Tilg, S., 2010*, Chariton of Aphrodisias and the invention of the Greek Love Novel*, Oxford.

Toohey, P., 1992, "Love, Lovesickness, and Melancholia", *ICS* 17, 265-86.

Tosi, T., 1957, "Sopra un passo di Senofonte Efesio*,* in Terzaghi, N. (ed.), *Scritti di filologia e di archeologia,* Firenze 183-185.

Tränkle, H. 1963, "Elegisches in Ovids *Metamorphosen*", *Hermes* 91, 459-76.

Trapp, M.B. 1990, "Plato's *Phaedrus* in second-century Greek literature", in Russell, D.A. (ed.), *Antonine Literature*, Oxford, 141–173.

Trzaskoma, S.M. 2009, "Aristophanes in Chariton (*Plu*. 744, *Eq*. 1244, *Eq*. 670)", *Philologus* 153.2, 351-353.

Trzaskoma, S.M. 2010, "Chariton and tragedy: reconsiderations and new evidence", *AJPh* 131, 219-231.

Trzaskoma, forth., "Citations of Xenophon in Chariton", in Chew, K. and Morgan, J.R. (eds.), *The Greek Novel and the Second Sophistic*, Groningen.

Tresling, A.H., *Adversariorum criticorum specimen*, Groningen, 1792, 34 (ad 1.1.6), 36 (1.2.6; 1.2.7), 51 (1.10.2), 54 (1.12.2).

Turasiewicz, R. 1990, "The problem of the style of Xenophon of Ephesus*,* in Tatum, J. and Vernazza, G. (eds.), *The ancient novel: Classical Paradigms and Modern Perspectives*, 135-6.

Turasiewicz, R. 1991, "De participii apud Xenophontem Ephesium usu", *Eos* 79, 17-22.

Turasiewicz, R. 1995, "Zum stil des Romanciers Xenophon von Ephesos", *GB* 21, 175-188.

Van Nijf, 1999, "Athletics, Festivals and Greek identity in the Roman East", *PCPS* 45, 176-200.

Upton, B.G. 2006, *Hearing Mark's Endings. Listening to Ancient Popular Texts through Speech Act Theory*, Leiden and Boston.

Van Nortwick, T. 1979, "Penelope and Nausicaa", *TAPhA* 109, 269- 276.

Vatin, C. 1970, *Recherches sur le marriage et la condition de la femme mariée*, Paris.

Vollkommer, R. 2007, *Künstlerlexikon der Antike. Über 3800 Künstler aus drei Jahrtausenden,* Hamburg.

Von Fleschenberg, S. 1909, *Die Rahmenererzählung in den Ephes. Geschichten des X. von Eph.,* Innsbruck.

Walters, J. 1995, "Egyptian religions in Ephesos", in Koester, H. (ed.), 281-310.

Ward, J. 1914, *History And Methods Of Ancient And Modern Painting: From The Earliest Times To The Beginning Of The Renaissance Period*, London, available online.

Watanabe, A. 2003, "The Masculinity of Hippothoos", *AN* 3, 1-42.

Weinstock. F. 1934, "*De somniorum visionumque in amatoriis graecorum fabulis vi atque usu*", *Eos* 35, 29–72.

West, M.L. 1988, "The rise of the Greek epic", *JHS* 108, 151-172.

Whitmarsh, T. 2005*, The Second Sophistic*, Oxford.

Whitmarsh, T. (ed.) 2008, *The Cambridge companion to the Greek and Roman novel,* Cambridge.

Wiedemann, T. 1981, *Greek and Roman Slavery*, London.

Winkler, J. 1990, "Penelope's Cunning and Homer's", in *The Constraints of Desire. The Anthropology of Sex andt Gender in Ancient Greece*, New York.

Wolff, C. 1973, "On Euripides' *Helen*", *HSCP* 77, 61-84.

Wouters, A., "The ΕΙΚΟΝΕΣ in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* IV 39,2: 'Beglaubigungsapparat'?", *Sacris Erudiri. Jaarboek voor Godsdienstwetenschappen* 31 (1989-90) 465-479.

Zanetto, G. 1990, "*La lingua dei romanzieri greci"*, in *GIF* 42, 233-242.

Zanetto, G. 1995, "*A Senofonte Efesio"*, in *SIFC* 13, 226-230.

Zanetto, G. 2008, "Recensione di Xenophon Ephesius, *De Anthia et Habrocome Ephesiacorum libri V,* ed. J.N. O'Sullivan", in *Gnomon* 80, 294-298.

Zeitlin, F. 2001, *Visions and Revisions of Homer in the Second Sophistic*, in Goldhill. S., *Greek Identity in the Second Sophistic*, Cambridge, 195-266.

Zeitlin, F. 2003, "Living Bodies and Sculpted Portraits in Chariton's Theater of Romance", in Panayotakis, S., Zimmerman, M. and Keulen, W. (eds.), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, Leiden, 71-84.

Zellner, H. 2008, "*Sappho's Sparrows"*, *CW* 101 (4).

Zelnick-Abramovitz, R. 2005, *Not Wholly Free: The Concept of Manumission and the Status of Manumitted Slaves in the Ancient Greek World*, Boston.

Zimmermann, F.W. 1949-50, "Die *Ephesiakà* des sogennanten Xenophon von Ephesos. Untersuchungen zur Technik und Komposition", in *Wurzburger Jahrbucher fur die Altertumwissenschaft* 4, 252-286.

Zimmerman, M. 2000, *Metamorphoses, book X, Apuleius Madaurensis; text, introduction and commentary*, Groningen.

Zimmerman, M. et al. 2004, *Metamorphoses books IV 28-35, V and VI 1-24: the tale of Cupid and Psyche / Apuleius Madaurensis ; text, introduction and commentary*, Groningen.