

STATUS, CLOSURE, AND PLOT:  
THE PERPETUATION OF SOCIAL HIERARCHY IN THE GREEK IDEAL NOVEL

by

ELIZABETH SCHAEFER DEACON

B. A., Bryn Mawr College, 2007

M. A., University of Colorado Boulder, 2013

A thesis submitted to the  
Faculty of the Graduate School of the  
University of Colorado in partial fulfillment  
of the requirement for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
Department of Classics

2019

This thesis entitled:  
Status, Closure, and Plot: The Perpetuation of Social Hierarchy in the Greek Ideal Novel  
written by Elizabeth Schaefer Deacon  
has been approved for the Department of Classics

---

John Gibert, Associate Professor

---

Laurialan Reitzammer, Associate Professor

Date\_\_\_\_\_

The final copy of this thesis has been examined by the signatories, and we find that both the content and the form meet acceptable presentation standards of scholarly work in the above mentioned discipline.

Deacon, Elizabeth Schaefer (Ph.D., Classics)

Status, Closure, and Plot: The Perpetuation of Social Hierarchy in the Greek Ideal Novel

Thesis directed by Associate Professor John Gibert

The scenes which bring closure to the plots of the Greek ideal novels are all fundamentally supportive of the hierarchies of social order. The happy endings of these novels are happy not only because the lovers reunite, but also because elite youth are returned from slavery and degradation to their original elite station and accepted back into their natal families by their fathers. The joy of their return to high status is shared by the whole community, from the powerful citizens who control and represent it to the people who are left behind in slavery while the protagonists are rescued. The correctness of the social hierarchies of freedom, political power, and familial power is reinforced by the communal relief and satisfaction in seeing the characters correctly placed within the hierarchy.

This pro-elite ideology is inherent to the plot structure of the novels and appears to be inherited along with it, as the same ideology is visible in the *Odyssey* as well. This ideology does not permeate the texts in their entirety, but only becomes unavoidable in the scenes that resolve the plot. Several of the texts have scenes earlier on that could be interpreted as drawing attention to the suffering of less powerful people in society and even the unfairness of that suffering. This suggests that the authors were not entirely committed to the pro-elite ideology themselves. The persistent presence of this ideology in the closural scenes is then best attributed to the structure of the plot itself. Part of the drama of this plot is the protagonists' loss of status and their triumphant resumption of their original status in the closural scenes; this can only happen within a hierarchical society, and the more severe the suffering of the lower classes, the more dramatic the return to the ranks of the elite is.

To my parents, for their support, encouragement, and inspiration.

## Table of Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
0.1 PREVIOUS SCHOLARSHIP .....	6
0.1.1 <i>Plot</i> .....	6
0.1.2 <i>Closure</i> .....	10
0.1.3 <i>Status</i> .....	12
0.2 CHAPTERS .....	14
0.3 CONCLUSION .....	18
<b>CHAPTER 1: ROMANTIC CLOSURE.....</b>	<b>20</b>
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	20
1.1 THE ODYSSEY .....	23
1.2 PRE-SOPHISTIC NOVELS .....	28
1.2.1 <i>Chariton</i> .....	28
1.2.2 <i>Xenophon</i> .....	34
1.3 SOPHISTIC NOVELS.....	37
1.3.1 <i>Achilles Tatius</i> .....	40
1.3.2 <i>Longus</i> .....	47
1.3.3 <i>Heliodorus</i> .....	55
1.4 CONCLUSION .....	61
<b>CHAPTER 2: FAMILIAL CLOSURE.....</b>	<b>64</b>
2.0 INTRODUCTION.....	64
2.1 THE <i>ODYSSEY</i> .....	68
2.2 PRE-SOPHISTIC NOVELS .....	73
2.2.1 <i>Chariton</i> .....	73
2.2.2 <i>Xenophon</i> .....	80
2.3 SOPHISTIC NOVELS.....	88
2.3.1 <i>Achilles Tatius</i> .....	89
2.3.2 <i>Longus</i> .....	95
2.3.3 <i>Heliodorus</i> .....	102
2.4 CONCLUSION .....	110
<b>CHAPTER 3: COMMUNITY CLOSURE.....</b>	<b>113</b>
3.0 INTRODUCTION.....	113
3.1 PRE-SOPHISTIC NOVELS .....	118
3.1.1 <i>Chariton</i> .....	119
3.1.2 <i>Xenophon</i> .....	129
3.2 SOPHISTIC NOVELS.....	142
3.2.1 <i>Achilles Tatius</i> .....	143
3.2.2 <i>Longus</i> .....	149
3.2.3 <i>Heliodorus</i> .....	157
3.3 CONCLUSION .....	171
<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>173</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>180</b>

## Introduction

Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* ends with a single, massive scene<sup>1</sup> that resolves every one of the complicated plot threads that have woven through the novel up to that point. The heroine finally makes it to her homeland of Ethiopia with her beloved, but in the abject status of prisoner of war, slated to be a human sacrifice. Before she can be sacrificed, however, she convinces the king that she is his daughter in a dramatic trial scene. Despite accepting her as his daughter and the crown princess, however, the king feels he does not have the authority to rescue her from the status of human sacrifice. He appeals to the citizenry of Ethiopia's capital, who have watched the events unfold, and they are delighted to exempt the beautiful princess from sacrifice. But the religious requirement for a human sacrifice remains, and her beloved is still trapped in the status of prisoner and sacrifice. The heretofore bold and clever princess finds herself too shy to tell her newly acknowledged father that she is engaged to marry this prisoner, so instead he is saved when a conversation between her birth father and her foster father (who appears unexpectedly at the last minute) reveals the engagement between the princess and her beloved. The king and citizenry acknowledge the betrothal, free the beloved from imprisonment, and decide to end the practice of human sacrifice as well. The plot of the novel is resolved by the two lovers' return to their original high social status, as sanctioned by the king and the community.

The *Aethiopica* is the last of the five extant Greek ideal novels. The ideal novels are lengthy fictional prose narratives of love and adventure. The genre appears to date back to the Hellenistic period, but only five ideal novels have survived intact, all of which are from the Roman era.<sup>2</sup> The five intact novels are Chariton's *Callirhoe*, Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaca*,

<sup>1</sup> 10.6-41.

Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*, Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, and Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*. They are frivolous and fun, earning them dismissal in the early modern scholarship and the somewhat deprecating categorization as romances rather than novels.<sup>3</sup> These early scholars tended to focus on the question of the origins of the genre, but the lack of knowledge about the authors and historical context of the ideal novels ultimately made it impossible to conclusively prove any of the theories.<sup>4</sup> Homeric epic and New Comedy appear to have had influence on ideal novels, but the precise circumstances of the genre's birth remain out of reach. In the 1970s scholarly interest turned to the novels themselves, as scholars began to look past the lightness of the novels' subject and see the sophistication of the genre, especially the later novels that were influenced by the trends of the Second Sophistic, a period of resurgent interest in sophists and rhetoric that began in the second century A. D. Recent scholarship has tended to focus on these exhibitions of skill and independent thought, resulting in substantial study of the elements that make the novels different from each other.<sup>5</sup>

Here I focus instead on some of their similarities, not in pursuit of passing judgment on the skill of the authors, but to study the ideological attitudes embedded in the core traits of the genres, specifically within the scenes that bring closure to the plot. Despite the variation in content, in the closural scenes of each novel a beautiful young member of the most elite classes

<sup>2</sup> Hägg 1983, 3. The novels' dates are tentative as little is known about the authors, but likely *Callirhoe* is from the first century AD, the *Ephesiaca* from the early or mid-second century AD, *Leucippe and Clitophon* from the late second, *Daphnis and Chloe* from the late second or early third, and the *Aethiopica* from the third or fourth. Cf. Bowie 1985, 40-41 and Tilg 2010, 78-79.

<sup>3</sup> Rohde 1876 was the first major modern treatment of the ideal novels and took a dim view of them. See Reardon 1991, 3-4 on the use of the term "romance" to describe the genre.

<sup>4</sup> Rohde 1876 and Perry 1967 are the two most influential of these studies. A more recent study of the topic is Tilg 2010, which argues that the earliest extant novel, *Callirhoe*, was in fact the first ideal novel ever written.

<sup>5</sup> For example, Whitmarsh 2011, Montiglio 2012, and De Temmerman 2014.

of society is found in dire straits by a powerful male relative who rescues them and returns them to their original status. Immediately after each scene the protagonist is accepted back with delight by the broader community, almost always due to the protagonist's extraordinary beauty. The joy and relief of the plot resolution in the ideal novels comes from the return of one of the elite to the power and status they were born into, and it is justified by the beauty they were born with, which is associated (with varying levels of explicitness) with their high status. While some of these details are particular to the genre of the ideal novel, the ideology is driven by the premise of the plot, that of the returning hero. The novels are *nostos* narratives, based on the *Odyssey* but part of an even older pattern.<sup>6</sup> In *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel* (2011), T. Whitmarsh describes how the resolutions of such plots are "widely associated with the legitimization of (a conservative conception of) the social order, particularly in terms of gender and class roles."<sup>7</sup> In this dissertation I will investigate the sources, forms, and effects of that legitimization.

Due to the novel's grounding in the *Odyssey*, studies of status dynamics in the *Odyssey*'s plot are to an extent applicable to the novels. In *The Swineherd and the Bow* (1998), W. G. Thalmann analyzes the interactions and implications of class in the *Odyssey*, and found that while elements questioning the rightness of the social hierarchy's inequalities are present in the middle of the poem, the end purely espouses an ideology that supports the hierarchy and presents it "as a structure that is self-evidently necessary, natural, and life sustaining."<sup>8</sup> This ideology's dominance in the scenes that resolve the plot is passed along to the ideal novels together with the

<sup>6</sup> See Whitmarsh 2011, 15. Also e.g. Lowe 2000, 224; Reardon 1991, 6; Hägg 1983, 110.

<sup>7</sup> Whitmarsh 2011, 178.

<sup>8</sup> Thalmann 1998, 107.



plot structures they inherit from the *Odyssey*. As the genre of the ideal novel develops there are substantial changes, especially as the fashions of the Second Sophistic came to heavily influence it, but even those changes prove to be driven in large part by these similarities in the underlying plot structure.

There are several underlying structures within this dissertation. The three chapters are build around the protagonists' three major relationships that are repaired in the closural scenes; their romantic relationship with each other, their relationships with their natal families, and their relationships with their home communities. Each of these three relationships is threatened by the events of the plot, and in the closure of the plot each of these relationships is repaired. The reunion and re-establishment of these relationships, and the ways in which status affects each of them, is the focus of each chapter. On a methodological level, this study is located at the confluence of plot, closure, and status. Attention to the plots of the novels highlights the importance of the loss and reacquisition of status by the protagonists over the course of the plot. The plot move that returns a protagonist to his or her original status is one of the primary actions that brings closure to the plot and contributes to the dominance of the pro-hierarchical ideology within these closural scenes, so it is instructive to focus my study of status change in the plot of the ideal novel on the scenes of closure. The plotlines themselves divide roughly into plots of romance and plots of homecoming. The *Odyssey's nostos* plot does not treat the two as separate; Odysseus' reunion with Penelope is simply one of the most prominent parts of his homecoming in the poem. The ideal novels elevate the importance of the romantic relationship, however, and even more critically send both of the lovers on travels and adventures. With the heroine abroad as well as the hero, reunion between the two is no longer necessarily part of the hero's return

home. Indeed, in the pre-sophistic novels, the closural scenes of the romantic plot, in which the lovers reunite after separation, occur before the closural scenes of the homecoming plot.

This final structural element is the separation between the pre-sophistic and sophistic novels.<sup>9</sup> This terminology comes from the effect of the literary trends of the Second Sophistic period on the ideal novel genre. The Second Sophistic is itself a somewhat vexed term. Like ‘novel,’ it is a modern category imposed on antiquity, and easily freighted with more weight than can be justified by the evidence.<sup>10</sup> There is however a detectable shift in the genre of the ideal novels between the two earliest extant novels, written at the very beginning of the Second Sophistic period, and the three later ones written well within the period. The latter group shows more literary sophistication and interest in displaying the fruits of the authors’ Greek education, and more to the point of this dissertation feature significant shifts to the plot structure. In the sophistic novels the lovers marry at the end of the novels rather than the beginning, and the parents of the lovers (especially the fathers) develop more important roles in the plot. The wedding creates a focus on the acknowledgement of the lovers’ relationship by the community in the final scenes, and the importance of the parents brings in a focus on the lovers’ relationship with their natal family.

Many ideologies are present throughout the entire texts of the ideal novels, but in the scenes that resolve plotlines this diversity of ideas and perspectives rapidly narrows down to a single idea. The closural scenes of the novels all perpetuate an ideology of innate elite superiority and a positive view of the power differentials within the social hierarchy. This ideology is

<sup>9</sup> On the division of the ideal novels into pre-sophistic and sophistic, see e.g. Hägg 1994, 47, De Temmerman 2010, 476, and Tagliabue 2017, 2. While the division is not perfect, and it is important not to dismiss *Callirhoe* as simple because it is not sophistic, the categorization is useful enough to render the terminology fairly standard, and helpful to this study.

<sup>10</sup> Whitmarsh 2013, 2-3.

inherent to the plot itself and was adopted along with the plot structure from the *Odyssey*. With this ideology established as a fundamental, plot-level theme of these scenes, the other aspects of the scenes are developed to support this theme. The result is that the final message of every novel is this message of the comfort and correctness of inequality. It is a message that suffuses ancient literature, and a dangerous one. Even in such light-hearted texts as the ideal novels it is important that scholars remain mindful of its presence.

## 0.1 Previous Scholarship

### 0.1.1 Plot

The study of plot goes back to Aristotle, who discusses plot-relevant concepts at length in the *Poetics*.<sup>11</sup> The modern study of plot is grounded in the Russian Formalists, who divided narratives into the *fabula* and the *sjuzhet*,<sup>12</sup> and whose work formed the foundation for the field of narratology. *Fabula* is the events of the story in the order in which they happened in the “world” of the story, and *sjuzhet* is the events in the order they are presented in the text, which can be quite different from the *fabula*. V. Shklovsky first demonstrated this with Sterne’s *Tristram Shandy*, and it appears in the classical tradition in the *Odyssey* when Odysseus does not start the narrative of his travels until Book 9.<sup>13</sup> *Sjuzhet* is frequently translated as “plot” in English, which is often defined as the order in which events are presented, but this definition fails to encompass the full usage of the term. Where does the scope for the idea of plot tension, the drama formed by the relationship between the events of the plot, find a place in the intentionally mechanistic concept of the *sjuzhet*? Plot begins with the organization of events, but it does not end there. Around the same time in *Aspects of the Novel* (1927), E. M. Forster

<sup>11</sup> Lowe 2000, 6-10; Curran 2016, 12.

<sup>12</sup> Variouslly transliterated, here I follow Lowe’s usage.

<sup>13</sup> Shklovsky 1921.

suggested a more dynamic model of plot. Forster used the terms “story” and “plot” in a similar manner to the formalists’ use of *fabula* and *sjuzhet*, but emphasized the importance of causality in turning a series of events into a plot: each event causes the next.<sup>14</sup> He also emphasized the reader’s role in constructing the story from the evidence provided by the plot. This model, of plot as the property of narrative that elicits interpretative work in the reader, has been highly influential. With the rise of reader-response criticism, plot studies have become sympathetic to Forster’s ideas, and recent scholarship on plot has centered around the way in which readers process the text rather than defining plot as purely a feature of the text on its own.<sup>15</sup> For example, in *Reading for the Plot* (1984), Peter Brooks analyzes the plots of several case studies with an approach that is heavily influenced by Forster, but also looks at the stories through the lens of a psychoanalytic idea of desire.<sup>16</sup> Brooks describes plot as the tension between *sjuzhet* and *fabula* that drives the reader’s action of interpretation, and in his case studies he focuses on the reader’s desire to find out what happens next in the plot. *Reading for Plot* was widely acclaimed, but was also formed in active resistance to the structures of formalism and narratology, which creates some difficulty in any attempt to apply its lessons more broadly.

N. J. Lowe presents a more systematic version of Forster’s ideas about plot in *The Classical Plot and the Invention of Western Narrative* (2000). Lowe’s definition of plot is grounded in models like Brooks’ that take the interpretation of the narrative required of the reader as a key part of plot, while maintaining some of the methodological precision of narratology: “Plot is the affective predetermination of a reader’s dynamic modeling of a story,

<sup>14</sup> This parallels Aristotle, but perhaps surprisingly Forster does not mention him by name at any point in *Aspects of the Novel* (Sternberg 1978, 10).

<sup>15</sup> See e.g. O’Grady 1965, Falk 1965, Sternberg 1978.

<sup>16</sup> Desire in this case being the concept of Eros as defined in Freud 1920 and Lacan 1966.

through its encoding in the structure of a gamelike narrative universe and the communication of that structure through the linear datastream of a text. In a classical plot, this narrative universe is strongly closed, privileging the values of economy, amplitude, and transparency.”<sup>17</sup> Plot, in this conception, relies on a set of rules of the game played between author and audience: what set of inputs into the “game” of the story can create what set of outputs according to the rules of the game. While reading, the reader receives information on how this particular story is progressing according to that set of rules and builds a mental model of the story as a whole; this goes back to Forster’s idea of plot as the interpretation the reader engages in to understand the *fabula* from the events as presented in the *sjuzhet*. This game is visible in a heavily rule-bound genre like that of the ideal novels. What is of interest to my study in particular is the end-state of the game. The game continues according to the logic of causality in this particular genre, which is similar but not identical to that of the real world.<sup>18</sup> The real world’s rules of causality can be violated in genres with paranormal elements,<sup>19</sup> but more often additional causal requirements are added on top of those of the real world, such as the common rule that the protagonists must survive until the end of the story. The rules of the ideal novels require the famous happy ending as the outcome, with all its heavy implications in terms of social order.

The ‘classical plot’ in the title of Lowe’s book is the plotting style first seen in the Homeric epics and later developed through classical Attic tragedy, New Comedy, and the ideal novels. This style of plot came to dominate Western literature, and today texts that diverge from

<sup>17</sup> Lowe 2000, 33.

<sup>18</sup> Lowe 2000, 54-60.

<sup>19</sup> For example, Aphrodite can whisk her favorites away from the battlefield in the *Iliad*. This causes difficulties in representing the scene of Paris and Menelaus’ duel in the film *Troy*, however, which has little or no inclusion of the paranormal in its game rules. So, in the film, Hector is the savior rather than Aphrodite, as he is capable of saving his brother within the bounds of real-world causality.

it do so with a self-conscious awareness that they are breaking the rules of the classical plot. This is what Lowe describes at the end of his definition of plot as a “narrative universe [that] is strongly closed, privileging the values of economy, amplitude, and transparency.” Economy is the tendency to make sure every element that is introduced into the story is used, which Heliodorus employs in an almost flamboyant manner, but which is also maintained on a more subtle level in all the texts discussed here.<sup>20</sup> Amplitude is the number of plot moves in the story, which is high in classical plots, but must be balanced with the demands of comprehensibility.<sup>21</sup> The audience must be able to hold the shape of the whole plot and its basic elements in mind at all times; for example, economy is useless if the reader has entirely forgotten the element being brought back into play. Lowe uses the metaphor of a game, the rules of which the players must be able to remember if they are to be able to play. Transparency, the most relevant aspect to this study, is the invisibility of the classical plot and its author.<sup>22</sup> Even as the plot follows those game-like rules, it appears to do so naturally, each event causing the next. It is the failure of transparency that Aristotle objects to when he criticizes a line in a play that says ἃ βούλεται ὁ ποιητῆς ἀλλ’ οὐχ ὁ μῦθος “what the poet wants but not what the plot wants.” (*Poetics* 16.1454b34-35) This transparency also makes plot an excellent vehicle for the kind of ideological messaging that appears in the plot closure of the novels. The plot and the author behind it are largely invisible, with perhaps one or two moments in which the author artfully draws attention to himself and his accomplishment in writing the narrative.<sup>23</sup> The ideas carried

<sup>20</sup> Lowe 2000, 62-65. Commonly referred to as “Chekhov’s gun,” as it was a narrative principle which the playwright Anton Chekhov commonly advised with the metaphor of only putting a gun on stage if it is to be fired later in the play, e.g. Chekhov 1 Nov. 1889, letter to A. S. Lazarev.

<sup>21</sup> Lowe 2000, 65-73. This is the μέγεθος Aristotle refers to in *Poetics* 8.1451a10-11.

<sup>22</sup> Lowe 2000, 73-78.

<sup>23</sup> Analyzed in more depth in Ch. 3 n. 74.

along in the plot are thus also transparent and hard to notice even while they are working their way into the minds of the reader. The transparency makes each plot move seem natural, as though things had to be this way, which is also how the ideology of the elites' natural superiority presents itself, as natural and inevitable.

### 0.1.2 Closure

In the late 1960s two influential books on closure drew interest to the topic, F. Kermode's *The Sense of an Ending* (1967) and B. H. Smith's *Poetic Closure* (1968). The first interpreted closure as an expression of awareness of our mortality and the second saw it as the satisfaction of psychological need for structure. Postmodernists saw closure in a more negative light, as in *Narrative and its Discontents* (1981), in which D. A. Miller argues that closure negates the uncertainties that allow for narrative in the first place. The study of closure burst into classics with D. Fowler's "First Thoughts on Closure" (1989) and J. R. Morgan's "A Sense of the Ending: The Conclusion of Heliodorus' *Aethiopika*" (1989), the first a call for more research into closure in classics, and the second a close study of how Heliodorus manages closural and anti-closural elements to create a sense of dramatic tension. Morgan describes how Heliodorus builds up the reader's anticipation of the ending by alluding to the end state of the plot and then thwarting the expectations, which results in a greater sense of satisfaction when the end finally arrives.

In his wide-ranging *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel* (2011) T. Whitmarsh devotes an entire chapter to *telos*, which he equates with the modern scholarly concept of closure. Whitmarsh is here interested in the tension between closural and anti-closural elements within the novels, which divide scholars' readings. On one side, Cooper reads marriage

and its restoration as inevitably closural and inevitably ideological.<sup>24</sup> On the other, Nimis finds the serial adventures of the lovers an indication of experimental exploration towards an unplanned and open ending.<sup>25</sup> Whitmarsh rightly encourages awareness of the presence of both countervailing forces at the same time, but it is the closural elements that are relevant here. The “return and restitution” element of the *nostos* plot in the ideal novels is strongly closural, associated with three phenomena: the resolution and the tying up of loose ends, a limitation of interpretative possibilities, and “the prescriptive enforcement of an ideological worldview.”<sup>26</sup> Whitmarsh finds these elements to not be inherently connected, but rather frequently associated with each other, as in the case of both the *Odyssey* and the ideal novels. The connections he sees here are a relevant corner of the overall pattern that is Lowe’s classical plot; tying up loose ends is what Lowe refers to as narrative economy,<sup>27</sup> and the limitation of interpretative possibilities is the approach of the final reconciliation between *sjuzhet* and *fabula* that creates the end of a plotline. This leaves the third phenomenon, the enforcement of an ideological worldview. Lowe does not cite that as an inevitable aspect of classical closure, and Whitmarsh describes it as merely associated with the other two phenomena. Many genres fit within these conventions, and some of them may choose not to employ the legitimization of social hierarchy as a closural element. In the ideal novels, however, it is a central feature of the resolutions of their plots, because they follow the *Odyssey* in centering their plots around the loss and reacquisition of social status.

<sup>24</sup> Cooper 1996, 31.

<sup>25</sup> Nimis 1999, 218.

<sup>26</sup> Whitmarsh 2011, 178.

<sup>27</sup> Lowe 2000, 61.



### 0.1.3 Status

Status, primarily in terms of social class, is the final element of this study. Due in part to the vague and often unrealistic treatment of social class in the novels, it has not been heavily studied, but while the novels may not be able to tell us much about class interaction in the real world, they have information on how people thought about class relations in antiquity and methods by which such ideas were perpetuated. In previous scholarship on the ideal novel, research on status has tended to focus on clear-cut social roles, such as those based on gender and ethnicity. There are a number of studies of the Hellenocentricity of the ideal novels and its treatment of non-Greek people and places.<sup>28</sup> These resonate with the question of class given the frequent treatment of non-Greeks as lesser than Greeks, but there is no lack of Persian and Egyptian aristocracy in the novels. It is therefore necessary to study class and social status separately from status as relates to ethnicity.

A well-known essay on gender is Winkler's "Education of Chloe" (1990), where he shows how the violence inherent in the unequal gender roles of antiquity is visible to the modern reader in *Daphnis and Chloe*, even though there is no overt or likely even intentional critique of gender roles in the novel. A less status-focused study of gender in the novel is Konstan's influential *Sexual Symmetry* (1994), which I engage with extensively in Chapter 2. Konstan studies the unique equalization of gender roles between the hero and heroine of each novel. He aptly describes the heroes as "hapless," despairing in the face of every challenge and unable to effect change in the world around them.<sup>29</sup> On the other side of the coin, ideal novel heroines are unusually plucky for women in the classical Greek settings of the novels, often notably more so

<sup>28</sup> For example, Kuch 1996 and Stephens 2008.

<sup>29</sup> Konstan 1994, 15-26.

than even other female characters within the same novel.<sup>30</sup> These exceptional characterizations result in equalized agency between the lovers in each novel, and thus exceptionally equal power dynamics for a relationship in erotic literature, unlike anything else Konstan can find that is comparable. He posits that this dynamic is driven by the conception of love and passion in the genre, which idealizes a love that is uncoercive, reciprocal, and faithful.<sup>31</sup> The hero's passivity—which is necessary to bring him anywhere near the disempowerment that Greek society inflicted on even the pluckiest heroine—drives the dynamic I study in Chapter 2. Another man must step into the position of power in the family that Odysseus fills in the original version of the plot, a position that the ideal novel hero effectively vacates.

In his *The Swineherd and The Bow: Representations of class in the Odyssey*, William Thalmann draws out a number of the dimensions of class interaction and conflict in the *Odyssey*, and analyzes the ramifications of Odysseus' mastery during the final scenes. Many of these are embedded within the plot itself, and it is this plot that created the foundation of the shared plot of the ideal novels. Along with this plot, they adopted the implications it has for class relations. For much of this shared plot structure there is room for contrary perspectives and voices; famously there is the sympathetic backstory of Eumaeus in the *Odyssey*, which Thalmann identifies as a “contradictory element” to the ideological program of positive representation of elite dominance. Thalmann makes the important point that, while Eumaeus is presented as a challenge to this ideology in the middle of the story, “this fact slips easily from sight by the poem's conclusion.”<sup>32</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Konstan 1994, 30.

<sup>31</sup> Konstan 1994, 57. He suggests that the special virtue that Foucault identifies as critical to the exceptional relationship of the protagonists is present, but it is not virginity, as Foucault suggests (Foucault 1984, 262-63) but instead fidelity, an emotional rather than physical state.

<sup>32</sup> Thalmann 1998, 100.

The story as a whole can tolerate multiple perspectives easily, but in the closural scenes the elements that question social hierarchy disappear.

Whitmarsh notes that closure is associated with “a limitation of interpretative possibilities” and “the prescriptive enforcement of an ideological worldview,” and this is exactly what Thalmann finds in the *Odyssey*, as well as what the *Odyssey* passes on to the ideal novels. When the happiness of the happy ending is predicated on regaining status, the misery and danger of lacking status is accepted as inevitable and the “solution” to the problems of that misery and danger is strictly the escape of the protagonist from those dire straits, leaving all other low-status people behind. This then combines with the mechanism for the protagonists’ escape, which is almost always tied into virtues that the texts treat as fixed qualities of the elite, and creates the sense that class differences are natural and inevitable. The world is also depicted as at peace when the hierarchy is in place. The *Odyssey* ends with Odysseus restoring order; it is the dominance of the king and the head of the family that ends the destructive chaos.<sup>33</sup> The hierarchy creates order, and the suffering that it also creates is downplayed. This attitude governs the closure of the ideal novels’ plots as strongly as it does the *Odyssey*’s, and affects how the scenes are formed on every level.

## 0.2 Chapters

In this dissertation, I identify the pro-elite ideology inherent in the way the plot closure works in the novels by showing which elements of the scenes remain consistent across the genre, despite changes in content. In many cases these elements are inherent to the plot structure itself, visible because they are present in the *Odyssey* as well, which is the ultimate source of the underlying plot structure that the ideal novels share. The pro-elite ideology of the plot structure

<sup>33</sup> Thalmann 1998, 284.

draws other aspects of the closural scenes along with it as well. Even in situations where the structure does not require it, the plots are set up so that they present hierarchical power structures as positive things that are required for happy outcomes. Non-plot elements like internal audiences are also used to bolster the pro-elite ideology.

Chapter 1, “Romantic Closure,” examines the importance of the protagonists’ resumption of their original status in the closural scenes. The scenes that resolve the plot of the lovers’ separation retain a focus on the reintegration of the lovers into the ranks of the elite in their home community, even as the lovers themselves lose interest in their return home. In the pre-sophistic novels, *Callirhoe* and the *Ephesiaca*, the lovers’ two primary motivations are to find each other again and to return home to their original community and status within that community, as their elite status is always lost in the course of their travels. In the sophistic novels the protagonists tend to be less driven by the desire to return home that was inherited from the *Odyssey*, and more focused on marriage to their beloveds.<sup>34</sup> Even in the *Aethiopica*, which is explicitly modeled on the *Odyssey* and alludes to it in many ways beyond the basic plot structure, the heroine Charicleia’s interest in returning to her birthplace in Ethiopia and regaining her status of crown princess is far less acute than Odysseus’ desperate longing for Ithaca or Callirhoe’s for Syracuse. Upon close reading Charicleia’s desire to return home is primarily grounded in the desire for a chance to legitimately marry her lover. The prominence of legitimate marriage at the end of the sophistic novels keeps the reintegration of the lovers into the community at the forefront of the closural scenes, however. Even beyond that, *Leucippe and Clitophon* makes the centerpiece of the scene that resolves its plot a quasi-magical, quasi-religious virginity test that permits the heroine to return to both free Greek society and her membership in her elite family. Similarly,

<sup>34</sup> Whitmarsh 2011, 145-155.

*Daphnis and Chloe* and the *Aethiopica* build their closural scenes around the protagonists' recognition by their parents and their reacceptance into the elite ranks of their home communities. Even as the motivation and characterization of the protagonists shifts, the importance of their reacquisition of status to the closural scenes remains rock steady.

In Chapter 2, "Familial Closure," I examine the roles of fathers in the closural scenes and the return of the protagonists to their families. In studying the familial reintegration of the protagonists a strong pattern emerges regarding the necessity of a high-agency adult man to govern the closural scenes. In the *Odyssey* this role is filled by Odysseus himself, but the novels' heroes are notoriously passive.<sup>35</sup> In *Callirhoe*, Chariton solves this by some very rapid character development for the hero at the end of the novel, but the pressures of the developing genre make this difficult even in the comparatively early *Callirhoe*, and no later author attempts it. The sophistic novels all place the scene-governing role squarely on the shoulders of the father of one of the two lovers. A single father appears as the primary representative of the lovers' families in *Callirhoe* as well. The authors appear to choose only one father in order to manage the dramatic tensions, as the plot tension of the lovers' return to their families is resolved in the reunion with one father; the lovers are not sufficiently differentiated from each other for their familial reunions to function as two separate plotlines. Only in *Daphnis and Chloe* does the second father appear at all in the closural scenes, and in that case the scene with the second father has notably less closural force and is partially folded into the community-reunion plotline.

Xenophon's *Ephesiaca*, which was likely written between *Callirhoe* and the sophistic novels, is perhaps the most interesting example here, as all of the parents die before the lovers return, in a manner reminiscent of Anticleia in the *Odyssey*. Xenophon makes no effort to

<sup>35</sup> Konstan 1994.

transform his hero from a passive ideal novel hero into a high-agency hero, however. Instead, the character in the usually secondary role of hero's companion is elevated to the level of main character and takes on the role of closural scene governor. This elevation of the companion, who usually disappears in the final scenes, is unique in the extant corpus, in a novel that is otherwise perhaps the least experimental of the extant example of the genre. This suggests that the lack of a governor character in the final scenes was seen as a serious deficit in need of correction. The *Ephesiaca* also provides the only instance of a governor who is not a member of one of the protagonists' families, and the companion takes charge of the heroine such that he is effectively her *kyrios* in the final book until he returns her to her husband, putting him in a pseudo-familial position. The governor appears to represent the family as a whole, and represents the family with the same hierarchy and power differentials that are seen in the representation of the broader community, where the existence of the elite and the positive nature of their superiority is so important to the resolution of these plots. The governor is in many ways in charge of arranging the happy ending; he sees to it that the protagonists return home and facilitates their acceptance into the family and the community. The novels, then, represent hierarchy in both the community and the family in the closural scenes, even when this presents a challenge due to the vagaries of the story, and attribute the happy ending to those hierarchies. The elite ranks of society must exist for the protagonists to return to them, and the governor must arrange the return for it to happen.

In Chapter 3, "Community Closure," I study the function of the crowds who are present in all closural scenes. There are no fully private closural scenes in the novels. Even the ones that must occur in private spaces, such as Chaereas finding Callirhoe in her cell, are immediately followed by acclaim from a crowd after the plot action is completed. The crowds sometimes

make one or two interventions in the plot, but they function primarily as an internal audience apart from the plot. It has been suggested that they are modeled on tragic choruses, but their function has remained obscure.<sup>36</sup> The comparison to tragic choruses appears to be strong, so here I pursue that line of analysis. Gould argues that the tragic chorus functions as a representative of collective experience,<sup>37</sup> and this interpretation is fruitful when applied to the chorus-like crowds of the novels. They are often but not always citizens of a Greek *polis*, occasionally but by no means always the one that is home to the protagonists. Rather than strictly representing the home state of the protagonists, they appear to represent the safe and civilized world more broadly, and show it approving of the protagonists' return to their original status. The reasoning usually given for the crowd's approval is the beauty of the protagonists, which is attributed to their elite origins,<sup>38</sup> tying the crowd's approval closely to collective approval of the social hierarchy. As an internal audience, the chorus-like crowd is also in part a representation of the reader's experience, so this approval of the hierarchy is also modeled for the reader as a kind of social norm within the collective of the audience.

### 0.3 Conclusion

The closural scenes of the ideal novels are dominated by an ideology that promotes the existence of unequal, hierarchical social structures in society. The elite and powerful are portrayed as deserving their status and power, and as using it wisely, for the benefit and happiness of all. Moreover these hierarchies are portrayed as accepted and even loved by everyone within them, and the novels even take steps to bring the readers along; the happiness

<sup>36</sup> Haight 1943, 79; Kaimio 1996, 67; Montiglio 2012, 155.

<sup>37</sup> Gould 1996.

<sup>38</sup> König 2008, 128.

that the reader feels due to the happy ending is based on the confirmation of the hierarchical structures. This ideology is driven by the underlying structure of the plots, which the novels inherited from the *Odyssey*, and the *Odyssey* too has an ending dominated by this pro-elite ideology. By close study of these scenes we can see the manners in which this ideology is woven into them, both subtle and overt, and see one method by which this type of pro-elite ideology has been passed along in society for millenia.



## Chapter 1: Romantic Closure

### 1.0 Introduction

One of the most prominent features of the Greek ideal novels is their romantic (in the sense of erotic) plotlines. They center around the adventures of a pair of lovers who must struggle against adversity to live happily ever after together. Therefore a study of the closure of plotlines in these novels must address the closure of the romantic plot. The closural scenes of these romantic plotlines offer an interesting puzzle to solve, as well. In a genre with a notoriously static, rule bound plot, a major change occurs between the pre-sophistic and the sophistic novels, that of moving the lovers' wedding from the beginning of the story to the end.<sup>39</sup> The first two novels take the *Odyssey* as a model, telling the stories of married couples trying to reunite, and the sophistic novels abruptly switch to emulating new comedy's pattern of locating the wedding at the end of the story. There is surprisingly little discussion in scholarship of what factors contribute to this change. Both epic and new comedy are major influences on the ideal novels throughout the life of the genre.<sup>40</sup> Specifically in terms of closure, it is also surprising that such different scenes can bring closure to fundamentally similar plots. The extant ideal novels vary from each other in a wide variety of ways, but one of the core similarities that allows the group to be considered a coherent genre is the consistency of the plot structure.<sup>41</sup> There are very few changes to the shared plot structure of the ideal novels on the scale of shifting the wedding from the beginning to the end. That this significant shift in the structure of the novels between the pre-

<sup>39</sup> On homogeneity of plot see Holzberg 1996, 13-14; Reardon 1969, 292; Lowe 2000, 242.

<sup>40</sup> Lowe 2000, 223.

<sup>41</sup> Holzberg 1996, 14 on the stereotyped plots of these five novels.

sophistic and sophistic ones has not attracted more scholarly interest is a sign of the invisibility (as Lowe would say, transparency)<sup>42</sup> of these classically styled plots.

The study of the dominance of the ideology legitimizing the status of the elite illuminates one contributing factor to this change. Thalmann describes how the *Odyssey* is fundamentally structured so that the final outcome in the poem's resolution legitimizes the hierarchy of social classes,<sup>43</sup> and the novels adapt the *Odyssey*'s ideology of status legitimization (that the powerless deserve their low status, and the powerful deserve their high status) along with its plot structure. The plot is not only of protagonists separated from their lovers and reunited with them, but of their losing and regaining high status, and the closural scenes must resolve both plotlines for the story to end in a closed manner. The change in the nature of the closural scenes of the romantic plots is needed because the original, *Odyssey*-style closural scenes cease to provide any sense of resolution to the status plot due to shifts in characterization of the protagonists. In his 2011 *Narrative and Identity in the Classical Greek Novel* Whitmarsh describes how in the pre-sophistic novels the main characters build their own sense of identity around their role in society. They long for their homes and families as much as for their lovers.<sup>44</sup> In the sophistic novels this changes. In Achilles Tatius' and Longus' novels this motivation shifts to a desire for sexual consummation of their relationship, and external cultural pressures force the expression of this via marriage.<sup>45</sup> Heliodorus largely desexualizes the lovers' desire for each other, but in Whitmarsh's words, "[it] is abstracted from society."<sup>46</sup> The protagonists' characterization

<sup>42</sup> Lowe 2000, 73.

<sup>43</sup> Thalmann 1998, 99-100.

<sup>44</sup> Whitmarsh 2011, 146.

<sup>45</sup> Whitmarsh 2011, 148.

<sup>46</sup> Whitmarsh 2011, 153.

changes, particularly in terms of what they desire and how they feel about their home communities and original statuses, at the same time as the novels make this radical change in their closural scenes.

The change in the closural scenes proves to be responsive to the change in characterization. The scenes do not only change from a personal reunion to a wedding, but also change the manner in which they depict the protagonists. The closural scenes in the *Odyssey* and the pre-sophistic novels are primarily focused on the emotional experience of the lovers, whereas the sophistic novels' closural scenes are almost entirely devoid of description of the lovers' emotions. This description is not merely diminished; in many places it is entirely gone. Instead, they focus on rituals that return the protagonists to high-status roles in society. It is also important to note that the romantic plotline is not hugely changed in the sophistic novels, which raises the question of why such different closural scenes successfully close similar plotlines as well. To distinguish the two scene types I will refer to the scenes that the pre-sophistic novels and the *Odyssey* use as "emotion-focused," and the scenes the sophistic novels use as "ritual-focused." The term ritual is used because while the three extant sophistic novels conclude their romantic plots with scenes of reintegrating rituals, only in *Daphnis and Chloe* is the culminating ritual even primarily focused on the wedding. *Leucippe and Clitophon* achieves closure in the ritual of the Ephesian virginity test, and in the *Aethiopica* the protagonists are married and made priests at the same time. Even in *Daphnis and Chloe* the bulk of the resolution of plot tension occurs during the recognition scenes, which are not formal rituals but share many traits with them.

It is striking that the perspectives of the lovers, which were important for the rest of the novel, are excluded from the closural scenes which are arguably the most important ones. These

scenes focus on the rituals and what they mean to society in deep and complex ways, and also show a loss of interest in the internal emotional experiences of the lovers. The effect is that these scenes make up for the protagonists' lack of interest or awareness of their proper positions in society throughout the rest of the novels. Throughout most of their length these novels are highly explicit about the emotions of the protagonists, tracking every increment of Daphnis and Chloe's increasing love, full of Clitophon's commentary on his opinions, and giving us substantial access to Charicleia's mind as well. In these climactic scenes, however, this focus on the protagonists and their own opinions of themselves and the world drops away, in favor of descriptions of what the rituals at the center of these scenes mean to society.<sup>47</sup>

### 1.1 The Odyssey

The reunion between Penelope and Odysseus is the original pattern for the emotion-focused romantic reunion scenes in the novels. Penelope's reaction when she is sure that she has been reunited with her husband is described in careful detail, including detail about the emotions that Penelope is experiencing (23.205-208)<sup>48</sup>:

ὥς φάτο, τῆς δ' αὐτοῦ λύτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ,  
 σήματ' ἀναγνούση τά οἱ ἔμπεδα πέφραδ' Ὀδυσσεύς:  
 δακρύσασα δ' ἔπειτ' ἰθὺς δράμεν, ἀμφὶ δὲ χεῖρας  
 δειρῆ βάλλ' Ὀδυσῆϊ, κάρη δ' ἔκυσ' ἠδὲ προσήυδα:

So he spoke, and her knees and the heart within her went slack  
 as she recognized the clear proofs that Odysseus had given;  
 but then she burst into tears and ran straight to him, throwing  
 her arms around the neck of Odysseus, and kissed his head, saying:

<sup>47</sup> Even Daphnis and Chloe's private moment at the end of their novel is a fundamentally socially connected one. Oakley and Sinos describe the Greek wedding as "a celebration of a sexual union sanctioned by the community" (Oakley and Sinos 1993, 9); the ritual of the wedding is the connection between the private sexual union of the lovers and their relationship's position in society. After blindly passing by numerous chances for sexual union that would be entirely divorced from their community, they finally succeed at the act in the moment where it gives them the position of married adults whose union is acknowledged by the community as an appropriate continuation of their elite families.

<sup>48</sup> All *Odyssey* translations are from Lattimore 1965, with modifications where necessary. Greek from Murray 1919.

In the first line her knees and heart are both loosened, perhaps here weakened, by the intensity of emotion.<sup>49</sup> She also weeps, δακρύσασα, another outward display of her emotion. And finally she throws her arms around his neck, ἀμφὶ δὲ χεῖρας δειρῆ βάλλ[ε]. After she makes a speech of greeting to him Odysseus' reaction is described as well; ὡς φάτο, τῷ δ' ἔτι μᾶλλον ὑφ' ἡμερον ὄρσε γόοιο/ κλαῖε δ' ἔχων ἄλοχον θυμαρέα, κεδνὰ ἰδυῖαν, "so she spoke, and still more roused in him the passion for weeping./ He wept as he held his lovely wife, whose thoughts were virtuous." (23.232). This is followed by the exceptionally evocative simile about the joy of the shipwrecked sailors who see shore, which is applied to Penelope but evokes Odysseus' feelings from previous scenes of shipwreck and sights of land.<sup>50</sup> The result is a scene deeply infused with the emotional reactions of the characters, describing them in multiple vivid manners so that the audience has every opportunity to feel the depth of it.

While the novels are presented with a challenge in approaching the full depth of emotion in this famous scene, they model their emotion-focused reunion scenes on these passages. This stands in stark contrast to ritual-focused scenes, where the emotions of the protagonists are mentioned little if at all. The protagonists' relief and joy in the emotion-focused closural scene is correlated to alignment of their desires and motivations with the plot's goals. When the desires of the protagonists cease to be closely entwined with the plot structure, in the sophistic novels, the protagonists' feelings are no longer important to the closural scenes of the romantic plots, and in fact cease to be represented at all. These scenes instead focus on the rituals that reintegrate the

<sup>49</sup> This may merely be meant to depict relief, but love is frequently depicted as physically draining in Greek literature, as in Sappho 31. In the ideal novels this is depicted by the scenes of the lovers wasting away when they have fallen in love but are too shy to tell their parents, in Chariton 1.1.7-10, Xenophon 1.5, Longus 1.13-14 for Chloe, 1.17-18 for Daphnis, Heliodorus 3.7 (cf. Ch. 3 n. 68).

<sup>50</sup> Murnaghan 1987, 45. This suggests a parallelism between Odysseus' and Penelope's plots, in which she experiences an internal version of his adventures and homecoming. On Penelope's plot as one of heroic withdrawal and return, see Sowa 1984, 107.

protagonists into their home societies. This suggests that it is the alignment of desires and plot goals that causes the protagonists' emotional reactions to be so central to these emotion-focused resolution scenes; because the fulfillment of their desires leads to the achievement of the plot goal, depiction of their emotional reaction can resolve the romantic plotline. In the *Odyssey*, Penelope's goal of accepting no one but the real Odysseus as her husband aligns with the overall plot goal of returning Odysseus to his status as king of Ithaca.

The goal of returning Odysseus to his status appears to hinge on Penelope's fidelity to him. While some scholars do make arguments in favor of the suitors' genuine attraction to Penelope, many also contend that the suitors also pursue her because her husband will be king of Ithaca.<sup>51</sup> Thalmann points to Eurymachus' speech when he describes Antinous' motivations for pursuing Penelope in 22.48-52:

ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἤδη κεῖται ὃς αἴτιος ἔπλετο πάντων,  
 Ἀντίνοος; οὗτος γὰρ ἐπίηλεν τάδε ἔργα,  
 οὔ τι γάμου τόσσον κεχρημένος οὐδὲ χατίζων,  
 ἀλλ' ἄλλα φρονέων, τὰ οἱ οὐκ ἐτέλεσσε Κρονίων,  
 ὄφρ' Ἰθάκης κατὰ δῆμον εὐκτιμένης βασιλεύοι  
 αὐτός, ἀτὰρ σὸν παῖδα κατακτείνειε λοχίσας.

But now the man is down who was responsible for all this, Antinous. It was he who pushed this action, not so much that he wanted the marriage, or cared for it, but with other things in mind, which the son of Cronos would not grant him: to lie in wait for your son and kill him, and then be king himself in the district of strong-founded Ithaca.

It is not clear that βασιλεύοι, "to be king" means the kind of fixed, hereditary monarch that the English translation evokes but marrying Penelope and killing Telemachus would apparently

<sup>51</sup> Finley 1965 argued influentially that the courting of Penelope was essentially a contest over succession; cf. Thornton 1970, Vernant 1988, Carlier 1984, Wohl 1993, Farron 1979 for further discussion. Thalmann 1998 181-187 says this is not mutually exclusive with a genuine erotic interest in Penelope, and adds that in the scene in Book 18 where Penelope tricks the suitors into giving her gifts the narrator explicitly describes the suitors as erotically interested. Following Halverson 1986, 124-126 and Thomas 1986, 263-264, Thalmann also notes Penelope's social value as a symbol of honor and wealth in an unstable society, and this may present an avenue to present the suitors' decision to court Penelope as one based on personal attraction but formed by social pressures.

allow a man to rule Ithaca in some manner. Thalmann proposes that it is the absorption of the wealth and status from Odysseus' *oikos*, of which Penelope as a high status woman is a major part, which allows this. The new husband's *oikos* would replace Odysseus' *oikos* as the preeminent one in Ithacan society, which may be what it means to be *basileus*.<sup>52</sup> Penelope's motivation to marry no one other than Odysseus and her ability to resist other suitors is thus critical to Odysseus' ability to step back into the role of *basileus* relatively easily. This is not to say it would be impossible, but having to force a replacement *basileus* out of power and reconstruct his *oikos* would present a far greater challenge than returning to the empty role that Penelope manages to hold open in the *Odyssey*.

Penelope's motivations are notoriously obscure, but she does give an explanation for her final test. Her steadfast resistance to marrying anyone other than Odysseus, up to the final test to make sure he is not an imposter, indicates that this is an important goal for her. After he passes the test, she makes some explanation at 23.214-24:

αἰεὶ γάρ μοι θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισιν  
 ἐρρίγει μὴ τίς με βροτῶν ἀπάφοιτο ἔπεσσιν  
 ἐλθῶν: πολλοὶ γὰρ κακὰ κέρδεα βουλεύουσιν.  
 οὐδέ κεν Ἀργεῖη Ἑλένη, Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα,  
 ἀνδρὶ παρ' ἄλλοδαπῶ ἐμίγη φιλότητι καὶ εὐνῆι,  
 εἰ ἦδη ὃ μιν αὐτίς ἀρήϊοι υἴες Ἀχαιῶν  
 ἀξέμεναι οἰκόνδε φίλην ἐς πατρίδ' ἔμελλον.  
 τὴν δ' ἦ τοι ῥέξαι θεὸς ὄρορεν ἔργον ἀεικές:  
 τὴν δ' ἄτην οὐ πρόσθεν ἐῶ ἐγκάτθετο θυμῶ  
 λυγρὴν, ἐξ ἧς πρῶτα καὶ ἡμέας ἵκετο πένθος.

For always the spirit deep in my very heart was fearful  
 that someone of mortal men would come my way and deceive me  
 with words. For there are many who scheme for wicked advantage.  
 For neither would the daughter born of Zeus, Helen of Argos,  
 have lain in love with an outlander from another country, if she had known that the  
 warlike sons of the Achaians would bring her  
 home again to the beloved land of her fathers.

<sup>52</sup> Thalmann 1998, 187-188.

It was a god who stirred her to do the shameful thing she did, and never before had she had in her heart this terrible wildness, out of which came suffering to us also.

These lines have long been doubted,<sup>53</sup> but if this scene resolves Odysseus' struggle to regain his status as *basileus* and Penelope is aware of this and reacting to it, they make good sense. Her primary fear is creating another power struggle like the Trojan war if she were to marry a second husband, a quite realistic piece of characterization for a character whose life has been so terribly disrupted by war. This is the potential other future from the previous paragraph, in which Odysseus finds another *basileus* in his place and has to fight to resume his old status. Penelope wants Odysseus to be able to regain his old status without starting another conflict on the scale of the Trojan war. Her personal motivations are thus entirely compatible with the status resumption plotline. Her relief at the proof that he is really her husband is both key to allowing him to resume that plotline (as she would presumably have resisted marriage to an imposter as much as to the other suitors), and a reaction to his success at resuming his original status, as king of Ithaca

<sup>53</sup> Murnaghan 1987, 141. The claim that these lines are an interpolation goes back to Alexandrian times, typically on the grounds that there is some jarring immorality or irrelevance in them. Platt 1899, 383-384 finds the contrast between Penelope and Helen logical at this point, as Penelope is defending her caution in accepting Odysseus by contrasting her caution here with Helen's immorality. Harsh 1950, 6 uses these lines to support his argument that Penelope has previously suspected Odysseus' identity, because her defense is not simply that she did not recognize him before, but that she did not want to risk falling into an error like Helen's. Amory 1963, 119-121, notes that many objections (e.g. Schwartz 1924, Wilamowitz 1884, Monro 1901, Mackail 1926) to these lines are grounded in the misconception that Penelope is defending her conduct with the suitors by comparing it to Helen's worse behavior, which is clearly incorrect given that Odysseus never objects to her behavior around the suitors and she does not mention it here. Amory argues that instead Penelope is claiming she was so afraid of falling in love with someone other than Odysseus that she could not accept anything less than perfect evidence that this is he, and that the defense of Helen (which has historically been one of the grounds for dismissing the passage since defending such immoral behavior is out of character for Penelope) is Penelope's expression of fear that her own human frailty could lead to a similar outcome. Murnaghan agrees with interpretations that find Helen and Penelope too different for Penelope to be at genuine risk of a similar mistake, but argues that Penelope is afraid that her desire to have Odysseus back might lead her to accepting an impostor, and that she considers this analogous to Helen's situation. While the arguments around Penelope's defense or fear over her own personal morality are in many cases persuasive, I wish to draw attention to Penelope's vivid evocation of war in this passage; her caution is not born from fear of personal shame or immorality, but fear of war. Penelope was not afraid of a moral lapse like Helen's, but the result of a queen's infidelity would be war whether she did it knowingly or not.



and her husband. This double function of her emotional reaction makes it a logical focus of the scene that resolves the tension of the plotline around Odysseus and Penelope's separation.

This is the paradigm on which the emotion-focused reunion scenes in the novels are based. The first, *Callirhoe*, achieves nearly as close a link between the emotional reaction and the plot resolution as the *Odyssey* does, but the protagonists' feelings decouple from the plots over time. The sophistic novels experiment more with characterization and motivation, which increases the distance between emotional reaction and plot, and they relocate the emotion-focused reunion scenes from the closure of the romantic plot to the interior of the plotlines if they feature them at all. The importance of the protagonists' resumption of status in the closural scenes of the romantic plots experiences far fewer changes.

## 1.2 Pre-Sophistic Novels

The desire between Chaereas and Callirhoe has from the very beginning of the novel what Cooper describes as “a public dimension and a civic purpose.”<sup>54</sup> It is presented as actively political, the end of the rivalry between the great general Hermocrates and Chaereas' father Ariston. Anthia and Habrocomes are less political figures, but their marriage is still depicted as a civic good. In the moment they first see each other and fall in love, the observing crowd cries out οἷος ἂν γάμος γένοιτο Ἀβροκόμου καὶ Ἀνθίας, “what a match Habrocomes and Anthia would make!”<sup>55</sup>

### 1.2.1 Chariton

Chariton's reunion scene exaggerates the positive emotions of the *Odyssey*'s reunion scene while downplaying the negative ones, but remains entirely focused on the emotional

<sup>54</sup> Cooper 1996, 28.

<sup>55</sup> Xenophon translations from Anderson 1989, with modifications where necessary.

reaction of the lovers. Penelope's serious concern about the potential of false recognition is translated into a light, farcical, but fundamentally similar episode. Chaereas and the Egyptian navy capture the Persian king's harem, unaware that Callirhoe is part of the group. There is a lacuna at 7.6.7, so the beginning of the episode is lost, but it appears that an Egyptian soldier sees her and, unaware of who she is, recommends her to Chaereas, who sends for her. The soldier comes back and attempts to convince Callirhoe to come with him, but makes the mistake of telling her only that the admiral wishes to marry her without naming him; the soldier's offer of marriage is the end of the lacuna.<sup>56</sup> Callirhoe, loyal to her husband, refuses to even see this admiral. The result is a humorous reversal of Penelope's situation; rather than fearing that the man who is presented as her husband may not be, she is unhappy about a man presented as a new suitor, unaware that he is her husband. Some small bit of tension is injected here, as Chaereas gallantly agrees to accede to her wishes (7.6.12)<sup>57</sup>:

Ὁ δὲ Χαιρέας “ἐπαφρόδιτος ἄρα” φησὶν “εἰμὶ καὶ ἐράσμιος, εἰ καὶ πρὶν ἰδεῖν ἀπεστράφη με καὶ ἐμίσησεν. Ἔοικε δὲ <τὸ> φρόνημα εἶναι τῆς γυναικὸς οὐκ ἀγεννές. Μηδεὶς αὐτῇ προσφερέτω βίαν, ἀλλὰ ἔατε διάγειν ὡς προήρηται: πρέπει γάρ μοι σωφροσύνην τιμᾶν. Καὶ αὐτὴ γὰρ ἴσως ἄνδρα πενθεῖ.”

“What a charming, irresistible man I must be,” said Chaereas, “if she rejects me and hates me before she has even seen me. She seems to be a woman of dignity. No one is to offer her violence; let her do as she pleases; self-respect deserves my respect. Perhaps she is mourning a husband herself.”

His perspective is as much a reference to Penelope's concern as Callirhoe's is, as he too is presented with a romantic interest whom he does not know is his spouse. He is in many ways a closer parallel to Penelope than Callirhoe is, since Callirhoe has no particular reason to think the

<sup>56</sup> Reardon 1989, 109.

<sup>57</sup> Chariton translations from Reardon 1989, with modifications where necessary.

admiral of the victorious Egyptian navy is her hapless, young, and Syracusan husband.<sup>58</sup> In the passage above Chaereas knows the woman is extraordinarily beautiful, noble (οὐκ ἀγεννές, the use of which phrase is an indication of the text's conflation of nobility of birth and virtue), and grieving for a lost husband, all traits that he knows belong to his wife.

In the scene of recognition Chaereas does have a moment that reflects Penelope's doubt concerning Odysseus' identity: (8.1.7)

Ἵπερβὰς οὖν τὸν οὐδὸν καὶ θεασάμενος ἐρριμμένην καὶ ἐγκεκαλυμμένην εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς ἀναπνοῆς καὶ τοῦ σχήματος ἐταράχθη τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ μετέωρος ἐγένετο: πάντως δ' ἂν καὶ ἐγνώρισεν, εἰ <μὴ> σφόδρα ἐπέπειστο Καλλιρρόην ἀπειληφέναι Διονύσιον.

When he saw her stretched out on the ground with her head covered, he felt his heart stirred at once by the way she breathed and the look of her, and felt a thrill of excitement; he would certainly have recognized her had he not been thoroughly convinced that Dionysius had taken Callirhoe for himself.

His belief that Dionysius still has Callirhoe stems from the earlier scene when Chaereas was told by Dionysius' household that the king had given Callirhoe to Dionysius when the war with Egypt started. This was not true, but Chaereas believed it due to his δυστυχῶν, "misery." (7.1.4).

In the recognition scenes, both Chaereas and Penelope look at a person who appears to be their spouse but cannot trust their eyes due to the previous interference of other suitors for the wife's hand. Where the *Odyssey* spends two hundred lines on the doubt and fear of incorrect recognition, however, Chaereas only suffers his doubt for that single suspended moment.

Chaereas and Callirhoe recognize each other instantly:<sup>59</sup> (8.1.8-9)

<sup>58</sup> His passivity through the majority of the novel may be another reason that a connection is drawn between him and Penelope; this passive characterization of the hero is critical to the depiction of *eros* in the novels (Konstan 1994, 57-59), but also quite alien to the characterization of epic heroes (Konstan 1999, 171), the character type which Chaereas inhabits with a certain amount of discomfort at the end of this novel (cf. section 2.2.1, "Chariton," in chapter two, "Familial Closure"). Despite Chaereas' abrupt character development at the end of the novel, he is still framed as conducting himself with passivity and caution more akin to an epic heroine than an epic hero.

<sup>59</sup> Montiglio 2012, 30, argues that the instantaneous nature of their recognition is part of the novel's idealized presentation of love. This will become an object of satire for the non-closural emotion-focused reunion scenes in the sophistic novels.

ἔτι λέγοντος ἡ Καλλιρόη γνωρίσασα τὴν φωνὴν ἀπεκαλύψατο καὶ ἀμφότεροι συνεβόησαν “Χαιρέα,” “Καλλιρόη.” περιχυθέντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις, λιποψυχήσαντες ἔπεσον.

Before he had finished speaking, Callirhoe recognized his voice and threw the covering from her face. They both cried out at the same time: “Chaereas!” “Callirhoe!” They fell into each other’s arms, swooned, and fell to the ground.

As in the *Odyssey*’s scene they embrace, and then rather than merely feeling weak, they faint dead away. They proceed to regain consciousness and then faint again three more times; where epic is dramatic, the novels frequently embrace melodrama.<sup>60</sup> The complete loss of consciousness is an exaggerated form of Penelope’s reaction, and is imitated in other emotion-focused reunions. Xenophon has his lovers fall (εἰς γῆν κατηνέχθησαν, “fell to the ground,” 5.13.3) but not lose consciousness, and Achilles Tatius’ first romantic reunion scene, at 3.18.7 after Leucippe’s first *Scheintod*, satirizes Chariton’s by including the embrace and some loss of awareness (no fainting is specified, but Clitophon describes himself after their collapse as μόλις ἀναζωπυρήσας, “only just rekindled” suggesting some faintness), but suggesting that Clitophon’s reaction is in part due to Leucippe’s horrifying appearance, as she is still wearing the costume that made her appear to have been sacrificed and gutted.

While Chariton’s reunion scene is overwhelmingly emotion-focused, Chariton still makes a nod towards ritual. As Chaereas escorts Callirhoe from the prison to the palace a crowd spontaneously gathers around them and showers them with flowers: Ἄνθη καὶ στεφάνους ἔβαλλον αὐτοῖς, καὶ οἶνος καὶ μύρα πρὸ τῶν ποδῶν ἐχεῖτο, καὶ πολέμου καὶ εἰρήνης ἦν ὁμοῦ τὰ ἥδιστα, ἐπινίκια καὶ γάμοι. “They had flowers and wreaths showered on them; wine and myrrh were poured out at their feet as they walked; the sweetest fruits of war and peace were joined in celebration of victory and marriage.” (8.1.12) The ἐπινίκια καὶ γάμοι at the end explicitly

<sup>60</sup> See Anderson 2017, 5-7, on the different uses of melodrama in each of the ideal novels.

compares this informal parade to the formal rituals of victory feasts and weddings, so this parade is the seed of what grows into the fully formed rituals of the later ritual-focused reunion scenes. This scene is still very close to the *Odyssey*, however. Although Chaereas usually slept on his ship, he and Callirhoe now go to bed together in the royal bedchamber of a palace captured from the Persian king, and tell each other the stories of what happened to them while they were parted (8.1.14-17). This is precisely what happens at the end of Odysseus' and Penelope's reunion scene, and for any reader who has not caught on yet, the final line of Chariton's scene is a quotation from the end of that scene, ἀσπάσιοι λέκτροιο παλαιοῦ θεσμὸν ἴκοντο, "they gladly came to the ancient rite of the bed." (Od.23.296)

If Chaereas shows similarities to Penelope, Callirhoe shares a few with Odysseus as well throughout the novel.<sup>61</sup> The individuation of the romantic plot from the homecoming plot is not at a very advanced stage in this early novel, and like Odysseus Callirhoe pines for both spouse and home with little differentiation. Whitmarsh argues that her sexual desire for Chaereas is largely translated into "social desire,"<sup>62</sup> noting that her laments are largely for home and family. This inherently connects her reunion with Chaereas to her return to her original home and status. Indeed, the moment that their recognition occurs she is returned to the status; after the initial scene of the moment of recognition, the next sentence is Φήμη δὲ διέτρεχεν ὅτι ὁ ναύαρχος εὔρηκε τὴν γυναῖκα, "Rumor spread that the admiral had found his wife." (8.1.11) The closure of the romantic plot immediately triggers Callirhoe's resumption of her status as the wife of Chaereas. Chaereas, in one of the last remnants of the agency and aggression of the epic hero

<sup>61</sup> This is in line with Konstan's theories about the shifts in agency between the lovers in order to create the distinctive form of *eros* seen in the novels. It is not only necessary that the hero become exceptionally passive to create the necessary equivalence of the lovers' social roles, but the heroine becomes extraordinarily active, compared to other women in similar social positions in the novels (Konstan 1994, 30).

<sup>62</sup> Whitmarsh 2011, 146.

that appears in the novels, has recently proved that he deserves his status as a member of the ruling class via martial prowess, winning the naval battle against the Persians.<sup>63</sup> Thus the reunion of the lovers not only makes Callirhoe Chaereas' wife again, but also makes her a member of a powerful Syracusan military family again. This is a strong reversal, as she is raised up from the pitiful status of prisoner of war, and all the disturbing implications that has for a woman in a story based on a Homeric epic.

In addition, all obstacles to her return to Syracuse are instantly removed. Chariton still treats the romantic reunion and the return home as separate; in the next section, 8.2, a messenger comes with information that the Egyptian ground forces have been defeated by the Persians and that the Persians are moving in on Chaereas' position (8.2.1), which causes the decision to leave for Syracuse (8.2.12). The line of causal continuity for the homecoming plot and the line of causal continuity for the romantic plot are tightly intertwined, but still separate. However, Chariton explicitly states that without the recognition and reunion Callirhoe would not have been able to return to Syracuse (8.1.2); the closure of the romantic plot is the cause of the successful closure of the homecoming plot. Odysseus' reunions with his family members, and particularly Penelope, are here being used as a model for the romantic resolution scene. Callirhoe's recognition by her husband allows her return to her original social status even more explicitly than Odysseus' recognition by his wife,<sup>64</sup> so despite the split that the novel creates between the

<sup>63</sup> Lowe 2000, 229-30 sees Chaereas' situation and behavior in and after the war between Egypt and Persia as Homeric, and De Temmerman 2014, 90-92, takes the characterization shift as Chaereas' development of self-control, after which he intentionally assimilates himself with epic heroes.

<sup>64</sup> It is not clear that Penelope could actually have prevented an imposter who the rest of the community believed from taking Odysseus' place, though her successful resistance to the suitors and the many dark references to Clytemnestra's successful resistance to Agamemnon's return indicate that it is far from a foregone conclusion that Penelope would have been forced to accept an impostor.

romantic and homecoming plots, romantic closure is still inextricably linked to the resumption of status.

### 1.2.2 Xenophon

Xenophon's reunion is one of the strongest scenes at the end of the *Ephesiaca*. He switches from summary back to full scene writing. Here is the moment of reunion: (5.13.3)

ὡς δὲ εἶδον ἀλλήλους εὐθὺς ἀνεγνώρισαν· τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐβούλοντο αἱ ψυχαί· καὶ περιλαβόντες ἀλλήλους εἰς γῆν κατηνέχθησαν, κατεῖχε δὲ αὐτοὺς πολλὰ ἅμα πάθη, ἡδονή, λύπη, φόβος, ἢ τῶν πρότερον μνήμη, τὸ τῶν μελλόντων δέος.

When they saw each other, they recognized each other at once, for that was their fervent desire. They embraced each other and fell to the ground. A host of different emotions took hold of them at once—joy, grief, fear, memory of past events, and anxiety for the future.

Xenophon actively rejects the doubt from the *Odyssey*'s reunion scene. Recognition occurs the instant they lay eyes on each other, without any moment of tension.<sup>65</sup> Any negative emotions are vague and external to their relationship, as neither shows any sign of fearing that their spouse no longer loves them, as Odysseus does about Penelope and Chaereas and Callirhoe do after the trial at Babylon. The embrace and physical collapse are present once again, though this time it is unclear if they lose consciousness; he simply says they εἰς γῆν κατηνέχθησαν, "they fell to the

<sup>65</sup> Montiglio 2012, 47-52 argues that the recognition scene itself is abnormally protracted, as the recognition between the lovers is preceded by recognitions between each of the lovers and their slaves Leucon and Rhode, in which the lovers and the slaves have what Montiglio considers surprising difficulty in recognizing each other. The lovers were wealthy children when Leucon and Rhode last saw them, however, and have gone through many harrowing adventures, and Leucon and Rhode have gone from slavery to freedom and wealth. Achilles Tatius has Clitophon fail to recognize Leucippe at 5.17 due to the change in appearance that has accompanied her change in status, so status shifts making people unrecognizable is within the standards of the genre, potentially rooted in Odysseus' disguise as a beggar. Real events such as those the provided the basis for the film *Le Retour de Martin Guerre* (1982) also provide evidence for the difficulty of securely identifying even a loved one after a time of separation. Montiglio argues more persuasively the multi-stage recognition scene is part of the tradition is connected to the elaborate recognition scenes in drama. The multiple recognitions prolong the scene as a whole, however, not the moment of recognition between the lovers themselves, which the passage above describes as εὐθὺς. This stands in contrast with truly prolonged recognitions such as Achilles Tatius 5.17 or Heliodorus 7.7.

ground.” Xenophon later describes them as ἀναλαμβάντες ἑαυτοὺς, “recovering themselves” (5.13.4) when they feel calm enough to stand up again, possibly a gesture towards versions of the scene where the protagonists faint, though with Xenophon’s literal habits of speech it may simply be a descriptor of standing. The lack of clarity in the reactions is bolstered by a list of the emotions they experience; this may indicate some concern on the author’s part that the descriptions may not draw the emotional reactions for the audience quite as clearly as Chariton’s scene does, much less the evocative simile of the *Odyssey*’s scene. This shows the degree of importance of these emotions to the scene; an author who is not as adept at evoking them lists them out, suggesting he considered the scene incomplete or ineffective without them.

The night after the reunion is described in more detail than usual, which is interesting given that Xenophon usually has less detail than the other novelists. The lovers’ stories to each other are usually thought of as a retelling of the story just told by the poem or novel, and are therefore only mentioned in summary to avoid repeating the whole text. This identifies the protagonists with the author, a long-standing method of pointing out the most important characters.<sup>66</sup> Anthia and Habrocomes have a more specific motivation than the desire to tell each other of their adventures. They are concerned to reassure each other that they have been sexually faithful. The stories are thus framed as a way of defending themselves from any potential charge of infidelity. Konstan draws attention to the importance of constancy over chastity in the ideal novels.<sup>67</sup> The important trait is the lovers’ fidelity to each other, since their physical chastity is

<sup>66</sup> The *Odyssey*’s reunion scene creates a stereotyped way to incorporate the scene of characters-as-storytellers, but not the only way. In the *Iliad* Achilles and Helen are both introduced in important scenes as halfway through a retelling of what appears to be the story they are in (Pantelia 1993, 495 on the similarity between *Iliad* 3.125-28 and 9.189). Apuleius uses different techniques to connect himself and his protagonist. Late in the peculiar eleventh book of the *Metamorphoses* the protagonist, Lucius, is referred to as *Madaurensis*, “the man from Madaura,” in a prophecy from Osiris. Lucius, however, is from Corinth; it is Apuleius who is from Madaura.

<sup>67</sup> Konstan 1994, 48 ff.



often threatened by forces beyond their control, and in Konstan's analysis it is the enduring strength of the lovers' *eros* for each other that is important. It is also a trait that they share with the *Odyssey*, where Odysseus' desire for Penelope and for a return to Penelope is unchanged, despite his having sexual relationships with Calypso and Circe.

The *Ephesiaca*'s emotion-focused—and fidelity-focused—reunion scene is very much in the mold of the *Odyssey*'s reunion scene. The internal experiences of the protagonists continue to be represented clearly in the novel, because they are in harmony with the plot's closural demands. Anthia and Habrocomes' fidelity to each other and joy at seeing each other feeds into strengthening their marriage, which has already been sanctioned as part of Ephesian society.<sup>68</sup> Indeed, all of their erotic impulses transform into what Whitmarsh describes as “socialized desire for the community.”<sup>69</sup> In *Xenophon's Ephesiaca: A Paraliterary Love-Story from the Ancient World* (2017), Tagliabue describes how the lovers' initial erotic desire for each other transforms into fidelity to each other over the course of the novel. Whitmarsh notes that this fidelity is ultimately a desire for the restoration of their marriage, and concludes that “as in *Callirhoe*, the location of that restoration in the lovers' homeland implicitly privileges the endogamous perpetuation of the local community.”<sup>70</sup> The close link between the romantic plot and the lovers' status in the community remains.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. 1.7 where as soon as the pair's parents agree to marry them to each other the first reaction that the narrator tells the audience about is the city's as a whole: Μεστὴ μὲν ἤδη ἡ πόλις ἦν τῶν εὐωχομένων, πάντα δ' ἦν ἐστεφανωμένα καὶ διαβόητος ὁ μέλλον γάμος, “Already the revelry filled the city; there were garlands everywhere, and the impending marriage was on everyone's lips.” (1.7.3) The entire city is involved in this marriage, and their public affirmation of the marriage is so important that we learn about it before hearing about Habrocomes' and Anthia's feelings on the subject, which do not come until 1.7.4.

<sup>69</sup> Whitmarsh 2011, 147.

<sup>70</sup> Whitmarsh 2011, 147.

Despite this thematic linkage, the plotlines in the *Ephesiaca* are not closely linked. Unlike Chariton, Xenophon does not create causal continuity between the romantic and homecoming scenes. Here each of the lovers decides to return home to Ephesus before they have found each other, Habrocomes having despaired of finding Anthia and planning to raise a tomb for her (5.10.5) and Anthia being brought there by their friend Hippothous who hopes to find Habrocomes or news of him in Ephesus, and plans to at least restore Anthia to her parents (5.11.1). Callirhoe could not return home without Chaereas, and it does not cross his mind to return home without her; their homecoming plot and ultimate return to their original status is ultimately subordinated to the romantic plot. Despite Anthia and Habrocomes' dominant focus on their fidelity to each other, they are both willing and able to return home without achieving romantic reunion, and would return to the ranks of the elite within Ephesian society if they did. This narrative structure, of permitting return to home and status without romantic closure, therefore privileges the resumption of status over the otherwise dominant romantic plot. Within this context, there is no need for the romantic closural scene to do significant work in the realm of status resumption, and the *Odyssey*-style emotion-focused scene serves to resolve the romantic plot. The *Ephesiaca* is the last novel that uses the emotion-focused reunion scene to resolve the romantic plot, however. The sophistic novels use these scenes internally, but as the desires and senses of identity of the protagonists change, the romantic plots require status-creating scenes for their ultimate resolutions, and the ritual-focused closural scene comes into use.

### 1.3 Sophistic Novels

The new literary fashions of the second sophistic brought in elements of rhetoric and performative *paideia* that had a profound impact on the novels, as far as can be extrapolated

from the surviving corpus.<sup>71</sup> While the latter three extant ideal novels follow the core rules of the genre, the authors find enough room within these rules to take new approaches to the material. One of the new approaches is the change in characterization around the protagonists' desires and goals that Whitmarsh identifies in *Narrative and Identity in the Ancient Greek Novel*. It is this change in the protagonists' motivation that shifts the iconic wedding from the beginning of the novel to the end, which is a salient change between the early novels and the pre-sophistic ones. As Whitmarsh says, "consummation is delayed to the end, and becomes the primary object of the lovers' quest,"<sup>72</sup> indicating that the focus in the sophistic novels is on relationships within families and between individuals. Whitmarsh also observes that the increased focus on desire for an individual is accompanied by a decrease in focus on desire for return to a community.<sup>73</sup> While Odysseus and Callirhoe are equally focused on reunion with their lovers and their original roles within those communities, the protagonists of the sophistic novels primarily desire union with the beloved and show diminished interest in their role in the community. Because the resumption of status is no longer an important goal to the protagonists, it would have disappeared from the closural scenes of the romantic plots if nothing had changed. Instead, the rules of the genre changed to make the closural scene of the romantic plot a scene about the reabsorption of the protagonists into the community—the wedding.

Despite the major motivation of the desire for consummation that Whitmarsh describes, the act is only tactfully mentioned in *Daphnis and Chloe* (4.40.3), obliquely referred to in the *Aethiopica*<sup>74</sup>, and can only be assumed to have occurred in *Leucippe and Clitophon* because

<sup>71</sup> Morales 2004, 6.

<sup>72</sup> Whitmarsh 2011, 148.

<sup>73</sup> Whitmarsh 2011, 73.

Clitophon says that they marry (8.19) and the Greek wedding ritual was not complete without consummation. Instead the ritual-focused romantic reunion scene is created. A wedding is always involved somehow, but there are other rituals featured as well. In the *Aethiopica* the lovers' wedding is combined with their accession into the priesthood, and in *Leucippe and Clitophon* the wedding is described only in summary (8.19), whereas the most critical closural scene is that of the semi-magical virginity test, which is a ritual of the temple of Artemis at Ephesus. These rituals are used to fit the protagonists back into their original high social statuses. Leucippe's test proves that she is a free woman,<sup>75</sup> and her father's daughter to be married to the man he has agreed to permit her to marry. The priesthood that Charicleia and Theagenes enter at 10.41 is the sole province of married members of the Ethiopian royal family. And Daphnis and Chloe's simple wedding at 4.37-40 is conducted in the countryside, but by their birth parents, which confirms their membership in their birth parents' elite families.<sup>76</sup> Although the whole

<sup>74</sup> When the lovers and Charicleia's crowd of parents leave at the very end of the novel they are accompanied by flutes and torches, traditional accompaniments of the procession component of the Greek marriage ceremony (Oakley and Sinos 1993, 26) and are heading to τῷ γάμῳ μυστικωτέρων...τελεσθησομένων, "into the more mystic parts of the wedding ritual...were to be performed" (10.41.3). The combination of μυστικός and τελέω suggest initiation into a mystery religion, however in this case the initiation appears to be into the mysteries of Aphrodite, as the core of the Greek wedding was the ritual of consummating the marriage at the end of the procession (Oakley and Sinos 1993, 3), which appears to be what is meant here.

<sup>75</sup> At 7.13 Clitophon explains that at the temple of Artemis which Leucippe flees to for protection a γυνή, as opposed to a παρθένος, may only enter if she is a slave bringing a charge against her master. The penalty for a γυνή entering under any other circumstances is death. Therefore if Leucippe is a slave then she has the right to enter the temple regardless of her sexual status; if she is a free woman she only has the right to enter if she is a virgin. There is an implied assumption that if she is proved not to be a virgin then she would choose slavery over death, though this is not investigated in any depth since she insists so forcefully that she is a virgin, and Thersander (her putative master) would prefer her returned rather than dead. He says at 8.11 that the choice is between proving that she is her father's daughter, and with the status of free citizen of Byzantium that implies, and that she is Thersander's slave, and suggests the temple's virginity test to decide which of these is her true status.

<sup>76</sup> This confirms Chloe as a member of her birth parents' family more securely, as the Greek wedding was ultimately a transition of the bride from her father to her bridegroom. (Oakley and Sinos 1993, 9-10) In 4.37.3 Megacles gives her away (παρέδωκε), indicating she is his to give. He does give her foster father money, cementing the transition of Chloe from foster father to birth father in the same sentence she is transferred from birth father to husband. Interestingly, there is no mention of who he gives her to, only that he does so in the presence of the nymphs. Technically it must be Daphnis, but the failure to mention him may be an indication of his depiction as still a child and under Dionysophanes' authority. Dionysophanes is the host of the wedding feast, which is typically hosted by the father of either the bride or groom, and in Menander's *Dyskolos*, where the feast is held at the shrine of Pan and

romantic plot appears to be leading to sexual scenes, the closure instead focuses on these rituals of societal bonding and positioning, and the emotional reunions of the earlier novels are relegated to temporary reunions earlier in the novels. This major change in the generic standards, which drops most of the features of the original emotion-focused closure scenes but retains the element of reintegration into elite society, suggests that this reintegration must be achieved for final closure of the romantic plot.

### 1.3.1 Achilles Tatius

*Leucippe and Clitophon's* three *Scheintode* are accompanied by three different reunion scenes, each of which is a different approach parodying the basic emotional reunions in the *Odyssey* and earlier novels.<sup>77</sup> The first, at 3.17.7, is a close copy of the reunion in *Callirhoe*. After Leucippe's first *Scheintod* their friend Menelaus, who was instrumental in her rescue, brings her to Clitophon in her coffin and opens it up to release her. She comes out still in the costume that made her appear dead:<sup>78</sup>

ὁ δὲ ἦνοιγεν ἅμα τὴν σορὸν καὶ ἡ Λευκίππη κάτωθεν ἀνέβαινε, φοβερὸν θέαμα, ὧ θεοί, καὶ φρικωδέστατον. ἀνέφκτο μὲν αὐτῆς ἡ γαστήρ πᾶσα καὶ ἦν ἐντέρων κενή· ἐπιπεσοῦσα δέ μοι περιπλέκεται καὶ συνέφυμεν καὶ ἄμφω κατεπέσομεν.

He opened the coffin and Leucippe rose up, a frightening (O gods!) and blood-chilling sight. The entire length of her stomach hung open, and the visceral cavity was hollow. She fell into my arms' embrace, we pressed close, and then we both collapsed.

the Nymphs as it is in *Daphnis and Chloe*, the bride's and groom's families collaborate to throw the feast, so his role as host secures Daphnis' membership in his family. (Oakley and Sinos 1993, 22)

<sup>77</sup> See Anderson 1982, 117 on interpretations of Achilles Tatius as writing humor or parody; Durham 1938, 1-19, believed him to be parodying Heliodorus specifically (working on the earlier theory of the novels' chronology that predated the papyrus finds showing them not to be as late as originally believed, which led to a revision in the order in which they are believed to have been written). In more recent scholarship Montiglio 2012, 66 describes him as "challenging novelistic stereotypes," Repath 2005, 258 as "playing with the generic expectations," and Chew 2000 argues that the novel is specifically a parody of the moral code of the genre.

<sup>78</sup> Achilles Tatius translations from Winkler 1989, modified where necessary.

The embrace, the collapse, and even the helpful friend all remain, but in this case are made rather more gruesome by the heroine’s apparent disembowelment. The word used for embrace are highly vivid, περιπλέκεται, “twine around,” and συνέφυμεν, “to grow together” or “to unite.” They elicit strong mental images and ironically—given that this is only the first of many separations and reunions—a sense of permanent union. The added element of embracing an eviscerated lover heightens the emotional nature of the scene to the point of absurdity, potentially adding an allusion to the *Iliad*’s scenes of reuniting with a loved one’s corpse after his death on the battlefield has been described with medical precision. Interestingly, in Homer περιπλέκεται appears when Penelope joyously embraces Eurycleia upon learning that Odysseus has killed the suitors, but before doubt creeps in and she decides to test him, at 23.33. Achilles Tatius is at great pains to remind the audience of his *paideia*, so it is perhaps not a surprise that he chooses this word to describe an embrace that turns out not to produce a lasting reunion.<sup>79</sup> This is not the ultimate, powerful closural scene that closes off the novel’s romantic plotline, but rather a humorous early episode.<sup>80</sup> The shift of the emotion-focused reunion scene from the final closural scenes of the novel to a weaker point of internal closure suggests a loss of importance to the genre.

The second reunion skewers the convention in the opposite way, by removing the element of recognition entirely. Leucippe recognizes Clitophon, but he does not recognize her. At 5.17.3 Clitophon arrives at Melite’s country estate alongside her as her new husband, and they are greeted by a slave:

ἐξαίφνης προσπίπτει τοῖς γόνασιν ἡμῶν γυνή, χοίνιξι παχείαις δεδεμένη, δίκηλλαν κρατοῦσα, τὴν κεφαλὴν κεκαρμένη, ἐρρυπωμένη τὸ σῶμα, χιτῶνα ἀνεζωσμένη ἀθλιὸν πάνυ, καί, “Ἐλέησόν με,” ἔφη, “δέσποινα, γυνὴ γυναῖκα.”

<sup>79</sup> See Whitmarsh 2001, 79-81 on Achilles Tatius’ ostentatious engagement with contemporary and classical literary trends.

<sup>80</sup> Anderson 1982, 24.

Suddenly a woman threw herself at our feet! She had heavy irons bound around her ankles, a workman's hoe in her hands, her head was shaved, her body was all grimy, her miserable clothing was hitched up for work, and she cried out: "Have mercy on me, m'lady, as one woman to another."

Not until 5.18 does the audience learn that this is Leucippe, rendered unrecognizable by her cut hair.<sup>81</sup> Clitophon does not even figure it out on his own, but is informed by a letter she sends him the next day upbraiding him for marrying Melite. This is the utter opposite of *Callirhoe's* reunion scene, and something of an unheroic and humorous version of the *Odyssey's*.<sup>82</sup> There is no recognition between the lovers, the attendant companion is a rival suitor, and the heroine addresses her rival instead of her lover. *Callirhoe* emphasized that Chaereas suspected it was she by the way she breathed, and she recognized him by his voice; here the emphasis is on how unrecognizable Leucippe has been rendered by the trappings of slavery. Nothing in her voice or movement alerts Clitophon; he can recognize his beloved only by her beauty, and later by her handwriting in the letter.<sup>83</sup> Emotion is present but delayed. Clitophon gives no information on his

<sup>81</sup> Whitmarsh declares that there is no "loss of status or identity" (Whitmarsh 2011, 149), but in this novel, as in each of the extant ideal novels, one of the protagonists is enslaved and rescued from that slavery, here Leucippe. This is the nadir of their separation from the high social status they leave at the beginning of the story and re-enter at the end. Slaves are a constant, highly visible presence in all of the novels, with the negative aspects of their low status highlighted (Scarcella 1996, 233, 241, 257, 268, 273). Even in Longus' idyllic, gentle world people are forced into sex slavery, and Heliodorus' idealized Ethiopia seems to disapprove of slavery (Scarcella 1996, 274). The protagonists get a taste of the horrors of slavery while they visit—they suffer beatings and temporary disfigurements such as Leucippe's here, and frequently have close brushes with death—but they always escape the permanent harm that the slaves and other marginalized characters around them suffer with great frequency (Kuch 1996, 213).

<sup>82</sup> Montiglio 2012 argues persuasively that the pre-sophistic novels set up immediate recognition of the beloved as one of the tokens of the perfection of the love between the primary protagonists in the ideal novels (Ch. 1, "True Love and Immediate Recognition), and that the failures of recognition in the sophistic novels therefore constitute a parody of the conventions of the genre (Ch. 2, "Beauty, Dress, and Identity). This is particularly important in *Leucippe and Clitophon*, where misrecognition and failed recognition are an ongoing theme, and no effort is made to apologize for the hero's failure of recognition.

<sup>83</sup> Montiglio 2012, 70-71 interprets his failure to recognize her voice as meant to be a humorously extreme failure, meant to stand in stark contrast with the heroes of the pre-sophistic novels who immediately recognize their beloveds. This would therefore be part of Clitophon's overall parodic characterization as unable to live up to heroic standards, as in 8.1 where he narrates his beating by his rival Thersander as if it were an equal fight. However, Montiglio does note in pp.21-23 that the convention established in the *Odyssey* was that voices are not necessarily unique (cf. Helen's story in Book 4) or a trigger for recognition; she refers to this as "epic convention" but the difficulty of recognizing a caller who did not name themselves in the times before the invention of caller ID may

feelings when he sees the apparent stranger, but after reading her letter he feels a great deal: Τούτοις ἐντυχῶν πάντα ἐγινόμεν ὁμοῦ· ἀνεφλεγόμεν, ὠχρίων, ἐθαύμαζον, ἠπίστουν, ἔχαιρον, ἠχθόμεν. “On reading this my feelings exploded in all directions—I turned red; I went pale; I wondered at it; I doubted every word. I was rapt with joy and racked with distress.” (5.19.1) The list recalls the one from Xenophon’s reunion scene, though in this case the distress (ἠχθόμεν) is perhaps more justified as Clitophon remains firmly separated from his beloved in their second “reunion.” Achilles Tatius once more uses the emotion-focused reunion not as a way to bring closure to a plotline, but as a target of parody.

In the final reunion scene virginity is brought to the fore. Here the lovers’ reunion scene is combined with the reunion between Leucippe and her father, which does the bulk of the work to resolve the homecoming plotline. The resolutions of both plotlines depend on the proof of Leucippe’s virginity for closure. Her father, Sostratus, comes to Ephesus to find her and Clitophon (7.12.4), which allows the resolution of both reunion and homecoming plots to happen in Ephesus, due to the close connection between acceptance by the father and resolution of the homecoming plotline.<sup>84</sup> Sostratus first finds Clitophon during Leucippe’s third *Scheintod*, so that he and Clitophon are both grief-stricken for half a scene and have a joyful semi-reunion when she appears alive at the end of it. In this scene, however, the heroine embraces her father rather than her lover: (7.16.3-4)

ἰδοῦσα δὲ ἡμᾶς, ἐξεπήδησε τοῦ νεώ, καὶ τὸν μὲν πατέρα περιεπτύξατο, τοὺς δὲ ὀφθαλμοὺς εἶχεν ἐπ’ ἐμέ. ἐγὼ δὲ εἰστήκειν, αἰδοῖ τῇ πρὸς τὸν Σώστρατον κατέχων ἐμαυτὸν (καὶ ἅπαντα ἔβλεπον εἰς τὸ ἐκείνης πρόσωπον) ἐπ’ αὐτὴν ἐκθορεῖν.

argue otherwise. Regardless, Morgan 1982, 263-264 argues that ancient readers would likely find situations in novels sufficiently realistic if there was precedent in literature, whether or not it would in fact be likely in real life.

<sup>84</sup> Discussed in more detail in Chapter 2. He comes to Ephesus in response to an epiphany of Artemis. Montiglio 2012, 76-77 notes that a god is always instrumental in the reunions of the protagonists with their beloveds and families. This holds true for the *Odyssey* as well, in which Athena’s favor is critical to Odysseus’ successful return. Artemis’ key role in the resolution of *Leucippe and Clitophon* is particularly notable given that Fortune is the primary supernatural force governing most of the novel. (Sandy 1994, 1557-58)



Seeing us, she leaped from the temple and embraced her father, keeping her eyes the while on me. Embarrassment before Sostratus keeping me from leaping on her, I stood there looking all the time into her face.

The embrace (περιεπτύξατο) is redirected onto the father, while the only connection between the lovers is sustained eye contact. There is certainly no collapsing. Clitophon even restrains himself from an inappropriate emotional display. They desire the embrace and emotional outpouring of their first reunion, and of the emotion-focused reunions in the pre-sophistic novels, but instead of indulging in it they restrict themselves to metaphorical embrace with the eyes and a near-total absence of emotional expression towards each other. This is particularly remarkable given Clitophon's mad rush to get to her in the first place; he runs towards her in chains and fights his jailers to reach her, but once he is in her presence merely stands and looks at her without so much as a spoken greeting.<sup>85</sup>

However, merely meeting the beloved/parent does not resolve the plotlines; it is lasting reunion that creates closure, so the moment of encounter between Clitophon, Sostratus, and Leucippe does not fully resolve the tension of the reunion plotline.<sup>86</sup> Even though Leucippe has

<sup>85</sup> Montiglio 2012, 81 notes that the embrace is not merely delayed but removed, as it is not mentioned after the wedding which is described only in summary. She argues that this leaves the recognition scene uncompleted, and contributes to the openness of the ending of this novel. The openness of *Leucippe and Clitophon's* ending is a fraught question due to the uncompleted frame. Early scholars such as Vilborg 1962, Scholes and Kellogg 1966, and Gaselee 1969, suggested that it was not a question of the novel being open or closed, but simply that part of the text was lost in transmission or even that it was due to incompetence on the part of the author; more recently Anderson 1997 includes these possibilities on a comprehensive list of explanations given for the unresumed frame, but they have largely fallen out of favor. Hägg 1971, 125-6 and Reardon 1994, 94 n.15 argue that this does not disrupt prevent the ending from being closed, as they feel that the opening frame fulfills its purpose in launching the story, and that the lack of a closing frame should be a non-issue, given that an opening frame without a closing one is also used in texts such as Plato's *Republic* and Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*; Marinčić 2007 and Winkler 1989 point to the *Symposium* as well. Goldhill 1995, 79, on the other hand, says that the failure to resume the frame means that the novel does not achieve true closure, despite the closural gesture of the marriage. Fusillo 1997, 220 suggests that the failure to resume the frame is open, and fits in with the novel's structure as an "ironic and ambivalent pastiche" of the genre, and Repath 2005 follows him to say that it is a device specifically designed to parody the firmly closed happy ending typical to the genre. Ní Mheallaigh 2007 shows that the novel has strong intertext with the *Phaedrus*, which does close its frame, but also questions writing's ability to communicate, so the lack of the frame at the end could be part of the Phaedran program of raising questions about communication and authorial absence.

reunited with her father and her beloved, she is not free to go. She has been enslaved, and escaped to a temple of Artemis that shelters mistreated slave women and free virgins. In order to protect the sanctity of the temple, she can only have properly entered if she fit into one of these categories, so her master argues to the Ephesian court that she can only be considered a free woman by the Ephesian court if she is still a virgin. Otherwise she is only eligible to have entered the temple as his slave. So if she is a virgin, she can go home with her father and her betrothed, and if not she must be considered a slave for the temple's sake. Her successful reunions rely on her virginity. Luckily for Leucippe the temple has a magical virginity test, in which the putative virgin enters a cave and only comes back out if she is in truth a virgin. Clitophon and her father wait in the crowd outside, and the moment she successfully comes back out, her permanent reunion with them is assured. Clitophon has given explicit description of his emotional experience throughout the novel but here says only ἐγὼ δὲ ὅστις ἐγγέγονειν οὐκ ἂν εἶποιμι λόγῳ, "There is no way I could put in words my feelings," 8.14. The emotional state of the hero at this critical moment remains opaque, and he has no access to Leucippe's feelings.<sup>87</sup>

The climactic scene's focus shifts away from the emotional experience of the protagonists to the general joyous reaction of the crowd, a shift that continues in Longus' and Heliodorus' novels. This indicates that the lovers' emotions are no longer valuable to the closure of the romantic plot, even though their romantic feelings for each other are no weaker than those of the lovers in the pre-sophistic novels. What has changed in their feelings is the degree of their desire to return to their homes and original status, which suggests that it is this change that has

<sup>86</sup> Temporary instances of reunion are scenes such as Leucippe's first *Scheintod* (3.17), Daphnis' visit to Chloe's family during the winter (3.9-11, cf. Chalk 1960, 41), Callirhoe's and Chaereas' encounter in the trial at Babylon (5.5), and potentially Odysseus and Penelope's *homilia* in Book 19.

<sup>87</sup> *Leucippe and Clitophon* is the only ideal novel narrated by the hero rather than a third person omniscient narrator. See Whitmarsh 2003, Konstan 1994, 62-73, Kauffman 2015, Marinčič 2007.

made their feelings irrelevant to plot closure. Odysseus longed for his home as well as his wife, and was not finished returning home until he had regained his kingship; what completes Leucippe's return home is not returning to her lover's arms, but her acceptance as a free woman by the citizenry of a Greek city.<sup>88</sup> Her marriage to her lover is a result of this climactic scene, which does all the work of resolving plot tension.<sup>89</sup> The wedding occurs in the declining action, after the climactic resolution of the virginity test scene, and the wedding is only described in summary.<sup>90</sup>

The virginity test places the couple's social position in the limelight. This scene in many ways appears to run counter to the motivations that have driven the plot up to that point. As mentioned above, the lovers are motivated by the desire for sex, and the closural scene is a ritual proving the heroine's virginity. Whitmarsh also argues that the protagonists in this novel are

<sup>88</sup> The term δῆμος is used with a distinct pattern in the ideal novels, referring to the crowds that form in cities to observe or support the protagonists, most often in the opening and closing scenes of the plot. Dowden 1996, 267 simply interprets the term as referring to a "popular audience," but the pattern of the usage of δῆμος as opposed to other terms for crowds suggests there is room for a more nuanced interpretation, particularly in light of its implications of political power. In Chapter 3 I track the usage of the term to study the pattern itself, with the assumption that it does imply some measure of social power, but there is more work to do in terms of contextualizing the usage in the historical time periods in which the novels were written which is outside the scope of the present project. For a discussion of the political dimension of the δῆμος in *Callirhoe* see Alvares 2001-2002.

<sup>89</sup> This only covers the plot tension within the story proper; famously, the opening frame is never resumed. Repath 2005 makes a strong argument that this is Achilles Tatius' way of parodying the convention of the happy ending that is standards to the genre. The novel would be part of the genre it was parodying if it diverged too strongly from the standard structure of the plot's end, so instead Achilles Tatius undermines these scenes by casting doubt onto them with the opening frame. This creates what is identifiably an ideal novel, but one that has, in Repath's words, "a non-happy, non-ending." This fundamentally disrupts the closure of the story within the frame, but still allows that story to function in a generically appropriate manner. As the closural scenes are merely reframed by the frame, without their own form being notably altered by it, the issues of the frame's effect on interpretation are not within the scope of the present study.

<sup>90</sup> Curiously, Clitophon's wedding is extensively presaged throughout the novel, even though in the end Achilles Tatius does not focus much on the event. His father's preparations for his marriage to his half-sister are described in exceptional detail in 2.11, illustrating how lavishly Greek brides were adorned (Oakley and Sinos 1993, 16). His wedding to Melite and the feast afterwards appear in 5.14, but he cannot bring himself to consummate the marriage yet, as he is still grieving for Leucippe whom he believes dead. Although they exchange vows, he says the feast afterwards ὄνομα μὲν ἦν τῷ δεῖπνῳ γάμοι, "was a wedding supper in name only." Despite all of the near-weddings foreshadowing Leucippe and Clitophon's true wedding it is their reunion and her vindication as a properly virginal free maiden who is eligible to marry him that resolve the plotline. The wedding is greatly desired but forever receding into the future, and it is the moments of emotional intensity that are emphasized in the plot.

notably uninterested in the *polis* in comparison to previous novels, and that instead “desire is anchored here in familial identity” (Whitmarsh 2011, 149). And yet in this resounding scene of closure it is the proof of Leucippe’s public status, as a free woman rather than a slave, that restores her familial identity. She is uninterested in her return to Byzantium and her citizenship there, but the structure of the novel makes everything hinge on her reacquisition of public status as a member of that most fundamental elite class, free people.

### 1.3.2 Longus

In *Daphnis and Chloe* the transition to the new style of romantic closure scene is complete. Since the separation is handled so differently in this novel most of the more dramatic aspects of closure are located in the recognition scenes with their parents.<sup>91</sup> Daphnis and Chloe are never apart long enough to develop the emotional strain that produces the scenes of embracing and fainting. By the time the romantic plotline is resolved with the wedding in the final pages of the novel, the stressful obstacles have all been cleared, and the bulk of the closure comes from the satisfaction of watching long-awaited goals achieved rather than the conclusion of the protagonists’ separation. The separation created by their ignorance about sex and love is resolved in the final line, in which they consummate their relationship on their wedding night. When Chloe finally learns about sex the last of their ignorance is dispelled and they are fully united as a married couple.

Emotional reunions do feature prominently in *Daphnis and Chloe*, but they are the lovers’ reunions with their parents rather than each other. The emotional distress of their

<sup>91</sup> The pair are together for most of the novel, with brief physical separations scattered throughout; Daphnis’ capture by pirates at 1.28, Chloe’s capture by Methymnians at the beginning of the war in 2.20, the winter when they do not go out to graze their flocks together at 3.3-11, and Chloe’s abduction by the rival suitor Lampis at 4.28. All aside from the winter are quite brief, and most of the episode of winter is taken up with Daphnis’ visit to Chloe’s house.

potential separations from each other is brief, and centered around Chloe's kidnapping by another suitor and the uncertain nature of her relationship with Daphnis due to their different statuses before her recognition. After Daphnis' recognition, Chloe despairs, assuming he has forgotten her and will marry a wealthy woman. Chloe is then kidnapped by a suitor who assumes the same thing, which causes the hapless Daphnis to despair.<sup>92</sup> Gnathon rescues her (hoping to get back into the newly elevated Daphnis' good graces), and this is the whole reunion scene (4.29.4-5):<sup>93</sup>

Προσάγει δὴ τὴν Χλόην αὐτῷ καὶ διδοὺς διηγεῖται πάντα: καὶ δεῖται μηδὲν ἔτι μνησικακοῦντα δοῦλον ἔχειν οὐκ ἄχρηστον, μηδὲ ἀφελέσθαι τραπέζης, μεθ' ἧν τεθνήξεται λιμῶ. Ὁ δὲ ἰδὼν καὶ ἔχων ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ τὴν Χλόην τῷ μὲν ὡς εὐεργέτη δηλλάττετο, τῇ δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀμελείας ἀπελογεῖτο.

He [Gnathon] brought Chloe to him [Daphnis], and as he handed her over he told the whole story, and asked him not to bear him any grudge any more but to take him as a slave who was not without his uses, and not to part him from a table whose loss would cause him to starve to death. Seeing Chloe and holding Chloe in his arms, Daphnis made his peace with Gnathon for his good service, and apologized to Chloe for his neglect.

The reunion is given in summary, and the actual moment of reunion is focused on Gnathon's tale of how he saved Chloe and his fear at losing his position as Daphnis' brother's parasite. The embrace is displaced forward, and described as a static state (ἔχων ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ, "holding in his arms") rather than an action, much less a vividly described action as was seen in previous emotional reunion scenes. The emotions of the lovers are not described, only Daphnis' actions after he hears Gnathon out, which are calm and sensible. Gnathon's fear of starvation stands out

<sup>92</sup> Konstan (1994, 15-26) notes that this is the normal reaction of ideal novel heroes, and posits that it is part of a systematic characterization of the heroes and heroines as similar, even equal, so that their *eros* for each other can be similarly equal and undifferentiated. Daphnis' lack of agency in this scene may therefore be a subtle way of including the lovers' emotional attachment in a series of scenes that has little overt representation of it.

<sup>93</sup> Longus translations from Morgan 2004, modified where necessary.

far more vividly than Chloe's fear of rape or Daphnis' fear of losing her. The emotional reunion has been relocated to the recognition scenes.

Indeed, all information about Daphnis and Chloe's emotional states drains away from the novel at the end. When it is revealed that Daphnis and Chloe are both highly born, Daphnis' parents quickly agree to let them marry officially. When the possibility of not being allowed to marry arises the lovers exhibit distress, in particular Daphnis who turns pale and weeps (4.31.12). When his father tells Chloe that she will still be able to marry Daphnis he begins by telling her to *θαρραεῖν*, "be brave/courageous," (4.31.2) which suggests she was not bearing up well before she was sure he would accept her recognition tokens as valid. This sort of second-order evidence of emotional state is standard for descriptions of the lovers' feelings for the rest of the novel. When Chloe is recognized as high-born and an eligible bride for Daphnis there is no description of how they feel in response, but instead Longus describes the parents' happiness. Daphnis' birth father rejoices to discover that Chloe is still a virgin, and Daphnis and Chloe's foster parents are all invited to a party thrown by Daphnis' birth parents. Longus says Chloe's foster father *συνεισιῖτο*, "feasted/celebrated together" (4.32.2) with the other foster parents. In contrast Daphnis and Chloe's descriptions are short and largely external, even though in a romantic plot with an emotion-focused reunion resolution scene this would be their most dramatic moment. The lovers are almost absent from the scene where they learn with certainty that they will never be parted again. This indicates a significant drop in importance of the lovers' feelings to the plot closure and the novel's end as a whole, as compared to the pre-sophistic novels.

The wedding is the scene that takes on the dramatic force that the reunions had in the novels of Chariton and Xenophon. The moment where the community acknowledges the lovers'

bond is now the resolution of the romantic separation plot, rather than the moment when they themselves become confident in their mutual attachment. The weddings in the earliest two novels were important scenes, but they were placed at the beginnings of the novels and so had relatively little plot tension to resolve. Now in *Daphnis and Chloe* the wedding is a grand finale, where many characters in the novel come together and celebrate, many with their own societal conflicts resolved.<sup>94</sup> Despite the desire for sex being a primary driver of the plot and motivation for the protagonists, the consummation is covered in a single sentence, with tactfully vague phrasing. There is not even the imitation of the scene in *Odyssey* 23.300-343 in which, in addition to tactfully described sex, the couple tells each other the stories of what happened to them while they were separated. Chariton imitates this scene at 8.1.13-17 with a direct quotation from the original scene in the *Odyssey*, and Xenophon imitates it at 5.14-15, as well as adding a complementary scene<sup>95</sup> of the lovers' wedding night in 1.8-9 where they discuss their attraction to each other. This device lends emphasis to the couples' unions without become risqué by giving an intimate portrait of the happy couple speaking alone together. Longus is familiar with the generic conventions of the ideal novel and could easily have added a version of it, and indeed is breaking with all previous tradition by having no scene of the whole story being retold by the protagonists.<sup>96</sup> He has made an active decision to focus the final scene on the wedding rituals, which establish the lovers' identities in their community as adults and confirm their relationships with their families.

<sup>94</sup> The rival who kidnapped Chloe is forgiven and invited to the wedding, and although her first suitor Dorcon is dead, his family attends in his place. Daphnis' more successful rival suitor, his erotic tutor Lycaenion, comes along with her husband, suggesting their relationship has improved (Morgan 2004, 247).

<sup>95</sup> Tagliabue 2017, 22 ff.

<sup>96</sup> Even Achilles Tatius includes this part, though he places the protagonists' stories at dinners they have with crowds of relatives and allies at 8.5 and 8.15 rather than alone together.

The wedding displays most of the characters from the novel interacting harmoniously in their societally prescribed roles. In the wedding rifts within rustic society are healed, and the rift between town and countryside is at least bridged. Daphnis and Chloe's emotional states are still not directly described; it is the ritual and related actions that are of interest here. The lovers' birth fathers are prominent; the protagonists spend the night before the wedding at Chloe's birth parents' house (4.36.3), and the next day return to the countryside where the lovers grew up to hold their wedding (4.37):

Ἡμέρας δὲ γενομένης συνθέμενοι πάλιν εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν ἤλαυνον· ἐδεήθησαν γὰρ τοῦτο Δάφνις καὶ Χλόη μὴ φέροντες τὴν ἐν ἄστει διατριβήν, ἐδόκει δὲ κάκεινοις ποιμενικούς τινας αὐτοῖς ποιῆσαι τοὺς γάμους. ἐλθόντες οὖν παρὰ τὸν Λάμωνα τὸν τε Δρύαντα τῷ Μεγακλεῖ προσήγαγον καὶ τὴν Νάπην τῇ Ῥόδῃ συνέστησαν καὶ τὰ πρὸς τὴν ἑορτὴν παρεσκευάζοντο λαμπρῶς. παρέδωκε μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ ταῖς Νύμφαις τὴν Χλόην ὁ πατήρ καὶ μετὰ ἄλλων πολλῶν ἐποίησεν ἀναθήματα τὰ γνωρίσματα καὶ Δρύαντι τὰς λειπούσας εἰς τὰς μυριάς ἐπλήρωσεν.

Next morning they came to an agreement and rode off back to the country. This was at the request of Daphnis and Chloe, who could not endure the urban grind, and they too thought it would be a good idea to celebrate their wedding in pastoral style. So when they got to Lamon's house, they presented Dryas to Megacles and introduced Nape to Rhode. Then they began making splendid preparations for the feast. Chloe's father gave her away in the presence of the Nymphs, and made a number of dedications, including her recognition tokens. He gave Dryas what was needed to make up the round ten thousand.

Daphnis and Chloe return to the countryside in grand triumph, actively choosing the location because of their fondness for it rather than having no choice other than to live there as before. This is a vivid display of social power, especially in contrast to their earlier helplessness. Before Daphnis' recognition he was about to be handed over as a sex slave to a suitor he had rebuffed; now he exerts control over his life. This passage also cements Chloe's status as a member of Megacles' wealthy family, not Dryas' poor one. Megacles literally pays Dryas for her, the last in a series of payments Dryas is given by men taking his foster daughter off of his hands<sup>97</sup>. He first

<sup>97</sup> Morgan 2004, 247, and he additionally notes that this is a fulfillment of Dryas' plans to use the obvious wealth of Chloe's birth family to improve his own socioeconomic status.



considers transferring her to another family when he and Nape begin to plan her marriage at 3.25, and Nape explicitly says they should marry her to a suitor who can make them rich. The nymphs assist Daphnis—at this point a slave and a goatherd—in becoming this rich suitor by directing him to a cache of three thousand drachmae lost by the Methymnians, which he gives to Dryas in return for the promise of Chloe’s hand at 3.29.4. After Dryas reveals Chloe’s status as a foundling from a wealthy family and due to this Dionysophanes agrees to let her marry Daphnis, Dionysophanes gives Dryas another three thousand. Finally at the wedding Megacles gives Dryas a final four thousand, confirming her membership in Megacles’ family and his authority to then give her away (*παρέδωκε*) to Daphnis and Dionysophanes’ family. Longus thus begins the wedding scene, and final closure of the romantic plot, with a reminder of Daphnis and Chloe’s newfound social power, and the ceremonial transfer of Chloe from poor family to rich natal family to another rich marital family. Emphasizing the role of the transfer of money in the transfer of Chloe herself brings emphasis to each family’s wealth or lack thereof, which is an important aspect of their status, especially given the novel’s focus on the foster families’ poverty. This monetary exchange is another way of illustrating the protagonists’ change in status.

The wedding party, held by Dionysophanes, is a display of the countryside as harmonious and appealing, with Lycaenion attending together with her husband and Lampis forgiven and invited (4.38.1). Daphnis’ goats are also allowed to attend, even though the town people do not like them, and he greets them fondly. His goatherd past here is once again contrasted with his present social power.<sup>98</sup> The country people are also allowed to participate in the final wedding procession, singing the wedding song in notoriously rustic voices (4.40):

<sup>98</sup> Morgan 2004, 248 notes that it is only Daphnis’ goats at the wedding, with no mention of Chloe’s sheep, and theorizes that the goats’ reputation for strong odor motivates the town guests’ negative response and allows for another opportunity to play up the contrast between country and town.

τότε δὲ νυκτὸς γενομένης πάντες αὐτοὺς παρέπεμπον εἰς τὸν θάλαμον, οἱ μὲν συρίττοντες, οἱ δὲ αὐλοῦντες, οἱ δὲ δᾶδας μεγάλας ἀνίσχοντες. 2. καὶ ἐπεὶ πλησίον ἦσαν τῶν θυρῶν ἦδον σκληρᾶ καὶ ἀπηνεῖ τῇ φωνῇ, καθάπερ τριαίνας γῆν ἀναρρηγνύντες, οὐχ ὑμέναιον ᾄδοντες. Δάφνις δὲ καὶ Χλόη γυμνοὶ συγκατακλιθέντες περιέβαλλον ἀλλήλους καὶ κατεφίλουσαν, ἀγρυπνήσαντες τῆς νυκτὸς ὅσον οὐδὲ γλαῦκες, καὶ ἔδρασε τι Δάφνις ὧν αὐτὸν ἐπαίδευσε Λυκαίνιον, καὶ τότε Χλόη πρῶτον ἔμαθεν ὅτι τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς ὕλης γενόμενα ἦν ποιμένων παίγνια.

Now, when night fell, everyone escorted them to their bedroom, some playing the pipes, some the flute, others brandishing huge torches. 2. And when they were close to the door, they began to sing with rough and uncouth voices, as if they were breaking up the ground with forks rather than singing the marriage hymn. Daphnis and Chloe lay together naked, embraced one another and kissed. That night they were more sleepless even than owls. Daphnis did something of what Lycaenion had taught him, and then, for the first time, Chloe learned that what had happened on the edge of the wood had been shepherd's games.

Winkler (1990, 124) and Zeitlin (1990, 457) interpret these last lines as having an ominous tone, due to the reference to Daphnis' dalliance with Lycaenion and the description of the rustics singing the wedding song in voices that are *σκληρᾶ καὶ ἀπηνεῖ*, two words with semantic associations with "hard" and "rough," and Winkler suggests "unpleasant" as well. Winkler and Zeitlin take these two aspects as allusions to the earlier appearances in the story of rape and sexual violence against women. Morgan (2004, 248-249) finds the description of the song to be a reminder of rusticity and agriculture, and therefore a nod towards the legitimate children that Daphnis and Chloe will produce, and that Lycaenion is mentioned in contrast with marital sexuality rather than in association with it. While Winkler's project of describing the appearance of the constrained and vulnerable role of the Greek woman as Chloe grows into it, and the disturbing nature of that role to a modern audience,<sup>99</sup> is a persuasive argument, this is a weak piece of evidence to support it. Unless the reader finds agriculture to be a disturbing process the Greek agricultural model of marriage is not one of the more troubling aspects of the institution,

<sup>99</sup> Winkler 1990, 104.

and casting the unartfulness of the rustics' song as a harbinger of violence reinforces the text's classism rather than analyzes it.

From the internal perspective of the text, rather than the modern reaction to unequal Greek social roles, the scene shows every sign of harmony and positive representation of marriage. The dramatic inequality of the Greek marriage is visible to the modern scholar, but the internal framing of the scene focuses on the peacefulness of the characters accepting their places in the social order rather than the inherent violence of that social order's power dynamics. The wedding scene's emphasis throughout is on members of the community, and on Daphnis and Chloe's roles in the community being established. The themes of this scene up to the point of the wedding procession are social correctness, success, and harmony, in pointed contrast to the hazards of the protagonists' time spent adventuring outside of their home society. Characters who were threatening or out of step with society in the arc of the plot, such as Lycaenion and Lampis, are present and behaving correctly in the wedding scene.<sup>100</sup> Daphnis and Chloe have sex when prompted to do so by society, in a planned manner, surrounded by the traditional torches and marriage hymns.<sup>101</sup> The resolution of the romantic plot becomes a scene of social harmony

<sup>100</sup> Morgan 2004, 247.

<sup>101</sup> Longus and Heliodorus both end their novels with weddings that bear a resemblance to each other and to classical Athenian ritual. In both novels the bride's birth father presides over the wedding. In a religious setting (in Longus 4.37.2 ἐπὶ ταῖς Νύμφαις, "in the presence of the Nymphs," in Heliodorus before the altar of the Sun and Moon) he declares to a large crowd that his daughter will marry the groom. This corresponds to the Athenian *anakalypteria* (Oakley and Sinos, 25), where the bride's father gave his daughter to the groom in front of the wedding guests after a feast (the guests and feast also appear in Daphnis and Chloe's planned wedding; Charicleia's is impromptu and lacks a formal feast). This was likely when the bride's ritual unveiling occurred, but veils do not figure prominently in the ideal novels. In the novels the couple then travels together to their bedchamber, accompanied by the crowd who plays the *syrinx* and *aulos* and carries torches, and when they arrive the married couple finally has their long-awaited sexual union, referred to with oblique tact. The procession was the central feature of the Athenian wedding and the torches were essential, and usually associated with the bridal couple's mothers (Oakley and Sinos, 26). Music was involved, but historical weddings seem to have been less specific about the *syrinx* being the source (Oakley and Sinos 27, flutes, cymbals, songs, and shouts were all involved). It is perhaps notable that Clitophon's wedding to Melite in 5.14 includes only the religious setting, the temple of Isis; the woodwinds, torches, and wedding guests never appear. On the other hand the mystical sound of a *syrinx* sent by Pan confirms Leucippe's virginity and therefore eligibility for marriage (8.13), and her father and the crowd of Ephesians are key characters in the scene.

integration. The closural scene of the romantic plot focuses on the resolution of status-based tensions despite Daphnis and Chloe's lack of awareness throughout the novel that such tensions exist.

### 1.3.3 Heliodorus

The *Aethiopica* takes the *Odyssey* as an explicit model in much the same way *Daphnis and Chloe* includes pastoral material, so that the *Aethiopica* is filled with overt allusions to the *Odyssey* as well as having its plot influenced by the epic on a fundamental structural level like the other ideal novels. The closural scenes of the *Aethiopica* are largely unlike the *Odyssey*'s however, and instead closely resemble those of the other two sophistic novels, despite the difference in the *Aethiopica*'s content given its quasi-mythic setting. The fundamental shift in the characterization of the protagonists remains, which puts the same stresses on the shared plot structure that this shift did in Longus and Achilles Tatius' novels, and requires similar remedies in the plot closure.

Charicleia and Theagenes lack the motivating desire to return home that animates the early novels' protagonists. Theagenes, uniquely among all of the novel protagonists, has no interest in returning home and never does.<sup>102</sup> All he wants is to marry Charicleia. Charicleia's motivations are both presented in more detail and are ultimately less clear. At 4.10-13 she and Calasiris meet in Delphi for a key plot scene. He has already figured out that she is the princess of Ethiopia and in love with Theagenes, and comes to present his plan for her to return to her

<sup>102</sup> It is worth noting, however, that Ethiopia is Hellenized by his and Charicleia's arrival, in that it abandons the practice of human sacrifice, which brings their religion into accordance with Greek taboo. Additionally, Theagenes and Charicleia, who look Greek (white) and have been raised in Greek culture, are made crown prince and princess and take on important priesthoods, so that both Ethiopia's religion and ruling monarchs become more Greek. Theagenes may not return to Greece, but in real ways he brings Greece with him.

birthplace and marry Theagenes there.<sup>103</sup> She agrees to the plan, but this section of the novel is a story told by Calasiris, so the narration only gives insights into his thoughts and feelings, so the thought processes that lead Charicleia to decide to go ahead with his plan can only be inferred from her statements. At 4.11.3 she says she would rather die than marry the man her foster father wants her to, and Calasiris describes her reaction to learning that she is an Ethiopian princess in this manner: ὡς δὲ ἐγνώρισεν ἑαυτὴν, καὶ τὸ φρόνημα διανιστᾶσα πλέον τῷ γένει προσέδραμε, “when she learned who she was, a pride befitting her birth being awakened in her, she ran to me.” (4.12.1) He then tells her the somewhat mysterious story that he was sent to find her by her mother, and ends with a series of claims intended to convince her to come with him to Ethiopia (4.13.2):<sup>104</sup>

ὥστε ἔνεστί σοι πειθομένη δρασμόν τε τὸν ἐνθένδε σὺν ἡμῖν αἰρουμένη, πρὶν τι καὶ πρὸς βίαν σε τῶν παρὰ γνώμην ὑποστῆναι, τοῦ Χαρικλέους ἤδη σοι τὸν Ἀλκαμένους γάμον ἐσπουδακότος, γένος μὲν καὶ πατρίδα καὶ τοὺς φύντας κομίζεσθαι Θεαγένει δὲ ἀνδρὶ συνεῖναι γῆς ὅποι καὶ βουλόμεθα συνέπεσθαι παρεσκευασμένῳ, ξένου τε καὶ ὀθνείου γνήσιον καὶ ἄρχοντα βίον ἀνταλλάξασθαι σὺν τῷ φιλάτῳ βασιλεύουσας, εἴ τι δεῖ θεοῖς τε τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ τῷ χρησμῷ τοῦ Πυθίου καταπιστεύειν.

So, if only you will put your trust in me and join me in getting away from here before you are compelled to submit to something distasteful—for Charicles has set his heart on marrying you to Alcamenes—you may be restored to your kinsfolk, to your homeland, to your parents, and be wedded to Theagenes, who is ready to follow us wherever in the world we choose to go. Thus you may exchange the life of an outcast in a foreign land for the throne that is your by right, where you will reign with your beloved at your side—that is, if one is to put any trust in the gods, in particular in the oracle of Pythian Apollo.

<sup>103</sup> Calasiris at first implies that he came to Delphi simply in search of a religious retreat, but then in this scene of persuading Charicleia to come with him to Ethiopia he tells her he was sent by her mother to retrieve her. Scholars initially simply took this to be an error on Heliodoros' part (Hefti 1950, Reardon 1971). Winkler 1982 argues that the inconsistency is an intentional narrative strategy of Calasiris, however, and that he never unambiguously says that he did not know of Charicleia's story before he came to Delphi. Heliodoros is not inconsistent; instead, like a skilled stage magician, he directs the reader's attention away from Calasiris' knowledge of the plot until the most dramatic moment. This is in parallel to the storyline of stopping human sacrifice in Ethiopia, which Winkler takes to be the underlying purpose of Charicleia's journey, and which is also not made clear to the readers until the end. The apparent error of Calasiris initially not knowing about Charicleia is in fact part of a sophisticated program of narrative experimentation.

<sup>104</sup> Heliodoros translations from Morgan 1989, modified where necessary.

Here Calasiris lays out every possible motivation; the desire to return to family, to status as both citizen and crown princess, escape from an undesired marriage and ability to marry her beloved, all topped off with the reminder that Apollo has prophesied that she will do this. Calasiris is something of a sophist rhetor, whose arguments are not all unimpeachable. In particular his claim that she lives the life of a *xenos* in Delphi is not backed up, as she is daughter of a Delphic priest, a chief acolyte of Artemis, greatly admired by the Delphians (cf. 3.4.8) and looks completely Greek. Her high status in Delphi also puts into question how meaningful the increase to royal status in Ethiopia is. Indeed, the decision to travel to Ethiopia puts her status at risk. In Delphi she is the daughter of a priest and an acolyte of Artemis; it is only after she leaves Delphi to travel to Ethiopia that she suffers loss of status. This speech would make sense to give to an enslaved Callirhoe, but the shifts that have occurred in the genre mean that it does not make complete sense. This is Charicleia's reply: *κάπειδὴ θεοῦς, εἶπεν, ὅτω βούλεσθαι σύ τε φῆς ἐγὼ τε πείθομαι, τί χρῆ πράττειν ᾧ πάτερ*, “‘You say that this is God’s will,’ she said, ‘and I believe you. So what am I to do, Father?’” (4.4.3) Given the whole list of options, it is the oracle of Apollo that convinces her. Out of the whole buffet of potential motivations, the one that activates Charicleia is piety.

Like *Leucippe and Clitophon*, the *Aethiopica* concludes the romantic plot with a ritual-focused reunion scene, but includes a brief separation and reunion of the lovers in the middle of the novel that ends in an equally brief emotional reunion scene. This is directly after the duel between Calasiris' sons that is a very clear allusion to the end of the *Iliad*. The romantic reunion here has far less closural force than the end of Calasiris' plotline that dominates the beginning of

Book 7, and has a distinct humorous note. Charicleia, disguised as a beggar, sees Theagenes from afar after a long separation, which leads to the following scene: (7.7.5-7)

Κατ' ἴχνος γὰρ ἐφεπομένη τοῦ Καλασίριδος καὶ πόρρωθεν ἀναγνωρίσασα τὸν Θεαγένην, ὄξυ γάρ τι πρὸς ἐπίγνωσιν ἐρωτικῶν ὄψις καὶ κίνημα πολλάκις καὶ σχῆμα μόνον κἂν πόρρωθεν ἢ κἂν ἐκ νότων τῆς ὁμοιότητος τὴν φαντασίαν παρέστησεν, ὥσπερ οἰστηθεῖσα ὑπὸ ὄψεως ἐμμανῆς ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἵεται καὶ περιφῦσα τοῦ αὐχένος ἀπρὶξ εἶχετο καὶ ἐξήρητο καὶ γοεροῖς τισι κατησπάζετο θρήνοις. Ὁ δὲ οἶον εἶκος ὄψιν τε ρυπῶσαν καὶ πρὸς τὸ αἰσχρότερον ἐπιτετηδευμένην ἰδὼν καὶ ἐσθῆτα τετραχωμένην καὶ κατερρωγυῖαν, ὥσπερ τινὰ τῶν ἀγειρουσῶν καὶ ἀληθῶς ἀλῆτιν διωθεῖτο καὶ παρηγκωνίζετο· καὶ τέλος ἐπειδὴ οὐ μεθίει, ὡς ἐνοχλοῦσαν καὶ τῇ θεᾷ τῶν ἀμφὶ Καλάσιριν ἐμποδῶν ἰσταμένην καὶ διερράπισεν.

She was following hard on Calasiris' heels and had recognized Theagenes from afar—for a lover's eyes are so quick to recognize the object of their love that often the merest movement or gesture, even if seen from a great distance or from behind, is enough to suggest an imaginary resemblance. Now, as if the sight of him had stung her to a frenzy, she threw herself upon him, flung her arms around his neck, and hung in a clinging embrace, tearfully sobbing out her greeting. But of course the sight of her face hideously disguised with filth and of her tattered and ragged garments led him to suppose that she truly was some mendicant vagabond, and he tried to push her away and elbow her aside. But she refused to let him go and made such a nuisance of herself, blocking his view of what was happening to Calasiris, that eventually he cuffed her round the head.

Heliodorus draws attention to the absurdity of the generic conventions by first stating that lovers always recognize each other, and then having Theagenes fail to recognize his beloved.<sup>105</sup> This is parallel to the scene at *Leucippe and Clitophon* 5.17, where Clitophon meets Leucippe after she has been enslaved and fails to recognize her because she is so changed by having her hair cut off. The absurdity of the moment is then increased by their physical struggle as she attempts to embrace him, resulting in his actually striking her, *διερράπισεν*, an action not seen between lovers since Chaereas' disturbing moment of tyrant-like behavior when he kicks Callirhoe into a

<sup>105</sup> Montiglio 2012, 118-123, notes the parallel to the *Leucippe and Clitophon* scene, and argues that Heliodorus sets up a tension between the generic and Platonic ideas of true love involving immediate recognition between the lovers, and the elements of status in both love and appearance. True love exists only between the elites in this novel, and Charicleia's disguise as a beggar fools Theagenes into thinking she is not of elite status, which is enough to make him assume she is not his beloved. The failed recognition is a marker of the importance of status in the novel.

coma.<sup>106</sup> Charicleia’s embrace is vividly described here, περιφῦσα τοῦ ἀγένοϋ, “growing around/clinging to his neck,” expressing the profound emotion on her side. Once she has made herself known to Theagenes by their prearranged code phrase he returns the embrace with enthusiasm and the word περιέβαλλέ, which distinctly recalls the wording of Penelope’s embrace of Odysseus at 23.208.

The final resolution of the romantic plot is at the very end of the novel, right after Charicleia’s homecoming plot is completed, and the emotion of the lovers is almost entirely absent from it. Charicleia’s parents recognize her at 10.16.1-2, and the Ethiopian assembly releases her from her role as human sacrifice at 10.17.1-2. The last insights into Charicleia and Theagenes’ thoughts and feelings are with their final spoken lines in 10.37-38. Theagenes informs Hydaspes with what appears to be a sense of triumph that the daughter Charicles is accusing him of kidnapping is in fact Charicleia at 10.37.2, and Charicleia races over to her foster father to apologize for running away from him at 10.38.1:

Καὶ ἡ Χαρίκλεια τῆς σκηνῆς ἐξέδραμε καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν ἐκ φύσεώς τε καὶ ἡλικίας αἰδῶ παραγκωνισαμένη βᾶκχιόν τι καὶ ἐμμανὲς ἐφέρετο καὶ τοῖς γόνασι τοῦ Χαρικλέου προσπεσοῦσα «ὦ πάτερ» ἔλεγεν, «ὦ τῶν φύντων οὐδὲν ἔλαττον ἐμοὶ σεβάσμιε, τιμώρησαι ὡς βούλει τὴν ἀθέμιτον ἐμὲ καὶ πατραλοῖαν, κἂν εἰς βούλημά τις ἀναφέρῃ θεῶν κἂν εἰς διοίκησιν ἐκείνων τὰ δεδραμένα μὴ προσέχων.»

Now Charicleia came running from the pavilion and, oblivious of the modesty incumbent on her sex and years, raced like a maenad in her madness towards Charicles and fell at his feet. “Father,” she said, “to you I owe as much reverence as to those who gave me birth. I am a wicked parricide; punish me as you please; ignore any attempts to excuse my misdeeds by ascribing them to the will of the gods, to their governance of human life!”

Charicleia’s last emotional expression is also towards Charicles. It starts out appearing to be a strong emotional impression, with βᾶκχιόν τι καὶ ἐμμανὲς ἐφέρετο, “raced like a maenad in her madness.” The lawyerly praeteritio at the end distinctly undercuts the narrator’s description of

<sup>106</sup> 1.4.8, cf. Tilg 2010, 48 on the trope’s association with tyrants.



uncontrolled emotional behavior, however.<sup>107</sup> And this is the last insight the audience is given into either Theagenes or Charicleia's thoughts. They speak no more lines, and the narrator gives no more descriptions of their thoughts. They even run out of agency. For the last few sections of the novel, those in which their separation finally ends and their long-desired marriage occurs, they do almost nothing. The crowd of Ethiopians, the king, and the sage Sisimithres take action to decide the lovers may marry and to marry them, and the lovers are to all appearances inert objects.

The king declares in a single brief speech that Theagenes will not be sacrificed, is permitted to marry Charicleia, and in fact that Theagenes and Charicleia are officially married by his royal decree. The marriage seems to be accomplished simply by the decree; he says *ξυνωρίδα ταύτην γαμηλίοις νόμοις ἀναδείκνυμι*, "I proclaim this couple by our nuptial laws" (10.40.2). He then suggests they confirm the decision with sacrifices, and the focus shifts from marrying the lovers to appointing them to the priesthood.<sup>108</sup> As married Ethiopian royalty they have the right to be priests of Helios and Selene, and the king and queen, who were previously the high priests, give their religious regalia to the new couple. At this point Theagenes and Charicleia do take action, but it is to offer the appointed sacrifices, *τὴν θυσίαν αὐτοὶ καλλιερήσαντες*, "offered sacrifices with their own hands" (10.41.3). Their last actions have debatable agency, because they occur entirely within the ritual context.

<sup>107</sup> The entire scene of Charicleia's recognition is in fact styled as a courtroom drama. Courtroom scenes are common to all of the novels, and Anderson 2017, 29 that this one has much the style of a *controversia*.

<sup>108</sup> Charicleia's journey from priestess of Artemis at Delphi to priestess of Selene at Meroe underpins the exceptionally religious bent of the *Aethiopica*, in a genre that is already fond of divine intervention (Montiglio 2012, 77). Rohde thought it might even be propaganda for the Sun cult (an idea that survived as late as Altheim 1951). The discovery of the novels' fourth century date refuted the theory (Reardon 1969, 302; Keydell 1966). For a more general discussion of the importance of religion in Heliodorus, see Hefti 1950, Szepessy 1957, Morgan 1996, 446-454.

So this ritual-focused reunion is still a scene of ritual but the ceremony of appointing new priests overlaps with and supersedes the wedding. Heliodorus assures the reader that more marriage-related rites will happen afterwards, which he describes as *μυστικωτέρων*, “more mysterious” (10.41.3), again blurring the distinction between priesthood and marriage.<sup>109</sup> Although the word usually refers specifically to mystery cults, here it carries a suggestion of the privacy of the marital bedroom. As in *Daphnis and Chloe* there is no reference to the emotional state of the couple after they learn that they will marry (or have married, in this case). Instead their performance of the rituals of priesthood and marriage is described. The rituals have some priesthood-specific aspects, notably that Theagenes and Charicleia perform sacrifices, but there are also traditional Greek marriage rituals (10.40.3).<sup>110</sup> Torches, pipes, and a procession are part of this ritual just as they are a part of *Daphnis and Chloe*’s wedding on Lesbos (4.40.1 in *Daphnis and Chloe*). Voluntary displays of emotion such as embrace are not, much less collapsing from intensity of feeling. The extra parents are once again included. Heliodorus takes care to inform the audience that Charicleia’s two other living father figures are part of the procession.

#### 1.4 Conclusion

At the end of both the *Aethiopica* and *Daphnis and Chloe* all of society is drawn together.

The protagonists do not exchange false parents for true ones, but instead add more parents into

<sup>109</sup> The association of sex and mystery cult also appears in *Leucippe and Clitophon* at 8.12.4, in the origin myth for the magical Ephesian virginity test. Aphrodite describes two adherents of Artemis who have taken oaths of celibacy as *ζεῦγος...ἐχθρὸν ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων μυστηρίων*, “a team...inimical to us and our mysteries.”

<sup>110</sup> The torches in particular were critical to the Greek wedding, but the role of the bride’s father, the procession with the bride and groom in vehicles, and the obscured but critical consummation of the marriage at the end of the procession were all key parts as well (Oakley and Sinos, 25-37). Theagenes rides in a horse-drawn chariot, common on vases. Charicleia is drawn by oxen which may have been more common in real life (Oakley and Sinos, 29), although in this case they may be an agricultural reference symbolizing the married couple’s future fertility, as in the agricultural references at the end of *Daphnis and Chloe*.

their lives and create a social network between the old family and the new. Whitmarsh notes that the social structure in both *Daphnis and Chloe* and *Leucippe and Clitophon* appears incidentally rather than through the lovers' efforts; what the lovers themselves strive for is sex, and their reintegration into society happens through luck.<sup>111</sup> Luck in a novel, however, is the plan of the author.<sup>112</sup> The mismatch of motivation and results works differently in the *Aethiopica*; the lovers suppress their sexuality and desire marriage as an acceptable way to express it rather than as a means of connecting to society.<sup>113</sup> Despite how different the goals of the lovers and the societies they return to are, however, the goals are achieved with the same style of marriage, and the lover's home societies connect to them via the same routes (approval by the father and citizenry, and marriage), and they serve to create social harmony and draw society together in the same way, down to the proliferation of parental figures. The shift in the protagonists' characterization and sense of personal identity that Whitmarsh is tracking occurs within consistently pro-societal plot structures; thus the characters may change while the genre maintains its own sense of identity.

Whitmarsh is correct that the protagonists in the sophistic novels lose their civic interest and sense of identity, but this does not lead to the novels abandoning the community-based identity of the protagonists as a major theme, particularly in their thematically critical closural scenes.<sup>114</sup> Instead, the protagonists' thoughts and feeling cease to be important in these scenes, which instead are focused on the process of reintegrating the protagonists into their home communities. Although the protagonists' construction of their identity shifts away from the norm

<sup>111</sup> Whitmarsh 2011, 150.

<sup>112</sup> Cf. Lowe 2000, 56-58 on the "control level" within narratives.

<sup>113</sup> Whitmarsh 2011, 153.

<sup>114</sup> Thalmann 1998, 107 on the closural scenes carrying the dominant ideology of the text.

of the early novels and, foundationally, the *Odyssey*'s focus on Odysseus' desire to return to Ithaca, the fundamental plot structure and the socializing demands of closural scenes do not change. The plot structure proves to be the immovable object in this case, and so the protagonists' motivations and reactions disappear from the closural scenes of the romantic plotlines. They are instead replaced by scenes focused on the rituals that integrate them back into their home states/societies, in most case the rituals accompanying marriage.

## Chapter 2: Familial Closure

### 2.0 Introduction

When the protagonists of the ideal novels leave home to adventure, they not only find themselves separated from their lovers and home communities, but also leave their positions in their natal families. This plotline is resolved at the end of the novel by their reacceptance into their families. Their reacquisition of the status of son or daughter of this elite family is in turn a key part of their reacceptance as a member of the broader elite community. Odysseus reunites with Laertes as well as Penelope in the process of completing his *nostos*, taking back up the position of son as well as husband, and the protagonists of the novels imitate this. The protagonists' return to their position in their natal family hinges on their acceptance by their fathers. Odysseus reunites with Telemachus as well, but due to their characteristic youth the protagonists of the novels almost never have children before the closure of the plot, and the only one who does, Callirhoe, leaves her son behind in the world of her adventure rather than at home to be reunited with. Mothers have less fixed roles in the plot than fathers. While they are sometimes involved in the closural scenes, they are often instead part of the plot at earlier stages and absent at the end, after the pattern of Anticleia in the *Odyssey*.<sup>115</sup> It is the acceptance of the father that in almost all cases allows the protagonists their return to their original status within the family.

The ideological message in support hierarchical social structures translates to the familial sphere by supporting the dominance of the family by what I will refer to as a high agency man. This character is an adult man with high status within Greek society, who is both capable and

<sup>115</sup> Mothers are always present at some point in the story. The sole exception is Theagenes' parents, both of whom are entirely absent. He is also the only one of the lovers who never returns to his homeland, so the absence of his parents appears to be part of a broader pattern of subordinating his role of protagonist to that of Charicleia.

willing to use the power this position in society grants him to effect the results he wants. He can and does decide who is part of his family and community, which can involve complicated planning, moving people across large stretches of the known world, and freeing, enslaving, or even killing other characters by his own hand. He takes a governing role over the closural scenes, and causes or leads the final actions of the plot. In the sophistic novels this role is typically filled by the father of one of the protagonists, but this is a later development to the plot structure. Like the closure of the romantic plotline, these scenes resolving the plot of the protagonists' separation from their families change as the genre changes. At first, the fathers are ultimately passive, indicators of acceptance with no ability to prevent or enforce the protagonists' reacceptance into the community based on their decision about whether this person is truly their child. The protagonists have enough power and agency of their own to force the community to accept them, and fathers primarily function as representatives of the community (both on a state and family level) that is accepting them. This model is the *Odyssey*'s; in both Homeric epics the heroes are powerful adult men whose fathers are firmly moved into the category of "elder," which in this society implies both wisdom and physical weakness.<sup>116</sup> While the epic hero has the agency to govern the closural scenes, however, the ideal novel hero is characterized by a lack of agency, and is almost never suited to the governing role.

D. Konstan, in his seminal 1994 book *Sexual Symmetry*, argues that a substantial amount of the structure of the novels is due to their idealization of *eros*. The idealization of the lovers' relationship is connected to the perfect symmetry of the *eros* that they feel for each other, which Konstan finds unparalleled in any other ancient or modern erotic genre.<sup>117</sup> This requires an

<sup>116</sup> Falkner 1995, 7.

<sup>117</sup> Konstan 1994, 7. The *Odyssey* takes something of an opposite tack, framing Penelope as independent and in many ways Odysseus' equal; Winkler 1990a argues persuasively that in the sphere of *metis* she is presented as

exceptional symmetry between the characters themselves, which results in the heroes' lack of agency.<sup>118</sup> Konstan describes them as "hapless,"<sup>119</sup> reacting to every challenge with despair, helplessness, paralysis, and suicide attempts. They rarely take action, even to attempt to obtain or rescue their beloveds. This is parallel to the more gender-normative restraint of the heroines, whose ability to act is constrained by the social norms of antiquity. The heroines do experience a corresponding increase in agency, but the scope is limited. They are more active than other women in the novels, but they are no Amazons.<sup>120</sup> The ultimate result is a pair of lovers who are perfect in their fidelity, but with limited agency available to defend it. It also means that the heroes cannot have high enough levels of agency to be able to govern the closural scenes of their novels while maintaining the necessary symmetry with the heroines in terms of amatory roles.

The heroes' lack of agency leaves a power vacuum. In the *Odyssey* the power over the *oikos* and Ithaca as a whole was passed from Laertes to Odysseus. Thalmann argues that because Laertes is weakened by age he is not in a position to challenge Odysseus' status as head of the *oikos*, which avoids intrafamilial conflict between Odysseus and Laertes for the control of the

exactly that. There is a tantalizing, though unprovable, possibility that the idealization of love between equals in the novels is derived on some level from Penelope and Odysseus' *homophrosune*. Konstan, however, emphasizes that her ability to *act* is highly constrained (Konstan 1994, 171). Some difficulty is presented by the lack of focalization through Penelope; does she suggest the contest of the bow because she knows or suspects her husband has come to rescue her, or because she is truly out of other options? How strong of a suspicion concerning the strangers' identity would be worth such a gamble, if she is not sure? The analysts solved the problem by simply declaring her decision out of character and a sign of narrative inconsistency (Kirk 1962, 247; Willamowitz 1884, 62). Some scholars now argue that she recognizes him on a subconscious level (Whitman 1958, 303; Amory 1963, 104; Austin 1975, 231-6, Yamagata 2011, 129), which would imply that she believes herself without choices when she announces the contest. Interpretations in which she recognizes him earlier (Harsh 1950; Vlahos 2011) or suspects his identity but believes she can maintain control of the situation after the contest if he is not Odysseus (Zerba 2009) maintain more of a sense of agency for her, but ultimately she can do no more than hold the suitors at bay, while Odysseus kills them and resolves the problem, rescuing her as no novel hero ever rescues his heroine.

<sup>118</sup> Konstan 1994, 15 ff.

<sup>119</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>120</sup> Konstan 1994, 30.

household.<sup>121</sup> This transfer of power over the *oikos* from father to son ceases to be necessary in the novels; Konstan's hapless heroes desire only marriage as a marker of adulthood, and are no threat to their fathers' power.<sup>122</sup> In the pre-sophistic novels this shift of power dynamics is only beginning, so the fathers remain passive (and in the *Ephesiaca*'s case ultimately dead) while agency shifts substantially among the other characters. However, by the time that the second sophistic fashions affected the novels the fathers retain full agency, and the influence of the epic relationship between the hero and his father has faded. The fathers in the sophistic novels retain authority, if not full control, over their families, which in turn changes the dynamic of the protagonists' reunion with their families and resumption of membership within them. Now that the fathers have retained this authority, they have the final say over who is and is not a member of the family. Regaining status as a member of an elite family within the community is the primary move with which the protagonists regain their overall status. Thus the paternal reunion scene in the later novels becomes extremely important, and the ultimate moment of closure is when the father is persuaded to accept his child back into his family.<sup>123</sup>

<sup>121</sup> Thalmann 1998, 220-221.

<sup>122</sup> Konstan does not go into great detail about Chaereas' abrupt development into a high-agency adult man at the end of the novel, which does result in his becoming a threat to the power of Callirhoe's father (the novels tend to allow one lover's father to stand in for both, aside from Xenophon where both appear at the beginning and neither at the end). Konstan does note that Chaereas' decision to marry his sister to his companion Polycharmus at 8.8.12 is in accordance with New Comedy convention and runs contrary to the norms of the ideal novel, in which women have a role in deciding who they marry. In section 2.2.1 below I discuss how epic influences are also visible in this characterization shift. Transforming Chaereas into a high-agency adult man pulls him away from the conventions of the ideal novel and makes him conform to the standards of heroes in the genres that had the most influence on the ideal novel.

<sup>123</sup> One father's acceptance becomes the focus, with the other's diminished or absent, indicating that the one acceptance is sufficient to resolve the plot tension of the family separation for both characters. Lowe (2000, 49-54) likens the classical plot (the plotting style which he describes and is used in both epics and novels) to a closed thermodynamic system in which potential energy is stored up by moving the characters away from their final goal state, much as potential energy is stored in a rock by raising it above the ground. In the closural scenes that potential energy becomes kinetic by moving the characters into their final state; in the case of the novel characters, they return to their homes, families, marriages, and most critically original statuses. This is the equivalent of dropping the stone, making potential energy kinetic. The potential plot energy created by separating the protagonists from their families



Despite the differences in the form of the paternal reunion scene, the underlying function is the same. A high-agency man from the elite stratum of the community controls the scene in which the protagonists are reintegrated into their community, returning to their original high status based on the inherent virtue they have due to their elite origin.<sup>124</sup> When the effect that Konstan describes becomes strong enough to remove the hero's agency even in the closural scenes, the role of the closural scenes' governor must be filled. This effect is visible in the abnormal prominent of the companion character Hippothous in the closural scenes of the *Ephesiaca*, where neither the hero or his father have the agency to control the action. The content of the stories and characterization of the protagonists shifts drastically, but the underlying pro-elite ideology and messaging of the closural scenes remains intact, shaping the possibilities for how the genre can change and maintaining an underlying sense of consistency in these scenes.

## 2.1 The *Odyssey*

The reunion between Odysseus and Laertes has little closural force, to the point that some readers have felt the scene is tacked on to a basically completed story.<sup>125</sup> There are a number of reasons for this, one of which is Laertes' inability to affect Odysseus' return to his original status, including his status within their family. Thalmann puts the matter succinctly: "Removed to the countryside and enfeebled, introduced into the text as an actor only after the poem's main action is over, Laertes cannot be competition with Odysseus for mastery in the *oikos*."<sup>126</sup> Laertes' dramatic loss of agency prevents him from exerting control of the *oikos*, including the question

is successfully realized in one child/father reunion scene; there is no remaining plot energy to power a second scene on a similar scale afterwards, as the metaphorical stone is already lying on the ground.

<sup>124</sup> This will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

<sup>125</sup> Thalmann 1998, 221; Murnaghan 1987a, 6

<sup>126</sup> Thalmann 1998, 220.

of who is and is not a member of it, and Odysseus instead holds that authority as a fully matured adult man, with the significant agency that is typical of epic heroes. The result of this is that Odysseus controls his own return to the family, and in the reunion with Laertes Odysseus tests Laertes' ability to recognize him out of interest<sup>127</sup> rather than because it is needed to obtain acceptance back into the family.

Part of the difference between the *Odyssey* and the novels here is simply the age of the characters. Odysseus and Penelope were married twenty years before the action of the poem, putting them at minimum twenty years older than the protagonists of the novels, and Laertes twenty years older than the vigorous fathers of the sophistic novels' heroes. Indeed, Dionysophanes is likely closer in age to Odysseus than Daphnis. The age of the hero merely sets up capacity for agency and authority in society, however; it is the behavior of the characters that is the final expression of agency. In Konstan's analysis of the characterization of the protagonists of the *Odyssey* as compared to those of the novels, he notes Odysseus' military defeat over the suitors, despite the numbers, as well as his pointed triumph over them in the contest of the bow itself. Konstan finds that Penelope's agency, in contrast, "is elided in the main and dominant account of events."<sup>128</sup> Her capacity is there and often subtly referenced, for instance in the moment she chooses to propose the contest and promise to marry the winner, when she appears to suspect her husband's return, and more broadly in her ability to resist the suitors as long as she did. Her potential for agency always appears, but is never quite fulfilled. As in the case of

<sup>127</sup> Laertes also tests Odysseus and demands proof of his identity, but Murnaghan notes that both proofs Odysseus offers recall times in their lives when Laertes was the head of the household and Odysseus his dependent (Murnaghan 1987a, 6). Ultimately, due to Odysseus' previous acceptance by the rest of the *oikos* and Laertes' inability to change that, the requirement that Odysseus prove his identity to his father fits very differently into the plot structure of the *Odyssey* than the parallel scenes in *Daphnis and Chloe* and the *Aethiopica*.

<sup>128</sup> Konstan 1994, 171.

Laertes, Penelope's expression of agency seems to be crowded out of the story by Odysseus' control over events.

Falkner argues in *The Poetics of Old Age in Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy* that the depiction of Telemachus, Odysseus, and Laertes in the *Odyssey* is an illustration of the three major stages of life and the movement of time. Odysseus' transitions in life are reflected in Telemachus' struggle with his coming of age and Laertes' notable decline towards death.<sup>129</sup> In the reunion scene itself there is a great deal of focus on Laertes' miserable state without his son. Without a son to defend him he lives in filth and exile, which are emphasized in his introduction (24.226-231):

τὸν δ' οἶον πατέρ' εὗρεν εὐκτιμένη ἐν ἀλωῇ,  
 λιστρεύοντα φυτόν: ῥυπόωντα δὲ ἔστο χιτῶνα  
 ῥάπτων ἀεικέλιον, περὶ δὲ κνήμησι βοείας  
 κνημίδας ῥαπτὰς δέδετο, γραπτῦς ἀλεείνων,  
 χειρῖδας τ' ἐπὶ χερσὶ βάτων ἔνεκ': αὐτὰρ ὑπερθεῖν  
 αἰγείην κυνέην κεφαλῇ ἔχε, πένθος ἀέξων.

He found his father alone in the well-worked orchard,  
 spading out a plant, and he had a squalid tunic upon him,  
 patched together and ugly, and on his legs he had oxhide  
 gaiters fastened and patched together, to prevent scratching,  
 and gloves on his hands because of the bushes, and he was wearing  
 a cap of goatskin on his head, to increase his misery.

This passage emphasizes his poverty; he must work his own land, apparently due to not having enough slaves to do all the work for him.<sup>130</sup> His chiton is also described as ῥυπόωντα, "filthy," which could be simply ascribed to the work he is doing, but in the speech Odysseus addresses

<sup>129</sup> Falkner 1995, 5.

<sup>130</sup> Murnaghan goes further, suggesting that his ragged clothes are almost an animal costume, demonstrating his removal from society (Murnaghan 1987, 4). This puts Laertes in a situation much like that of the sophistic ideal novel protagonists; without their fathers to connect them to their community, the novel protagonists cannot connect themselves to it. Here, without the head of his household, who is Odysseus now that Laertes is too feeble to take on the role, Laertes cannot connect to and participate in the Ithacan community, and the animal disguise dramatizes that as a disconnection from humanity itself.

him with next, he pretends to mistake Laertes for a slave and says αὐτόν σ' οὐκ ἀγαθὴ κομιδὴ ἔχει, ἀλλ' ἅμα γῆρας/ λυγρὸν ἔχεις ἀρχμεῖς τε κακῶς καὶ ἀεικέα ἔσσαι, “you yourself are ill cared for; together with dismal/ old age, which is yours, you are squalid and wear foul clothing upon you.” (24.249-250) This refers back to the opening description of Laertes, which is now shown to have been focalized through Odysseus, who adds that this is evidence that Laertes’ master is not taking good care of him. Odysseus’ use of ἀρχμεῖς, “you are squalid,” and his criticism of a man who would even let his slave live in such conditions, confirms that the earlier description of Laertes’ dirty clothing is meant to imply he cannot care properly for himself. When Odysseus met his mother in the underworld, she attributed Laertes’ condition to grief due to his longing for Odysseus’ return (11.195-6). The text is explicit here that Laertes depends on Odysseus’ presence for decent quality of life, and when Odysseus left Laertes was not able to return to his original role as head of the *oikos*, an act requiring substantial agency to recapture power, but rather suffered the degradation associated with a dependent losing protection.<sup>131</sup> The head of household role has shifted permanently from Laertes to Odysseus, and the power associated with being a mature man from the elite classes in this culture has gone with it.

Odysseus also describes the life that Laertes ought to be living in this speech: βασιλῆϊ γὰρ ἀνδρὶ ἔοικας./ τοιούτῳ δὲ ἔοικας, ἐπεὶ λούσαιτο φάγοι τε,/ εὐδέμεναι μαλακῶς: ἡ γὰρ δίκη ἐστὶ γερόντων, “you look like a man who is royal,/ and such a one as who, after he has bathed and eaten, should sleep on a soft bed; for such is the right of elders.” (24.253-255) Falkner argues that this, in combination with Odysseus’ criticism of the supposed master’s poor caretaking of Laertes, shows that he believes that the life he describes in 253-255 is what he owes his father as a filial duty. Now that Laertes is a γέρων, “elder,” it is his son’s duty to

<sup>131</sup> Falkner 1995, 40.

provide him with a comfortable life, which he will now do as part of his reestablishment of order in the *oikos*.<sup>132</sup>

Laertes' decrepitude has further implications than Odysseus' duty to care for him. Thalmann points out that this is also an image of a peaceful *oikos* in that Laertes is too weak to compete with Odysseus for mastery of the *oikos*, and says this is "the paradigm of the son's successful transition to maturity and the negotiation of potential rivalry between generations."<sup>133</sup> Laertes must be elderly and enfeebled in order for the plot of Odysseus' homecoming to be fully resolved, because if he retained his power and agency he could take the role of head of this *oikos* and therefore as king of Ithaca. The status, both in terms of family and community, that Odysseus needs to return to in order to resolve the plotline, must be open and available to him. Since Odysseus has successfully completed this transition to maturity, that role is head of the *oikos*, so it is important that neither his father nor his son have the power and agency to fulfill that role.<sup>134</sup> This would set the stage for conflict to occur within the bounds of the *oikos*, of the sort Penelope feared would happen if she remarried (23.214-24). The *Odyssey* is explicit that Odysseus' *oikos* will not suffer this sort of familial infighting and collapse, with the constant comparisons of Odysseus' *nostos* to Agamemnon's; the threat is presented and avoided, for all members of the family. The full resolution of the happily ended *nostos* plot is perfect familial harmony, without internal conflict over status and power, and this is a principle adopted by the ideal novels.

<sup>132</sup> Falkner 1995, 40-41.

<sup>133</sup> Thalmann 1998, 220.

<sup>134</sup> *ibid.*

## 2.2 Pre-Sophistic Novels

Unlike the theme of familial harmony, the *Odyssey*'s theme of time passing did not sit comfortably in the ideal novels, which have a timelessness within their stories so marked that Bakhtin argued that time passes entirely differently while the protagonists are on their adventures,<sup>135</sup> which contributes significantly to the maintenance of a childlike passivity in the heroes. The protagonists start out as unmarried and in a liminal space between childhood and adulthood, even in the pre-sophistic novels where the wedding is placed at the beginning of the novels, and while they progress far enough in their life stages to marry, the timelessness of the novels does not allow them to make it to Odysseus' level of maturity. In *Callirhoe* Chariton bridges the gap by incorporating some elements of a coming of age story for the protagonists, so that the lovers begin the novel in a state of equitable youthful helplessness, and end it with more mature adult behavior patterns that resemble epic characters.<sup>136</sup> Tensions between this epic-style characterization and the conventions of the novel are already apparent even in *Callirhoe*, however, and by the *Ephesiaca* the attempt to make an epic hero out of a novel hero has already been abandoned. The *Ephesiaca* is a striking example of a genre in transition on this point, as it experiments with shifting the primary role of adult male with significant agency not to the father, but to the encouraging companion character, a structure whose traces appear in other novels but which is never again employed as strongly as it is by Xenophon.

### 2.2.1 Chariton

*Callirhoe* is often treated as a template for the "normal" ideal novel from which later novels vary, but on the point of the hero's agency it hews more closely in many ways to the example of the *Odyssey* than to the later generic standard. At the beginning of the novel

<sup>135</sup> Bakhtin 1981, 92-94.

<sup>136</sup> Cf. Scourfield 2003 on Chaereas' character arc.

Chaereas fulfills what over time became the generic standard of the hero's reduced agency. A primary example that Konstan points to is the way Chaereas originally competes for *Callirhoe's* hand. There is a crowd of suitors hoping to marry her, in many ways parallel to Penelope's suitors, but where Odysseus slaughters the competitors in order to win back his bride, Chaereas wins by being so stricken with lovesickness for Callirhoe that he nearly dies, causing the broader community of Syracusans to demand that her father Hermocrates allow Chaereas to marry Callirhoe (1.1). Konstan notes in particular that Chaereas here fails to offer a direct challenge to his rivals, as Odysseus so emphatically does.<sup>137</sup>

Chaereas also has a marked tendency to despair, but this provokes him to different behaviors at varying points in the novel, and to some degree tracks his increasing sense of agency over time as he advances through his coming of age. When he believes he has killed Callirhoe he has a fairly understandable episode of despair and asks to be executed (1.5), and tries to kill himself when his fellow citizens refuse to convict him (1.6.1). But even after he learns that she has survived and where she is, and is about to sail off to retrieve her, his suicidal ideation turns out to remain with him. His parents, terrified that Chaereas will die on the mission, beg him not to leave them, and his mother quotes Hecuba's speech to Hector before his duel with Achilles<sup>138</sup> making the allusion to the plight of epic heroes' parents explicit. Chaereas, torn between the choice of abandoning either his parents or Callirhoe, attempts to kill himself (3.5.6). This is only a partial list of his moments of despair, which also include 1.1.8, wasting away with unrequited love for Callirhoe rather than trying to marry her, 1.4.7, considering suicide when he is falsely told Callirhoe is unfaithful to him, 4.2.7, silently submitting to crucifixion after he has

<sup>137</sup> Konstan 1994, 171.

<sup>138</sup> At 3.5.6 Chaereas' mother completes her speech begging him to say with Hecuba's line from *Il.* 22.82-3.

been enslaved during his attempt to rescue Callirhoe, and 6.2, trying to kill himself after the trial at Babylon over who should be Callirhoe's husband is not immediately decided in his favor.

Konstan notes that a key part of this pattern of despair is the inability to make a decision.<sup>139</sup>

When Chaereas is faced with a difficult decision he typically attempts suicide rather than making some externalized attempt to resolve the situation; he behaves as if he has power only over himself and none over the world around him, of which as a high-status male citizen he has a great deal. This is one of Konstan's central examples of the pattern of feminized helplessness in the heroes of the ideal novels, which brings them to an equal level of social power and agency as that of the heroines, who are fundamentally constrained by their gender.<sup>140</sup>

It is also important, however, that the final instance of Chaereas' habit of despair that Konstan lists is different from the rest. In 7.1.6-11, Chaereas believes Callirhoe is lost to him forever, and decides once again to die. In previous instances his friend Polycharmus had talked him out of suicide, but this time he agrees it is an appropriate decision as long as they die in battle. So rather than throwing himself off the side of a ship or submitting to execution, he joins the Egyptian rebellion against Persia, becomes the admiral of the entire fleet after capturing Tyre in a daring raid, and wins the naval side of the war even as the king of Egypt loses the land battle. This is an astonishing reversal. Chaereas, who is helplessly swept along by events for most of the novel, transforms into an exaggeratedly successful and influential hero as soon as he is put in a military context. His characterization is consistent; he goes to war driven by his ever-present despair, but in the final two books of the novel he wields power and agency like an epic hero.<sup>141</sup>

<sup>139</sup> Konstan 1994, 20.

<sup>140</sup> Konstan 1994, 15-26.



This corresponds with the homecoming scene, which is entirely under Chaereas' control, to the point that he exerts extra, unnecessary control over the moment of return in order to make it more dramatic. At 8.6 the lovers return to Syracuse, and when the Syracusans sight the fleet they are concerned it may be an invasion and inform Callirhoe's father, the general Hermocrates (8.6.4):

καταδραμῶν οὖν ὁ Ἑρμοκράτης ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν κωπῆρες ἐξέπεμψε πλοῖον ἀπαντᾶν αὐτοῖς. ὁ δὲ ἀποσταλεὶς ἐπυρθάνετο πλησίον ἐλθῶν τίνες εἶψαν, Χαίρεας δὲ ἐκέλευσεν ἀποκρίνασθαί τινα τῶν Αἰγυπτίων “ἡμεῖς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου πλέομεν ἔμποροι, φορτία φέροντες, ἃ Συρακοσίους εὐφρανεῖ.” “μὴ ἀθρόοι τοίνυν εἰσπλεῖτε” φησὶν, “ἕως ἄν γνῶμεν εἰ ἀληθεύετε· φορτίδας γὰρ οὐ βλέπω ναῦς ἀλλὰ μακρὰς καὶ ὡς ἐκ πολέμου τριήρεις, ὥστε αἱ μὲν πλείους ἕξω τοῦ λιμένος μετέωροι μεινάτωσαν, μία δὲ καταπλευσάτω.” “ποιήσομεν οὕτως.”

Hermocrates hurried down from the main square to the shore and sent a rowboat to meet them. The man he sent, when he drew near, asked who they were. Chaereas instructed one of the Egyptians to reply, “we are merchants from Egypt, with a cargo that will delight the Syracusans.” “Well, do not all sail in together, said the Syracusan, “until we find out whether you are telling the truth. I cannot see any cargo ships—only naval vessels, which look like warships that have been in action. Most of you will have to stay at sea outside the harbor; one ship can come in.” “We will do as you say.”

This is a mild version of the power struggle between powerful adult male members of the same family that the *Odyssey* works so hard to avoid. Hermocrates attempts to control what appears to be a volatile situation, by sending out the Syracusan to ask the mysterious fleet who they are and to give them directions controlling their movement after they turn out to claim they are friendly. Chaereas, rather than ceding control of the situation to Hermocrates, instructs one of his subordinates to give a fairly transparent lie, that a fleet of triremes is a group of merchants.<sup>142</sup>

<sup>141</sup> Graverini (2014, 288-290) makes the important point that a novel character cannot be “faithful replica” of the epic archetypes due to the significant cultural distance between the world of Homeric epic and the world of the ideal novels, so Chaereas' epic characterization is restricted to specific qualities that can be emulated such as high agency and martial skill.

<sup>142</sup> Montiglio notes that this instruction constitutes a kind of disguise much like Odysseus' disguises, in particular his disguise as a merchant in *Od.* 8.161-63. This gives Chaereas control over the scene similar to the control Odysseus cultivates with his disguises, so Chaereas not only has the agency of a generic epic hero in this scene but specifically of Odysseus. (Montiglio 2012, 30)

This keeps the Syracusans unsettled; an attacking fleet would of course be kept out, and one confirmed as friendly could come in, as they later do at 8.6.9 after the revelation that this is Chaereas' fleet. Since Chaereas refuses to give up enough information for the Syracusans to fully control the situation, they cautiously allow one ship to enter. Chaereas' control over the flow of information shapes the whole situation.<sup>143</sup>

The aversion to intrafamilial conflict may explain why the primary action in this combative sequence is kept between father and son-in-law.<sup>144</sup> Chaereas' parents are characters in the story, but Chariton explicitly places them out of the initial arrival scene, saying that they did not come out of the house to see the mysterious navy arrive. (8.6.5-7):

ἐπεὶ δὲ καθωρμίσθη, πᾶς ὁ λιμὴν ἀνθρώπων ἐνεπλήσθη· φύσει μὲν γὰρ ὄχλος ἐστὶ περιεργόν τι χρῆμα, τότε δὲ καὶ πλείονας εἶχον αἰτίας τῆς συνδρομῆς. βλέποντες δὲ εἰς τὴν σκηνὴν ἔνδον ἐνόμιζον οὐκ ἀνθρώπους ἀλλὰ φόρτον εἶναι πολυτελεῆ, καὶ ἄλλος ἄλλο τι ἐμαντεύετο, πάντα δὲ μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ ἀληθές εἵκαζον· καὶ γὰρ ἦν ἄπιστον ὡς ἀληθῶς, ἤδη πεπεισμένων αὐτῶν ὅτι Χαιρέας τέθνηκε, ζῶντα δόξαι καταπλεῖν καὶ μετὰ τοσαύτης πολυτελείας. οἱ μὲν οὖν Χαιρέου γονεῖς οὐδὲ προήεσαν ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας.

When the ship docked, the whole harbor was full of people; a crowd is naturally an inquisitive thing, and on this occasion they had several other reasons for collecting. When they saw the tent, they thought that it contained not people but rich cargo; they made various conjectures about it, but guessed everything except the truth. For since they were already convinced that Chaereas was dead, it was quite out of the question that they should expect him to land back home alive, and amid such luxury. So Chaereas' parents did not even come out of their house.

The logic of this passage is not completely solid, as the subject switches from the crowd of Syracusans on the dock to Chaereas' parents, who are explicitly not on the dock, but the implication appears to be that nothing will draw them out of their house now that they believe their son is dead. Chaereas' parents, unwilling to leave their house even to see a strange and

<sup>143</sup> For a more in-depth discussion of Chaereas' control over other characters through the means of rhetoric, see De Temmerman 2009.

<sup>144</sup> Smith 2007, 190-1.

dangerous navy arrive, are introduced as being in this Laertes-like state. Chaereas' father, Ariston, had been a major player in politics (1.1.3) and has abandoned it, which Chariton indicates by his description of how Hermocrates' behavior contrasts with Ariston's in the next clause: Ἑρμοκράτης δὲ ἐπολιτεύετο μὲν, ἀλλὰ πενθῶν, καὶ τότε εἰστήκει μὲν, λαυθάνων δέ, "Hermocrates was active in the city's affairs but was also in mourning; on this occasion he was present but stayed in the background." (8.6.7) Like Laertes, Ariston has left his previous position as a mature man involved in the community's politics. In contrast to Ariston, Hermocrates has managed to remain in politics, but is still so reduced that he can manage to escape notice (λαυθάνων) in the middle of a crowd of Syracusans that a few sections ago were looking to him to direct the defense against a possible invasion. Hermocrates is turned from a commanding general and *de facto* leader to a grieving, disappearing member of the crowd.<sup>145</sup>

Since Ariston is so completely weakened as to be removed from the scene, the climactic paternal reunion is between Callirhoe and Hermocrates. It is standard in the ideal novels to put more emphasis on the reunion between one protagonist and his or her father than the other; the only one in which there is no strong preference is the *Ephesiaca*, in which all parents are dead by the end of the novel. As Callirhoe is the more prominent protagonist and her father is the famous historical figure, it is unsurprising that their reunion should be the focus of this scene. After the Syracusans tell the fleet that only one ship can enter the harbor, Chaereas sails his own ship in,

<sup>145</sup> All of the extant ideal novels except for the *Ephesiaca* choose one of the two lovers' fathers to function in the role of familial representative in the major closural scene, although Chloe's father is eventually introduced in *Daphnis and Chloe* in a scene with limited closural impact. It is usually the heroine's father as it is here, which may indicate further effort on the authors' part to avoid the intrafamilial conflict of the son's inevitable replacement of his father. However, the exception here is *Daphnis and Chloe*, where Daphnis' father is the one present in the scenes that resolve the plot, which appears to be due to Daphnis' greater participation in the plot. Note the Callirhoe and Charicleia are both the main characters of their novels to the point of displacing their beloveds. While Clitophon's role as narrator makes him more prominent it also makes him a type of internal audience, and Leucippe is more central to the action, including in the virginity test scene that resolves the plot. Daphnis' more integral role in the plot of his novel likely contributes to the choice of his father as the one governing the closural scenes.

with himself and Callirhoe in a tent on the deck, and then dramatically drops the curtains. The first person in the crowd to act is Hermocrates (8.6.8):

Ἑρμοκράτης δὲ ἀνεπήδησεν ἐπὶ τὴν σκηνὴν καὶ περιπτυξάμενος τὴν θυγατέρα εἶπε “ζῆς, τέκνον, ἢ καὶ τοῦτο πεπλάνημαι;” “ζῶ, πάτερ, νῦν ἀληθῶς, ὅτι σε τεθέαμαι.” δάκρυα πᾶσιν ἐχεῖτο μετὰ χαρᾶς.

Hermocrates leapt on board, ran to the tent, and threw his arms around his daughter. “Are you alive, my child,” he cried, “or is this too an illusion?” “I am alive, Father! I am really alive now that I have seen you!” They all wept for joy.

There is not the slightest suggestion of doubt in the protagonists’ identities, even though a few sentences before the narrator has said that all the Syracusans were convinced Chaereas was dead. Chaereas’ stage management works exactly as he meant it to, impressing the Syracusans and giving them the information of his and Callirhoe’s survival in the exact moment he chooses. The great general Hermocrates exerts no control over the situation, and instead reacts to Chaereas’ decision.<sup>146</sup> While the specter of challenges to the protagonists’ re-acceptance into the community is raised by the scene in which the Syracusans suspect that Chaereas’ fleet is an invasion, the reality does not appear. Recognition is instantaneous, and the protagonists receive even less resistance than Odysseus does from Laertes. All it requires is an abrupt and drastic development in Chaereas’ character in the second to last book of the novel, turning him from novel hero to epic hero.

The quick and substantial change in characterization of the hero so that he can be the governor of the closural scenes is not used again in the novels. After this point the protagonists maintain a consistently low level of agency until the *Aethiopica*, in which the character arcs of the protagonists are in some ways opposite to Chaereas’; they start out behaving more like epic heroes and their characterization adjusts in the direction of novel protagonists. The presence of

<sup>146</sup> On Hermocrates’ effect on the novel see Billault 1989, Connors 2002, 15-16, Smith 2007, 51-64.

this shift in the *Aethiopica* shows that the question of who can have agency over the return and reintegration of the characters into their home community remained a challenge throughout the life of the genre, even after the sophistic novels came to the solution of leaving agency with the father. Xenophon's novel appears to have been written before that solution was developed, but he also does not attempt the radical character arc for his hero that Chariton manages at the end of *Callirhoe*. The result is a fascinating bridge between the epic and sophistic novel approaches.

### 2.2.2 Xenophon

In the *Ephesiaca* the hero has lost agency but the father has not yet regained it, which creates a vacuum. Indeed, in the closural scenes the parents have lost agency to the most extreme degree possible. Like Anticleia in the *Odyssey*, the four parents of the protagonists die of grief before their return, without even the final chance at effecting the plot that dead epic characters occasionally manage in scenes of ghost visits or *katabasis*. With the hero too firmly fixed in the passivity of the novel heroes to exert any control over the situation, and the parents gone, the next most active character is the hero's companion, a stock character who rescues and reunites the lovers throughout the novel. These characters are high in agency, providing the ability to make choices and move forward through the plot when the protagonists cannot, but they typically serve this function in the beginning and middle of the novels. By the closural scenes the companions have been lost on an adventure, are surpassed in agency by the developed hero (in the case of Chaereas), or simply disappear. Hippothous moves in the other direction, becoming more important as the story goes on, and in the closural scenes he is presented as a protagonist equal to the lovers themselves. His elevation to the position of primary character shows that this role of the governor of the closural scenes—a man with substantial agency who causes the social reintegration of the protagonists in the closural scenes—was not treated as optional in the ideal

novels; the authors always fill it, even when that requires substantial shifts to the function of the secondary characters. Hippothous is elevated in the *Ephesiaca* in much the same way that the fathers are in the sophistic novels.

In contrast to Hippothous, the *Ephesiaca*'s hero Habrocomes fulfills the conventional passivity of his role. Konstan finds Habrocomes and Anthia to be "the clearest examples of the equivalence of the male and female amatory roles that is specific to the novel."<sup>147</sup> The episodes he uses to illustrate his point are two that occur when the lovers are first kidnapped by pirates at the beginning of the novel. When the pirates board their ship Habrocomes and Anthia approach them as supplicants to ask them not to kill everyone on the ship, and to enslave them instead (1.13.5-6). The address to the pirates is attributed to both of them, with nothing to distinguish their attitudes, and no suggestion that Habrocomes might instead prefer to fight. His position is identical to Anthia's, and they protect their shipmates in the same way, one which Anthia can do along with Habrocomes. Similarly, after their capture one of the pirates falls in love with each of them, and this is presented as again completely equivalent. Both are equally disempowered, due to their slavery, and both equally appalled at being asked to take another lover. Konstan focuses in particular on the structure of the narrative, which is set up to put Anthia and Habrocomes in the same position, and shows that they react in the same way, indicating that their love for each other is identical.<sup>148</sup> He argues that this is what drives the equalization of the social roles of the novels' protagonists, the imperative to characterize the protagonists as loving each other in the same way. In order to keep Habrocomes' love for Anthia equal to her love for him, he cannot be

<sup>147</sup> Konstan 1994, 26.

<sup>148</sup> Konstan 1994, 25.

more powerful than she is. This leads to a heroine with a great deal of pluck, Habrocomes is also to some degree forced down within the same constraints as a young woman in Greek society.

Xenophon does not attempt anything like Chaereas' abrupt transformation when he becomes an admiral at the end of the novel and rapidly transforms into a high-agency epic-style hero; Habrocomes remains a novel hero throughout, with the passivity inherent to that role. Tagliabue argues that there is a limited coming of age plot around the lovers, but that it is focused on the nature of their love for each other. They themselves remain largely similar, including in the quality of their love for each other, but their approach to that love shifts from a focus on the physical to a more mature focus on fidelity.<sup>149</sup> The change is in their relationship to each other rather than their relationship to the world. There are still substantial remnants of epic characterization for the protagonists' parents, however. When Anthia and Habrocomes first leave Ephesus on their voyage, which was demanded by the oracle that also insisted they marry each other (1.6), Habrocomes' parents are stricken with despair. The narrator says ἔκειντο εἰς γῆν ἄθυμοῦντες, "they lay on the ground disheartened" (1.10.7). They are reacting to the oracle's prediction of a difficult journey for their son, and so even before Habrocomes leaves they begin the emotional reaction that kills Anticleia and ages Laertes. It is notable that Anthia's parents, though suffering the same experience, are εὐθυμότεροι, "in better spirits," focused on the prediction that the pair will ultimately be happy. The parents of the groom are without θυμός, spirit but also will and courage, and the parents of the bride retain theirs better. This aligns with the idea of a male heir taking over the active, powerful social role from his father, which in many ways is the enactment of a powerful θυμός, whereas a bride leaves her natal family and does not need to take over the dominant social position in it from a parent. Her parents can remain strong

<sup>149</sup> Tagliabue 2017, 21.

and spirited without any threat of social struggle with the adult woman she is becoming. This is theoretical, however, because ultimately both Habrocomes and Anthia's parents meet the same fate. Their deaths leave the role of the closural scene's governor open, and the other high-agency stock character of the novels is the hero's companion.

As mentioned above, the companion is a character who supplies the agency necessary to move the plot forward when the hero's passive characterization prevents him from doing so. The companion is typically a male friend who supports and encourages the hero.<sup>150</sup> Chariton's friend Polycharmus fills this role in *Callirhoe*, and is instrumental in ensuring that Chaereas makes it to the end of the novel alive. In *Leucippe and Clitophon* the hero is spoiled for choice of friends, though the most constant is his cousin Clinias. In Watanabe's 2004 article "The Masculinity of Hippothoos," he notes perceptively that all of these companions are from the elite strata of society. He argues that the *Aethiopica* splits the role between Cnemon and Thyamis, and that *Daphnis and Chloe* is alone in not having such a character.<sup>151</sup> This is due to the gulf between Daphnis and the rustics around him due to his elite nature, and in many ways Chloe fulfills the role instead.<sup>152</sup> Aside from Chloe's anomalous role, these are all elite men who function with the

<sup>150</sup> Whitmarsh draws attention to the companion's additional role of emotionally detached counselor as well (Whitmarsh 2011, 206). The companion has more control than the hero not only over the world around them, but also over himself. Létoublon emphasizes the companions' role as erotic adviser (Létoublon 1993, 93-95) and as a kind of alternate hero, due to their similar backgrounds and life circumstances (99-103). This parallel hero function is important to the companion's ability to step in for the hero and make the choices he cannot. This character type is not exclusive to novels; it is familiar from drama as well. Pylades' role in accompanying Orestes and giving him the final encouragement when he hesitates to kill Clytemnestra shows clear parallels to the functions of the ideal novel companions. In New Comedy, the increasingly helpless *adulescens* develops a substantial need for external support. Given how strongly the ideal novel draws on drama (Lowe 2000, 223) it is likely that these trends in drama were a major contributor to the prominence of companions in the novel.

<sup>151</sup> Watanabe 2004, 26. Létoublon only discusses Cnemon as fulfilling the companion role in the *Aethiopica* (Létoublon 1993, 100), but also does not include any in-depth character study of Thyamis.

<sup>152</sup> I would add to this that his brother Astylus does as well in the final book of the novel, because his first action when he appears in the novel is to tell his father that it is his fault that Daphnis' garden was destroyed in order to prevent his father from punishing the enslaved Daphnis (4.10). Unlike the other novel heroes Daphnis spends most of the novel genuinely lacking the social power that supports agency, and at this point his brother is the only one with the power of an elite man needed to resolve the situation, turning the slightly comic convention of the



agency typical of elite men who are able to wield that social power when the hero is too restricted by the passive characterization required of him in the ideal novels to take the actions that his status leaves open to him. When Chaereas tries to kill himself instead of solving his problems, Polycharmus stops him from committing suicide and takes the actions necessary to start solving the problems. When Clitophon is easily convinced for the third time that Leucippe is dead and responds by trying to get himself executed, Clinias points out that after the previous two episodes it is unlikely that she has died this time either (7.6.2) and defends the suicidal Clitophon to the court. When Leucippe is captured by bandits (the *boukoloi* whom ideal novel protagonists always encounter on trips to Egypt) during Clinias' absence in Book 3, Clitophon's loyal slave Satyros and new friend Menelaus step into the gap left by both Clitophon and the primary companion, and rescue Leucippe from the bandits (3.17).<sup>153</sup> These companions act as almost an external personification of the agency and confidence that the heroes lack, taking the actions that would be done by the hero in a genre with more aggressive leading men.

Hippothous carries the normal dynamic between the hero and the companion further than the others, becoming as central to the novel as the lovers are. He begins with all the signs of being a secondary character as companions usually are, not appearing until partway through the novel (at 2.11), and even then only for individual scenes that send the lovers to their next

despairing hero rescued by his friend into a serious life and death situation. Despite the seriousness of this scene, in situations where Daphnis does have the social power to solve problems he does not use it. In 2.22, after Chloe has been kidnapped by Methymnians at the beginning of the conflict between Methymna and Mytilene, Daphnis despairs of saving her and instead criticizes the nymphs for not protecting her, who rather frostily inform him that they have convinced Pan to save her (2.23.4). When she is kidnapped by a rival suitor after Daphnis' recognition, when he is fully Astylus' equal with all the power of that station, it never even crosses his mind that he might save her (4.28) and she is instead rescued by Daphnis' rejected suitor Gnathon (!) who is attempting to get back into his good graces, in fear that he might use some of his power as the son of an elite family for revenge on Gnathon, despite his previous track record of passivity.

<sup>153</sup> Létoublon considers Menelaus to be a "double" of Clinias, due to their parallel tragic stories of homosexual love in addition to filling the same companion role. She finds Hippothous to then fill the same stock role. (Létoublon 1993, 94 and 102)

adventure. But he returns to the story repeatedly, until by 4.3 he has his own storyline entirely independent of either of the lovers. In the final stages of the plot it is he who finds Anthia, and after discovering her identity at 5.9.13 takes the actions necessary to return her to her original status, freeing her from slavery and returning her to her home. It is on their way back to Ephesus that they run into Habrocomes at 5.13, resolving the romantic separation plot. Not only does Hippothous have substantial social power and agency, but his use of them also leads to the resolution of the plot. It is Hippothous' action that returns Anthia to both her husband and her home, putting him in an almost paternal relationship with her.<sup>154</sup> He literally becomes his lover's father, by adopting the young man once they arrive in Ephesus at 5.15.4, so he presages the fathers in the sophistic novels taking up this role in more ways than one.

The romantic reunion and homecoming are parallel to each other rather than in sequence in this novel, because the lovers' ability to return to their homes is not predicated on first finding each other. The only other novel to decouple the two primary plot goals like this is *Daphnis and Chloe*, which all but does away with the romantic separation plot. In the *Ephesiaca*, Habrocomes gives up on finding Anthia completely and decides to go home without her, make a tomb for her, and as he tells himself καὶ σαυτὸν ἤδη παρ' αὐτὴν ἄγε, "bring yourself to lie beside her" (5.10.5), presumably a suicidal intention.<sup>155</sup> This is quite active for Habrocomes, who is usually too passive to make decisions as significant as giving up on his search for his beloved, and rarely even gets as ambitious as Chaereas' ongoing attempts on his own life. However, Habrocomes

<sup>154</sup> Thank you to Yvona Trnka-Amrhein for drawing Hippothous' position at this point in the novel as Anthia's *kyrios* to my attention.

<sup>155</sup> Suicidal ideation is a consistent character trait of the ideal novel heroes. Konstan 1994, 16 adduces it as a primary example of the extraordinary passivity of the novel hero, whose response to challenges or the loss of his beloved is to attempt to kill himself rather than to solve the problem or take steps to get his beloved back. Perkins 1995, 98-103 interprets the frequent suicidal gestures of ideal novel characters as a reaction to the inability to fulfill their assigned roles in life.

makes it only as far as Rhodes, where he encounters his and Anthia's former slaves Leucon and Rhode, who fulfill the companion character position in a more typical manner than Hippothous. They discover him and, like Polycharmus, prevent the hero from either killing himself or going home early. Then at 5.11 Hippothous, who has found Anthia, decides to bring her home, also through Rhodes, and when Leucon and Rhode stumble across her much as they did Habrocomes they reunite the two lovers, resulting in the closural scene of the romantic separation plot. While the lovers are always too passive in the novels to engineer their own reunion, this is a particularly prominent and active role for the companion characters, and lays the groundwork for how they are treated in the denouement.

The final section of the novel is half a page that quickly wraps the story up after the romantic reunion. There are no more scenes after the romantic reunion, only summary, which creates a sense of hurrying to finish the novel off. The paternal reunion cannot happen because all four parents die before Habrocomes and Anthia return, but the importance of the parents remains, so they are mentioned briefly (5.15.3):

καὶ ταῦτα ποιήσαντες ἀνελθόντες εἰς τὴν πόλιν τοῖς γονεῦσιν αὐτῶν τάφους  
κατεσκεύασαν μεγάλους, ἔτυχον γὰρ ὑπὸ γήρωσ καὶ ἀθυμίας προτεθνηκότες.

When they had done this, they went up to the city and built large tombs for their parents (for they had already died from old age and despair).

They die ὑπὸ γήρωσ καὶ ἀθυμίας, “from old age and despair.” The lack of θυμός in the end carries off both sets of parents as it does Anticleia in the *Odyssey*, who explains her death by saying that longing for Odysseus took the θυμός from her (*Od.*11.202-203), and suggests that a similar process is aging Laertes. Anthia and Habrocomes' parents are unlikely to be extremely elderly, given that their children are teenagers, so the epic theme of elderly parents dying without

their children's care fits somewhat uneasily into the novel, and this makes it stand out as native to epic.

Another odd feature of the scene is Hippothous' continued presence. Companions are rarely mentioned at all in the closural scenes, but the last two sentences of the *Ephesiaca* are about not Habrocomes and Anthia, but Leucon, Rhode, and Hippothous (5.15.4):

καὶ ὁ Λεύκων καὶ ἡ Ῥόδη κοινωνοὶ πάντων τοῖς συντρόφοις ἦσαν, διέγνω δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἰππόθοος ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τὸν λοιπὸν καταβιῶναι χρόνον. καὶ ἤδη Ὑπεράνθη τάφον ἤγειρε μέγαν κατὰ Λέσβον γενόμενος, καὶ τὸν Κλεισθένη παῖδα ποιησάμενος ὁ Ἰππόθοος διήγεν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ μεθ' Ἀβροκόμου καὶ Ἀνθίας.

Leucon and Rhode shared everything with their companions; and Hippothous too decided to spend the rest of his life in Ephesus. He now erected a great tomb for Hyperanthes in Lesbos, and adopting Cleisthenes as his son, he spent his life in Ephesus with Habrocomes and Anthia.

The final sentences of the novel shift the focus away from the lovers and towards their companions, with a focus on how those companions stay with the lovers in a pseudo-familial way. Hippothous receives the bulk of the description; Leucon and Rhode, who disappear for most of the novel and reappear in the companion roles at the very end, have only half a sentence describing their fate, whereas Hippothous has substantial detail. He is also cast in the role of a lover and a family builder, raising a tomb for his old lover who is a foil for Anthia.<sup>156</sup> He also adopts his current lover, creating a legal family bond between them even though marriage is not an option.<sup>157</sup> Hippothous has in many ways the same level of prominence in the end of the novel, and the same sort of social contextualization and stabilization, as Habrocomes and Anthia do; he

<sup>156</sup> Konstan 1994, 27; also Alvares 1995, 394 on Hippothous' characterization as a romantic hero. Note also that Habrocomes had a similar plan to build a tomb for Anthia when he gave up hope of finding her at 5.10.5.

<sup>157</sup> Konstan 1994, 39 n.38 notes that his role as the beloved's "father" is of course only technical, and that the adoption is parallel to Habrocomes and Anthia's marriage. Konstan suggests that this may even be meant to place Hippothous and his beloved on a more equal footing, as the relationship ceases to exist in the pederastic frame with its inequalities of power and desire, and is now comparable to the more balanced one of the protagonists. On the continuation in antiquity of originally pederastic relationships after the beloved becomes an adult, see Price 1989, 247-49 and Cantarella 1988, 58-65.

is elevated from secondary character to primary character. In this novel, where both the hero and the fathers of both protagonists are unable to take charge of this stabilization, the task falls on the high-agency companion character, indicating that Xenophon cannot or will not close his plot without a high-agency elite male character to guide the closural scenes. The ideology perpetuated by the *Odyssey*'s closural scenes, that society returns to peace and order when an elite male returns to reassert the hierarchical order of society, remains key to the closural scenes of the novel, even when it requires substantial reshuffling of the stock characters.

### 2.3 Sophistic Novels

In the sophistic novels the fathers are re-empowered. This avoids oddities like Chaereas' sudden, abbreviated character development arc or Hippothous' unique elevation to primary protagonist. In each of the sophistic novels the fathers become increasingly powerful, as part of a steady progression in the genre. In the *Odyssey*, Laertes has already been fully supplanted as head of the *oikos* by Odysseus at the beginning of the story. In the pre-sophistic novels the fathers still lose their positions as head of their *oikoi* by the end of the text, but this changes in the sophistic novels. In *Daphnis and Chloe* and the *Aethiopica*, the fathers not only retain the position of head of the *oikos*, but their status is also elevated with kingship and associations with divinity.<sup>158</sup> This shift of power from the hero to the father also pulls closural force away from the romantic scene. Despite the ideal novels' reputation of being focused on the erotic relationship of the lovers, the later form of the genre shifts the primary closure away from the romantic reunion scenes and towards the scenes of the fathers deciding to accept their children. This indicates that the key step in bringing closure to the plot is this societal reintegration. The primary closural

<sup>158</sup> See Morgan 2004, 231-232 and Chalk 1960, 43 on associations between Daphnis' father and Dionysus.

scene is the one in which an event occurs that allows the protagonists to return to their original statuses.<sup>159</sup>

### 2.3.1 Achilles Tatius

*Leucippe and Clitophon* is still transitional in some ways like the *Ephesiaca*. Leucippe's father Sostratus is the one present in the closural scene. He has minimal control over the events of the scene, which is focused on the virginity test to determine whether Leucippe is Sostratus' free daughter or Thersander's slave, and puts the primary agency in the hands of the gods. However, once it is determined that Leucippe is legally his daughter and within his power, the lovers' ability to return home hinges on Sostratus' choice to allow them to marry, which means they are willing to return to their family. Sostratus' decision is what ultimately permits their return and reintegration, giving him a measure of power over the closure of the plot. Therefore this novel makes substantial movements towards overtly tying plot closure to the protagonists' familial reintegration, and through the familial reintegration their return to their original high status.

The lovers themselves are not entirely drained of agency in this novel, but the agency they have is undermined by the structure of the novel. At the beginning they show substantial initiative in their attempt to plan a secret tryst and, after their discovery, the subsequent decision to elope. The tryst is arranged in direct opposition to their parents' wishes, as Clitophon is engaged to his half-sister and, when Leucippe's mother discovers a man in her daughter's bedroom, she makes her displeasure clearly known (2.24). However the primary focus is kept on Leucippe's boldness in this situation; even though her mother has guessed the truth, she stands

<sup>159</sup> See Lowe 2000, 46-60 on the shifts of narrative power that create closure in this kind of plot.

up to her mother and pretends the man in her room had broken in without her knowledge. This is not only her initial response to her mother's accusation (2.25), but also what she maintains the next day (2.28). Her active decision-making in their plan to elope is also emphasized (2.30):

Ἐν τούτῳ δὲ ἔτυχον πέμψας τὸν Σάτυρον πρὸς τὴν κόρην ἀποπειρασόμενον τῆς φυγῆς. ἡ δὲ πρὶν ἀκοῦσαι, πρὸς τὸν Σάτυρον “Δέομαι,” ἔφη, “πρὸς θεῶν ξένων καὶ ἐγχωρίων, ἐξαρπάσατέ με τῶν τῆς μητρὸς ὀφθαλμῶν, ὅπῃ βούλεσθε· εἰ δέ με ἀπελθόντες καταλίποιτε, βρόχον πλεξαμένη τὴν ψυχὴν μου οὕτως ἀφήσω.”

It was just then that I dispatched Satyrus to her to sound her out about an elopement. But before he could get a word in, she said: “I beg you, by all the gods—ours and anyone else’s, get me out of my mother’s sight, anywhere you like. If you go and leave me behind, I will hang myself.”

Clitophon, on the other hand, is quite tentative; he sends his slave Satyrus to speak to her rather than going himself, and the word for what he’s asking Satyrus to do is ἀποπειρασόμενον, “make trial of,” testing whether she would be interested in running away, rather than something direct like ask her or suggest to her. Leucippe, in contrast, has had the same idea herself and asks before Satyrus can even say his piece.<sup>160</sup> Clitophon did not even come up with the plan himself. He originally decided to flee as a team decision with Satyrus (2.25), and the idea to wait a bit and ask Leucippe to come with them belonged to the companion character, Clitophon’s cousin Clinias (2.27). This is the dynamic of the passive hero and active heroine that Konstan describes.<sup>161</sup> By keeping focus on the heroine’s active role during the scene in which the lovers

<sup>160</sup> Napolitano 1983-4, 88 finds actions like this to give Leucippe an exceptionally vivid and realistic characterization for a novel heroine. Morales 2004, 206 agrees, but only for the first half of the novel. She argues that after the epiphany of Artemis at 4.1.3-5 converts Leucippe to remaining a virgin until marriage, Leucippe’s characterization becomes clichéd. De Temmerman 2014, 188, draws attention to the intriguing ambiguity of Leucippe’s actions here; due to the tight focalization through Clitophon at this point, it is not clear if she wants to leave because she is in love with Clitophon or because she wants to escape punishment from her mother, so the reader is held in suspense on the question of whether Leucippe has fulfilled the ideal novel rule/cliché of being instantly and deeply in love with the hero.

<sup>161</sup> Konstan 1994, 30.

show the most agency, the characterization of the hero as passive is maintained even when the plot gives him an opportunity to be characterized as active.

The heroine's active positioning here, as in most cases, does not threaten the father's power over the family in the way an active hero can due to the fundamentally disempowered position of women in Greek society. Konstan also has an incisive discussion of how the narratorial structures serve to undermine her position of power, and ultimately Clitophon's as well.<sup>162</sup> *Leucippe and Clitophon* is the only ideal novel narrated throughout in the first person, and for most of the novel the narrator is Clitophon himself. This creates a distinctive power dynamic, because it makes Clitophon the viewer and Leucippe that which is viewed, the object of the male gaze, and in most cases the audience is cut off from her internal experience.<sup>163</sup> This does not entirely empower Clitophon in exchange, however, due to his fundamental passivity; he is not an active subject but instead a spectator. The lovers are situated by the structure of the novel and society at large in a position of weakness.

This is similar to Anthia and Habrocomes' childishness, but in this novel the movement towards re-empowering the parents has begun. The lovers elope at the beginning of the novel because they cannot imagine any other way of escaping their parents' plans to marry them to other people, and leave their parents furious instead of grieving. The lovers are unhappy with the requirements laid on them by the heads of their families, and the only action open to them to resist is to leave the entire family structure. When they do return to the family at the end of the

<sup>162</sup> Konstan 1994, 63-73.

<sup>163</sup> There are a few notable exceptions here, apart from scenes where she expresses her thoughts in dialogue. First is Leucippe's letter to Clitophon after their second reunion at 5.18 where she writes a letter to him criticizing him for not recognizing her, which is a clear expression of her thoughts and feelings at a critical moment, in her own words. Then towards the end of the novel the tight focalization through Clitophon begins to slip, allowing for the scene at 6.11-22 where Thersander captures Leucippe and tries to seduce her, culminating in her grand speech about her pride at preserving her virginity from various threats at 6.22 which lays the groundwork for her escape to the temple of Artemis at 7.13 and eventual success at the virginity test.



novel it is because their parents have changed their minds. At 5.10, right after Leucippe's second *Scheintod*, Clitophon reunites with his cousin Clinias,<sup>164</sup> who tells him that days after they eloped Clitophon's father received a letter from Leucippe's agreeing to allow the pair to marry.

Clitophon refuses to go home without Leucippe and flees Alexandria to avoid being found and taken back home by his father, and ends up in Ephesus where Leucippe's father Sostratus finds them instead. No other fathers in the ideal novels travel to find their children and force their return to the family like this, making this a major characterization shift compared to the pre-sophistic novels.<sup>165</sup>

This empowerment of the fathers correlates to an increased importance in the scene of familial reunion and reunification. As becomes standard for the sophistic novels, the closure of the romantic separation plot does not occur in a scene that is totally separated from the scene of reuniting with the father and returning to original familial status. In the scene at 7.16 where Leucippe and Clitophon are reunited after her third *Scheintod*, it is also her reunion with her father. The virginity test makes her father even more prominent; this is Thersander's formal challenge requesting it (8.11.1):

“Ἄλλ’ οὐκ,” ἔφη, “λόγων δεῖ. δύο γὰρ προκαλοῦμαι προκλήσεις, Μελίτην τε ταύτην, καὶ τὴν δοκοῦσαν εἶναι τοῦ θεοπρόπου θυγατέρα, οὐκέτι βασανίσων, ὡς μικρῶ πρόσθεν ἔλεγον τῷ δὲ ὄντι δούλην ἐμήν.”

<sup>164</sup> Clinias is gone from 3.5-5.10, when they get separated by a shipwreck. In his absence the companion role is filled by Menelaus, a man the group meets on that ship at 2.33. Menelaus parts ways with Clitophon at 5.15, right after Clinias' return, making his role as a substitute evident. Mitchell 2014 shows how Clitophon's successes depends on his relationship with these two and his loyal slave Satyros.

<sup>165</sup> There is one possible exception, Charicleia's foster father Charicles. He travels all the way to Meroe to find her, but once he is there he finds that she has already been accepted back into her birth family by her birth father, so despite his active choice to search for her he is in the end unable to succeed at his goal due to having less social power and weaker social connections to Charicleia than her birth father. It is not clear whether he realizes he is in competition with the king himself; he certainly does not know that she is a princess in Delphi, but many scholars (e.g. Morgan 1978, 1982, and 2008, Hefti 1950, Sandy 1982, Woronoff 1992) read him as knowing that the princess is the daughter he's come to find when he asks for the king's help at 10.37. Kruchio 2017 lays out a coherent reading of the scene based on the assumption that Charicles does not know his foster daughter is the princess, however, and is asking the king for help in good faith.

“There is no need for speeches. I have two challenges to issue—one against Melite and one against this alleged daughter of the pious ambassador (I no longer intend to have her tortured, as I said a short while ago), who is in reality my slave.”

The question is framed as whether she is Thersander’s slave or Sostratus’ daughter. Not whether she is free or enslaved as an inherent state of existence, but whether her status is as an enslaved member of Thersander’s household or a family member of Sostratus’.<sup>166</sup> When Sostratus is introduced at 7.12, we learn that the embassies are important to Ephesus because they stop all punishments of criminals while the embassies are in town, and that Sostratus is leading an embassy to thank Artemis for the Byzantines’ victory over Thrace, a reminder that he is a general.<sup>167</sup> Leucippe’s options are thus in stark contrast, and the high rank that she returns to after passing the test is due to her father’s status. The resolution of the romantic separation plot also depends on her ability to rejoin her family; her father has already agreed to marry her to Clitophon, something he can only do if she is acknowledged as his daughter. This is the opposite of the situation in *Callirhoe*, where the heroine’s return to her home and original status (as well as the ultimate closure of the plot) relied on her recognition by her high-status husband.

Paternal agency does not yet have complete control over the world in *Leucippe and Clitophon*. While Sostratus and Clitophon’s father have control over whether or not their children will be accepted into their families, Thersander’s claim of ownership over Leucippe

<sup>166</sup> Doody 1996, 66 interprets the stunning beauty of the ideal novel heroine as empowering, but Morales 2004, 159-162 points out how the reality of Leucippe’s captivity by Thersander reveals how hollow that power is. The climactic scene, in which Leucippe’s “freedom” is in reality simply transfer of her possession from Thersander to Sostratus to (ultimately) Clitophon, is another reminder of the ultimately disempowered status of the Greek woman. Leucippe remains permanently the possession of a man, and the measure of her increasing power is merely how much respect and good treatment that man owes her and how actively he is willing to use his power over her.

<sup>167</sup> This is first mentioned in 2.14.2, in a sentence that contains the only reminder of the opening frame after the end of the frame itself, as it contains the speech tag ὡς ἔφη, “as I said.” Clitophon has not previously said that Sostratus is a general, so this is typically taken as a reference to the conversation he had with the narrator of the opening frame before the beginning of the novel.

compromises her father's power to take her back. Sostratus' and Thersander's power over Leucippe compete with each other, though by this point the disempowerment of the hero is so complete that Clitophon has no ability to affect the situation. Sostratus is not forced to submit to any other mortal's choices for his daughter, however. Instead that authority is handed over to supernatural forces, as the priest of Artemis explains (8.6.11-13):

οὖν τὴν σύριγγά φασι ἀναθεῖναι μὲν ἐνθάδε τὸν Πᾶνα, περιορίσαι δὲ εἰς σπήλαιον αὐτήν, θαμίζειν τε αὐτοῦ καὶ τῇ σύριγγι συνήθως ἀυλεῖν. χρόνῳ δὲ ὕστερον χαρίζεται τὸ χωρίον τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι, συνθήκας ποιησάμενος πρὸς αὐτήν, μηδεμίαν ἐκεῖ καταβαίνειν γυναῖκα. ὅταν οὖν αἰτίαν ἔχη τις οὐκ εἶναι παρθένος, προπέμπει μὲν αὐτήν ὁ δῆμος μέχρι τῶν τοῦ σπηλαίου θυρῶν, δικάζει δὲ ἡ σύριγξ τὴν δίκην. ἢ μὲν γὰρ παῖς εἰσέρχεται κεκοσμημένη στολῇ τῇ νενομισμένη, ἄλλος δὲ ἐπικλείει τὰς τοῦ σπηλαίου θύρας. κἂν μὲν ἢ παρθένος, λιγυρόν τι μέλος ἀκούεται καὶ ἔνθεον, ἥτοι τοῦ τόπου πνεῦμα ἔχοντος μουσικὸν εἰς τὴν σύριγγα τεταμιεύμενον, ἢ τάχα καὶ ὁ Πᾶν αὐτὸς ἀυλεῖ.

They say, then that Pan dedicated this syrinx here and locked it up in a cave, and that he frequents the place and is in the habit of playing on the pipes. At a later date the area was presented to Artemis, Pan having struck an agreement with her that no woman not a virgin was to enter it. Whenever a woman is accused of not being a virgin, the populace accompanies her up to the doors of the cave and lets the syrinx pass judgment. The girl enters, dressed in the proper attire, and someone else closes the cave doors. If she be a virgin, a delicate, ethereal melody is heard—either the place itself has a musical breath that plays on the pipes or perhaps it is actually Pan himself playing.

If the woman is not a virgin, she screams and disappears, so whatever force controls the test, it is capable of taking material action. Achilles Tatius is coy about exactly which supernatural power makes the final judgement. The place is dedicated to Artemis, but the priest attributes the function of the test to Pan maintaining the agreement with her, rather than any action on her part. He initially says it is the syrinx itself that decides, δικάζει δὲ ἡ σύριγξ τὴν δίκην, “the syrinx passes judgment.” A few sentences later he adds in more options for the agent when he starts to speculate on whether Pan or τοῦ τόπου πνεῦμα, “the breath of the place” is playing the syrinx, which switches from a depiction of the syrinx as an agent in its own right to the tool of either Pan or the ‘place.’ This uncertainty over the agent controlling the test softens the removal of power

from Sostratus again; it is possible that he must submit to control of his daughter's fate belonging to the indisputably more powerful but nevertheless mostly humanoid Pan, or it could merely be the place itself. The power over the final decision of Leucippe's status is dissipated away.<sup>168</sup>

Once she is confirmed as her father's daughter the situation is left there. The wedding occurs in summary in the final section, 8.19, which strips it of almost all closural force. At the beginning of the massive final episode of the plot in Book 5, the passage around Clinias' return to Clitophon arranged for all plot closure to hinge on Leucippe passing the virginity test. At 5.10 Clinias informed Clitophon that Sostratus had agreed to let the lovers marry, so as soon as Leucippe is returned to her father the marriage is a foregone conclusion. At 5.11 in Clitophon's response he refuses to return to his own father without Leucippe, as he would be too ashamed of his role in her unfortunate fate, so with her return to the status of free (and living) woman Clitophon's return home, too, is assured. All closure in the novel derives from Leucippe's acceptance back into her family by her father, and his agency in this matter is mitigated only by the gods themselves. As the genre continues even the gods' ability to come between father and child disappears from the ideal novels, and the fathers are given full control over their children's fate, once they learn that their children are alive. In the final two novels, the closure of the plot hinges on recognition scenes between the protagonists and their fathers.

### 2.3.2 Longus

In Longus and Heliodorus the parental reunions become the primary source of closure, and are constructed around the trope of the recognition of foundling children. Longus even shows reunions between both protagonists and their fathers in scene rather than removing one or

<sup>168</sup> Montiglio 2012b, 15-16, argues that Artemis is presented as a "typical savior deity" as one of the closural gestures. Together with the powerfully closural nature of the scene, and its connection to Artemis due to the focus on the virginity test, the scene could be taken as ultimately under Artemis' control.

relegating it to summary,<sup>169</sup> though Daphnis' reunion with his father Dionysophanes still has far more closural force than Chloe's. The re-empowerment of the father has come to its full form in *Daphnis and Chloe*, such that Dionysophanes always has life-and-death power over Daphnis. At the beginning of the novel he has Daphnis exposed, simply because he already has enough children (4.24). This is the first instance in the novels of a father being anything other than utterly grief-stricken at the possibility of his child dying.<sup>170</sup> Daphnis is also the only ideal novel hero to have a brother, much less two older brothers who entirely fulfilled his father's need for children.<sup>171</sup> At the end of the novel, when Dionysophanes is fully introduced as a character, it is as the owner of the idyllic landscape that the rest of the novel has occurred in and as Daphnis' master. His acceptance of Daphnis as his son is a necessary prerequisite to both Daphnis' and Chloe's acceptance back into the elite community, and their ability to marry each other.<sup>172</sup> The father's power in *Daphnis and Chloe* has become greater and more important than the lovers' attachment to each other and their desires.

<sup>169</sup> For an analysis of the earlier novelists' use of scene and summary, see Hägg 1971, 87-111. He uses the definition of the terms "scene" and "summary" given in Liddell 1953, 67: "Scene is that part of a novel in which the novelist makes things happen under the reader's eyes. Summary is that part of a novel in which the novelist says that things are happening, or have happened."

<sup>170</sup> Morgan 2004, 239-240 notes that Dionysophanes is explicitly shown to regret a choice made in error (as his oldest two children died which created enough space in his family for his youngest), but to feel no "shame or remorse" at the decision to expose his child. Boswell 1988, 89-91 discusses the ethics of child abandonment in more detail. He finds that while ethical writings tend to encourage raising children, it seems to have been viewed as an unrealistic demand to ask people to raise all of their children. In the novels there is no censure of parents who expose infants, only regret that it was necessary and gratitude towards those who rescue the children.

<sup>171</sup> The only other sibling any novel protagonist has is Clitophon who has a half-sister, and she is characterized as a rival to Leucippe due to their father's plans to marry his children to each other. Daphnis' brothers are instead rivals for paternal affection. Rivals for romantic affection are a required part of the plotline going all the way back to the *Odyssey*; rivals for paternal affection are unique to Daphnis, and put him in a uniquely disadvantaged position.

<sup>172</sup> At 3.31 Daphnis' foster father says he cannot promise Daphnis' hand in marriage to Chloe without permission from his master, who proves to be Dionysophanes. It is not clear that Daphnis and his family are slaves until 3.26, when his and Chloe's marriage begins to be discussed in earnest, indicating that the power dynamic of Daphnis as his father's slave is only important to the mechanisms of plot closure rather than to the body of the plot.

Daphnis and Chloe are some of the most disempowered of the ideal novel protagonists, on par with Anthia and Habrocomes. They begin the main plotline even younger than Xenophon's lovers (Daphnis and Chloe are fifteen and thirteen, respectively, in 1.7, while Habrocomes and Anthia are sixteen and fourteen in 1.2), which puts them very close to the social status of children and creates a rationale for their helplessness and naïveté. The naïveté is then made fundamental to the plot of the lovers who are never separated for long by external forces, and instead the plot derives their separation from their lack of knowledge on how to achieve sexual union. Konstan even argues that they are constructed as having an inherently adolescent sexuality that does not include intercourse, which is part of adult marital sexuality.<sup>173</sup> More than any of the other novel protagonists Daphnis and Chloe are children, and this childishness shapes the entire novel. It also brings with it a lower status than adults have and a reduced level of agency as compared to adults. The influence of genre adds to this. While most of the ideal novels take their principal extra-generic influences from Homeric epic and New Comedy, *Daphnis and Chloe* distinctively incorporates the pastoral mode.<sup>174</sup> The shepherd heroes of pastoral have very low social status, and do not have to fulfill the social bargain of epic heroes that Sarpedon outlines in *Il.*12.310-328, of elite status in exchange for martial valor. Shepherds also lack the confidence born of privilege in the bourgeois New Comedy heroes, which Daphnis' brother Astylus exhibits in his easy rescue of Daphnis in the episode at 4.10-13, where a rival suitor of Chloe's destroys the garden Daphnis tends for his master and Astylus tells Dionysophanes that his own horses did the damage to protect Daphnis from punishment. Daphnis, in turn, shows he

<sup>173</sup> Konstan 1994, 86-90.

<sup>174</sup> Chariton does situate *Callirhoe* within the context of Thucydides' *Peloponnesian War*, but primarily for world-building rather than style. See Connor 2002, 14-16. See Hägg 1983, 54 on Heliodorus' use of the *Odyssey* as a model, and Morgan 2004, 7 on Longus' use of Theocritus.

has not yet internalized this attitude at 4.28 when he does not have the confidence to ask his father to help save Chloe who has been abducted by that same rival suitor. When he is told of her abduction this is his reaction (4.28.2):

ὁ δὲ ἔξω τῶν φρενῶν γενόμενος οὔτε εἰπεῖν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ἐτόλμα καὶ καρτερεῖν μὴ δυνάμενος εἰς τὸν περὶ κηπον εἰσελθὼν ὠδύρετο.

He was beside himself; he did not have the courage to speak to his father, but unable to suffer in silence he went into the kitchen garden and lamented.

This passage has two interesting points. First, although Daphnis is now recognized by his birth parents and elevated to the same status as Astylus, he is not bold enough to use it; Konstan points out that he is still a pastoral hero, despite the technical change in his status.<sup>175</sup> Second, the power to solve the problem is once again in Dionysophanes' hands. In the final book of *Daphnis and Chloe* almost all power in all situations is ultimately his.

Dionysophanes differs far more from Laertes than the fathers in previous novels. He voluntarily let his son die (4.24), as far as he was aware, and had plenty of other children to care for him in his old age. When he appears in the novel (4.13) he is old enough to be a man with grown sons, but still handsome, healthy, and rich, and his emotional state is quite good; if he ever mourned for the exposed child, he has long since made it through the grieving process by the end of the novel. Dionysophanes and his wife never lament in the novel. Their emotional response to the reunion is still intense and of interest to the author, however: Ἔτι λεγούσης αὐτῆς καὶ τοῦ Διονυσοφάνου τὰ γνωρίσματα φιλοῦντος καὶ ὑπὸ περιττῆς ἡδονῆς δακρύνοντος, “While she [Daphnis' mother] was saying this, and Dionysophanes was kissing the tokens and weeping from the intensity of his joy” (4.22.1). He was not broken and alone without his son, and the return of his son simply makes his happy life happier. This is not epic's nightmarish

<sup>175</sup> Konstan 1994, 19-20.

vision of the parent weakened with grief at the loss of a child, but rather a father who retains all of his powers and capacities. His status, wealth, and virtue give him the authority and ability to decide that someone will be welcomed back into society.

While Sostratus, Leucippe's father, simply retained his power as an elite father, Dionysophanes is in many ways exaggerated. The most salient aspect of this exaggeration is that he is Daphnis' master. Daphnis is not simply an outsider whom the head of household may choose to invite back into the family, but a possession over whom Dionysophanes has the power of life and death. No matter what choice he makes, he retains massive amounts of power over Daphnis.<sup>176</sup> Dionysophanes also has some godlike aspects, most notably in his name, which means "Dionysus manifest" and has been used by many scholars to link the character to Dionysiac or Orphic cult.<sup>177</sup> The garden which Daphnis was supposed to tend for him and which the rival suitor destroyed also contains a temple of Dionysus (4.3), in which the statue of Dionysus is given a flower crown made of Daphnis' flowers (4.4.1). When the garden is destroyed and the gardeners are terrified of punishment, it is finally revealed at 4.13 that the master whose wrath they fear has the speaking name Dionysophanes. So while Achilles Tatius allowed the father to retain power over his family while ultimately yielding some of it to the

<sup>176</sup> This dynamic also brings into focus how much these closural family reunion scenes are about status, and the hero's return to his original status. Daphnis never leaves Lesbos throughout the novel, and he will return to his birthplace at Mytilene either way. After Daphnis rejects Gnathon's advances, Gnathon goes to Astylus to ask for help, and extracts this assurance from Astylus, αἰτήσῃν αὐτὸν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐπηγγέλατο καὶ κομίσειν εἰς τὴν πόλιν αὐτῷ μὲν δοῦλον, ἐκεῖνῳ δὲ ἐρώμενον, "[he] promised to ask his father to give him Daphnis and to take him back to the city to be his own slave, and Gnathon's darling" (4.17.1) At 4.19 he does so and Dionysophanes grants the request, at which point Daphnis' foster father confesses that the boy is a foundling from an elite family in order to stop this. So Daphnis is already returning home on a physical level before the recognition, but this return would bring no closure to the plot, because his status would not be recovered. He must return to his position in both space and the community to resolve the plot.

<sup>177</sup> Morgan 2004, 231.



divine, Longus goes a step further in giving the father the power over his son that a master has over his slave, and connecting the father himself to the divine.

Corresponding with the increase in paternal agency is a new emphasis on familial reunification independent of the romantic plotline. In *Leucippe and Clitophon* the scene of the virginity test was framed as a question of whether or not Leucippe would be recognized by the Ephesian community as her father's daughter. However, it also served to resolve the romantic plot since the lovers' parents had promised to let them marry, so as soon as Leucippe was back in her father's power her marriage to Clitophon was assured. In this case the familial reunion and the romantic reunion are largely merged, with a slight preference for the familial reunion. In *Daphnis and Chloe* the scene with the most closural force is Daphnis' recognition by his parents, which not only fails to confirm his connection with Chloe, but actually puts it in danger since the two are separated by their different statuses as long as Chloe remains unrecognized. This separation is distinguished by Chloe's despair at 4.27.1-2:

ἐκάθητο κλάουσα, τὰ πρόβατα νέμουσα, λέγουσα οἷα εἰκὸς ἦν· “ἐξέλαθετό μου Δάφνης· ὄνειροπολεῖ γάμους πλουσίους. τί γὰρ αὐτὸν ὀμνύειν ἀντὶ τῶν Νυμφῶν τὰς αἶγας ἐκέλευον; κατέλιπε ταύτας ὡς καὶ Χλόην. οὐδὲ θύων ταῖς Νύμφαις καὶ τῷ Πανὶ ἐπεθύμησεν ἰδεῖν Χλόην. εὗρεν ἴσως παρὰ τῇ μητρὶ θεραπαίνας ἐμοῦ κρείττονας. χαιρέτω· ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ ζήσομαι.”

She sat weeping, grazing her sheep, and saying what you would have expected: “Daphnis has forgotten me. He is dreaming of a wealthy marriage. What was the point of making him swear by his goats instead of the Nymphs? He has deserted them as he has deserted Chloe. Even when he was making offerings to the Nymphs and Pan he had no desire to see Chloe. Maybe he has found maids in his mother's service who are better than me. Farewell to him! I shan't go on living.”

The narrator introduces the passage as οἷα εἰκὸς, “saying what you would have expected,” and indeed it is a common kind of passage in the ideal novels. It is, however, an anomaly because it

is Chloe's only lament of this kind.<sup>178</sup> At previous points of separation, such as when Daphnis is kidnapped by pirates at 1.28, or when she was kidnapped by the Methymnians at 2.20, she took action to prevent or resolve the separation (in both cases asking for help, from Dorcon at 1.28.3 and from the Nymphs at 2.20.3, both of whom help her though the Nymphs are delayed by needing to acquire Pan's help at 2.23.4). In this case she considers their separation totally unresolvable.

Interestingly, it is Chloe's recognition as high status by Daphnis' father that does the bulk of the work resolving tension in her family separation plotline; after Dionysophanes has seen her recognition tokens at 4.31.2 neither he nor anyone else expresses any doubt concerning her status, and they are completely confident that her birth parents will be found and will accept her as well. The recognition scene between her and her father at 4.35 is a smaller scale replication of Daphnis', and occurs after Dionysophanes' dream at 4.34 in which Eros commands him to allow the lovers to marry and tells him how to find Chloe's father.<sup>179</sup> There is therefore no doubt about the outcome of Chloe's recognition, even within the story, and little novelty in it as it repeats elements from an earlier scene while having an assured outcome. The resolution of both familial separation plots is thus in the scenes in the middle of Book 4 with Dionysophanes, reducing the

<sup>178</sup> This form of lament, as a reaction to separation from the lover and in place of attempting to reunite and especially with the consideration of suicide, is also more typically associated with heroes than heroines. Heroines more often consider suicide when they are pressed by a suitor they can find no other means of escape from (e.g. Callirhoe at 6.6.5, Anthia at 2.1.4, 3.6 ff, and 4.5.6, Charicleia at 1.8.3). Heroes frequently consider suicide as an initial reaction to separation from their beloveds, or even the threat of such (e.g. Habrocomes at 2.7.1 and 5.10.5, Clitophon at 3.17.1, Daphnis at 2.22.4, Theagenes at 2.2.1, and Chaereas passim). Exceptions to this division usually happen when there is some confusion of gender roles, such as in the *Aethiopica* at 1.2.4 when Charicleia says she will kill herself if Theagenes dies. This is immediately after a battle in which Charicleia killed most of their enemies (compare 1.1.5 and 5.32.4), which puts her in a masculine position as a warrior, and her intended method of dying by sword is also masculine (cf. Loraux 1987, 11). Conversely, Habrocomes at 2.1.3-4 considers suicide to protect his chastity from one of the pirates who has captured them, in a scene where his and Anthia's gender roles become utterly undifferentiated (Konstan 1994, 25).

<sup>179</sup> Montiglio 2012b, 32 notes that Eros' appearance here is itself a closural signal, much like Artemis' role as savior goddess at the end of *Leucippe and Clitophon*.

sense of differentiation between them. The serial nature of the recognitions nevertheless allows for Chloe's moment of fear that they will not be able to marry, echoing Lamon's concern at 3.30.5 that Daphnis' secret elite status would make his marriage to a shepherd girl inappropriate. The family separation plot is fundamentally inimical to the happy resolution of the romantic plot, and it is only the double nature of the family plots (that both the lovers have the same history of elite birth, exposure, and growing up as poor shepherds) that allows the happy romantic resolution. In *Daphnis and Chloe* the family plot ceases to be a background to or support of the romantic plot, and instead takes on a life of its own to become the dominant plotline in the scenes which resolve the bulk of the plot tension.

### 2.3.3 Heliodorus

The trend of the increasing power of the father and the increasing importance of the scene in which the father accepts his child back into the family continues in the *Aethiopica*. Hydaspes is not only a wealthy and powerful man but a king. As in *Daphnis and Chloe* he becomes his child's master and only his recognition saves the child from a terrible fate, but in this case the fate is death as a human sacrifice. He is a picture of agency and power, bowing only to the will of the community as a whole.<sup>180</sup> The question of the lovers' agency is more complex. The *Aethiopica* takes the *Odyssey* not only as the underlying source of the plot structure for the whole genre, but also as the primary point of allusion outside the ideal novel genre, much as *Daphnis and Chloe* does the poems of Theocritus. Heliodorus does not constrain himself too firmly by this, so there is no attempt to map Theagenes directly onto Odysseus and Charicleia directly onto Penelope, but both characters are frequently compared to a variety of epic heroes, and at least

<sup>180</sup> This point is discussed in greater depth in Chapter 3, "Community Reunion."

superficially display epic virtues like martial valor and agency.<sup>181</sup> Their agency is undercut in key plot moments, however, and during the closural phase of the novel they undergo transitions much like Chaereas' abrupt character development into a conquering general, but in reverse.

The lovers are presented much in the style of epic heroes. In the first scene they are introduced as the victors of a battle against challenging odds, an impossible feat for any of the other novels' lovers aside from potentially Chaereas at the very end of *Callirhoe*. Charicleia and Theagenes are also frequently connected to epic and mythological heroes; Theagenes in most cases to his ancestor Achilles (2.34, 4.3), but Charicleia at various times is connected to Artemis (1.2), Penelope (5.22), and of course Andromeda (4.8.5 and 10.15.1). They both display a fair amount of agency during their elopement, but this is only after Calasiris convinces them to and comes up with a plan. When they fall in love they respond by hiding it and growing ill (Charicleia at 3.7, Theagenes at 3.10.4-11.1), exactly as the lovers do in *Callirhoe* and the *Ephesiaca*. Theagenes rises to the level of agency that Chloe at times displays—he goes to Calasiris and asks the old priest to help him, as he has no idea what to do about having fallen in love. Charicleia stoically hides her feelings and becomes increasingly ill until Calasiris can persuade her to trust him and go along with his plan. Calasiris does not tell either of the lovers what he intends to do until the day of the elopement (4.17), previously convincing each to promise to do whatever he told them and leaving them otherwise in the dark (Theagenes at 4.6.7, Charicleia at 4.13.5). The two lovers, despite their high-agency, militaristic introduction as the winners of the fight with the pirates, turn out to have begun the plotline of their romance as thoroughly passive participants.<sup>182</sup>

<sup>181</sup> See Tagliabue 2015 for a discussion of how the opening scene which introduces the lovers is meant to recall the *mnestērphonia* in the *Odyssey*, and Feuillâtre 1966 on the particular comparison of Charicleia to Odysseus in this scene.

At the end of the plot this striking passivity returns. Structurally they are placed in a nearly powerless position by their capture as prisoners of war at 8.16.7. This is mitigated only by Charicleia's right to bring a lawsuit under Ethiopian law, and even then her right to do so is predicated on her Ethiopian citizenship, which is the question at issue. When she demands to be heard the sages immediately agree to it, but the king, Hydaspes, immediately points out at 10.10.4 that only ἐγχωρίους, "inhabitants," have this right, not ξένους, "foreigners." A sentence earlier he categorizes Charicleia in an even weaker position, as an αἰχμάλωτον, "prisoner of war," certainly a group of people who do not have civil rights, especially since they are eligible to become human sacrifices, which is Charicleia's stated fate. The king agrees to let the case go forward based on the insistence of the sages, saying he does it ἐπειδὴ βούλεται Σισιμίθρης, "since Sisimithres wishes it" (10.10.4), and shows no sign that he has been persuaded that she truly has legal standing. The sages insist that she be heard shortly after Sisimithres explains their objection to the tradition of human sacrifice at 10.9.6-7, so their support of her suit seems to be because they support anything that might stop the sacrifice, rather than because they believe she has the right. This is an interesting exchange; in most cases the initial trigger for the process that rescues the protagonists from slavery is their beauty, usually because someone who is attracted to them wants to change their status to facilitate a sexual relationship of some kind with them.<sup>183</sup> Charicleia's beauty is extensively commented on immediately before the trial begins and gains her sympathy, but the sympathy is attributed to the crowd and queen Persinna (10.9.5), neither of whom have the power to help her. Thus even the passive personal power of her beauty is not an

<sup>182</sup> See Konstan 1994, 97-98 on the ebbs and flows of Charicleia's and Theagenes' agency.

<sup>183</sup> There are two exceptions to this, Chaereas at 4.2 who is elevated because of Mithridates' attraction to Callirhoe rather than to Chaereas, which is a fairly minor variance. More significantly Leucippe in the final books of *Leucippe and Clitophon* is initially kidnapped and sold into slavery due to her beauty and is saved by her bold escape to the temple of Artemis and her virginity.

element of her rescue; she is instead the beneficiary of an intragovernmental power struggle.

Even after she is recognized and elevated to the status of crown princess, Charicleia shows uncharacteristic passivity in the closural scene.<sup>184</sup> As in *Daphnis and Chloe*, the romantic plot is largely divorced from the family separation plot. Charicleia's recognition has no effect on Theagenes' status and he remains a prisoner of war slated to be a human sacrifice. At 10.18 Hydaspes openly asks her who Theagenes is, and floats the idea that since Charicleia had earlier claimed he was her brother, that would make him Hydaspes' and Persinna's son. Hydaspes says he does not think this can be true, but in raising the possibility he raises the possibility of rescuing Theagenes from sacrifice, and opens up the opportunity for Charicleia to explain that he is in fact her fiancé, the piece of information that eventually saves his life at 10.38. Back in 10.18, however, Charicleia is overcome with maidenly modesty and suggests that Hydaspes ask Theagenes about the true nature of their relationship instead, giving this explanation: ἀνὴρ τε γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐμοῦ τε τῆς γυναικὸς εὐθαρσέστερον ἐξαγορεύειν οὐκ αἰσχυνθήσεται, "for he is a man and can explain himself with less shame and embarrassment than I could as a woman." (10.18.2) This is strange on several levels. She says Theagenes can speak εὐθαρσέστερον, more bravely than she, but she showed no lack of courage when she demanded her hearing at 10.10, and even had to encourage him to keep his spirits up in 9.24 when he expressed doubt that she would be recognized by her parents and that this would save them. Presumably the logic here is that she is ashamed to admit to engaging herself to be married without her parents' permission, but this is still suspect as both she and Theagenes have just passed a magical virginity test in front of her

<sup>184</sup> De Temmerman argues that in this scene she is struggling with an excess of her fundamental character trait of *sophrosune*. This is combined with a transition from being able to control others (such as Thyamis) with rhetoric and words to becoming the object of her parents' rhetorical control. Her parents' agency supersedes hers, and her iron self-control becomes a hindrance rather than a help. (De Temmerman 2014, 52) Morgan takes the opposite stance, interpreting her behavior as uncharacteristic and included in order to delay plot closure and maintain suspense. (Morgan 1989, 315-318)

parents and the entire crowd at 10.9. They can therefore hardly be accused of doing anything meriting as strong a word as αἰσχυνθήσεται, which implies not only shame but dishonor.<sup>185</sup> In addition, when the information is revealed at 10.38 the lovers receive no disapproval except from Charicles, Charicleia's foster father whom she ran away from to be with Theagenes. Even his criticism is aimed at Theagenes as an abductor rather than a fiancé; he says that Theagenes is his daughter's συλαγωγήσας, a fairly rare compound of ἀγωγός, guide, and συλάω, a verb used in the *Iliad* to refer to stripping the armor off of a fallen enemy. The complaint is not about the engagement but about the theft of his daughter. Charicleia's reticence about her engagement seems tenuously connected to the reactions it gets in reality.

Her behavior does make sense within the frame of equalized agency between the lovers, however. Theagenes at this point is still at the nadir of his social power; he is a prisoner of war and a human sacrifice. Charicleia's position as crown princess puts a huge gap between their relative social status and power. If she were to take advantage of it and rescue him it would put her as a plot agent in the position of an epic hero like Odysseus rescuing Penelope from her suitors, or even Chaereas post-transformation into a military hero who rescues Callirhoe from whatever plans the king of Persia had for her, though he does so unwittingly and thus preserves some of the power balance between them. Charicleia in this scene suddenly becomes Daphnis in Longus 4.28, high status but too afraid to ask her newly recognized father to help save her beloved. Charicleia and Daphnis are in most cases characterized quite differently, which suggests that their remarkably similar behavior at this point in the plot—recognized but unwilling to use their new social power even for the sake of saving their beloveds—has a structural motivation outside of the characterization. Another interesting point of similarity is the fear of their fathers

<sup>185</sup> On the *Aethiopica*'s moral attitudes around the αἰσχρόν see Brethes 2007.

at this point; Daphnis is described as unable to help Chloe because οὔτε εἰπεῖν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ἐτόλμα, “he did not dare to speak to his father” (4.28.2), and while Charicleia is ashamed to explain her engagement to her father, she does tell her mother, as the queen explains at 10.38.2, after Theagenes is out of danger. In both cases the protagonist, socially elevated above the beloved to a position that notionally allows for enough power to save the beloved, is too afraid of the extremely powerful and high agency father from whom this new social power is derived to save the beloved.<sup>186</sup>

In both cases the beloved is also rescued from danger by a previously hostile character and then restored to high social status by the father. In *Daphnis and Chloe* Chloe is rescued by Daphnis’ erstwhile suitor Gnathon, and in the *Aethiopica* Theagenes is inadvertently rescued by Charicleia’s foster father Charicles. In attacking Theagenes for kidnapping his daughter and asking for Hydaspes’ help as a king in punishing him, he convinces Hydaspes that Theagenes is romantically attached to this mysterious daughter (10.35-36). This gives Theagenes the opportunity at 10.37 to explain that the woman in question is Charicleia, and the abduction was what allowed her to be returned to Hydaspes. At this point everyone present is aware and convinced of Theagenes’ identity as Charicleia’s fiancé, but this is only a notional change of status and not a rescue, because Hydaspes then turns to the chief sage and asks him for advice on the choice he must make concerning Theagenes’ identity (10.39.1):

τί χρὴ δρᾶν, ὃ σοφώτατε, εἰπόντος, ἀρνεῖσθαι τὴν τῶν θεῶν θυσίαν οὐκ εὐσεβες,  
σφαγιάζειν τοὺς παρ’ αὐτῶν δωρηθέντας οὐκ εὐαγες. ἐπινοητέον ἡμῖν τὸ πρακτέον.

<sup>186</sup> Konstan offers the intriguing possibility that the aberration is created due to the re-imposition of the *Odyssey*’s plot over the ideal novel plot, which by this point had developed a far stronger emphasis on the romantic reunion than the *Odyssey*, which primarily focuses on the homecoming. The *Aethiopica* re-privileges the homecoming narrative with the focus on the paternal recognition, and since this leaves power in Hydaspes’ hands, Charicleia is unsure if identifying Theagenes as her fiancé would be sufficient to save him; the lengthy denouement functions to put the agency in the matter of Theagenes’ rescue firmly in Hydaspes’ hands. (Konstan 1994, 91-94)



What are we to do, all-wise one? To refuse the gods their due sacrifice would be irreverent; to put those who are the gods' gifts to the knife would be sacrilegious. We must consider carefully what to do.

Here the king lays out the choice he feels he has to make to his advisor. He phrases it as a choice the two of them are making together, most notably using ἡμῖν, “us” in the last sentence here, but the sage's response makes it clear that while he expects his advice to be followed, it is only advice; he does not have the power to make this decision on his own. He says that the gods are trying to indicate that the tradition of human sacrifice should be ended, by having the sacrifices be the lost princess and her betrothed,<sup>187</sup> who will make everyone very happy if they are allowed to live, and ends by saying this (10.39.3):

ἀλλ' αἰσθανώμεθα τοῦ θεοῦ θαυματουργήματος καὶ συνεργοῖ γινώμεθα τοῦ ἐκείνων βουλήματος καὶ ἐχώμεθα τῶν εὐαγεστέρων ἱερείων, τὴν δι' ἀνθρώπων θυσίαν καὶ εἰς τὸν ἔξῃς αἰῶνα περιγράψαντες.

Let us not be blind to the miracles the gods have wrought; let us not thwart their purpose; let us abolish human sacrifice forevermore and hold to purer forms of offering!

The sage continues to use the first person plural form, but he also uses the hortatory subjunctive for all of his verbs, indicating that he can only encourage the king in this matter, not insist. This conforms with their earlier conversation about the human sacrifice tradition back in 10.10. There, the sage already objected to the practice, but did not have the power to stop it. That power rests with the king and, interestingly, with the wider community.

Hydaspes, apparently convinced by the sage's advice, then makes this speech to the watching crowd of Ethiopians (10.40.1-2):

«οὐκοῦν, ὦ παρόντες,» ἔλεγε, «θεῶν νεύματι τούτων οὕτω διαπεπραγμένων τὸ ἀντιβαίνειν ἀθέμιτον· ὥστε ὑπὸ μάρτυσιν αὐτοῖς τε τοῖς ταῦτα ἐπικλώσασι καὶ ὑμῖν

<sup>187</sup> Winkler 1982, 152ff., argues that this speech frames the entire religious message of the novel as the gods' method of convincing the Ethiopians to abandon the practice of human sacrifice. Charicleia's strange appearance and adventures, including her recognition, would in this interpretation be attributed to divine will.

ἀκόλουθα ἐκείνοις φρονεῖν ἐνδεικνυμένοις ξυνωρίδα ταύτην γαμηλίοις νόμοις  
ἀναδείκνυμι καὶ συνεῖναι θεσμῶ παιδογονίας ἐφίημι. Καὶ εἰ δοκεῖ, βεβαιούτω τὰ δόξαντα  
ἢ θυσία καὶ πρὸς τὰ ἱερά τρεπόμεθα.»

My people, these things have been brought to pass by the gods' will: we must not oppose them. So now, calling to witness both the gods who have spun the thread of this destiny, and you whose obedience to their decrees is amply proven, I declare that this couple has been joined by the laws of matrimony, and I give them leave to pass their lives together in accordance with god's ordinance for the bearing of children. With your permission, let us make our sacrifice to confirm this decision; let us turn our minds to the gods' service.

Here he makes two announcements of what he is enacting based on his own authority; first, he creates the marriage, with the phrase ξυνωρίδα...ἀναδείκνυμι which literally means "I proclaim this couple" or "I make this couple." The connection between Theagenes and Charicleia had previously been personal promises; now it exists in the legal system, giving Theagenes the status of husband of the princess. The second proclamation is συνεῖναι θεσμῶ παιδογονίας ἐφίημι, with ἐφίημι, "I allow," indicating the king's role as agent of this act, and the phrase συνεῖναι θεσμῶ παιδογονίας, "to be together in the law for bearing children," which has the form of a traditional phrase that could be part of a wedding ritual but also cannot be fulfilled unless Theagenes lives long enough to sire children.<sup>188</sup> With this sentence Hydaspes raises Theagenes from the status of prisoner and sacrifice to the status of prince and consort to the crown princess, the act which Theagenes and Charicleia, for all their epic hero styling, could not possibly do themselves.

Intriguingly the next sentence shows the limits of Hydaspes' power; while he can rescue Theagenes and marry him to Charicleia on his own authority, he begins the sentence proposing the sacrifice to sanctify the marriage with εἰ δοκεῖ, "if it seems good to you." This is addressed to the crowd of Ethiopians. The religious actions of sanctifying the marriage, as well as those of

<sup>188</sup> Formulaic statements of betrothal in Greece typically mentioned that the marriage was for the purposes of bearing legitimate children (Oakley and Sinos 1993, 9-10), so this would lend another tinge of familiar Greek cultural practice to the scene. Similar formulas are known from Menander plays, so among all the other references to drama in this scene there is a possibility that this, too, would recall New Comedy to the ancient reader. See Gomme and Sandbach 1973, 262 and 531.

abolishing the tradition of human sacrifice, are not solely within the authority of the king. They must be approved by the community as a whole, which has been present in the background of the whole scene. Their stamp of approval is required for the final resolution of the novel. As I shall discuss in the next chapter, this is as necessary to the closural scenes of the novel as the reunion of the lovers and their acceptance back into the family. While the community is not an agent in the plot to the same degree as the protagonists and their immediate families, the community's acceptance of the protagonists' return to their final status, and the community's enthusiastic affirmation that they deserve that status, is one of the most profound closural elements of them all.

## 2.4 Conclusion

The final closural scenes of the ideal novels always occur under the control of a high-agency, elite male character. In the *Odyssey* the man in question is Odysseus, but the high agency of the epic hero does not carry over into the ideal novels. Due to the construction of the *eros* between the lovers as equal and reciprocal, major social power differentials and especially agency levels between the hero and heroine of each novel are not tolerated.<sup>189</sup> While there is some increase in the agency of novel heroines compared to similar side characters in subordinate tales told in the novels,<sup>190</sup> there were constraints on the behavior of women and especially teenaged girls in Greek culture that prevent their level of agency from rising to the level of an epic hero's without being cast as Amazon-type characters. Instead, the heroes' agency is lowered drastically, making the standard behavior of the ideal novel hero too passive to be able to direct the closural scene and cause the happy ending to come into being.

<sup>189</sup> Konstan 1994, 218.

<sup>190</sup> Konstan 1994, 30.

In the first novel, *Callirhoe*, the author gets around this problem by rapid character development at the very end, which transforms the hero from a novel hero to an epic hero in short order and allows him to be in control of the closural scene. This approach is not attempted again, however. The *Ephesiaca* leaves the hero's agency level where it is and simply retains the companion character, a category of characters who frequently take on the role of externalized masculine agency for the passive heroes, all the way through to the end. This places a typically secondary character in a primary protagonist position, which also does not seem to have inspired imitation in later writers.

The authors of the sophistic novels hit on the solution of giving this role of guiding the closural scene to a father of one of the two lovers. The *Odyssey* takes pains to show Odysseus' father as too old and weakened to threaten him for control of their household. The transmission of power within the family from father to son has already occurred before the beginning of the poem and has proven irrevocable. This transmission is in no way necessary for the characterization of the ideal novel heroes, however. They are all quite young, too young to take over governorship of the family in most cases. Simply leaving the agency of the father intact and restricting the already minimal maturation of the hero to things like the quality of their romantic relationship,<sup>191</sup> creates a tidy solution to the problem of who will govern the closural scene, and is maintained in all three extant sophistic novels.

It is telling, however, that this is a problem that needs solving for the novels. There is no inherent need for an elite man to guide the happy ending into being. The novels are quite comfortable with serendipity and vague divine will leading to closure, and employ these broadly. And yet the role of the closural scene's governor is always filled, even when it creates notable

<sup>191</sup> Cf. Tagliabue 2017.

strain on the generic conventions or characterization of major characters. This governing role is not technically necessary to the closure of the plot—the mechanics of resolving the plot would still work—but none of the extant novels treat it as optional. It therefore appears to be fulfilling a need external to the strict plot mechanics. The convention is not only that the novel end happily, but that it end happily due to the actions of an elite man. The model of the world represented here is once again the ideology that the elite deserve to be elite, and that they use social power to set the wrong things in the world right. In the *Odyssey* and *Callirhoe* this is a simple expression of the virtue of the hero. Later in the sophistic novels the hero's father's retention of power, and use of that power to return the heroes to the status they deserve, reiterates the community-level phenomenon of the deserving elite within the family. These novels model a positive vision not only of elite male control of society and masters' control of households, but also of fathers' control of their families. In the *oikos*, as in the *polis*, power is unequal, and this is presented as a good thing and the engine that creates the happy ending of the novel. The separation of the roles of hero and head of the *oikos* in the sophistic novels makes the promotion of the power hierarchy within the *oikos* more apparent, but it is there all along, in parallel with the community-level ideological message. The ends of the novels are suffused with pro-hierarchical message, on multiple levels, treated as an inherent necessity for the plot to be resolved happily.

## Chapter 3: Community Closure

### 3.0 Introduction

The role of the broader community in the closural scenes of the novels is not as immediately salient as the roles of the lovers and their parents, but it appears to have been equally critical given its persistent presence. Many scenes in the novels occur in the confines of homes, ships' cabins, prison cells, and other private spaces, but closural scenes are always public affairs.<sup>192</sup> A crowd of community members, most often citizens of a Greek city, are present, and they offer reactions to the events of the closural scene and in later novels they even participate. Taken on an individual basis the crowds function largely as background, but the persistent presence of community members in closural scenes, even as the genre and its conventions shifted substantially, indicates that these crowds play some necessary role in the closure of the plot. Given the centrality of the protagonists' return to elite status in these scenes, it is perhaps inevitable that the ever-present crowds in them contribute to creating and confirming this return.

Previous studies on the function of crowds in the novel have illustrated their role in guiding the audience's emotional reactions. In her 1996 "How to Enjoy a Greek Novel," Maarit Kaimio identifies the community's reaction to events as one of Chariton's primary tools for this, both reflecting the feelings of the main characters and of the audience of the novel, or at least the feelings the author expects of his readership.<sup>193</sup> What the crowd feels in response to the scene is what Chariton wants his audience to feel. She also suggests that Chariton may have been

<sup>192</sup> Whitmarsh 2011, 259 says that all the novels end with "pan-civic parties" aside from *Leucippe and Clitophon*, and finds this to be festival imagery which creates continuity with classical culture and with the readers. He suggests this is derived from the festivities in comedy, in which the audiences of comedies were themselves at a festival, they were truly part of the festive ritual. The readers of the novel could be distant from each other in time and space, but the festive ritual is retained within the text. I would add that *Leucippe and Clitophon* is not entirely stripped of civic festival at the end; the climactic virginity trial ends with the victorious lovers ὑπὸ πάντων εὐφημούμενοι, "cheered by all" (8.14.6). πάντων here is the Ephesian δῆμος and εὐφημούμενοι has distinct festive overtones.

<sup>193</sup> Kaimio 1996, 59.

influenced by the tragic chorus' function of reacting to what the protagonists do and say in developing these emotional crowds.<sup>194</sup> Tilg responds positively to Kaimio's theory, since the idea of the audience needing guidance works well with his argument that *Callirhoe* was the very first Greek novel.<sup>195</sup> He prefers to think of the crowds as analogies for the audience rather than a chorus, noting that Chariton makes an explicit allusion to Aristotle's *Poetics* in the recapitulation at the beginning of Book 8,<sup>196</sup> and that Aristotle discusses tragedy in terms of its effect on the audience with little reference to chorus. This may indicate a similar level of interest in the audience on Chariton's part. Montiglio comes down on the other side, arguing that the importance of the crowds' emotional response is a strong parallel to the tragic chorus, and finding support for this view as far back as Haight in 1942.<sup>197</sup>

The difficulty of detecting whether audience or chorus is the role most similar to that of these crowds is itself instructive. The tragic chorus has several points of particular contact with the audience. In the past it has often been described as an idealized version of the audience,<sup>198</sup> a very similar function to Kaimio's concept of the novel crowds' role as an internal audience that has the author's desired emotional reaction to the scene, in order to exemplify for the external audience what reaction is desired. The chorus is certainly a kind of ideal audience.<sup>199</sup> The ideal spectator is an oversimplification of the chorus' role, however; its connection to the real spectators was not simply one of substitution. Gould draws out the interference that the

<sup>194</sup> Kaimio 1996, 67.

<sup>195</sup> Tilg 2010, 140.

<sup>196</sup> Tilg 2010, 130.

<sup>197</sup> Haight 1942, 79.

<sup>198</sup> Gould 1996, 217.

<sup>199</sup> Mastronarde 1999, 90.

marginalized identities common to the tragic chorus create for complete equivalence between the chorus and the audience.<sup>200</sup> Where routes for identification between audience and chorus do appear, they are not simply the common experience of watching the play. Weiss points to the familiarity of the ritual action of the chorus to the audience as a source of fellow-feeling and authority,<sup>201</sup> while Goldhill suggests that simply the chorus' role as embodiment of collective experience is enough to imbue it with authority.<sup>202</sup> The relationship between the external audience and a collective body of characters who function at least in part as an internal audience is an inherently complex one, and while the novels are in many ways simpler than tragedies, this inter-audience relationship is inherently complex.

An internal audience is thus not a simple thing to include, especially at such critical points as the closural scenes of the plot.<sup>203</sup> Despite functioning at a distance from the narrative and the major characters who are wholly engaged in the narrative, which can make the internal audience appear distanced from the text as a whole, the connection between internal and external audience makes the internal one a powerful element. Weiss shows how the apparent distance created between the play and the chorus in the Attic tragedies at the end of the fifth century is an artefact of modern scholarship's lack of focus on the musical aspect of the plays.<sup>204</sup> The novel

<sup>200</sup> Gould 1996.

<sup>201</sup> Weiss 2017, 236-237.

<sup>202</sup> Goldhill 1996, 253.

<sup>203</sup> The chorus-like crowds show up in places other than the closural scenes, but those appearances are beyond the scope of this study. Unlike the tragic choruses they are not always present, and indeed are absent more often than present. The chorus' constant presence on stage is born out of its ritual importance, and the tragedians had to find a way to cope with the constant presence of an internal audience, much as they had to cope with the fixed scenery. The novel is a far less constricted genre at most points; Lowe, comparing the novel to the epic and dramatic genres that it developed out of, says "the novel's challenge is to knock away the walls of its world without the roof falling in." (Lowe 2000, 224) With the requirement for the constant presence of the internal audience gone, the authors of the novels are free to only bring in their internal audience at points where it is useful.

<sup>204</sup> Weiss 2017.



does not have any missing musical or ritual dimension to create authority in the internal audience (the chorus-like crowds) or means of promoting identification with the external audience. It is perhaps unsurprising, then, that the chorus-like crowds have a persistent identity as the citizenry of a Greek or Greek-like state. This stands in contrast with the choruses, whose identities usually create a sense of ‘otherness.’<sup>205</sup> The crowds, as will be shown below, are referred to as the δῆμος of their city at meaningful points in almost all of the novels, and the cities are almost always powerful Greek *poleis*. This creates an aspirational identity in the crowds for the readership of the novels under the Roman empire, which is increasingly visible as the nostalgic Second Sophistic style pervades the genre.<sup>206</sup> The presence of these crowds has a significant potential for impact on the readership, then, and they are always present in the closural scenes of the novels. Even Achilles Tatius, who creates by far the most domestic and family-focused of the novels,<sup>207</sup> does not drop the chorus-like crowd from the climactic scene. Whatever functions the crowds serve must be important or they would not appear so consistently, given the amount of experimentation and parody that appears in the later novels, and emotional amplification alone is not a sufficient explanation. Scholarship on the tragic chorus, both because the chorus is a parallel internal audience in a classically plotted genre,<sup>208</sup> and also a point of reference for the crowds actively alluded to in the novels, is helpful in finding the greater implications of the persistent presence of an internal audience.

Gould’s emphasis on the chorus’ embodiment of a collective experience is likely applicable to the majority of internal audiences, and certainly is in the case of the chorus-like

<sup>205</sup> Gould 1996, 224.

<sup>206</sup> Bartsch 1989, 7.

<sup>207</sup> Whitmarsh 2011, 149.

<sup>208</sup> Lowe 2000, 180.

crowds of the novels. In their role of internal audience they are part of a collective with the readers, the external audience, both representing them and influencing them on this level. As the collective representatives of the community that the protagonists return to after their lengthy adventures, they represent a shared experience of home, safety, and stability with the protagonists. While the crowds do represent home to the protagonists, they are not in all cases other members of the *polis* from which the protagonists originate. They may come from another nearby friendly *polis*, from the home of only one of the two lovers, or even in the rare case of Chaereas' soldiers in *Callirhoe* 8.1 simply a friendly group with a dominant Greek contingent. The choruses represent a very broad idea of the community, in some cases as large as any group that could be notionally considered Greek. Much like the novels' foggy conceptualization of the 'elite' group from which the protagonists arise, the idea of what constitutes society as a whole is also broad and unspecific, encompassing everyone who could convey friendliness and stability for the protagonists. And as representatives of these influential collectives, the crowds support the ideological program embedded in the plot that the novels have adopted from the *Odyssey*. As the final steps of the plot are taken, the crowd as the obligatory witnessing audience reacts with delight, confirming the support of the broader collective for this ideology.

The *Odyssey* is still a fundamental model for the idea of the wider community having a role in the closural scenes, but since the novels' crowds take tragic choruses as their primary model, the *Odyssey*'s model is less relevant to their behavior. While Odysseus does have to find a way to get the Ithacan community to accept him, this is not done using an internal audience model for the community. The most prominent representatives of the Ithacan community are the suitors, who are presented as a largely anonymous crowd, but the resemblance to the novel

crowds ends there.<sup>209</sup> The suitors are characters whose actions are integral to the plot of the *Odyssey*, and the external audience is actively encouraged not to identify with them.

Additionally, Odysseus is not accepted by them on the grounds of passive elite virtues the way the lovers are, but instead forces broader community acceptance via the expression of the epic elite virtue of martial skill. The underlying ideological program inherited from the *Odyssey*'s plot structure does govern the result of the novel crowds' role, however. The outcome of this plot is the confirmation of the correctness of elite status, and the crowds ultimately support this message, through the mechanisms available to an internal audience.

### 3.1 Pre-Sophistic Novels

The role of the community in the protagonists' reacceptance into their home society differs significantly between the *Odyssey* and the novels. To some degree this can be attributed to the different characterizations required of epic and novel protagonists, as was described in the previous chapter. Odysseus as an epic hero has sufficient agency to overcome significant community resistance to his return, and one of his primary virtues is that of martial skill. Because of these factors defeating the suitors in combat and having a promising start in the battle against their families is within both his capabilities and the norms of epic characterization. The necessarily passive heroes of the novel are not required to display military virtues, and when they have them (as in the case of Chaereas, Theagenes, and Charicleia) they deploy them far less often.

Instead, the primary virtue of the novel protagonists is beauty. Their beauty wins the sympathy of the crowds and convinces the crowds to voluntarily accept them back into their

<sup>209</sup> Thalmann 1998, 133. The suitors' relatives in Book 24 are also representatives of the community, but as the plot is largely resolved by Book 24 they are not as strong a parallel for the chorus-like crowds for whom the role of witness to the closure of the plot is important.

original status. Beauty is also treated as a fixed, heritable trait. Skillful (and expensive) adornment can enhance the beauty of a novel protagonist, but cannot create beauty by itself.<sup>210</sup> Their beauty is not unlike the foundling's birthmark that proves Charicleia's identity as princess of Ethiopia; it is an inborn and unchangeable marker of their families' elite status, and cannot be acquired by anyone who was not born into that status or lost by anyone who has it. The beauty of the protagonists is one of the most consistent rules of the genre, on the level of the central importance of the romance between the lovers. Just as consistently, their beauty motivates the crowd in the closural scenes to either accept the protagonists back into their original status or even to take active steps to return them to that status.

### 3.1.1 Chariton

*Callirhoe* features two distinct closural scenes, one romantic and one at the homecoming, and both of them are witnessed by delighted crowds. In the romantic closural scene at 8.1 it is the members of Chaereas' navy, and in the homecoming scene at 8.6-8 it is the citizens of Syracuse. These crowds take a less active role in the narrative than is typical for novel crowds, potentially indicating a more chorus-like behavior pattern here at the beginning of the genre, before the genre-specific conventions have fully developed. The absence of a narrative function for the crowds makes their functions in terms of connecting to the external audience and managing its reaction all the more critical.

The soldiers in 8.1 are quite aberrant for a novel crowd. First and most notably, they are Egyptian rather than Greek. While the crowd in the *Aethiopica* is Ethiopian rather than Greek, the Ethiopians in that novel are paralleled to Greeks on many levels. Egyptians, in contrast, are

<sup>210</sup> As seen in Longus 4.32 and Heliodorus 10.9.3, where the heroines put on expensive and high-status clothing that makes them more beautiful, but have already been noted as exceptional even in their previous rags.

one of the primary groups established as Other in opposition to the Greek Self in the ideal novels, along with the Persians, and *Callirhoe* is no exception. When Chaereas is given permission by the Egyptian king to form a strike force to attack Tyre, he scours the Egyptian army for Greek mercenaries. (7.3.6-7) He explicitly tells them that the king told him to choose the best men in the army, and that is why he selected the Greek mercenaries, telling them that they must surpass the rest of the army in ἀρετή as well as εὐγένεια. The strike force succeeds, making Chaereas a war hero. Chariton is entirely clear about the superiority of Greeks in his novel, and yet he makes the soldiers of the Egyptian navy, only 300 of whom are even of Greek origin, his first internal audience.<sup>211</sup>

This is more like the marginalized identity of the tragic chorus than the fixed δῆμος of a Greek polis that becomes the norm for the novel crowds. Chaereas' soldiers have a far more similar identity to the soldier choruses in Sophocles' *Ajax* and *Philoctetes*,<sup>212</sup> who as not only martial groups of adult men but also as crews of the heroes' ships are quite parallel to Chaereas' navy. Gould noted that these two choruses were rare instances of choruses consisting of adult men in the relatively high-agency position of soldier, who nevertheless are in an ultimately marginalized position due to their heavy reliance on the hero. Chaereas' navy is in a very similar position due to the Egyptian army's catastrophic loss in battle to the Persians at 7.5, due to the heroics of Callirhoe's second husband, the Ionian Greek Dionysius. The Egyptian king kills himself after this loss, resulting in the failure of the Egyptian rebellion against Persia, and so

<sup>211</sup> At 7.3.7 he finds three hundred Greeks to be his core strike force, and at 8.3.12 the narrator says the navy is composed of Greeks, Egyptians, and Phoenecians, so this is uniquely a crowd of mixed ethnicity. Kuch 1996, 216-218, describes the persistent pro-Greek and anti-"barbarian" prejudice of the novel, which he describes as a standard feature of the genre.

<sup>212</sup> Cf. Gould 1996, 220 on the identity of these choruses as the exception that proves the rule of choral lack of agency. They are the only tragic choruses composed of men in the prime of life, and their agency is compromised by the extent to which they depend on their commanders. Chaereas' navy is in a nearly identical situation.

despite Chaereas' success at sea, the men in his navy rely directly on him to find somewhere for them to go. He brings only the Greeks and those Egyptians and Phoenicians he finds εὐζωνος (8.3.12), here applied to men in the classical sense of "well-equipped" rather than the Homeric epithet for women, suggesting that only the best of the Egyptians and Phoenicians are as good as every Greek soldier is. The remaining Egyptians he sends home, with the expectation that they will be able to return to their homes and families, though they all wish to come with him (8.3.11). So while they are not as fully helpless as the tragic choruses, they still rely heavily on their leader. The mixture of Greeks, Phoenicians, and Egyptians in the armed forces also indicates that the collective identity of this group is based on membership in this military group, rather than a political one, as with other closural scene crowds.

This early, especially chorus-like version of the novel crowd also plays the choral role of ritual celebration, in this case a wedding.<sup>213</sup> While the weddings in the pre-sophistic novels notoriously take place at the beginnings instead of the ends, Chariton explicitly calls the romantic reunion scene a metaphorical wedding in the section dealing with the crowd's reaction, 8.1.11-12:

Φήμη δὲ διέτρεχεν ὅτι ὁ ναύαρχος εὗρηκε τὴν γυναῖκα. οὐ στρατιώτης ἔμεινεν ἐν σκηνῇ, οὐ ναύτης ἐν τριήρει, οὐ θυρωρὸς ἐν οἰκίᾳ· πανταχόθεν συνέτρεχον λαλοῦντες “ὦ γυναικὸς μακαρίας, εἴληφε τὸν εὐμορφότατον ἄνδρα.” Καλλιρῶς δὲ φανείσης οὐδεὶς ἔτι Χαιρέαν ἐπήνεσεν, ἀλλ’ εἰς ἐκείνην πάντες ἀφεώρων, ὡς μόνην οὖσαν. ἐβάδιζε δὲ σοβαρά, Χαιρέου καὶ Πολυχάρμου μέσην αὐτὴν δορυφοροῦντων. ἄνθη καὶ στεφάνους <ἐπ>έβαλλον αὐτοῖς, καὶ οἶνος καὶ μύρα πρὸ τῶν ποδῶν ἔχεῖτο, καὶ πολέμου καὶ εἰρήνης ἦν ὁμοῦ τὰ ἥδιστα, ἐπινίκια καὶ γάμοι.

The rumor spread that the admiral had found his wife. Not a soldier stayed in his tent, not a sailor on his ship, not a lodgekeeper at his door. People poured together from all sides, saying to each other, “What a lucky woman, to win such a handsome husband!” But when Callirhoe appeared, no one praised Chaereas any more; they all turned their gaze on her, as if she alone existed. She moved with dignity, escorted on either side by Chaereas and Polycharmus. They had flowers and wreaths showered on them; wine and myrrh

<sup>213</sup> Oakley and Sinos 1993 24-25, Budelmann and Power 2015, 261-263.

were poured out at their feet as they walked, the sweetest fruits of war and peace were joined in celebration of victory and marriage.

This immediately follows the lovers' reunion scene, which occurs privately in Callirhoe's cell, witnessed only by Chaereas' companion Polycharmus and the Egyptian soldier who had been guarding the captive Persian noblewomen. The passage above follows the recognition scene. The public reaction immediately following the protagonists' return to elite status is a pattern that will recur frequently in the other novels. Logic suggests that the Egyptian guard ran out to inform the others but in the actual phrasing φήμη, rumor, seems almost to spread itself and the crowd forms with striking rapidity outside Callirhoe's cell door.<sup>214</sup>

The initial reaction of this crowd is confirmation of both Chaereas' and Callirhoe's exceptional beauty. This is one of the most consistent behaviors of these crowds in all of the novels. The protagonists' beauty is connected to the crowds' reactions as well; here the only explicit connection is the crowd's belief that Callirhoe is lucky to marry Chaereas, and their fixed attention on her after they see her. The actions of forming into a crowd and of using flowers, wine, and myrrh to turn their exit from the cell into a procession, are not given explicit motivations, but appear to be motivated by a combination of reaction to their beauty (since this immediately precedes the procession) and devotion to Chaereas as the victorious admiral (since he is referred to as ναύαρχος in the sentence where the crowd forms).<sup>215</sup> Chariton compares the procession to that of a victory celebration and a wedding (ἐπινίκια καὶ γάμοι), with the mention of war making the ἐπινίκια explicitly a celebration of Chaereas' martial victory. Following my

<sup>214</sup> Tilg 2010, 240-270, argues that rumor in *Callirhoe* functions as an intrusion of the author's voice.

<sup>215</sup> Oakley and Sinos 1993, 27 note that the crowd's role of throwing flowers in this scene seems to be the ritual function of crowds at weddings and victory parades called the φυλλοβολία. The strong ritual roots of the tragic chorus (cf. Winkler 1990), and therefore of this chorus-like crowd, gives context to the crowd's spontaneous demonstration of ritual behavior in what is not in fact any kind of ceremony.

discussion in Chapter 2 of Chaereas' characterization as an epic hero at the end of the novel, that theory is bolstered by the comparison to an ἐπινίκια here. The crowd responds positively to the virtues of the protagonists that the text celebrates, and martial skill is a very epic virtue.

The comparison to a marriage is intriguing, given that a major difference between the pre-sophistic and sophistic novels is the movement of the wedding from the beginning of the novel to the end. But even in this earliest extant ideal novel there is a ceremony explicitly compared to a wedding in the scene in which Callirhoe is returned to her original status, as Chaereas' wife and a woman of an elite military Syracusan family. The wedding's function of situating the bride and groom as well as their relationship in society is a valuable closural gesture, and with the *Odyssey* as such a major source there was always the example of Odysseus and Penelope's reunion after he wins the competition for her hand in marriage, which itself has distinct wedding undertones.<sup>216</sup> The pseudo-wedding in *Callirhoe* provides circularity with the couple's real wedding at the beginning of the novel, which was demanded by the Syracusan crowd after they found out that Chaereas was wasting away from love sickness for Callirhoe.

This is the passage: (1.1.10)

ἐπόθει δὲ τὸ γυμνάσιον Χαιρέαν καὶ ὡσπερ ἔρημον ἦν. ἐφίλει γὰρ αὐτὸν ἡ νεολαία. πολυπραγμονοῦντες δὲ τὴν αἰτίαν ἔμαθον τῆς νόσου, καὶ ἔλεος πάντας εἰσήει μειρακίου καλοῦ κινδυνεύοντος ἀπολέσθαι διὰ πάθος ψυχῆς εὐφυοῦς.

The gymnasium missed Chaereas; it was almost deserted, he was the idol of the young folk. They asked after him, and when they found out what had made him ill, they all felt pity for a handsome youth who looked as if he would die because his noble heart was broken.

This follows with the entire *ecclesia* demanding that Hermocrates marry Chaereas to his daughter, so the feelings of the youth of the gymnasium seem to be widely shared. The reasoning given for the crowd's support of their marriage here is their sympathy for Chaereas as a

<sup>216</sup> This scene is explicitly referenced with the quotation of *Odyssey* 23.296 in 8.1.17.



μειράκιον καλόν, beautiful youth, suffering from the passions of a εὐφυής spirit, an interesting word that most frequently refers to something having a good shape—another implication of beauty, though in this case not physical.

The pair's desire to marry each other was also predicated on their beauty. The text is unfortunately somewhat fragmentary here, but does not appear to be missing substantial amounts, and reads ταχέως οὖν πάθος ἐρωτικὸν ἀντέδωκαν ἀλλήλοις <.....> τοῦ κάλλους <...> γενεῖ συνελθόντος, “At once they were both smitten with love... beauty had met nobility...” (1.1.6) What remains of the passage agrees with the later, intact passage at 1.1.10, that the marriage is predicated on their elite birth and their beauty. So when the marriage is reenacted at the end of the novel with Chaereas' navy as the supportive crowd, the virtues being referenced are their beauty and elite birth once again. These are the qualities that make them desire to marry, and the qualities that make those around them delighted with their marriage.

At the final scene in which they return to Syracuse, the people of Syracuse constitute a much more typical chorus-like crowd. Tilg 2010, 130-140, finds Kaimio's suggestion that the Syracusan δῆμος is a chorus-like crowd to be plausible, but finds her idea that they function strictly in the role of emotional amplification to be oversimplified. He prefers to view the crowd as an internal audience in the vein of the audience Aristotle analyzes in the *Poetics*.<sup>217</sup> Chariton describes the resolution of the novel as cathartic at 8.1.4 which Tilg argues is a reference to the *Poetics*, and therefore feels comfortable applying Aristotle's ideas to the closure of this novel. Aristotle famously has little to say about the chorus in the *Poetics* and instead discusses the impact of tragedy on the external audience in depth. The final scene of the crowd listening to Chaereas tell the story of the novel certainly casts them in the role of audience rather than

<sup>217</sup> As in *Poetics* 1454b.

participants. However, as discussed above the chorus in tragedy has aspects of being an internal audience, which bridges the gap between Kaimio's and Tilg's interpretation of the Syracusan crowd. It also offers potential answers to Tilg's point that the crowd's emotional amplification role makes poor sense as an interpretative aid to the readership (Tilg 2010, 140), as emotional clarity is not a problem in need of solving in this scene. This in many ways corresponds to Gould's objections to Schlegel's idea of the chorus as the ideal spectator.<sup>218</sup> The presence of the community as witness of the plot is more than a simple reduplication of the audience; it offers a collective context to protagonists and audience alike.

At 8.6 Chaereas sails into the harbor at Syracuse with the fleet of ships he allowed to join him out of the Egyptian navy and has one of his sailors tell the Syracusans that they are Egyptian merchants (8.6.5). His ship alone sails into the harbor with him and Callirhoe on the deck of their ship obscured by tapestries, and a crowd of curious Syracusans collects, including Callirhoe's father Hermocrates. I analyzed his role in this scene in Chapter 2; let us now examine the crowd around him. First, the moment that the tapestries are dropped: (8.6.7-8)

*πάντων δὲ ἀπορούντων καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐκτετακότων αἰφνίδιον εἰλκύσθη τὰ παραπετάσματα, καὶ ὤφθη Καλλιρῶη μὲν ἐπὶ χρυσηλάτου κλίνης ἀνακειμένη, Τυρίαν ἀμπεχομένη πορφύραν, Χαιρέας δὲ αὐτῇ παρακαθήμενος, σχῆμα ἔχων στρατηγοῦ. οὔτε βροντὴ ποτε οὕτως ἐξέπληξε τὰς ἀκοὰς οὔτε ἀστραπὴ τὰς ὄψεις τῶν ἰδόντων, οὔτε θησαυρὸν εὐρών τις χρυσίου τοσοῦτον ἐξεβόησεν, ὡς τότε τὸ πλῆθος, ἀπροσδοκῆτως ἰδὸν θέαμα λόγου κρεῖττον.*

No one knew what to make of it, and they were all straining their eyes, when suddenly the tapestries were drawn back. Callirhoe could be seen reclining on a couch of beaten gold, dressed in Tyrian purple; Chaereas, dressed like a general, sat beside her. Thunder never so stunned the ears nor lightning the eyes of those who beheld them, nor did anyone who had found a treasure of gold ever cry out as did that crowd then, when beyond all expectation they saw an indescribable sight.

<sup>218</sup> Gould 1996, 235 n.2 for a brief explanation of the impact of the idea originating in Schlegel.

Immediately after this Hermocrates rushes forward to embrace his daughter, the first person to act. The first reaction given, however, is that of the crowd. They had thought Chaereas dead and Callirhoe irretrievably lost to the Persians, since Chaereas had been the one slated to save her,<sup>219</sup> so some of their reaction is due to the surprise of their presence, as is expressed by the adverb *ἀπροσδοκῆτως*, “beyond all expectation” in the final sentence. The descriptions of Chaereas and Callirhoe also detail the elements to which Chariton is attributing his internal audience’s stunned reaction, and therefore the desired reaction from the external audience. Chaereas is described as *σχῆμα ἔχων στρατηγοῦ*, “dressed like a general,” indicating that his rapid development from hapless youth to military hero is his primary feature here, predicated on his martial skill. Callirhoe is described as *ἐπὶ χρυσηλάτου κλίνης ἀνακειμένη, Τυρίαν ἀμπεχομένη πορφύραν*, “reclining on a couch of beaten gold, dressed in Tyrian purple,” which also references Chaereas’ military accomplishments since it is booty won from the Persians. Her description is far more visual, however; he is merely said to be in the form of a general, with whatever visual markers the reader imagines would be necessary for the crowd to understand his status by looking at him. Callirhoe is on a beaten-gold couch, and wearing purple clothing; given the constant reference to her divine beauty throughout the novel, her presence as subject of the sentence also carries a suggestion of astonishing visual beauty.

By this point at the end of the novel Callirhoe has developed a number of other skills and virtues through her adventures, but her most salient one is always her beauty, the marker of her exceptional nature.<sup>220</sup> Callirhoe and Chaereas’ primary virtues are drawn out by this tableau, her beauty and his military skill as a general. From 3.4-5 when the Syracusan people sent Chaereas

<sup>219</sup> At 3.4.17.

<sup>220</sup> De Temmerman 2014, 47-48 describes Callirhoe’s exceptional nature in terms of both *eugeneia* and beauty, even as compares to Chaereas.

to rescue Callirhoe there was no question of whether their return would be accepted by this crowd, so here the emphasis on their elite virtues is less an immediate cause of their acceptance than a reminder of why their acceptance is a foregone conclusion. Whitmarsh's model of the novels turning from an emphasis on civic identity to one on domestic and individual identity focuses on the lovers' sense of their own identity. (Whitmarsh 2011, 100 ff.) Callirhoe's desire to return to her original status and identity is made clear in 2.5.10-12, but the Syracusans' desire to have her back is just as clear in the next book in 3.4-5. In later books, even as the protagonists' priorities shift away from the desire to regain their original status, it will become clear that the home communities' prioritization of reintegrating the protagonists does not.

Chariton is quite clear that this crowd is the citizens of Syracuse, both male and female. Once the rest of the navy comes in and the lovers disembark and greet their family and friends personally, the scene shifts to Chaereas' final recapitulation of the story.<sup>221</sup> Chariton makes the crowd the mechanism of the scene change: (8.7.1-3)

Ἀθρόον δὲ τὸ πλῆθος ἀνεβόησεν “ἀπίωμεν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.” ἐπεθύμουν γὰρ αὐτοὺς καὶ βλέπειν καὶ ἀκούειν· λόγου δὲ θᾶπτον ἐπληρώθη τὸ θέατρον ἀνδρῶν τε καὶ γυναικῶν. εἰσελθόντος δὲ μόνου Χαιρέου πᾶσαι καὶ πάντες ἐπεβόησαν “Καλλιρόην παρακάλει.” Ἑρμοκράτης δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἐδημαγώγησεν, εἰσαγαγὼν τὴν θυγατέρα. πρῶτον οὖν ὁ δῆμος εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβλέψας εὐφῆμει τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ χάριν ἠπίστατο μᾶλλον ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης ἢ τῆς τῶν ἐπινικίων· εἶτα ποτὲ μὲν ἐσχίζοντο, καὶ οἱ μὲν ἄνδρες ἐπῆνουν Χαιρέαν, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες Καλλιρόην, ποτὲ δ' αὖ πάλιν ἀμφοτέρους κοινῇ· καὶ τοῦτο ἐκείνοις ἥδιον ἦν. Καλλιρόην μὲν οὖν ὥς ἂν ἐκ πλοῦ καὶ ἀγωνίας εὐθὺς ἀσπασαμένην

<sup>221</sup> Chariton recapitulates the story in the narration at 5.1 and 8.1, and then again in Chaereas' speech at 8.7-8. Whitmarsh (2011, 59-60) finds the 8.1 recapitulation to have exceptionally strong closural force because it not only describes what has gone before, but also what will happen at the end. Fusillo (1997, 215-216) notes how the 8.7-8 summary increases the sense of the novel's completeness and unity. The vagaries of the plot are ironed over by the unified whole presented in Chaereas' speech. The narrator's recapitulations at 5.1 and 8.1 only appear here, in the earliest of the novels, perhaps due to the damage they do to authorial transparency, which is valued in this plot style (Lowe 2000, 73-78). The other novels all use the style at 8.7 of putting the recapitulation in the mouth of a character during a reunion scene, with greater or lesser detail (Xenophon 5.14, Achilles Tatius 8.5 and 8.16 because Leucippe and Clitophon tell their stories separately, Longus focusing on the recognition plot at 4.19 and 4.29, Heliodorus throughout Book 10 in pieces as various reunions occur). These all allude to the passage in the *Odyssey* at 23.300-343 when Odysseus and Penelope tell each other of their adventures while separated. Notably the two shortest novels, Xenophon and Longus, have much less detailed recapitulations than the *Odyssey* and the long novels, which perhaps increase the detail due to a stronger need to remind the audience what has occurred and enhance the sense of the narrative's unity and completeness.

τὴν πατρίδα ἀπήγαγον ἐκ τοῦ θεάτρου, Χαιρέαν δὲ κατεῖχε τὸ πλῆθος, ἀκοῦσαι βουλόμενον πάντα τὰ τῆς ἀποδημίας διηγήματα.

With one voice the throng cried out, “Let us go to the assembly!” for they were eager both to see and to hear them. More quickly than words can tell the theater was filled with men and women. When Chaereas came in by himself, they all cried out, men as well as women, “Call Callirhoe in!” In this too Hermocrates did what the people wanted: he brought his daughter in too. First the people lifted their eyes to heaven and praised the gods, more thankful for that day than for the day of their victory. After that, for a time they divided, the men uttering praise of Chaereas, and the women of Callirhoe; but then they turned to praising them both together—and that pleased the couple better. As soon as she had expressed her greetings to her country, Callirhoe was taken home from the theater after her journey and the distress she had suffered. But the crowd kept Chaereas there; they wanted to hear the whole story of his journey.

Here Chariton makes the crowd’s delight at reaccepting Chaereas and Callirhoe clear at some length. He also makes the crowd’s status clear; in the sentence where they thank the gods for the return of the protagonists, he calls them ὁ δῆμος. These are the citizens of Syracuse, and their political power is confirmed at the very end of the novel, where Chaereas asks that the Greeks in his army be given citizenship, and the response is *πάλιν ὁ δῆμος ἐπεβόησεν ‘ἄξιοι μεθ’ ἡμῶν πολιτεύεσθαι· χειροτονείσθω ταῦτα.’* ψήφισμα ἐγράφη καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκεῖνοι καθίσαντες μέρος ἦσαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, “Again the assembly cried, ‘They are worthy to be citizens of Syracuse—let us have that voted!’” A decree was passed, and they took their places at once as members of the assembly.” (8.8.13-14) So this is a crowd with the right to vote in new citizens, and it is once again referred to as ὁ δῆμος when the decree is enacted. Anachronistically, Chariton specifies that it is a crowd of both men and women, something he does repeatedly with crowds throughout the novel (e.g. 3.4.4, 6.1.4-5).<sup>222</sup>

<sup>222</sup> Chariton is frequently at pains to record the presence of women in crowds and their reactions, see 3.3.4, 3.5.3, 5.4.1-2, 6.1.2-5, and the scene discussed here at the end of Book 8. Egger (1994, 36) hypothesizes that the persistent, marked presence of women in the crowd scenes of *Callirhoe* is an indicator that the novel was intended to be read by women as well as men. She notes that both here and in the assembly in 3.4.4, which is also specified as including women, parts of the novel itself are retold, making the Syracusan *demos* a literal audience for the story of the novel. The women also repeatedly identify with Callirhoe as they do in the passage quoted above, indicating an expectation on Chariton’s part that female readers will identify with female characters. Konstan 1994, 77-78 and Kaimio 1996,

So unlike the previous crowd at the romantic reunion scene, which had the uncommon identity of strictly male soldiers, this crowd is explicitly made up of the male and female citizens of Syracuse. The identity of the intended audience of the novels remains obscure, but we may guess they were literate, and literate in Greek specifically, with an interest in reading stories about Greek superiority set in a time before the rise of the Roman empire. The citizens of Syracuse soon after its defeat of Athens<sup>223</sup> are an image of Greek glory and self-determination before the Roman conquest, so there is a strong potential for appeal to an audience looking for stories of the pre-Roman past. The novel thus ends with this internal audience of mixed gender and desirable status listening raptly to Chaereas' recapitulation of the novel's story, utterly thrilled to have the beautiful Callirhoe and the successful general Chaereas re-ensconced at the top of the Syracusan social order. This, then is the reaction of the internal audience that Chariton presents as a pseudo-social context for his external audience: happiness that the elite have their high social status, a sense that it is inevitable that they have it, and delight in the story of the novel.

### 3.1.2 Xenophon

In Xenophon's *Ephesiaca*, the protagonists' return to Ephesus itself is presented entirely in summary rather than full scene.<sup>224</sup> This leaves the bulk of the closural work in the romantic reunion scene in Rhodes. The Rhodian scene contains the requisite crowd, whose actions are part

<sup>63</sup> agree that the women in the crowd scenes may be an indication that Chariton expected both men and women to read his novel and for them to react differently from each other. See also Kaimio 1995, 122ff.

<sup>223</sup> Which is mentioned at 1.1.1, 1.11.2-3, 2.6.3, 3.4.16, 3.4.18, 3.5.3, 3.10.8, 6.7.10, 7.2.3-4, 7.5.8, 8.2.12, 8.6.2, 8.6.10, 8.6.12, and 8.7.2. Chariton frequently plays on Thucydides, and his constant reminders of the glorious Syracusan victory over the Athenians in the Sicilian expedition are a prominent aspect of this allusion. (Tilg 2010, 158-159)

<sup>224</sup> See Lowe 2000, 40 and Bal 1985, 72-75 for more discussion of scene vs summary and their use to control a story's rate of flow.

of the causal continuity that leads the reunion of the lovers. The homecoming scene includes the emotional reaction of the Ephesians to their return but no mention of any community action, leading some scholars to argue that the lovers are distanced from external society in the closural scenes of the novel. However, the centrality of emotional reaction to crowd function in the closural scenes of the novels as a genre suggests that the mention of the Ephesians' reaction itself in such a short summary is significant and a sign of connection between the lovers and their home community. This is not to say that the prominence of the full scene with the Rhodian crowd over the summary presence of the Ephesian crowd is not significant. Xenophon treats them as interchangeable, a phenomenon that will be repeated by Achilles Tatius. This shows that the genre does not place much emphasis on the chorus-like crowd in the closural scenes being from the home city of the protagonists; the crowd's primary function lies elsewhere. There is evidence to suggest that their class as citizens is more important than the *polis* of which they are citizens.

Both Tagliabue and Montiglio find the brevity of the Ephesian community's role at the end of the novel to be an indication of a lack of connection between the lovers and Ephesus. The only reference to the Ephesian people in the summary of the protagonists' return is the phrase προεπέπυστο δὲ τὴν σωτηρίαν αὐτῶν ἢ πόλις ἅπασα, "The news had already reached the whole city that they were safe," (5.15.2) with no further mention of any action on their part. Montiglio calls the Ephesian crowd's role "unmarked and muted," comparing it to the scene of acclamation in *Callirhoe* and the full scene of the Rhodians responding to the romantic reunion in 5.13, and notes that the plot is functionally resolved in the scene at Rhodes.<sup>225</sup> She argues that this shows that Xenophon emphasizes the restoration of the marriage over the protagonists' reintegration

<sup>225</sup> Montiglio 2012, 54.

into the community. Tagliabue also focuses on the lack of action by the Ephesian crowd, noting the pattern that in previous scenes the Ephesian and Rhodian crowds always performed a communal prayer or sacrifice,<sup>226</sup> which is conspicuously lacking here; the emotional reaction is given, but not followed by any communal religious activity. Instead, the final lines of the novel discuss the lovers' religious activity and the happily-ever-after endings of themselves and their companions. He argues that this shows the protagonists forming an "exclusive society of love" together, disassociated from the Ephesian community.<sup>227</sup> The brevity of the final mention of the Ephesian people, and the lack of any ritual component, is indisputably aberrant, but it is not as critical to the scene as Montiglio and Tagliabue suggest. It is important to note that the final scene is not a scene, but rather a summary, which means that some assumed actions are left out of the description. The emotional reaction role of the crowd is more consistently present in the parallel scenes in other novels than the ritual action, so while a pattern internal to the novel is broken, a larger pattern across the genre is preserved. In addition, although Montiglio says "the circle is drawn uncompleted"<sup>228</sup> in reference to the plot beginning in Ephesus and ending in Rhodes, there is substantial circularity between the romantic reunion scene in Rhodes and the beginning of the adventure in Ephesus.<sup>229</sup>

<sup>226</sup> At 1.2.7-1.3.1, 1.7.2, 1.10.5, and 5.13.1.

<sup>227</sup> Tagliabue 2017, 153-154.

<sup>228</sup> Montiglio 2012, 54

<sup>229</sup> Whitmarsh finds the primary circularity to be between the two Rhodian episodes instead (Whitmarsh 2011, 49). The circularity between these scenes is indisputable, but the first Rhodian episode at 1.12.1-2 is in summary, much like the final Ephesian episode in 5.15, which weakens its ability to build plot tension. In terms of plot significance the scene of leaving Ephesus at 1.10 is the primary parallel for the reunion in Rhodes at 5.13. Whitmarsh also interprets 5.15 as more climactic than most other readers, taking the subject of the verbs of making sacrifice to be ἡ πόλις ἅπασα rather than the lovers as Tagliabue and Montiglio do, which leads to greater circularity between the final Ephesian scene and the departure scene. This leads him to interpret 5.15 as more important and 5.13 as less so, and therefore to see the two Rhodian episodes as more balanced. While his reading is not impossible, taking the lovers to be the ones making sacrifice is a significantly easier reading and I would agree with Tagliabue that the



What appears to be a lack of connection to the community in Ephesus is, in fact, Xenophon treating the communities of Greek cities as functionally the same. Once the lovers have been reintegrated back into a Greek city in Rhodes there is no need to repeat the scene in Ephesus. This is an indication that what is important about these scenes is the restoration of the elite status of the protagonists, rather than their specific connection to their home *polis*.

Xenophon treats the two Greek cities, Ephesus and Rhodes, as interchangeable for the purposes of the plot. There are several pieces of evidence for this. First of all, the word δῆμος appears only twice in the *Ephesiaca*, once in reference to the Ephesians at 1.10.5 and once in reference to the Rhodians, in the closural scene at 5.13.3. δημοσίᾳ, “public,” is also used twice, at 1.12.2 and 5.11.2, both times in descriptions of Rhodian religious practice. The first refers to the prayers the Rhodians offer in celebration of Habrocomes’ and Anthia’s first visit right after they leave Ephesus, and the second is the festival of Helios which prevents Anthia from sailing back to Ephesus before she and Habrocomes can be reunited at Rhodes. The connection here is not strong, but Xenophon does seem to be framing Rhodes as a friendly Greek polity in these scenes where the lovers’ adventure begins and ends. The first use of δῆμος is during the scene in which the lovers set sail on their adventure as ordered by the oracle:

Θυσίαι δὲ πρὸ τῆς ἀγωγῆς τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι καὶ εὐχαὶ τοῦ δήμου παντὸς καὶ δάκρυα πάντων, ὡς μελλόντων ἀπαλλάττεσθαι παίδων κοινῶν.

There were sacrifices to Artemis before they set sail; the whole population prayed and wept at the impending loss as if they regarded the children as their own.

Here Habrocomes and Anthia are set strongly within the Ephesian community given that τοῦ δήμου παντός, “the whole population” feels as though they are family. The next, and only other use of δῆμος occurs in the reunion scene, describing the Rhodian crowd when they rejoice at the

final Ephesian scene is missing the community ritual element, in one of the many ways that its closural force is diminished in favor of the Rhodian scene at 5.13.

reunion of Habrocomes and Anthia: ὁ δὲ δῆμος ὁ Ῥοδίων ἀνευφήμησέ τε καὶ ἀνωλόλυξε, μεγάλην θεὸν ἀνακαλοῦντες τὴν Ἴσιν, «πάλιν» λέγοντες «ὀρῶμεν Ἀβροκόμην καὶ Ἀνθίαν τοὺς καλοῦς.», “The Rhodians cheered and shouted in their excitement, hailing Isis as a great goddess and exclaiming, “Now once again we see Habrocomes and Anthia, the beautiful pair!” (5.13.3) As in the final scene of *Callirhoe*, the crowd is the δῆμος of a Greek city whose function is to accept the lovers back into its community in the closural scenes.

In addition to these cues within the two scenes that they are in parallel, the structure around them is also identical. After they leave Ephesus at 1.10, the public scene is followed by a private one between Habrocomes and Anthia in which the lovers swear oaths of loyalty to each other (1.11.3-6).<sup>230</sup> These oaths are of course tested throughout the novel, as the two constantly encounter other people who are smitten by their beauty and attempt to pressure or outright force the protagonists into sex or marriage with them. The other suitors are a generic requirement, but the strict physical loyalty that Anthia and Habrocomes commit themselves to in 1.11 is not; the genre only requires that the protagonists stay emotionally constant towards each other.<sup>231</sup> The protagonists’ success at escaping all other lovers is therefore somewhat notable rather than strictly rote, and the scene in which they triumphantly assure each other of their success is salient. It is, of course, at 5.14, immediately after the closural scene in Rhodes. Thus the parallels between the two crowd scenes extend to their placement in relation to the following scenes of private connection between the protagonists as well.

Habrocomes and Anthia are not alone in being reaccepted by a crowd from a *polis* they did not originate in. The same thing occurs in *Leucippe and Clitophon*, and Theagenes in the

<sup>230</sup> See Tagliabue 2017, 36-37 on the circularity of the oaths with the reunion scene.

<sup>231</sup> Konstan 1994, 48-55. *Callirhoe*, *Clitophon*, and *Daphnis* all have sex with a rival suitor to their beloved at some point, and all are presented as remaining faithful because their affections do not waver.

*Aethiopica* is accepted in the Ethiopian city of Meroe, which he has never been in before but which, as was discussed previously, is treated as a pseudo-Greek community in terms of status. As Tagliabue noted, the reunion scene in Rhodes does have the ritual component which is missing from the Ephesian crowd's response;<sup>232</sup> the crowd praises Isis for the reunion, and immediately after this the lovers hurry to her temple to thank her. Additionally, the reunion scene is causally linked to the festival of Helios mentioned above which prevents Anthia from sailing for Ephesus before she finds Habrocomes again. The presence of Helios parallels the Ephesians' prayers to Artemis in the scene where they leave Ephesus. It is interesting to note here that both Anthia and Habrocomes are at this point in the text planning to return to Ephesus; there is nothing stopping Xenophon from simply locating the reunion scene in Ephesus rather than Rhodes. He treats Anthia nearly sailing for Ephesus before the reunion the way Chariton treats Chaereas' plan to return to Syracuse without the Persian women he has captured, unaware that Callirhoe is among them. This is not logically coherent, as Anthia and Habrocomes would have ultimately met in Ephesus. This may be a generic rule that has been awkwardly applied, as none of the five extant novels have the lovers reunite in their home cities; the romantic reunion and homecoming always occur separately. Xenophon's decision to resolve all plot tension in a single scene may have therefore driven his treatment of Rhodes and Ephesus as doubles, if he needed to follow a generic rule that reunion happened abroad and needed a way to allow the "abroad" location to fulfill the functions of the home community re-accepting the protagonists.

Previous to the reunion scene in Rhodes, Xenophon treats the Greek and non-Greek worlds as fundamentally different. Greek places and people are by and large safe for the lovers, and non-Greek are dangerous. All of Anthia's rival suitors are non-Greek, which Anthia herself

<sup>232</sup> Tagliabue 2017, 153.

remarks upon at 5.14.2 when she is assuring Habrocomes that she has remained faithful to him.<sup>233</sup> In the same vein, the perilous adventures the couple goes through are also largely in non-Greek lands. When they leave Ephesus, the first place they travel to is Rhodes at 1.12.1, where they are greeted by the adoring Rhodian crowd and make a costly dedication to Helios (1.12.2). Here they are still together, still happy, and still unquestionably part of the elite. After they leave Rhodes they are attacked by Phoenician pirates (1.13), who enslave them and take them to Tyre (2.2.3). After this point their closest brushes with Greek territory are Alexandria and Syracuse. Despite Alexandria's Greek origins Egypt is heavily coded as foreign in the ideal novels,<sup>234</sup> and when Anthia is taken there by pirates in 2.11 she is immediately sold to an Indian king. Syracuse is presented more as a genuinely Hellenic location. Habrocomes goes to Syracuse in 5.1 and immediately leaves to travel the rest of Sicily, but finds the Spartan expatriate Aegialeus. The episode of Aegialeus and the inset love story of him and his wife are a distinctive interlude in the novel, as they are one of the romantic parallels to Habrocomes and Anthia, along with Hippothous and his original beloved, Hyperanthes.<sup>235</sup> Habrocomes' visit to Aegialeus thus seems to be a temporary respite in a friendly house, breaking up the story that is otherwise a litany of perils encountered and escaped in a manner similar to how Tolkien's hobbits often stop and rest at the houses of benevolent powers before continuing on their dangerous journeys. Sicily and its

<sup>233</sup> Scarcella 1996, 245-246. The one exception is Hippothous, who becomes briefly enamored of her but then voluntarily stops pursuing her when he discovers she is the wife of his friend Habrocomes; his passion for her is a device to resolve the plot rather than another hazard. His subplot has the same element of losing and regaining status that appears in the lovers' plot, but to a far greater degree, as he becomes a bandit and is then redeemed back into civilization (Alvares 1995). He is from Perinthus, a Greek colony in Thrace, putting him at the edge of the Greek world but nevertheless he is ethnically Greek.

<sup>234</sup> Nimis 2004 analyzes the depiction of Egypt in the novels in depth, noting common threads of depicting Egypt as barbaric and yet mystic on pg 45.

<sup>235</sup> Alvares 1995, 396, theorizes that both the Hippothous/Hyperanthes couple and the Aegialeus/Thelnixoe one suffer unhappy endings due to failing to match up to Habrocomes' and Anthia's virtue. De Temmerman 2014, 135 notes that both of the stories of the other couples are inset narratives with Habrocomes as the narratee, potentially bringing an element of character development to him as he learns how other men have acted in his situation.

Greek inhabitants are the exception that proves the rule that the world beyond Rhodes is foreign and dangerous to Habrocomes and Anthia.

Rhodes thus functions as an extension of home to the lovers. They are not initially in danger until they leave Rhodes, and once they have returned to it the danger passes. There is no lack of circularity in the text, or failure to reintegrate Habrocomes and Anthia into their home communities. Rather, Rhodes holds the same function within the text as Ephesus and the two are treated as interchangeable. Although Xenophon, like the other novelists, sets his novel in a pre-Roman setting, he does not recreate the sense of independence that the Greek *poleis* of that time period had from each other. These novels are set only lightly in the Greek Classical and Hellenistic periods, and are more reflective of the time period in which they were written.<sup>236</sup>

The scene in which closure occurs around the lovers' return to their home community, then, is the same scene in which the romantic closure occurs, their meeting in Rhodes at 5.13.1-3. The observing Rhodian crowd is heavily involved, not only in reacting but also in the action. The primary agents before this section are Leucon and Rhode, who were Habrocomes' and Anthia's slaves when the group left Ephesus but who quickly transition into the role of companion characters. They find Habrocomes at the temple of Helios in Rhodes at 5.10 and take him into their care. At 5.11 the other companion character Hippothous brings Anthia to Rhodes and the temple of Helios, and at 5.12 Leucon and Rhode meet her there. They tell her that they have Habrocomes at 5.12.6, which is apparently overheard by the crowd around them, as this is the following section (5.13.1-3):

(1) Συνέρρει δὲ ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν Ῥοδίων, πυνθανόμενον τὴν Ἀνθίας εὕρεσιν καὶ Ἀβροκόμου· παρῆν δὲ ἐν τούτῳ καὶ ὁ Ἰππόθοος, ἐγνωρίσθη τε τοῖς περὶ τὸν Λεύκωνα καὶ αὐτὸς ἔμαθεν οἳ τινὲς εἰσι· καὶ ἦν τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐπιτηδείως, τὸ δὲ ὅτι μηδέπω Ἀβροκόμης ταῦτα ἐπίσταται· ἔτρεχον δὲ ὡς εἶχον ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν. (2) Ὁ δὲ ὡς ἤκουσεν ὑπὸ τινος τῶν Ῥοδίων τὴν τῆς Ἀνθίας εὕρεσιν, διὰ μέσης τῆς πόλεως βοῶν «Ἀνθία»

<sup>236</sup> Swain 1996, 109-113.

εοικῶς μεμνηότι ἔθεε. Καὶ δὴ συντυγχάνει τοῖς περὶ τὴν Ἀνθίαν πρὸς τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἴσιδος, πολὺ δὲ τῶν Ῥοδίων πλῆθος ἐφείπετο. (3) Ὡς δὲ εἶδον ἀλλήλους, εὐθὺς ἀνεγνώρισαν· τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐβούλοντο αἱ ψυχαί· καὶ περιλαβόντες ἀλλήλους εἰς γῆν κατηνέχθησαν· κατεῖχε δὲ αὐτοὺς πολλὰ ἅμα πάθη, ἡδονή, λύπη, φόβος, ἢ τῶν πρότερον μνήμη, τὸ τῶν μελλόντων δέος· ὁ δὲ δῆμος ὁ Ῥοδίων ἀνευφήμησέ τε καὶ ἀνωλόλυξε, μεγάλην θεὸν ἀνακαλοῦντες τὴν Ἴσιν, «πάλιν» λέγοντες «ὀρῶμεν Ἀβροκόμην καὶ Ἀνθίαν τοὺς καλοὺς.»

(1) When the Rhodians heard that Anthia and Habrocomes had been found, they all surged together. Hippothous too was among them; he was recognized by Leucon and Rhode, and learned in turn who they were. And now they had everything they wanted, except that Habrocomes still did not know the news. They ran to the house just as they were. (2) And when he heard from one of the Rhodians that Anthia had been found, Habrocomes ran through the middle of the city like a madman, shouting “Anthia!” And so he met Anthia near the temple of Isis, followed by a great crowd of Rhodians. (3) When they saw each other, they recognized each other at once, for that was their fervent desire. They embraced each other and fell to the ground. A host of different emotions took hold of them at once—joy, grief, fear, memory of past events, and anxiety for the future. The Rhodians cheered and shouted in their excitement, hailing Isis as a great goddess and exclaiming, “Now once again we see Habrocomes and Anthia, the beautiful pair!”

Leucon and Rhode are on their way to take Anthia to Habrocomes at their house (ἔτρεχον δὲ ὡς εἶχον ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν, “they ran to the house just as they were”), and the reunion scene could certainly have occurred there privately. Instead the report runs ahead of them, and Habrocomes learns ὑπό τινος τῶν Ῥοδίων, “from one of the Rhodians” that Anthia is coming and races out to meet her in the street. Xenophon takes an extra step to ensure both that the crowd has a causal role in the romantic reunion and is present to observe and approve of it. With the romantic and community closure scenes combined like this the first reaction reported is that of the lovers, but it is immediately followed by that of the Rhodian crowd, ὁ δὲ δῆμος ὁ Ῥοδίων ἀνευφήμησέ τε καὶ ἀνωλόλυξε, “The Rhodians cheered and shouted in their excitement.” As mentioned above, this is the second and last time the word δῆμος is used in the novel, creating circularity with the first usage in the scene where the lovers leave Ephesus at 1.10. The crowd’s reaction is less complicated than the lovers’, which is full of complex and overwhelming feelings. For the crowd

this event is purely positive, exciting, and interestingly enough religious. While the action so far has occurred at the temple of Helios, everyone ascribes the reunion to Isis and the next section is the lovers going to the temple of Isis to thank her.<sup>237</sup> As a result the lovers' reunion is woven into the religious practice of the city, and the lovers themselves act in concert with the community in ascribing their reunion to Isis.<sup>238</sup>

The Ephesian and Rhodian crowds' positive response to the lovers is explicitly based on their beauty. The first lines of the novel explain why Habrocomes is exceptional (1.1.1-3):

Ἦν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἀνὴρ τῶν τὰ πρῶτα ἐκεῖ δυναμένων, Λυκομήδης ὄνομα. Τούτῳ τῷ Λυκομήδει ἐκ γυναικὸς ἐπιχωρίας Θεμιστοῦς γίνεται παῖς Ἀβροκόμης, μέγα δὴ τι χρῆμα [ὠραιότητι σώματος ὑπερβαλλούσῃ] κάλλους οὔτε ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ οὔτε ἐν ἄλλῃ γῆ πρότερον γενομένου. Οὗτος ὁ Ἀβροκόμης ἀεὶ μὲν καὶ καθ' ἡμέραν εἰς κάλλος ἠϋξετο, συνήνθει δὲ αὐτῷ τοῖς τοῦ σώματος καλοῖς καὶ τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγαθὰ· παιδείαν τε γὰρ πᾶσαν ἐμελέετα καὶ μουσικὴν ποικίλην ἤσκει, θήρα δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ἵππασία καὶ ὄπλομαχία συνήθη γυμνάσματα. Ἦν δὲ περισπούδαστος ἅπασιν Ἐφεσίοις, ἅμα καὶ τοῖς τὴν ἄλλην Ἀσίαν οἰκοῦσι, καὶ μεγάλας εἶχον ἐν αὐτῷ τὰς ἐλπίδας ὅτι πολίτης ἔσοιτο διαφέρων. Προσεῖχον δὲ ὡς θεῶ τῷ μαιρακίῳ· καὶ εἰσιν ἤδη τινὲς οἱ καὶ προσεκύνησαν ἰδόντες καὶ προσηϋξάντο.

Among the most influential citizens of Ephesus was a man called Lycomedes. He and his wife, Themisto, who also belonged to the city, had a son Habrocomes; his good looks were phenomenal, and neither in Ionia nor anywhere else had there ever been anything like them. This Habrocomes grew more handsome every day; and his mental qualities developed along with his physical ones. For he acquired culture of all kinds and practiced a variety of arts; he trained in hunting, riding, and fighting under arms. Everyone in Ephesus sought his company, and in the rest of Asia as well; and they had great hopes that he would have a distinguished position in the city. They treated the boy like a god, and some even prostrated themselves and prayed at the sight of him.

<sup>237</sup> This attribution to Isis is in response to the original oracle at 1.6 which sent them on their adventures. Whitmarsh 2011, 48 and Guez 2012, 37-38 suggest that Isis may be identified here with the Ephesian Artemis. The Rhodians' knowledge of this oracle may be explained by the lovers' fame during their first visit to Rhodes at the beginning of their voyage, though it is equally possible that Xenophon was not concerned with the causal continuity here and was simply tying up the loose thread of the oracle.

<sup>238</sup> Kerényi 1927 argued that all of the ideal novels were secularized expressions of the legends of mystery religions, especially the Isis cult. Merkelbach 1962 developed this theory even more, claiming that the novels were in fact sacred texts of the mysteries. Neither theory has found many followers, but softer versions of them have been more fruitful, such as Beck 1996, who finds the journeys of the protagonists to have literary kinship with the mysteries, if not a religious one. For critiques of Kerényi see Nock 1972, Stark 1989, 145, and Reardon 1971, 318. For critiques of Merkelbach see Turcan 1963, Reardon 1971, 393-399, Reardon 1976, and Stark 1989, 147-149.

The novel begins by explaining Habrocomes' distinguished pedigree. It is not clear why his parents' high social status is a critical context for his description, but their status seems very closely linked to the initial assertion of his extraordinary beauty, possibly as an explanation. He is exceptional, even among the elite, but the close linkage suggests that he may not have been capable of becoming the most beautiful boy in Asia if not for his elite origins. Qualities other than beauty are listed, but variations of κάλλος are used three times in quick succession to describe him, and after this section Xenophon returns focus to Habrocomes' beauty and does not mention his spiritual beauty again. The effect created by his exceptional qualities is the love of all the Ephesians. There is no discussion of his personal relationships, with his presumably proud parents or any potential suitors; only the mass approval of the Ephesian people.

Anthia's introduction is even more focused on beauty (1.2.5)

Ἦρχε δὲ τῆς τῶν παρθένων τάξεως Ἀνθία, θυγάτηρ Μεγαμήδους καὶ Εὐίπτης, ἐγχωρίων. Ἦν δὲ τὸ κάλλος τῆς Ἀνθίας οἷον θαυμάσαι καὶ πολὺ τὰς ἄλλας ὑπερεβάλλετο παρθένους. Ἔτη μὲν τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα ἐγεγόνει, ἦνθι δὲ αὐτῆς τὸ σῶμα ἐπ' εὐμορφία, καὶ ὁ τοῦ σχήματος κόσμος πολὺς εἰς ὄραν συνεβάλλετο.

Anthia led the line of girls; she was the daughter of Megamedes and Euipe, both of Ephesus. Anthia's beauty was an object of wonder, far surpassing the other girls'. She was fourteen; her beauty was burgeoning, still more enhanced by the adornment of her dress.

Her parents are once again named, this time described as ἐγχωρίων, fairly close to Habrocomes' mother's description as ἐπιχωρίας, though falling short of the description of his father's power in the community. Once again the protagonist's beauty is contextualized in her parents' origins as Ephesians, natives rather than aliens. This leads immediately into the description of her beauty, this time without even the brief acknowledgement Habrocomes got of his other skills. Instead the details of her appearance and dress are given, and the description is once again followed with the reaction of the Ephesian people, Πολλάκις αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ τεμένους ἰδόντες Ἐφέσιοι



προσεκύνησαν ὡς Ἄρτεμιν, “Often as they saw her in the sacred enclosure the Ephesians would worship her as Artemis.” (1.2.7)<sup>239</sup> Like Habrocomes, people react so strongly to her beauty that she is treated as divine. The two protagonists are elevated in status even above the highest ranks of humanity and made obeisance to (προσεκύνησαν in both cases) due to their beauty. They come from high status origins, Ephesian parents, which makes their exceptional beauty possible, and then the Ephesian people allot them even greater status due to this beauty. Status and beauty are a virtuous cycle here.

The Rhodians’ reaction to the pair is similar. Here is their arrival at Rhodes (1.12.1-2):

Κατήγετο δὲ ἡ ναῦς εἰς Ῥόδον καὶ ἐξέβαινον οἱ ναῦται, ἐξήει δὲ ὁ Ἀβροκόμης ἔχων μετὰ χεῖρα τὴν Ἀνθίαν· συνήεσαν δὲ πάντες οἱ Ῥόδιοι, τὸ κάλλος τῶν παιδῶν καταπεπληγότες, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις τῶν ἰδόντων παρήλθε σιωπῶν· ἀλλ’ οἱ μὲν ἔλεγον ἐπιδημίαν [ἐκ τῶν] θεῶν, οἱ δὲ προσεκύνουν καὶ προσεπιτινοῦντο. Ταχὺ δὲ δι’ ὅλης τῆς πόλεως διεπεφοιτῆκει τὸ ὄνομα Ἀβροκόμου καὶ Ἀνθίας. Ἐπεύχονται δὲ αὐτοῖς δημοσίᾳ καὶ θυσίας τε θύουσι πολλὰς καὶ ἑορτὴν ἄγουσι τὴν ἐπιδημίαν αὐτῶν.

So the ship put into Rhodes, and the sailors disembarked; Habrocomes too came off, hand in hand with Anthia. All the Rhodians gathered, amazed at the young people’s beauty, and no one who saw them passed by in silence: some said that it was a visitation of auspicious gods; some offered them worship and adoration; and soon the names of Habrocomes and Anthia had traveled all through the city. Public prayers were offered to them; the Rhodians offered many sacrifices and celebrated their visit as a festival.

This is a near-duplicate of the scenes introducing the protagonists. Compare Clitophon’s arrival in Alexandria in Achilles Tatius, where his reaction to the city is the most important element of

<sup>239</sup> Comparison of the heroine to Artemis is a constant in the novels, and often appears through the lens of Odysseus’ and Nausicaa’s meeting in *Odyssey* 6. Chariton makes this explicit at 6.4.6, where the king of Persia imagines how wonderful it would be to have Callirhoe join him on a hunt, and quotes *Od.* 6.102-104, a comparison of Nausicaa to Artemis. She is also compared to Artemis at 1.1.16 and 3.8.6, her wedding day and right after the birth of her son, so her virginity and marital status are referenced (3.8.6 also mentions Athena). Anthia and Charicleia are connected to Artemis more strongly; both meet their lovers while engaged in religious duties for Artemis, in contrast to Callirhoe who is on her way to the temple of Aphrodite when she meets Chaereas. Anthia and Charicleia are both mistaken for Artemis herself when they first appear, Anthia at 1.2.7 and Charicleia at 1.2.6, as Odysseus pretends to mistake Nausicaa on first seeing her. Artemis watches over Leucippe, but Leucippe is never confused with her. Artemis also never appears in *Daphnis and Chloe*, where the interested gods are strictly Eros, Pan, and the nymphs. Heliodorus gives Artemis the largest role; Charicleia dedicates herself to Artemis at Delphi (2.33), and when she gets to Ethiopia takes her mother’s place as high priestess of Selene (10.41). Cioffi 2014 interprets the confusion of the heroine for a goddess as a type of epiphany.

the scene, or Habrocomes and Anthia's many separate arrivals in many other cities throughout the *Ephesiaca* in which their beauty either goes unremarked on or is only reacted to by a single overzealous suitor. This scene at Rhodes is unlike any of them, and instead like the introduction scenes, in which the crowd's reaction is the most salient element of the scene, and they react by worshipping (once again προσεκύνουν) the pair. Rhodes is once again a duplicate of Ephesus, and what is being duplicated is the elevation of the protagonists to a near-divine status due to their beauty. This is the grounding for the closural scene at 5.13, explaining the reaction of the Rhodians there and their role in the scene. The public excitement of that scene is explained by the public excitement in 1.12, and it is key to the function of the closural scene. Not only is the crowd's delight at the lovers' reunion an important part of raising the drama of the scene,<sup>240</sup> it is also what allows the Rhodian crowd to serve the role of the accepting community reacting positively to the protagonists' return to their original status.

The *Ephesiaca*'s ending is thus not as strange as it seems. The crowd plays its standard role of accepting the lovers back into the elite ranks of Greek society due to their beauty, which is implied to rely at least in part on their parents' status as citizens of a great Greek city. The only peculiarity here is that Rhodes is a double for Ephesus, with the two treated as interchangeable in terms of the community's reaction to and behavior towards the lovers. This beauty appears to be attributed at least in part to the protagonists' origins as the children of Ephesian citizens, but is also a self-sustaining status marker, at least once they return to the safety of Greek territory. This elevation of the lovers to elite status is done at Rhodes and Ephesus in reaction to their beauty, but when the protagonists are in places where they are not citizens or pseudo-citizens they have functionally no status. In non-home polities their beauty puts them at risk and strips them of

<sup>240</sup> Cf. Lowe 2000, 71 on the function of rising affective intensity in the shaping of the plot.

status, as either slaves or under slave-like levels of control by aggressive suitors. Their beauty both marks them as elite and makes them into elite in the communities that they are a part of, which can receive them back into an original elite status. If beauty alone were enough to confer status they would have been elevated to a sufficiently high social status to preserve their safety anywhere that people have eyes and similar standards of beauty to the Greeks. Instead it appears to be a marker of pre-existing status, and can only return them to the status that they previously had as citizens of Ephesus.

### 3.2 Sophistic Novels

The role of the crowd in the closural scenes shows far less differentiation between the pre-sophistic and sophistic novels than the other phenomena studied here. Part of this must be attributed to the crowd's role as internal audience. While the interrelations of the major characters shift as the genre develops, the crowd stands partially outside the narrative observing the plot, like the tragic choruses that watch helplessly as the characters in the play head towards bad ends.<sup>241</sup> The novel crowds have greater capacities and requirements to intervene in the narrative than the choruses, but there are no strong trends in the kind of intervention they must take. They dip their toes into the stream of the narrative once, like tentative swimmers, but are not part of the river itself like the major characters.

The consistent role of the crowd in spite of the significant changes in the closural scenes which were discussed in previous chapters is another indication of the value of the crowd not

<sup>241</sup> Aristotle (or potentially pseudo-Aristotle) *Problemata* 19.48 characterizes the chorus as less active and engaged in the plot than the main characters, which modern scholarship largely follows, e.g. Mastronarde 1998, 67. Foley 2003, 14-16, agrees with the basic principle but cautions against applying this assumption too absolutely, especially for Aeschylus' choruses. On Aeschylean choruses as more active, see Podlecki 1972 and Kaimio 1970. In *Poetics* 18.1456a25-28 Aristotle says the chorus should συναγωνίζεσθαι with the main characters, which sounds like it suggests a more active role for them, but his meaning is highly debated.

only being in the closural scenes but fulfilling this role of emotional amplification for the audience. As the nature of the closural scenes changes around them, with the marriages moving into them and the characterization of the protagonists shifting, the crowd remains the same, still present, still adoring the protagonists, still enthusiastically supportive of the way the story ends.

### 3.2.1 Achilles Tatius

Where Xenophon gives short shrift to the crowd in the home city of the protagonists, Achilles Tatius omits them altogether. Similarly to Xenophon, he does all the closural work in a single scene in the location away from home where the lovers reunite, ironically enough the city of Ephesus, and narrates the homecoming in brief summary. Rather than taking Xenophon's approach of turning the city in which the lovers reunite into a double of their home, he reduces the importance of the home cities and their communities and creates a novel that is primarily focused on the individual and the family.<sup>242</sup> The lovers do not share a home community, and Clitophon is not even from a Greek city. It is therefore striking that even this novel, which Whitmarsh eloquently describes as "relentlessly non-civic"<sup>243</sup>, still features the same crowd in the closural scene: the citizenry of a Greek city, supportive of the protagonists and delighted to see them returned to their original status. The crowd's presence in the final scenes a novel that prefers the private, intra-familial sphere over the public one is an indication of how necessary the crowd is to the closure of the ideal novel plot.

*Leucippe and Clitophon* extensively parodies the conventions of the ideal novel genre, and the role of the home community is no exception. When the two protagonists are introduced Achilles Tatius is at pains to show that they are part of the same familial community but not the

<sup>242</sup> Whitmarsh 2011, 149.

<sup>243</sup> Whitmarsh 2011, 254

same civic community. After the end of the opening frame, Clitophon begins his narration with a description of his (and as is later shown, Leucippe's) pedigrees (1.3.1):

Ἐμοὶ Φοινίκη γένος, Τύρος ἡ πατρίς, ὄνομα Κλειτοφῶν, πατήρ Ἰππίας, ἀδελφὸς πατρὸς Σώστρατος, οὐ πάντα δὲ ἀδελφός, ἀλλ' ὅσον ἀμφοῖν εἷς πατήρ· αἱ γὰρ μητέρες, τῷ μὲν ἦν Βυζαντία, τῷ δὲ ἐμῷ πατρὶ Τυρία. ὁ μὲν οὖν τὸν πάντα χρόνον εἶχεν ἐν Βυζαντίῳ· πολὺς γὰρ ὁ τῆς μητρὸς κληρὸς ἦν αὐτῷ· ὁ δὲ ἐμὸς πατήρ ἐν Τύρῳ κατοῖκε.

I was born at Tyre in Phoenicia. My name is Clitophon. My father and his brother are named Hippias and Sostratus—they are not full brothers; they had the same father, but my uncle's mother was a lady of Byzantium, and my father's mother was from Tyre. My uncle Sostratus indeed spent all his time in Byzantium, where his mother had left him a considerable estate. My father dwelt in Tyre.

In 1.4.1, when Sostratus arrives to visit his brother, he brings his daughter Leucippe. Thus

Achilles Tatius manages to thread the needle of replacing the civic community connection of the pre-sophistic novels with a familial connection. He also undermines the Greek ethnocentricity which is so important in the novels with Clitophon's very first words in which he says his γένος is Phoenicia. Note, however, Winkler's choice to translate the sentence as "I was born at Tyre in Phoenicia."<sup>244</sup> In the Budé, Garnaud translates the line as "Je suis Phénicien, Tyr est ma patrie,"<sup>245</sup> which does seem to get at a likelier version of the core meaning of the phrase as it stands alone. Winkler's choice makes better sense from a broad perspective, however.

Phoenicians are strongly Hellenized in the ideal novels.<sup>246</sup> Clitophon's name is Greek, like the names of all his relatives, and he makes flamboyant display of his Greek *paideia* throughout the novel.<sup>247</sup> His Phoenician origin is like many of Achilles Tatius' parodic moves; he upends a generic convention, but in such a way as to leave the larger structure of the novel intact.

<sup>244</sup> Winkler 1989, 178.

<sup>245</sup> Garnaud 2002, 6.

<sup>246</sup> Briquel-Chattonet 1992, 194.

<sup>247</sup> Montiglio 2012, 67.

Clitophon is foreign in the most Greek way possible, and Leucippe shows no indication of being anything but a Byzantine Greek.<sup>248</sup>

In terms of community connection Leucippe's membership within the Greek community is the most prominent one in the closural scenes, as the closure primarily hinges on her elevation from slave back to elite Greek woman. Clitophon goes through a milder version of the loss and then resumption of status when he is imprisoned and then released, and true to the genre's rule the supportive crowd appears. Right before the romantic reunion scene at 7.16 Clitophon had been under arrest and convicted of Leucippe's murder (7.12), and when he hears she is alive breaks loose from his guards in order to run to her. As in Xenophon, the word *δῆμος* is used sparingly in most of this novel, appearing once at the very beginning of the opening frame (1.1.1), a few times in Clitophon's adoring description of Alexandria at 5.1, and then not again until the romantic reunion at the very end of Book 7. When the guards come to collect Clitophon, a crowd simply described as *οἱ παρόντες* protects him (7.16.1) and refuses to allow them to arrest him again since they know he did not kill the woman standing alive right next to them. The priest of the temple of Artemis then promises the guards he will bring Clitophon to be presented to *ὁ δῆμος* at court when the case is taken up again. The connection here is not direct, but the crowd resisting the prison guards implies that the people have already made their decision, given that Clitophon is manifestly not guilty of murder, and indeed he never returns to prison. The scene is a very mild version of the community acceptance convention, with the pattern nevertheless

<sup>248</sup> Morales 2004, 49 takes her to be Phoenician as well but this is not supported by the text. Her mother and paternal grandmother appear to be Byzantine Greeks, and the origins of the lovers' shared grandfather are unclear. It is possible to take Clitophon's "*Ἐμοὶ Φοινίκη γένος*" to mean that the grandfather is Phoenician, but Clitophon has three other grandparents whose origins he could be referring to, and Winkler of course takes it to simply indicate Clitophon's birthplace.

visible. The bulk of the community closure, however, like all other forms of plot closure in this novel, is reserved for the scene of the virginity test.

A notable reversal of the generic convention in Clitophon's community acceptance scene is that he is not protected by the crowd (and thus reaccepted into the community of free people) on the grounds of his beauty. Instead it is his beauty that initially created his problem by leading Melite to insist on marrying him, and thus making him the target of her unexpectedly still living husband Thersander's anger which leads to his arrest at 6.5. He is returned to freedom due to his innocence of crime.<sup>249</sup> This reversal of convention also holds true for Leucippe, who is enslaved because of her beauty,<sup>250</sup> and then released and formally returned to being the daughter of her high-status Byzantine father on account of her virginity. Virginity is treated as an elite virtue (particularly for women) in the sophistic novels and not the pre-sophistic, with their married heroines. In the sophistic novels a detectable though largely non-explicit association between elite maidens and virginity appears. They are highly rewarded for their virginity as in this case, and find themselves able to maintain it even in highly unlikely circumstances with the implication that this is due to divine favor.<sup>251</sup>

<sup>249</sup> Though the innocence is somewhat technical; he does commit adultery with Melite, but not until after Thersander's return, and the crime Thersander charges them with is specifically adultery in his absence (8.11). Ironically, Clitophon is in fact guilty of a worse crime than he is charged with, but as it does not occur to Thersander to ask about the actual crime Clitophon is freed.

<sup>250</sup> Chaereas kidnaps her because he has fallen in love with her (5.3), and the pirates who help him kidnap her decide to kill Chaereas and sell Leucippe because she will be worth more money than the other woman the pirates had intended to sell (8.16.3). The reason for her greater worth is not explicitly spelled out, but appears to be due to her beauty as well.

<sup>251</sup> Leucippe receives a dream from Artemis at 4.1 which changes her mind about being willing to indulge in premarital sex with Clitophon, and then remains a virgin even after being kidnapped by pirates and ending up in the hands of the sexually threatening Thersander and Sosthenes. Achilles Tatius writes a scene acknowledging the unlikelihood of this in 6.21-22, in which she invokes Artemis as her protector, and indeed it is at the temple of Artemis that she is protected and released. Chloe and Charicleia's virginity is less explicitly associated with their divine favor, but both rely on their virginity for their happy endings and their happy endings are attributed to the extraordinary divine favor they receive. The causal lines between elite origins, divine favor, and virginity are rarely explicitly drawn but all three traits are highly correlated with each other and with the heroines in the sophistic novels.

Leucippe's scene of return to high status and acceptance by the community is the primary locus of emphasis and closure, the grand scene of the virginity trial at 8.13-14. At 8.13.1, at the very beginning of the scene, Achilles Tatius specifies that ὁ δῆμος ἅπας the "entire populace" shows up at the trial, and when Leucippe passes the test the first reaction he describes is that of the crowd: πᾶς μὲν ὁ δῆμος ἐξεβόησεν ὑφ' ἡδονῆς καὶ τὸν Θέρσανδρον ἐλοιδόρουν, "the people gave a loud cry of joy and started abusing Thersander." Only after this sentence is Clitophon's reaction described. The crowd here fulfills all the standard requirements; they are the δῆμος of a Greek city, they observe and approve of the protagonist's return to her original status (her father's daughter rather than Thersander's slave). Their approval also reinforces her return to high status, since Thersander, who was attempting to keep her enslaved, flees the city to avoid being stoned to death by the δῆμος (8.14.4), a measure of their degree of attachment to Leucippe. The connection between Ephesus and her home *polis*, Byzantium, is not as strong as the doubling of Ephesus and Rhodes in the *Ephesiaca* but is nonetheless present. Artemis helps the Byzantines win a war, and Leucippe's father is sent as the head of an embassy to make a sacrifice in thanks for the assistance at the temple of Artemis in Ephesus, which is accepted with ceremony by the Ephesians (7.12). One of the temple attendants calls her a "κόρη...ξένη" at 7.15.1, confirming her as not Ephesian but also implying the friendly aspect of *xenia*, since the temple is at that point harboring her. The Ephesians are not fellow-citizens of Leucippe's, but they are linked to her city, her family, and herself by bonds of religion, ethnicity, and ceremony. They are also, most prominently, all part of the community that is free people, and the virginity trial scene is as much about her return to the community of the free as it is about her return to her family.



Whitmarsh's interpretation of *Leucippe and Clitophon* as a family-focused rather than a *polis*-focused novel may in part be a response to the reduced importance of the homecoming scene, since it is given in such brief summary after the closural scene of the virginity test. The home is indeed less prominent in this novel since Clitophon and Leucippe do not have the same home *polis*, and Tyre's symbolic function as a home community is diminished by its being Phoenician in such a Hellenocentric genre. The increased importance of Leucippe's father in the closural scene does some work to counterbalance this effect, however, bringing a major representative of home to the lovers even if they are not yet home. Primarily, though, *Leucippe and Clitophon* also maintains the importance of the idea of the *polis*, if not the home *polis*, by the importance of the crowd of Ephesians in the climactic scene. As in the *Ephesiaca*, the "home" that the protagonists return to is the safety of Greek territory in which they are recognized as members of the elite. This draws greater attention to the question of class, since Leucippe was brought back into Greek territory as a slave and remained in danger there until the community acknowledged her status as a free woman and Sostratos' daughter. As always, Achilles Tatius tests the rules of the genre and asks the questions that are raised.<sup>252</sup> But in the final scene, the moves that resolve the plot confirm that it is right for the heroine to be free, elite, and safe, and does not raise the question of the suffering of slaves again. This is highly parallel to Thalmann's discussion of class structure in the *Odyssey*, which raises the question of the suffering of the lower classes in the body of the narrative, in cases such as Eumaeus' suffering and that of

<sup>252</sup> Compare this to Heliodorus' use of this trope in which the heroine is brought to territory where her elite status would protect her as a slave who is still in danger, since Charicleia returns to Ethiopia as a prisoner of war marked for sacrifice. Ethiopia has markers of being both Greek and barbarian, and it is in the act of choosing to make Charicleia and Theagenes safe and abolishing human sacrifice that the Ethiopians become more Greek. Where Achilles Tatius raises an uncomfortable truth, that slaves are unsafe in the society that keeps the elite safe, Heliodorus arranges a clever literary maneuver that transforms a dangerous barbarian place into a Greek place by virtue of becoming a safe haven for the protagonists. Each author employs the same trope and handles it in accordance with his distinctive style.

Odysseus while disguised as a beggar. Just as in *Leucippe and Clitophon*, however, the sympathetic characters have elite origins, and the difficulties raised by their suffering are simply not discussed again at the conclusion of the narrative, where the scenes are dominated by the ideology of the correctness of the social hierarchy and the ways in which that hierarchy is good for the elite.<sup>253</sup> In *Leucippe and Clitophon* this is demonstrated by the narrow focus on the Ephesians' acceptance of Leucippe back into her original status, which addresses the discomfort of the danger she was in as a slave by returning her to the community of free people, rather than leaving any attention on the plight of slaves. The final ideological message once again is that what is wrong is not anything about the social hierarchy, but that people who belong in one part of the social hierarchy have been moved to another part, and this is what is fixed to produce the happy ending.

### 3.2.2 Longus

Longus includes a fairly standard crowd scene at the end of his novel, but as is common in *Daphnis and Chloe* he also pushes the conventions of the novel in new directions as well, forcing them into confrontation with the pastoral world and examining the conflicts of culture and class at the place where the two meet. There is a total of three crowd reaction scenes. There is a standard one at 4.33.3-4 in which the people of Mitylene gather to meet the protagonists when they arrive, and a scene focused on the pastoral crowd of rustics at the wedding in 4.38-40. But before either of these, at Daphnis' recognition which is in many ways the scene with the most closural force, there is a crowd consisting of his father's household (4.19, and 22-23). This crowd is therefore mostly house slaves, and their presence as a reaction crowd presents a new

<sup>253</sup> Thalmann 1998, 97-100.

way within the extant novels for the class divisions in Greek society to be illuminated and confirmed.<sup>254</sup>

The standard reception scene at 4.33.3-4 has the least closural force of the three, and primarily functions to lay the groundwork for Chloe's recognition, which becomes an extension of the scene. The protagonists, their elite origins revealed, travel to Mytilene and arrive at night. The next morning there is a crowd waiting outside the house, and in this case the theme of the crowd accepting the lovers back into their society is explicit due to Chloe's still-liminal state (4.33.4):

Τότε μὲν οὖν ἔλαθον τοὺς πολίτας, νυκτὸς κατελθόντες· τῆς δὲ ἐπιούσης ὄχλος ἠθροίσθη περὶ τὰς θύρας ἀνδρῶν, γυναικῶν. Οἱ μὲν τῷ Διονυσοφάνει συνήδοντο παῖδα εὐρόντι, καὶ μᾶλλον ὀρῶντες τὸ κάλλος τοῦ Δάφνιδος· αἱ δὲ τῇ Κλεαρίστῃ συνέχαιρον ἅμα κομιζούσῃ καὶ παῖδα καὶ νύμφην. Ἐξέπλησσε γὰρ κάκεινας ἡ Χλόη κάλλος ἐκφέρουσα παρευδοκιμηθῆναι μὴ δυνάμενον· ὅλη δὲ ἄρα ἐκινεῖτο ἡ πόλις ἐπὶ τῷ μεираκίῳ καὶ τῇ παρθένῳ, καὶ εὐδαιμόνιζον μὲν ἤδη τὸν γάμον, ἠύχοντο δὲ καὶ τὸ γένος ἄξιον τῆς μορφῆς εὐρεθῆναι τῆς κόρης· καὶ γυναῖκες πολλαὶ τῶν μέγα πλουσίων ἠράσαντο θεοῖς αὐταὶ πιστευθῆναι μητέρες θυγατρὸς οὕτω καλῆς.

It was dark when they reached the town, and none of the citizens knew of their arrival until the following day, when a crowd of men and women gathered around their door. The men congratulated Dionysophanes on having found a son, especially when they saw how good-looking Daphnis was, and the women shared Cleariste's happiness at bringing home both a son and a bride, for even they were impressed by the vision of unsurpassable beauty Chloe presented. So the whole city was excited about the boy and girl. Already they were counting them happy in their marriage, and praying that the girl's family would turn out to be worthy of her beauty. And many a very rich lady begged the gods that she might pass for the mother of so lovely a daughter.

Chariton specifies that the excitement is generated by the beauty of the protagonists, and that the desire of the crowd is to absorb them into the community given the hope that Chloe is not only their fellow-citizen but potentially their daughter. In this case the status of the crowd is less clear

<sup>254</sup> Morgan 2004, 239 notes that the house slaves' lives involve far more class awareness than the country slaves, since the house slaves spend all day waiting on their masters and the country slaves rarely ever see people who are significantly higher in social class than they are.

than is often the case, as they are at no time referred to as the δῆμος of Mytilene. They are an ὄχλος of men and women when first described, recalling the explicitly mixed-gender crowds of Chariton. In 4.33.4 they are called the ὅλη...ἡ πόλις, creating a stronger association between them and the city and potentially implying they are the citizenry.

Their hope for Chloe's assimilation is interesting, ἤχοντο δὲ καὶ τὸ γένος ἄξιον τῆς μορφῆς εὐρεθῆναι τῆς κόρης, "praying that the girl's family would turn out to be worthy of her beauty." The next line describes the γυναῖκες πολλαὶ τῶν μέγα πλουσίων, "women of great wealth" hoping to be her mother. Here family rank and wealth are strongly associated with beauty, the implication being that elite families *ought* to be able to produce as beautiful a girl as Chloe, but that this is not certain. This is a unique perspective on the association of beauty and status; typically beauty is treated as evidence of status, and the idea that a low class family could produce a beautiful child is treated as unlikely at best once the issue has been raised.<sup>255</sup> Here the association between beauty and elite birth is shown as something the crowd actively desires, as well as something they assume to be true.

The rustics at the wedding are not a completely identical phenomenon to purely chorus-like crowds, due to the presence of many named secondary characters. There are some consistent similarities, however. This crowd engages in group ritual action in their role as wedding guests, and also exhibits approval of not only Daphnis' and Chloe's status, but the other named characters' as well. Everyone arrives at the wedding and behaves properly, peacefully accepting their social roles and everyone else's (4.38.1-2):

<sup>255</sup> Before Daphnis and Chloe's foster parents admit that the children are foundlings no one questions the lack of family resemblance, but as soon as doubt is introduced the children's beauty is the first issue raised. It is why Chloe's foster father becomes suspicious that Daphnis may also be a foundling at 3.32, is one of the reasons Daphnis' birth father finds his foster father's story of Daphnis' exposure plausible at 4.20, and one of the reasons Chloe's foster father lays out to support his story that she, too, is the exposed child of a wealthy family at 4.30.

Ὁ δὲ Διονυσοφάνης, εὐημερίας οὔσης, αὐτοῦ πρὸ τοῦ ἄντρου στιβάδας ὑπεστόρεσεν ἐκ χλωρᾶς φυλλάδος καὶ πάντας τοὺς κωμήτας κατακλίνας εἰστία πολυτελῶς. Παρήσαν δὲ Λάμων καὶ Μυρτάλη, Δρύας καὶ Νάπη, οἱ Δόρκωνι προσήκοντες, <Φιλητᾶς>, οἱ Φιλητᾶς παῖδες, Χρῶμις καὶ Λυκαίνιον· οὐκ ἀπῆν οὐδὲ Λάμπις συγγνώμης ἀξιοθεῖς.

As the weather was fine, Dionysophanes laid out beds of green leaves right there outside the cave, invited all the village folk and feasted them lavishly. The guests included Lamon and Myrtale, Dryas and Nape, Dorcon's family, <Philetas>, Philetas' sons, Chromis and Lycaenion. Even Lampis had been forgiven and was there.

This is a catalogue of people who have struggled along with the protagonists to define their identities, who now peacefully attend the ceremony that confirms the two as elites, members of their birth families, and each other's spouses. Lamon, Myrtale, Dryas and Nape are the foster parents, who pretended the protagonists were their blood children and non-elite like them. Dorcon and Lampis were both suitors of Chloe's who exhibited violence in the attempt to force her to marry them instead of Daphnis.

Lycaenion, of course, was the successful alternate suitor to Daphnis who convinced him to have sex with her by not challenging his bond with Chloe.<sup>256</sup> She is perhaps the most extreme example, as the others treated Daphnis and Chloe in manners not strictly appropriate to the pair's true identities (the foster parents pretending the two were not elite, Philetas encouraging premarital sex, Chloe's suitors both not respecting her relationship with Daphnis and not aware that her status was too high for them), but behaving appropriately in terms of their *own* identities (given that it is not inappropriate for a couple to adopt a foundling or for a single man to wish to marry a maiden, and premarital sex does not appear to be problematic in this society for non-elites such as Philetas thought the lovers to be). Lycaenion transgressed the bounds of her own identity, however, as Chromis' wife, and in the process elicited Daphnis' most transgressive behavior. Her appearance at his wedding at her husband's side displays not only an acceptance of

<sup>256</sup> Konstan 1994, 54.

Daphnis' and Chloe's new status, but an acceptance of her own as well.<sup>257</sup> The universal presence and appropriate ritual behavior of the wedding guests demonstrates everyone's acceptance of the social hierarchy in which they find themselves. As in the *Odyssey* various cruelties and injustices of this hierarchy have been highlighted throughout the middle of the text, but at the end the overriding story of the conclusion is of the successful function of the hierarchy and its acceptance by everyone in it.

The climactic closural scene of *Daphnis and Chloe* is in many ways Daphnis' recognition. The crowd in this scene has uniquely low status within the ideal novels. The typical crowd identity is a mixed-gender group of citizens of a Greek *polis*, and the exceptions previously discussed are the men in Chaereas' navy and the poor shepherds from the region where Daphnis and Chloe were raised at the wedding. The shepherds seem to be a mixture of slaves and free but poor people, given that Daphnis' foster family are slaves and Chloe's appear not to be.<sup>258</sup> This is already quite an anomalously low status for a crowd, and the high proportion of named characters in it makes it another anomaly in *Daphnis and Chloe* rather than an indication of possible further flexibility in the genre's rules. In Daphnis' recognition scene however, Longus makes clear that the crowd members are slaves. The scene begins with Daphnis' birth father informing his foster parents that he is bringing Daphnis back to town with him as a house slave. Before the foster father can reply with information on Daphnis' true origins, a crowd is slipped in: Ἐνταῦθα ὁ Λάμων, πάντων ἤδη συνερρηκόντων καὶ ὅτι καλὸν ὁμόδουλον ἔξουσιν ἠδομένων, αἰτήσας λόγον ἤρξατο λέγειν· “Everyone was already crowding

<sup>257</sup> Morgan 2004, 210.

<sup>258</sup> In 3.30-31 Daphnis' foster father puts off promising to allow Daphnis and Chloe to marry by saying he must get his master's approval first (though in fact he does not want to approve of it because he hopes to marry Daphnis to someone of what he believes to be a higher class than Chloe). Chloe's foster father needs no such permission to propose the marriage to Daphnis', suggesting that her family is free, though their status is clearly very similar to Daphnis' family despite this disparity.

round, delighted at the prospect of having such a handsome fellow-slave, when Lamon asked leave to speak.” (4.19.3) It is not immediately clear that this is a chorus-like crowd, but their reaction to the situation is presented before the major characters can take the next action, which is typical of how chorus-like crowds function, and *συνερρηκώτων*, “streaming together” is suggestive of the behavior of gathering into a crowd at the beginning of a closural scene. They are certainly slaves, however, given that they think of Daphnis as a *ὁμόδουλον*. The mention of this crowd is easily passed over, as crowd mentions often are, and they disappear until the recognition has occurred.

The information is laid out and Daphnis’ birth parents acknowledge him as their son with no mention of the crowd, and indeed Daphnis himself is not in the room. The crowd reappears in the next scene where Daphnis’ brother runs out to him to inform him of his new status, and it turns out there is a crowd following him (4.22.2-23.1):

(4.22.2) Ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Δάφνις θέοντα μετὰ πολλῶν καὶ βοῶντα «Δάφνι», νομίσας ὅτι συλλαβεῖν αὐτὸν βουλόμενος τρέχει, ῥίψας τὴν πήραν καὶ τὴν σύριγγα πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐφέρετο ῥίπων ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς μεγάλης πέτρας. (3) Καὶ ἴσως ἄν, τὸ καινότερον, εὐρεθεὶς ἀπωλώλει Δάφνις, εἰ μὴ συνείης ὁ Ἄστυλος ἐβόα πάλιν· «στῆθι, Δάφνι, μηδὲν φοβηθῆς· ἀδελφός εἰμί σου, καὶ γονεῖς οἱ μέχρι νῦν δεσπότες. (4) Νῦν ἡμῖν Λάμων τὴν αἴγα εἶπε καὶ τὰ γνωρίσματα ἔδειξεν· ὄρα δὲ ἐπιστραφεὶς πῶς ἴασι φαιδροὶ καὶ γελῶντες. Ἄλλ’ ἐμὲ πρῶτον φίλησον· ὄμνυμι δὲ τὰς Νύμφας ὡς οὐ ψεῦδομαι.» (4.23.1) Μόλις οὖν μετὰ τὸν ὄρκον ἔστη καὶ τὸν Ἄστυλον τρέχοντα περιέμεινε καὶ προσελθὼντα κατεφίλησεν. Ἐν ᾧ δὲ ἐκεῖνον ἐφίλει, πλῆθος τὸ λοιπὸν ἐπιρρεῖ θεραπεόντων, θεραπαινῶν, αὐτὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἢ μήτηρ μετ’ αὐτοῦ. Οὗτοι πάντες περιέβαλλον, κατεφίλουν, χαίροντες κλάοντες. (2) Ὁ δὲ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἐφιλοφρονεῖτο, καὶ ὡς πάλαι εἰδὼς προσεστερνίζετο καὶ ἐξελεθεῖν τῶν περιβολῶν οὐκ ἠθέλεν· οὕτω φύσις ταχέως πιστεύεται.

(4.23.2) But when Daphnis saw him running with a great crowd of people and shouting “Daphnis!”, he thought that he was running to catch him and take him away. Dropping his bag and pipes, he headed off towards the sea to hurl himself off the great rock. (3) Daphnis might have been lost in being found—an event without precedent—had Astylus not realized what was happening and called out again, “Stay where you are Daphnis! Don’t be afraid! I am your brother, and those who hitherto were your master and mistress are your mother and father. (4) Lamon has just told us about the nanny goat and shown us the recognition tokens. Turn round and see with what radiant, happy faces they are

coming. But kiss me before anyone else. I swear by the Nymphs that I am not lying.” (4.23.1) In response to this oath, Daphnis reluctantly came to a halt, and waited for Astylus who was running after him. When he reached him, he kissed him, and while he was kissing him the rest of the crowd came surging up, man-servants and maid-servants, and his father himself, and his mother beside him. (2) All of these were embracing and kissing him, rejoicing, weeping, but he warmly greeted his father and mother before anyone else: he hugged them to his breast as if he had known them all his life, and refused to leave their embrace. So quickly does nature win credence.

In the previous scene there was no mention of anyone but Daphnis’ two fathers and the parasite Gnathon, whose desire to bring Daphnis to town as his sex slave precipitates the recognition.<sup>259</sup> Once Daphnis’ birth father recognizes the tokens, his mother is called in to confirm his judgement. Astylus and the house slaves may have remained “on stage” since the beginning of the scene when the crowd is first mentioned, but Daphnis himself is not present when his parents recognize of the tokens despite his exit not being described, which suggests some time has passed. Similarly to *Callirhoe* 8.1 and the *Ephesiaca* 5.13 the mechanism for spreading information to the crowd is not described; they seem to have always been watching, like the external audience. The description of them as *θεραπόντων* and *θεραπεινῶν* at 4.23.1 confirms that this is meant to be a chorus-like crowd, as Longus specifies his crowds as mixed-gender in the same manner as Chariton.<sup>260</sup>

<sup>259</sup> Gnathon holds a strange position, as a homosexual in a genre that glorifies heterosexual desire, as a companion but to the hero’s brother rather than the hero, as an attempted rapist and agent of Daphnis being forced into sexual slavery, but also the rescuer of Chloe and agent of Daphnis’ recognition. For more discussion of his role, see Morgan 2004, 230; Effe 1987; Winkler 1990, 101ff.; Konstan 1994, 14ff.; Epstein 1995; Goldhill 1995, 46ff.

<sup>260</sup> Morgan 2004, 239 suggests that this description here is also meant to illustrate Daphnis’ new role as their social superior. Longus specifies mixed-gender crowds at 2.2 and 4.33.3 in the same manner as 4.23 in that a crowd is simply described as mixed-gender, and at the wedding in 4.38 named female characters are included. Chariton does the same at 1.1.11-13, 1.6.3, 8.6-7, and at 5.4 describes the various reactions of the Babylonian populace to the trial for Callirhoe’s hand based on similar demographic divides, though here the crowd is not physically gathered and the men and women are further subdivided (wealthy vs poor, beautiful women vs ordinary). Heliodorus does not use the trope with the same degree of consistency but it does appear at 7.8.3 where three groups who identify strongly with Thyamis, Theagenes, and Charicleia appear (men in the prime of life, ephebes, and maidens respectively). Unusually enough, he also has a strictly male crowd in the final scene beginning in 10.4, which will be discussed further below. Xenophon and Achilles Tatius do not use this trope. It is often used to divide the crowd into even more closely identifying groups according to each protagonist, as Heliodorus does, but not always; at Longus 2.2 for



The low status of the members of this crowd make it an interesting version of the phenomenon, as their position is not aspirational and would not encourage audience identification. The crowd's behavior pattern is the same as the citizen crowds in most other instances, however. They react with delight to Daphnis' initial elevation from country slave to house slave, and then are equally happy to see him revealed as the master's son. The paired reactions here to Daphnis' two successive increases in status illustrates the chorus-like crowd phenomenon in greater detail and as often in *Daphnis and Chloe*, draws greater attention to issues of class. As a goatherd slave Daphnis has the lowest status available in this society.<sup>261</sup> The initial news that he is to become one of the house slaves is thus a parody of the ideal novel hero's status elevation at the end of each novel, except that in this case the community he is joining is the other house slaves rather than the other citizens of the *polis*. When the true elevation back into the most elite echelons of society occurs, Daphnis' birth family joins the welcoming crowd and he turns his affection primarily to them, but the crowd of slaves from the beginning of the scene continues to be the witnessing crowd. They are just as delighted to accept him as a master as they were to accept him as an equal; there is no hint of resentment of his good fortune to be the one rescued from slavery, or of his new role as a master to the members of the crowd. Thus while the crowd can no longer function in the role of the accepting community, which must be

example the men flirt with Chloe and the women with Daphnis, and Chariton will often state that women are present in the crowd without having them react more strongly than anyone else to Callirhoe. The trope is not a rule of the genre given that it appears so inconsistently, but the instances in which Longus uses it are not similar enough to those in Chariton to indicate direct allusion, so it appears to be an element available to ideal novel authors but not required of them. The pointedly mixed-gender crowds stand in contrast with the single-gender composition of tragic choruses. Choruses are frequently given the identity of an other, alienated from the external audience, and gender is a primary method of creating this effect (Gould 1996, 220; Mastronarde 1999, 94-95). The mixed-gender crowds of the novels, on the other hand, are often pointed to as evidence for a mixed-gender audience (Konstan 1994, 77-78; Kaimio 1996, 63). The inclusion of women in these crowds thus indicates the importance the novels' authors placed on making the crowds easy to identify with and not alienating, as the tragic choruses so often are.

<sup>261</sup> As is made clear in the competition with Dorcon at 1.16. The goatherd's low status that Dorcon claims is confirmed in Donatus' *Life of Virgil*, though not all pastoral uses this hierarchy. (Morgan 2004, 165)

enacted by the citizens of Mytilene in 4.33, they can still fulfill the role of a large group reacting positively to the hero's attainment of his proper status in society. Indeed, it adds an extra layer of reinforcement to the ideology of the elite meriting their status, because the hierarchy is demonstrated to be accepted by everyone in the hierarchy, even if they are very low in it. The hierarchy maintains its power by teaching people placed in vulnerable and unpleasant positions within it to nevertheless accept the validity of the hierarchy.<sup>262</sup>

The combination of the conventions of the pastoral and ideal novel genres in *Daphnis and Chloe* not only allows but even demands attention to the way people cope with class and social hierarchy. The romanticized poverty of the pastoral shepherds and the romanticized elite status of the novel protagonists clash and reveal hints of the realities of social inequality throughout the novel. The Odyssean tradition underpinning the novels easily permits this, but it also requires that all of the difficulties be smoothed over in time for the final happy ending.<sup>263</sup> The three crowd scenes play a key role in this smoothing process. The citizens of Mytilene as the home community happily welcome the protagonists back in the standard fashion, and both the poor shepherding community and the house slaves whose master Daphnis will now be demonstrate their acceptance of both his elevation above them, and their own roles lower down in the hierarchy.

### 3.2.3 Heliodorus

The *Aethiopica* is an interesting outlier among the five extant novels because it does not end in a Greek *polis*. Instead the protagonists are welcomed into the kingdom of Ethiopia, with

<sup>262</sup> This is what Winkler examines in *The Education of Chloe* (1990), in terms of the position of women rather than lower socioeconomic classes.

<sup>263</sup> See Thalmann 1998, 107 on this dynamic in the *Odyssey*.

emphasis on the capital city of Meroe. The functional difference of this is limited, however. Ethiopia is depicted entirely out of the Greek mythological and ethnographical imagination, and becomes more Greek-like in the process of accepting the protagonists into its community. The prominence of the citizenry of Meroe in the final book of the novel bridges the gap between the small Greek *poleis* and the notional size of the Ethiopian kingdom. Ultimately what appears superficially to be a highly unusual closural scene is in fact very well in line with the norms of the genre, especially in terms of the function of the prominently featured crowd.

The word δῆμος is not uncommon in the *Aethiopica*, being used to describe the chorus-like crowd in Delphi in Calasiris' story about how the protagonists met, and also for the Athenians in Cnemon's story and even the people of Memphis a few times in 8.9 when they are standing with Charicleia and against the evil Persian aristocrat Arsace. So here δῆμος retains the sense of applying to a group of positively portrayed citizens of a powerful city, but is not quite as strictly applied to Greek cities as is usual. When the people of Meroe appear, Heliodorus gives them a full paragraph of introduction which draws attention to their solidarity as a community and support for the royal family (10.3.3):

Ἐμπέπληστο γοῦν αὐτίκα χαρᾶς ἡ Μερὴν, νύκτωρ τε καὶ μεθ' ἡμέραν χοροὺς καὶ θυσίας κατὰ γένη καὶ ἀγυιάς καὶ φατρίας τοῖς θεοῖς ἀναγόντων καὶ τὰ τεμένη καταστεφόντων, οὐκ ἐπὶ τῇ νίκῃ τοσοῦτον ὅσον ἐπὶ τῇ σωτηρίᾳ τοῦ Ὑδάσπου θυμηδούντων, ἀνδρὸς δι' εὐνομίαν τε ἅμα καὶ τὸ πρὸς τοὺς ὑπηκόους ἰλεῶν τε καὶ ἡμερον πατρικόν τινα ἔρωτα τοῖς δήμοις ἐνστάξαντος.

In an instant Meroe was filled with joy as night and day, in their families, in their communities, in their clans, the people dance and offered sacrifice to the gods, festooning their sanctuaries with flowers and rejoicing not so much at the victory as at the safe return of Hydaspes, whose righteousness, combined with his civility and graciousness towards his subjects, had instilled an almost filial devotion in his people's hearts.

The description of the community has a distinct Greek flavor; φατρίας is a variant of φράτρα, which refers to clans in Homer and was a type of political body in the Athenian democracy, and

ἀγυιάς is part of the Odyssean formula δύσετό τ' ἥελιος σκιάωντό τε πᾶσαι ἀγυιαί, “and the sun set, and all the journeying ways were darkened.”<sup>264</sup> Heliodorus, like the other two sophistic novelists, writes for an audience with good Greek *paideia*,<sup>265</sup> and therefore describing this crowd in terms that evoke Homer and Athens would bring a sense of Greekness and familiarity to what could have been a very alien group. Note also the reference to the whole group as δῆμοι at the end of the passage, continuing the pattern seen in previous novels of using this term to describe chorus-like crowds. This is a community organized in familiar Greek ways, that has proper sacrificial behaviors in addition to the taboo-violating human sacrifices. Furthermore, the people are happy with their good king and their role in the hierarchy with respect to him.

This crowd parallels the Homeric Achaeans in their monarchical societies more closely than the classical Greeks that most of the chorus-like crowds are presented as, including the Delphians in the *Aethiopica*. This is due both to the *Aethiopica*'s overt allusion to the *Odyssey* and the Ethiopians' origins in the Homeric epics.<sup>266</sup> There is no indication that Heliodorus expects this to significantly impair his external audience's ability to identify with them, perhaps because by the time he was writing the classical Greeks were nearly as distant from his readership as the Bronze Age ones. Introducing the Ethiopians in this way frames their identity as Greek-like δῆμος rather than hostile barbarians like most of the Egyptians and Persians. There is also the aberrant aspect that when the crowd is assembled at 10.4.4 for the final scene only men are permitted to attend due to the religious nature of the ceremony (the human sacrifice to Helios and Selene). The only other chorus-like crowd that is specified as strictly male is the

<sup>264</sup> Translation from Lattimore 1965, appears at 2.388, 3.487, 3.497, 11.12, 15.185, 15.296, 15.471.

<sup>265</sup> Morales 2004, 6.

<sup>266</sup> The Ethiopians are frequently referenced in the Homeric epics (*Iliad* 1.423-424, 23.205-207, *Odyssey* 1.21-25, 4.81-84, 5.281-287) and the *Aethiopica* explicitly takes the *Odyssey* as its model on a number of levels, cf. Morgan 1996, 436.

crowd made up of Chaereas' navy at *Callirhoe* 8.1, and as was discussed above (n. 58) Chariton and Longus are both far more likely to specify a crowd as mixed-gender, whereas Xenophon and Achilles Tatius tend to not mention the gender mix of crowds. This crowd's strictly male composition is only mentioned once more, so the gender composition appears to function primarily as a method of building atmosphere, perhaps to make the Ethiopians appear more religious or to evoke the all-male crowds of Achaean warriors in the Homeric epics. This crowd is also given an exceptional amount of power, as the decision to go forward with the human sacrifice or not is as much in their hands as in the king's, so it may have felt more natural in ancient society for such a politically powerful body to be made up of men. At the very end of the novel at 10.40-41 the king asks if they approve of making (non-human) sacrifice to solemnize the lovers' marriage. At this final point in the scene Heliodorus specifies that it is ὁ στρατός, the army that gives approval, even though the crowd was said to include people of all ages at 10.38.3, which muddles the identity of the crowd but does serve to keep decision-making power in the hands of men in their prime years. This is the only other point at which the crowd's all-male nature is referenced, so this may be another indication that the gender makeup is due to the power dynamics.

This political power strengthens the crowd's ability to demonstrate approval of the protagonists and their acceptance into society as not only elite, but royalty and future rulers.

Initially the crowd is highly in favor of the rite of human sacrifice.<sup>267</sup> At 10.7.1 they demand it:

<sup>267</sup> Winkler 1982 takes the final scene to indicate that the entire point of Charicleia's adventures was to get the Ethiopians to cease the practice. The sage Sisimithres says νῦν τὴν κορωνίδα τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ ὡσπερ λαμπάδιον δράματος τὸν νυμφίον τῆς κόρης τουτονὶ τὸν ξένον νεανίαν ἀναφῆναντες, "now, to make our happiness complete, as the torch of a drama they have revealed that this young stranger is betrothed to the maiden." (10.39.2) This revelation is what convinces the Ethiopians to give up on human sacrifice altogether, and also allows the lovers to marry, so Winkler's interpretation is convincing. The phrase λαμπάδιον δράματος here causes some difficulty; it seems to refer to some kind of theatrical climax. Rattenbury 1960, 125 described it as "tout à fait obscure," and guessed that perhaps the hairstyle was meant instead of a torch, and the height of it transferred to the meaning of "climax," which is a fairly vexed interpretation. Arnott 1965 suggested that instead the line is a

Καὶ ἔτι τούτων δρωμένων βοή τις ἀθρόον ἠγείρετο συμμιγῆς τε καὶ ταραχώδης καὶ οἷα εἰκὸς ὑπὸ πλήθους ἀπείρου συγκλύδων ἀνθρώπων, «Τὰ πάτρια τελείσθω» τῶν περιστώτων ἐκβοώντων, «ἢ νενομισμένη θυσία λοιπὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους τελείσθω, αἱ ἀπαρχαὶ τοῦ πολέμου τοῖς θεοῖς προσαγέσθωσαν.»

But before the ceremony could be completed, it was interrupted by an outbreak of shouting, as incoherent and disorderly as one might expect from so immense and nondescript an assembly. “Perform the traditional rite!” shouted the crowd. “Now make the time-honored offerings for the nation’s safety! Offer the gods the first fruits of war!”

Here there is no doubt left about the crowd’s excitement for the sacrifice. It is also described as συμμιγῆς τε καὶ ταραχώδης, which is notable as the chorus-like crowds are rarely if ever described in negative terms. There is also a sense of dehumanization in the description πλήθους ἀπείρου συγκλύδων ἀνθρώπων, which evokes a massive, perhaps uncontrollable mob rather than a collection of reasonable individuals. Here, where this crowd demands a highly taboo sacrifice, the negative adjectives create space between the internal and external audiences that is not usually necessary but has undeniable value here. At 10.7.6 the king says he cannot rescue Charicleia from sacrifice even at the queen’s request due to the crowd’s insistence, and at 10.9.7 the sage Sisimithres also attributes the persistence of the practice (which he finds abhorrent) to the desires of the crowd.

Charicleia’s beauty elicits a measure of hesitation in the crowd’s devotion to the sacrifice. Even before Sisimithres attributes the perpetuation of the practice to the crowd, they are beginning to waver in their devotion to it due to Charicleia’s beauty. Here is their reaction to her passing the virginity test, which of course qualifies her to be sacrificed (10.9.4-5):

Θάμβος γοῦν ἅμα πάντας κατέσχε· καὶ βοήν μίαν ἄσημον μὲν καὶ ἀναρθρον δηλωτικὴν δὲ τοῦ θαύματος ἐπήχησαν τῶν τε ἄλλων ἀγασθέντες καὶ πλέον ὅτι κάλλος οὕτως ὑπεράνθρωπον καὶ τὸ ὄριον τῆς ἀκμῆς ἄθικτον ἐτήρει καὶ ἔχειν ἐνεδείκνυτο σωφροσύνην πλέον ἢ τῇ ὥρᾳ κοσμούμενον. Ἐλύπει μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλους τῶν ὄχλων ἀρμόδιος τῇ θυσίᾳ φανεῖσα, καὶ δεισιδαμονοῦντες ὁμῶς ἥδιστα ἂν εἶδον ἕκ τινος μηχανῆς περισωθεῖσαν.

reference to the *komos* at the end of a comedy, which would have involved torches. Winkler 1982, 154 suggests that it may simply be a reference to the wedding torches, since comedies so frequently end with them.

A thrill of wonder ran through the crowd, who in unison made the heavens resound with their cry, wordless and unmeaning, but expressive of their astonishment. What they found especially awesome was that she had preserved pure and undefiled a beauty so far surpassing that of humankind, even in the springtime of its years: visible proof had been furnished that, for all her youthful charms, the greatest ornament to her beauty was chastity. The crowd as a whole was saddened by this confirmation that she was meet for the sacrifice, and, despite their religious scruples, they would have been glad to see some miracle occur to save her.

At this point the crowd is still depicted in a fairly negative manner. The word ὄχλων for crowd carries association with unruly mobs, and δεισιδαίμονοῦντες usually implies superstition rather than condoned religious behavior. The use of such words is unsurprising given that the religious practice they feel bound to here was so taboo in Greek practice. But at the same time they are beginning to behave like the kind of internal audience that the reader could identify with, given their reaction to the heroine's beauty and desire to see her saved. Their reactions can function both as a means of directing the reader's reaction and as a means of making this crowd a more plausible option of identification for the external audience. The external audience's awareness of Charicleia's beauty and desire to see her saved are pre-established by the last several hundred pages of story about the effects of her beauty, which has likely wrapped the reader up in a desire to see the plot play out as expected if they have made it this far. This passage also immediately follows a vivid descriptive passage of Charicleia's appearance in her Delphic robe that references the opening tableau, her appearance in the scene in 3.4-5 when she and Theagenes fall in love, and 5.31 where Calasiris gives the backstory to the opening tableau. This circularity with the two beginnings of the story (in the sense of both the *fabula* and *sjuzhet*)<sup>268</sup> is an indication that the plot is coming to a close, and raises anticipation of that closure. With a crowd that had

<sup>268</sup> These categories are useful in analyzing narrative texts, but the terminology has never become fixed in English; here I use Lowe's rendering of Shklovsky's terminology. The categories were developed by the Russian Formalists to distinguish between the story events in the chronological order they happen within the world of the story, and the way they are ordered in the text. See Bal 1985, 5 for a description of how the categories are typically used in classics (using the terms *fabula* and *story* in van Boheemen's translation).

been more purely sympathetic this positive reaction to the heroine could stand on its own to evoke those reactions in the external audience, but with this more alien crowd Heliodorus pairs the traditional chorus-like crowd reaction of approval due to beauty with the description of Charicleia's appearance that can do the heavy lifting of creating that reaction in the reader. This turns the typical paradigm on its head, leveraging the similarity of the internal and external audiences' reactions to make the external audience identify with the internal one, rather than leveraging the sense of identification to create the similar reaction. In this case, as often, Heliodorus shows off his skills as a writer.<sup>269</sup>

The next point at which there is a key crowd reaction is in many ways the most important one, the scene in which they save Charicleia from being sacrificed. When she is acknowledged by the king and queen as their daughter there is first a quick, strictly emotional reaction given from the crowd in 10.16.3. This is followed by the king telling the crowd that it is within their authority, not his, to save her from sacrifice, which they proceed to do at 10.17.1-2. First, the reaction scene at 10.16.3:

Οὐ μὴν εἰς τὸ παντελές γε ἐξεκρούσθη τῶν πρακτέων, ἀλλ' ὀλίγον ἐπιστὰς τόν τε δῆμον κατοπτεύσας ἀπὸ τῶν ἴσων παθῶν κεκινημένον καὶ πρὸς τὴν σκηνοποιίαν τῆς τύχης ὑφ' ἡδονῆς τε ἅμα καὶ ἐλέου δακρύνοντας ἠγῆν τέ τινα θεσπεσίαν ἄχρῖς αἰθέρος αἴροντας καὶ οὔτε κηρύκων σιγὴν ἐπιταπτόντων ἐπαίοντας οὔτε τὸ βούλημα τοῦ ταραχου προδήλως ἐκφαίνοντας, τὴν χεῖρα προτεινάς καὶ κατασειῶν πρὸς ἡσυχίαν τὸ κλυδώνιον τοῦ δήμου κατέστελλε·

Nevertheless, he was not altogether deflected from what he had to do. For a moment he stood and looked at his people, whose emotions were no less than his own and who were weeping from a mixture of delight and pity at destiny's stage management of human life. An unearthly clamor rose from their lips to make the heavens resound, and, call as the heralds might for silence, the people paid no attention, though they did not make the meaning of this uproar plain. Hydaspes raised his arm and with a motion of his hand stilled the tempest that raged in the people.

<sup>269</sup> See Morgan 1989 on Heliodorus' sophistication and skill as a writer, particularly as exhibited by his handling of plot closure.



This passage is focalized through King Hydaspes, which is rare if not unique in the chorus-like crowd reaction passages, as they are generally focalized through the narrator.<sup>270</sup> He thinks of his people as a δῆμος, a term which the narrator has not used to describe them since the initial introduction of the Meroeans as a whole at 10.3.3, when the focus was on their delight at welcoming the king home and not yet on the sacrifice. There is uncertainty within the passage about the interpretation of the crowd's behavior, as their tears are attributed to ὕφ' ἠδονῆς τε ἄμα καὶ ἐλέου, but the ἠχὴν, noise that they make is said to not have its reason made clear. The weeping and noise are closely juxtaposed, with δακρύνοντας and ἠχὴν right next to each other, but Hydaspes understands the motivation for the weeping and not for the uproar. To the external audience it is plain that delight in accepting Charicleia as their princess motivates both of the crowd's reactions, which makes it clear that this description is Hydaspes' perspective. He follows this with a lengthy speech in which he says he is prepared to follow the demands of the sacred rite and sacrifice Charicleia, even though it grieves him terribly. Heliodorus informs the reader at 10.17.1 that the words of his speech were ἐνηδρευμένων, which literally means to wait in ambush and is generally taken here to mean that the speech is meant as a kind of reverse psychology.<sup>271</sup>

This makes Heliodorus' decision to focalize the first crowd reaction through the king understandable. At this point in the novel there is little suspense for the external audience as to

<sup>270</sup> All of *Leucippe and Clitophon* except the opening frame is narrated by Clitophon so his descriptions of the crowds could be argued as focalized through a protagonist in a similar manner to this passage here, but by the end of the novel where the crowd scenes appear there is a more appreciable separation between Clitophon-as-narrator and Clitophon-as-character, so the distorting impact of the character focalization is far less significant. Hägg 1971, 124-136 analyzes Clitophon's shifting function as narrator in depth, noting the points where the first person focalization breaks down most significantly on 134.

<sup>271</sup> e.g. Groves 2012, 174 ; De Temmerman 2014, 297; Morgan 2006, 57-61. Morgan notes that this is Phoenix uses this trope in the *Iliad*, and this may be an allusion, especially given how similar Hydaspes' line at 10.16.9 is to Achilles' answer to Phoenix at *Iliad* 9.612. On Phoenix as father figure see Held 1987.

whether Charicleia will be saved, but Hydaspes is far less sure, so Heliodorus reports his fatherly fear as to whether the crowd supports her re-acceptance into their society as crown princess strongly enough to override their religious sensibilities. His offer to sacrifice her then creates the opportunity for a far stronger reaction from the crowd in which they not only passively accept her return to their community in obedience to the royal couple's desire to acknowledge their daughter, but actively insist on it (10.17.1-2):

Τὸ δὲ πλῆθος τῶν Αἰθιοπῶν ἐσείσθη πρὸς τὰ εἰρημένα καὶ οὐδὲ πρὸς βραχὺ τῆς Χαρικλείας ἀγομένης ἀνασχόμενοι μέγα τι καὶ ἀθρόον ἐξέκραγον «Σῶζε τὴν κόρην» ἀναβοῶντες, «σῶζε τὸ βασιλείον αἷμα, σῶζε τὴν ὑπὸ θεῶν σωθεῖσαν· ἔχομεν τὴν χάριν· πεπλήρωται ἡμῖν τὸ νόμιμον. Ἐγνωρίσαμεν <σε> ὡς βασιλέα· γνώριζε καὶ σὺ σαυτὸν ὡς πατέρα. Ἰλήκοιεν οἱ θεοὶ τῆς δοκούσης παρανομίας. Πλέον παρανομήσομεν ἀνθιστάμενοι τοῖς ἐκείνων βουλήμασι· μηδεὶς ἀναιρεῖτω τὴν ὑπ' ἐκείνων περισωθεῖσαν. Ὁ τοῦ δήμου πατήρ, γίνου καὶ κατ' οἶκον πατήρ.»

But his words jolted the Ethiopian assembly into activity: they would not allow Charicleia to take so much as a single step towards the altar, and exclaimed loudly, as with one voice: “Let the girl live! Let the blood royal live! The gods have preserved her; you must do the same! We are satisfied; the requirements of the law have been met as far as we are concerned. We recognize you as our king; now recognize yourself as a father! May the gods forgive this apparent infringement of the law; it would be a greater infringement if we opposed their will. No one must slay her whose life they have saved! You are father of the people; now be a father in your own house!”

Heliodorus has arranged this scene so as to emphasize how strongly the crowd desires to return Charicleia to the status of crown princess. The crowd even specifies that they want to save her in the name of preserving the monarchy when they say *σῶζε τὸ βασιλείον αἷμα*, “save the royal blood,” and reiterates their acceptance of Hydaspes’ position over them as king with *Ἐγνωρίσαμεν <σε> ὡς βασιλέα*, “we recognize you as king.” The community-wide acceptance of Charicleia is explicitly attached to her hyper-elite status and preserving the dramatic social inequality of a monarchical government.

At this point in the scene, however, the crowd has only agreed that Charicleia herself will not be sacrificed. The practice itself is still condoned and expected to continue. Notably the

crowd in this passage is referred to as *Tò δὲ πλῆθος τῶν Αἰθιοπίων*; now that we have returned to focalization through the primary narrator, they are *πλῆθος* again rather than *δῆμος*. Theagenes himself is still in peril of being sacrificed, since Charicleia was too shy to tell her father of their engagement. Theagenes evokes reactions from the observing crowd as well, though not such strong ones as Charicleia does. When he passes the virginity test along with Charicleia everyone marvels (*θαυμασθεῖς*, 10.9.1) that such a handsome young man is still a virgin, so his beauty has the standard effect of encouraging the crowd to think positively of him. Heliodorus gives his hero more virtues than beauty alone, however. He impresses the observers with two athletic feats as well, catching a runaway bull and winning a wrestling match. When he defeats the bull the crowd cheers for him (10.30.5), and here in celebrating his victory they are called *δῆμος*, as they are again at 10.30.7 where they demand he wrestle a local athlete. Here their reaction to him is given more context (10.30.7):

Καὶ τοῦ Ὑδάσπου μέλλοντός τι πρὸς τὸν Θεαγένην λέγειν τε καὶ πράττειν ὁ δῆμος ἅμα μὲν ἠσθεῖς τῷ νέῳ καὶ ἐξ οὐπὲρ τὸ πρῶτον ὄφθη προσπαθῶν, ἅμα δὲ καὶ τῆς ἰσχύος ἐκπλαγεῖς, πλέον δὲ τι καὶ πρὸς τὸν Αἰθίοπα, τὸν ἀθλητὴν τὸν Μεροήβου, ζηλοτυπία δηχθεῖς.

Hydaspes was on the point of speaking to Theagenes and of dealing with him when he was interrupted by the populace: they were delighted with the young man, with whom they had sympathized from the moment they first saw him; they were impressed by his strength, but, more important, they were still smarting with resentment against Meroebos' Ethiopian champion.

Theagenes thus wins the crowd with not only the virtue of beauty, but also of athletic prowess.

This theme continues in the wrestling contest. After Theagenes defeats the giant local wrestling champion, the crowd breaks into cheers again (10.32.3):

Μιᾶς δὴ οὖν βοῆς ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ γεγωνοτέρας ἢ τὸ πρότερον ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους ἀρθείσης, οὐδὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐκαρτέρησεν ἀλλ' ἀνήλατό τε τοῦ θρόνου καὶ «Ὡ τῆς ἀνάγκης» ἔλεγεν· «οἷον ἄνδρα καταθύειν ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου πρόκειται.»

At this, with one voice, the people erupted into a clamor even more deafening than before. Even the king could not restrain himself: he leapt from his throne crying, “O Destiny, what a man the law obliges us to sacrifice!”

Here the king himself merges into the internal audience. He expresses a communal desire to, if not accept Theagenes into his community, at least raise him above the status of prisoner and sacrifice. Simple affection for Theagenes and admiration for his virtues is insufficient for this, however. He has proved himself to be elite within the Greek context of his origins with these virtues, but he has no original status within Ethiopian society that he can be returned to.

Ultimately he instead shares in Charicleia’s status due to their relationship. Before arriving in Ethiopia they clearly do not consider themselves fully married, which maintains their virginity and thus allows them to become sacrificial candidates.<sup>272</sup> When their relationship is challenged by her unknowing parents, however, they push back with the language of marriage. The priests who perform the human sacrifice must be a married couple, just as the sacrifices must be virgins, and creating this liminal status of married yet chaste makes the lovers appropriate candidates for both the roles of priests and sacrifices, creating an entertaining paradox.<sup>273</sup> When Hydaspes refuses to rescue Theagenes from sacrifice on what he believes are simply the grounds of Charicleia’s fellow-feeling with him (10.20.1), she asks if she can at least be the one to sacrifice him, and is told that she is not eligible to perform the sacrifice as the

<sup>272</sup> At Charicleia’s request, Theagenes swears an oath at 4.18.5 that he will not insist on sex before they reach Ethiopia and find her family (πρότερον ἢ γένος τε καὶ οἶκον τὸν ἡμέτερον ἀπολαβεῖν), or if they are unable to make it to Ethiopia, he will not make her his wife (γυναῖκα ποιεῖσθαι) against her will. He swears and insists he would never have had any other thoughts, and when the lovers are alone together at 5.4.5 they keep to this plan without difficulty. This shows that before Book 10, they think of their non-sexual relationship as inherently a non-marital one, intentionally preserved as such until Charicleia has left the dangerous, liminal state of runaway and is safely re-ensconced in her original status within her home community. As soon as she regains this status, they begin to treat the oath as functionally fulfilled and their relationship as marital, if not yet sexual.

<sup>273</sup> The Greek wedding was at its core a ceremony to give the couple’s sexual relationship legitimate status within the community (Oakley and Sinos 1993, 9), and the ceremony itself ended with consummation (Oakley and Sinos 1993, 37), so a virginal married couple was inherently a contradiction in terms.

priests of Helios and Selene must be married. The words Hydaspes uses here are τοῦ μὲν γυναικὶ τῆς δὲ ἀνδρὶ συνοικουσίας, “living together with a wife or husband” (10.21.2). While she cannot talk to her father about this, she does tell her mother «ἔστι γὰρ κάμοί, μητέρα, ὁ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτο πληρῶν, εἰ καὶ ὑμεῖς βουλευθείητε.», “there is a man I can call husband, mother, if you will give your consent” (10.21.3). For Charicleia, the connection is formed between the two of them with the exception of parental agreement. When Theagenes has the same conversation with Hydaspes about whether Charicleia can serve as his sacrificer he drops the caveat, simply saying ἔχει ἄνδρα καὶ αὐτὴ, “she has a husband” (10.33.1). It is possible that the unspecific nature of the Greek words for husband and wife is working in favor of creating the paradox here. Once the queen finally understands what the lovers are saying she calls Theagenes the more specific term νυμφίον, “bridegroom” (10.38.2). The lovers are certainly the relevant man and woman in each other’s lives, respectively, even if the wedding ritual has not been performed.

The Ethiopians accept the engagement between the lovers as soon as they understand it, including the necessary elevation in Theagenes status from sacrificial prisoner to crown prince.<sup>274</sup> Immediately after the queen calls Theagenes Charicleia’s bridegroom, the crowd erupts into celebration (10.38.3-4):

Ὁ δῆμος ἐτέρωθεν σὺν εὐφήμοις ταῖς βοαῖς ἐξεχώρευε, πᾶσα ἡλικία καὶ τύχη συμφώνως τὰ γινόμενα θυμηδοῦντες, τὰ μὲν πλεῖστα τῶν λεγομένων οὐ συνιέντες, τὰ ὄντα δὲ ἐκ τῶν προγεγονότων ἐπὶ τῇ Χαρικλείᾳ συμβάλλοντες, ἢ τάχα καὶ ἐξ ὀρμῆς θείας ἢ

<sup>274</sup> The appointment of a Greek as consort to the crown princess of Ethiopia attracts little consternation, from either the characters in the novel or scholars reading it. Burrus 2005, 83 finds both Charicleia’s and Theagenes’ ethnic identities to be lightly held, recalling Perkins 1999’s comparison of Charicleia’s situation to that of black characters in American novels who pass as white, and argues the protagonists here do little more than “pass” as either Greek or Ethiopian. Whitmarsh 2011, 125-6 notes the sophistry in Theagenes’ argument that Achilles was from his hometown, which recalls the strategies that cities with what he describes as “marginal claims to Greekness” used to shore up that claim. As a descendant and double for Achilles, Theagenes is deeply Greek, but as a Thessalian who must twist mythology in knots to claim Greek identity, and a man who happily leaves Greece for Ethiopia with no plan to ever return, he is indeed only lightly Greek. The oracle that predicts the end of the story, and which is repeated at the end as the protagonists are inducted into the priesthood, describes Theagenes’ and Charicleia’s brows as μελαινομένον, “turning black” (10.41.2), so in the absence of any mention of physical transformation this may be meant to refer to cultural transformation of a kind, as they are seamlessly integrated into Ethiopian society.

σύμπαντα ταῦτα ἐσκηνογράφησεν εἰς ὑπόνοιαν τῶν ἀληθῶν ἐλθόντες. Ὑφ' ἧς καὶ τὰ ἐναντιώτατα πρὸς συμφωνίαν ἠρμόζετο, χαρᾶς καὶ λύπης συμπεπλεγμένων, γέλωτι δακρύων κεραννυμένων, τῶν στυγνοτάτων εἰς ἑορτὴν μεταβαλλομένων, γελόντων ἅμα τῶν κλαιόντων καὶ χαιρόντων τῶν θρηνούντων, εὐρισκόντων οὐκ μὴ ἐζήτουν καὶ ἀπολλύντων οὐκ εὐρηκέναι ἐδόκουν, καὶ τέλος τῶν προσδοκηθέντων φόνων εἰς εὐαγεῖς θυσίας μεταβαλλομένων.

The populace cheered and danced for joy where they stood, and there was no discordant voice as young and old, rich and poor, united in jubilation, for though they had understood very little of what was said, they were able to surmise the facts of the matter from what had already transpired concerning Charicleia; or else perhaps they had been brought to a realization of the truth by the same divine force that had staged this whole drama and that now produced a perfect harmony of diametric opposites: joy and sorrow combined; tears mingled with laughter; the most hideous terror transformed to celebration; those who wept also laughed; those who grieved also rejoiced; they found those whom they had not sought and lost those whom they thought to have found; and finally the offering of human blood, which all had expected to see, was transformed into a sacrifice that was free of all stain.

The crowd celebrates even before the king has agreed that this is a divine sign for the Ethiopians to abandon human sacrifice and agrees to allow the lovers to marry. The revelation of Theagenes' engagement to Charicleia, whom the crowd has already accepted as princess, is enough for them to accept him instantly in his new status. Note that here the crowd is described as very comprehensive. It is referred to as the δῆμος at the top of the passage. There is no reference to its strictly male composition, and the ways in which it does span multiple demographics within the δῆμος are drawn out with the phrase πᾶσα ἡλικία καὶ τύχη, "all ages and fortunes." This creates the sense of the entire community agreeing to this young foreigner being the consort to the crown princess, which cold logic would suggest is not inevitable. The king had previously suggested she marry her cousin in 10.24, who would make a far more logical future king for Ethiopia. This puts extra pressure on the community's demonstration of acceptance for Theagenes, since there is a distinct possibility that they might not accept him despite his various virtues as a hero.

Interestingly the first verb used to describe the crowd's reaction is ἐξεχώρευε; it dances.<sup>275</sup> This is one of the most overt references to the chorus-like crowd's similarity to the tragic chorus in any of the novels, and is followed by the reference to a divine force that has ἐσκηνογράφησεν, "staged" the scene. Winkler interprets the divine force as Heliodorus, and thus the communication of what has happened to the crowd places the crowd in the role of the external audience of the novel.<sup>276</sup> This move strengthens the previously shaky identification between the internal and external audience, whose understanding of the Greek and of the conventions of the genre are more explicable.<sup>277</sup> The gap between the external audience and the internal one is fully bridged at the very end of the novel, where their understanding of the scene merges. Heliodorus draws the connection between the internal and external audience at the same time as he reminds the reader of the connection between the internal control level (the gods) and the external one (himself),<sup>278</sup> and makes the reference to theater explicit. The real world and

<sup>275</sup> The form ἐκχορεύω usually means to *leave* a dance, but the ἐκ- clearly functions as an intensifier here. It is possible that there is some connection to the idea of Charicleia leaving her role as Artemis' acolyte and becoming a married woman and priestess of Selene, due to a line in Euripides (*Hel.*382) that uses this rare compound of χορεύω and describes Artemis driving a maiden from her chorus for being too beautiful (a Merops is also mentioned as the maiden's father, a name associated with Ethiopia and Meroe). If there is an intentional reference here to Euripides that would strengthen the connection between this scene and elements of Attic tragedy, but the contradictory uses of ἐκχορεύω leave the possible allusion uncertain. Hägg 1983, 73 notes Euripides' extensive influence on Heliodorus, so this subtle allusion may be part of that larger pattern.

<sup>276</sup> Winkler 1982, 127.

<sup>277</sup> Groves 2012, 170 notes that Heliodorus has already presented a rationale by which the non-Greek speaking crowd can understand the major characters' Greek conversation (at 10.15.1 it is stated that some in the crowd who do speak Greek explain the action to the others). Heliodorus' decision to not use the same rationale again shows that the gap in causal continuity created by the crowd's comprehension is intentional, and suggests that Heliodorus does this to create a sense of transcendence and draw attention to the role of himself as the author; he is of course the divine force staging the scene. Winkler 1982, 106 takes the theme of language barriers throughout the novel to create a degree of separation between the reader, who must know Greek to understand the Greek text, and any barbarian characters who do not know Greek. The crowd's last-minute miraculous comprehension of Greek is then another means of creating the final sense of identification between this crowd and the reader.

<sup>278</sup> The "control level" is part of Lowe's conception of the rules that govern classical plots (Lowe 2000, 56-58). The control level explains why the world of the story is following these rules; in epic poetry and the highly epic-intertextual *Aethiopica*, it is the will of the gods. Typically it is a sign of poor writing when the plausibility of the internal control-level slips and reveals simply the will of the author, as Aristotle objects to in the *Poetics* 15-16. Reminders of the author's influence can at times be used for intentional effect, usually at the end of the text.

story world are both brought to the attention of the reader, and the reader's happiness at seeing the story end in a satisfying manner is used as part of the motivation for the Ethiopians' acceptance of Theagenes into their community. The happy ending of the story is thus reliant not only on the community's happiness to see him as their prince, but also the reader's.

### 3.3 Conclusion

The ideal novels all include a crowd in the final scene which represents the broader community and expresses joy at the return of the protagonists. These crowds are internal audiences that resemble, and in some cases actively allude to, the function of choruses in tragedy. Like the tragic choruses, this internal audience function can easily be oversimplified into reading the internal audience as a model for the external one, to assist in the successful interpretation of the scene. There is little reason to assume that the external audience found these scenes difficult to interpret, however, or that the authors suspected that their audiences (who are frequently treated as highly educated by the novel authors) would find them difficult. The functions of the internal audience are inevitably more complex, especially as the internal audiences are presented as targets for the external audience to identify with.

Gould argued that one of the major functions of the tragic chorus is to represent collective experience, in contrast to the highly individual experience of the major characters, and this is certainly a function of the novels' crowds as well.<sup>279</sup> The crowds are almost always presented as representatives of the totality of the home community that the protagonists are

Examples are Heliodorus here, Chariton's first person remarks on the contents of his final book at 8.1.4, and the description of the protagonist Lucius in the *Metamorphoses* as "Madaurenses" at 11.27, Apuleius rather than Lucius being the one from Madaura. Winkler 1985, 128 argues persuasively that this is not a reason to take Lucius as a cipher for Apuleius for the entirety of the book. This is supported by these similar instances in Chariton and Heliodorus, which are more clearly intentional breaks from patterns of strict authorial transparency (cf Lowe 2000, 73-78) that they maintain in the earlier portions of the novels.

<sup>279</sup> Gould 1996, 222.



rejoining via the successful resolution of the plot. As targets of identification for the external audience they also represent the readers to some degree; indeed, despite the radical difference of identity between the members of the crowd and the readers, their shared role of audience connects them to each other. The strong tendency to give the crowd members the identity of Greek citizens, in addition to the relative indifference of several authors as to whether the crowds are actually the other citizens of the *polis* that the protagonists originated in, suggests that they represent Greek society in a fairly broad and unspecific way. Standing in these three roles, the crowds express their delight at the return of the protagonists to elite status, usually on the basis of their extraordinary beauty which is an inborn marker of the protagonists, and in several cases explicitly linked to their elite birth. The final closural scenes of the novels show the community as a whole sanctioning the elites' retention of their high status, on the basis of their innate superiority to those around them. This community is constructed as not only representing the fictional characters in the novel, but on some level also representing the readers themselves. The end effect is not only to tell the readers that the characters within the text are happy with the structure of society, but even to tell the readers that they themselves (or more properly we ourselves) are happy with it as well.

## Conclusion

The scenes which bring closure to the plots of the Greek ideal novels are all fundamentally supportive of the hierarchies of social order. The happy endings of these novels are happy not only because the lovers reunite, but also because elite youth are returned from slavery and degradation to their original elite station and accepted back into their natal families by their fathers. The joy of their return to high status is shared by the whole community, from the powerful citizens who control and represent it to the people who are left behind in slavery while the protagonists are rescued. The correctness of the social hierarchies of freedom, political power, and familial power is reinforced by the communal relief and satisfaction in seeing the characters correctly placed within the hierarchy.

This pro-elite ideology is inherent to the plot structure of the novels and appears to be inherited along with it, as the same ideology is visible in the *Odyssey* as well. This ideology does not permeate the texts in their entirety, but only becomes unavoidable in the scenes that resolve the plot. Several of the texts have scenes earlier on that could be interpreted as drawing attention to the suffering of less powerful people in society and even the unfairness of that suffering. This suggests that the authors were not entirely committed to the pro-elite ideology themselves. The persistent presence of this ideology in the closural scenes is then best attributed to the structure of the plot itself. Part of the drama of this plot is the protagonists' loss of status and their triumphant resumption of their original status in the closural scenes; this can only happen within a hierarchical society, and the more severe the suffering of the lower classes, the more dramatic the return to the ranks of the elite is.

Built on this plot move, these closural scenes become suffused with this pro-hierarchy ideology throughout, even in non-plot aspects of the scenes. The element of return to the natal

family is a part of the *Odyssey*'s homecoming plot, but relegated to the declining action in Book 24, and the dynamics of familial power shift significantly between the *Odyssey* and the novels. Nevertheless, every novel's closural scenes include an element of the natal family or family-like structure returning to a stable form under the firm, guiding hand of a man who can be head of the household. The positive associations with hierarchical community structure, which are critical to the main plot of the protagonists' loss and resumption of status, are reflected in hierarchy of the family, which receives an equally positive and persistent representation in the closural scenes despite less obvious importance to the plot structure. The chorus-like crowds, a supportive internal audience, are barely connected to the plot at all. They are observers, and the final actions of the plot do not require their validating presence, but the importance of the pro-hierarchical ideology to the scene is apparently such that none of the authors of an extant novel were willing to do without the representatives of the broader collective experience reinforcing the correctness and happiness of the final plot actions.

The first chapter of this dissertation discussed how the closure of the romantic plots is always contextualized as part of the lovers' return to their original ranks in society. The lovers' relationship with each other is famously equal. Konstan showed how the sharply differentiated gender roles between men and women in both ancient and modern erotic literature are uniquely absent from the relationships of the lovers in the ideal novels. They desire each other equally, struggle to stay together equally, and are equally helpless against the adventures that pull them apart.<sup>280</sup> As the genre develops, they also become less interested in their own social status, shifting from being primarily motivated by the desire to return to their original communities and social roles, to being motivated by the desire to marry their beloved.<sup>281</sup> My analysis shows that

<sup>280</sup> Konstan 1994.

the closural plot scenes of romantic union and reunion focus on the return of the lovers to their elite positions in their home communities. As the lovers lose interest in their status, the narratives shift away from focus on their personal reunions and towards scenes of public ceremonies that establish the social status of the protagonists. The shift of the wedding from the beginning of the novel to the end is the most salient example, but ceremonies confirming the protagonists as the children of their powerful parents also appear, and the emotional experiences of the protagonists disappear from the climactic closural scenes. The result is that the closural scenes of the romantic plotline continue to focus on the return of the protagonists to their original elite status, regardless of how the characterization of the protagonists or the shapes of the stories change.

In Chapter 2, I examine the dynamics of the protagonists' return to their families, and discover that in each of them a man with substantial agency and authority in one of the protagonists' natal families governs the action of the closural scenes.<sup>281</sup> Initially Odysseus himself is the governing character in the *Odyssey*, masterfully orchestrating and controlling the action of the final scenes. The heroes of the novels are far more passive than Odysseus, however, so the authors of the novels must find other candidates. The early, pre-sophistic novels struggle with this, and we see two different experiments with varying levels of success, one in which the hero's character rapidly develops into a more epic mold at the very end of the novel, and one in which a secondary character is elevated into a primary character. The authors of the sophistic novels ultimately solved the dilemma by putting the father of one of the protagonists in control of the closural scenes. The effect of this is to present familial hierarchy as a prime contributor to the maintenance of the community hierarchy, and as something both positive and necessary.

<sup>281</sup> Whitmarsh 2011, 145-155.

<sup>282</sup> Or pseudo-families as in the *Ephesiaca*.

In Chapter 3, I step away from plot to study the role of the internal audience of the closural scenes. Almost all of the plot-resolving actions take place in public, in front of an approving crowd that usually consists of the citizens of a Greek or home-associated state. These crowds function much like the choruses of the Attic tragedies, representing collective experience both within the story and without. Internally, they represent the home community re-accepting the protagonists, and externally they function as representatives of the readership. Standing as representatives of these groups, the chorus-like crowds then demonstrate strong approval of the final moves of the plot, in which the protagonists are returned to elite status. In almost all of the novels, the crowds' approval of the protagonists and their return to the community is explicitly grounded in their extraordinary beauty, which is associated with their elite status.<sup>283</sup> So not only does the internal audience reinforce the idea that social hierarchy is acceptable and good, they also predicate their positive judgement of this hierarchy on the idea that the elite are born naturally better and more virtuous than other people.

The reaffirmation of the pre-existing social order and the comforting confirmation of the correctness of the familiar that comes along with it is then the dominant theme of the closural scenes.<sup>284</sup> I argue here that this comfort must be disrupted, even in the modern day. The suffering inherent in the inequalities of ancient hierarchies is the driver of the drama of the ideal novels, and to be comforted by the protagonists' rescue from the suffering of low status people is to ignore the suffering of those who languished in disempowered states historically. Scholars of the ideal novel therefore need to bear the presence of the pro-elite ideology in mind whenever we

<sup>283</sup> The exception is the ever-parodic Achilles Tatius, in whose novel the protagonists' beauty is what gets them into trouble in the first place, and it is the grace of Artemis that rescues them. This is somewhat parallel with Athena's role in Odysseus' successful return to his original status at the end of the *Odyssey*, so while Achilles Tatius inverts the norms of the genre, his choice is not out of step with the broader cultural ideas about the causes and effects of eliteness.

<sup>284</sup> Whitmarsh 2011, 178.

study these texts. The transparency of the classical plot makes plot-borne ideological messaging difficult to notice and therefore insidious, so active mindfulness is necessary on the part of scholars to recognize these messages and analyze them rather than accept and perpetuate them. This is true of any narrative genre, even the non-classically plotted ones,<sup>285</sup> as plot transparency is not limited to the epic and dramatic genres, and the modern scholar's heavy exposure to classically plotted modern novels may create in us a habit of not paying attention to plot moves on an analytical level.

There are important questions to be asked about the source and effects external to the novels of the pro-hierarchical ideology in their closural scenes, such as the reactions that the external audience had to this ideology both emotionally and behaviorally, and possible effects of the political circumstances of the times and places in which the novels were written on the popularity of these plot structures and ideologies. The historical context of the novels lies beyond the scope of this dissertation, but there is potential to address it in future studies. The authors of the novels were widely separated from each other in space and time, and brought many different influences and elements into their novels, and yet as I have demonstrated they maintained a striking level of consistency within the genre. The lack of information on the authors creates a significant challenge to the investigation of these questions, as it is difficult to know what the historical contexts were for people about whom we know so little. A similar lack of information about the readership makes study of the effects of this sort of messaging a challenge.<sup>286</sup>

A fair amount of information about both author and readership can be deduced from available evidence, however.<sup>287</sup> The forms of the novels afford opportunities for understanding

<sup>285</sup> Lowe 2000, 79-99.

<sup>286</sup> For an overview of what information is extant, see Morgan 1995.

the effect of these ideologies on readers and other authors, and the transmission of such ideas outside of the texts themselves. That is, the ideal novels are themselves evidence for how readers of the *Odyssey* processed and reacted to such ideology in antiquity. The adoption of this material from the *Odyssey* by the genre of the ideal novel is evidence that the novel authors found it effective, and included it in their own writing because they desired to have a similar effect on their readers. This same logic holds for texts that draw material from the ideal novels, most notably novel-like Christian tales such as *Paul and Thecla*.<sup>288</sup> Better evidence is also available for the Byzantine reception of the novels.<sup>289</sup> Ideal novels are also far from the only genre in which the closural scenes are dominated by conservative, pro-hierarchical social ideologies.<sup>290</sup> Other genres with better documented social context could offer more answers as to why these plot structures and ideologies exhibit such broad and sustained appeal, as Attic tragedy aided in my study of the chorus-like crowds in Chapter 3.

Plot can be difficult to study, with the hazy colloquiality of the word rendering it both useful and imprecise. In the end, however, it is worth the challenge. To study the plot of a text is to look at the bones of the thing, stripped of the fascinating but distracting detailed features, the skin and fur and feathers. The basic plot structure of the hero losing status and regaining it in the end contains dangerous ideological ramifications. The happiness of the happy ending is merged with the confirmation of the injustices of the world, and the comfort in these endings is derived from the familiarity of the unjust social hierarchies. Underneath Heliodorus' cleverness, Longus' erudition, Achilles Tatius' wryness, Chariton's earnestness, and even Xenophon's simplicity are

<sup>287</sup> As in Tilg 2010, 24-82, Hunter 2008, Bowie 1996.

<sup>288</sup> Hilton 2017, Pervo 1996, Hägg 1983, 154-165.

<sup>289</sup> Burton 2008, Beaton 1996.

<sup>290</sup> Whitmarsh 2011, 178, Parrinder 2006, 106-25, Radway 1987, 65-7.

the ancient shapes of the stories the Homeric bards made to please the Bronze Age aristocracy. Those aristocratic habits of mind are passed down unnoticed from one generation to the next until we notice and examine them, and by means of our examination free our minds from the subtle controls of the plot.



## Bibliography

- Altheim, F. 1951. *Roman und Dekadenz*. Tübingen.
- Alvares, J. 1995. "The Drama of Hippothous' in Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaca*." *The Classical Journal*, 90.4, 393-404.
- Alvares, J. 2001-2002. "Some Political and Ideological Dimensions of Chariton's 'Chaereas and Callirhoe.'" *The Classical Journal*, 97.2, 113-144.
- Alvarez, J. 2014. "Daphnis and Chloe: Innocence and Experience, Archetypes and Art." A *Companion to the Ancient Novel*. Ed. E. P. Cueva, S. N. Byrne. Wiley Blackwell.
- Amory, A. 1963. "The Reunion of Odysseus and Penelope." *Essays on the Odyssey: Select Modern Criticism*, ed. C. H. Taylor, Jr. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Anderson, G. 1982. *Eros Sophistes*. The American Philological Association.
- Anderson, G. 1997. "Perspectives on Achilles Tatius." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II*, 34.3.
- Anderson, G. 2017. "Artistry in the Ancient Novel." *Ancient Narrative* 14, 1-46.
- Arnott, W. G. 1965. "ΩΣΠΙΕΡ ΛΑΜΠΙΑΔΙΟΝ ΔΡΑΜΑΤΟΣ." *Hermes* 93, 253-255.
- Austin, N. 1975. *Archery at the Dark of the Moon: Poetic Problems in Homer's Odyssey*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.
- Bakhtin, M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Ed. M. Holquist, trans. C Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bal, M. 1985. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. Trans. C. van Beoheemen. University of Toronto Press: Toronto, Buffalo, London.
- Bartch, S. 1989. *Decoding the Ancient Novel*. Princeton University Press.
- Beaton, R. 1996. "The Byzantine Revival of the Ancient Novel." In Schmeling, G. ed. *The Novel in the Ancient World*. E. J. Brill, Leiden, New York, Köln.
- Beck, R. 1996. "Mystery Religions, Aretalogy and the Ancient Novel." *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. G. Schmeling. Brill: Leiden, New York, Köln.
- Billault, A. 1989. "De L'Histoire au Roman: Hermocrate de Syracuse." *Revue des Études Greques*. 102.487, 540-548.

- Boswell, J. 1988. *The Kindness of Strangers*. Pantheon Books, New York.
- Bowie, E. L. 1985. "The Greek Novel," in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* ed. P. E. Easterling and B. M. W. Knox, Cambridge University Press. Reprinted in *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, ed. S. Swain, 1999, Oxford University Press.
- Bowie, E. L. 1996. "The Ancient Readers of the Greek Novel." In Schmeling, G. ed. *The Novel in the Ancient World*. E. J. Brill, Leiden, New York, Köln.
- Branham, R. B. 2002. *Bakhtin and the Classics*. Northwestern University Press.
- Brethes, R. 2007. "Poinēin aischra kai legein aischra, est ce vraiment la même chose?" *Seeing Tongues, Hearing Scripts: Orality and Representation in the Ancient Novel*. *Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 7.
- Briquel-Chatonnet, F. 1992. "L'image des Phéniciens dans les romans grecs." *Le Monde du Roman Grec*, ed. M. Baslez, P. Hoffman, and M Trédé. Études de Littérature Ancienne Tome 4. Presses de l'École normale supérieure – Paris.
- Brooks, P. 1984. *Reading for Plot*. Vintage Books. Random House, New York.
- Burton, J. B. 2008. "Byzantine Readers." Whitmarsh, T. ed. *The Greek and Roman Novel*. Cambridge University Press.
- Budelmann, F. and T. Power. 2015. "Another Look at Female Choruses in Classical Athens." *Classical Antiquity*, 34.2, 252-295.
- Burrus, V. 2005. "Mimicking Virgins: Colonial Ambivalence and the Ancient Romance." *Arethusa* 38.1, 49-88.
- Cantarella, E. 1988. *Secondo natura : La bisessualità nel mondo antico*. Bari: Riuniti.
- Carlier, P. 1984. *La Royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre*. Études et travaux, Université des sciences humaines de Strasbourg, groupe de recherche d'histoire romain 6. Strasbourg : AECR.
- Chalk, H. H. O. 1960. "Eros and the Lesbian Pastorals of Longus." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 80, pp. 32-51.
- Chekov, A. P. 1889. Letter to A. S. Lazarev, Nov. 1st.
- Chew, K. 2000. "Achilles Tatius and Parody." *The Classical Journal* 96.1, 57-70.
- Cioffi, R. L. 2014. "Seeing Gods: Epiphany and Narrative in the Greek Novels." *Ancient Narrative* 11, 1-42.

- Cioffi, R. L. 2016. *Travel in the Roman World*. Oxford Handbooks Online.
- Connors, C. 2002. "Chariton's Syracuse and its histories of empire." *Space in the Ancient Novel*, ed. M. Paschalis, S. Frangoulidis. *Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 1.
- Cooper, K. 1996. *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts; London, England.
- Cresci, L. 1999. "The Novel of Longus the Sophist and the Pastoral Tradition." *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, ed. S. Swain. Oxford University Press.
- Curran, A. 2016. *Aristotle and the Poetics*. Routledge.
- De Jong, I. 1987. *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*. B. R. Grüner Publishing Co. – Amsterdam.
- De Temmerman, K. 2009. "Chaereas Revisited: Rhetorical control in Chariton's 'ideal' novel *Callirhoe*." *Classical Quarterly* 59, 247-262.
- De Temmerman, K. 2010. "How ideal is the oldest ideal Greek novel?" *Mnemosyne* 63, 465-478.
- De Temmerman, K. 2014. *Crafting Characters*. Oxford University Press, Oxford Scholarship Online.
- Dowden, K. 1996. "Heliodoros: Serious Intentions." *Classical Quarterly* 46,1, 267-285.
- Durham, D. B. 1938. "Parody in Achilles Tatius." *Classical Philology* 33, 1-19.
- Effe, B. 1987. "Der griechische Liebesroman und die Homoerotik. Ursprung und Entwicklung einer eischen Gattungskonvention." *Philologus* 131, 95-108.
- Egger, B. 1994. "Looking at Chariton's *Callirhoe*." *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, ed. J. R. Morgan and R. Stoneman. Routledge.
- Epstein, S. J. 1995. "Longus' werewolves." *Classical Philology* 90, 58-73.
- Falk, E. H. 1965. *Types of Thematic Structure*. Chicago.
- Falkner, T. M. 1995. *The Poetics of Old Age in Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy*. University of Oklahoma Press: Norman and London.
- Farron, S. G. 1979. "The *Odyssey* as an Anti-Aristocratic Statement." *Studies in Antiquity* 1, 59-101.

- Feuillâtre, E. 1966. *Études sur les Éthiopiennes d'Héliodore: contribution à la connaissance du roman grec*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Foley, H. 2003. "Choral Identity in Greek Tragedy." *Classical Philology* 98, 1-30.
- Forster, E. M. 1927. *Aspects of the Novel*. London.
- Foucault, M. 1984. *Histoire de la Sexualité*. Vol. 3, *Le souci de soi*. Paris : Gallimard.
- Fowler, D. 1989. "First Thoughts on Closure: Problems and Prospects." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 22, 75-122.
- Fowler, D. 1997. "Second Thoughts on Closure." *Classical Closure*, ed. D. H. Roberts, F. M. Dunn, D. Fowler. Princeton University Press.
- Freud, S. 1920. *Beyond the Pleasure Principle [Jenseits de Lustprinzips]*. In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Freud*, ed. J. Strachey, 1953-74. London: Hogarth Press.
- Fusillo, M. 1997. "How Novels End: Some Patterns of Closure in Ancient Narrative." *Classical Closure*, ed D. Roberts, F. Dunn, and D. Fowler. Princeton University Press.
- Garnaud, J. 2002. *Achille Tatius: Le Roman de Leucippé et Clitophon*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres
- Gaselee, S. 1969. *Achilles Tatius: Leucippe and Clitophon*. Harvard University Press.
- Goldhill, S. 1995. *Foucault's Virginité*. Cambridge University Press.
- Goldhill, S. 1996. "Collectivity and Otherness." *Tragedy and the Tragic*, ed M. Silk. Oxford University Press.
- Gomme, A. W. and F. H. Sandbach, 1973. *Menander: A Commentary*. Oxford.
- Gould, J. 1996. "Tragedy and Collective Experience." *Tragedy and the Tragic*, ed M. Silk. Oxford University Press.
- Graverini, L. 2014. "From the Epic to the Novelistic Hero." *A Companion to the Ancient Novel*. Ed. E. P. Cueva and S. N. Byrne. Wiley Blackwell.
- Greitlein, J. 2016. "Minding the Middle in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*: False Closure, Triangular Foils, and Self-Reflection." *The Classical Quarterly*, vol 66, pp 316-335.
- Groves, R. 2012. *Cross-Language Communication in Heliodorus' Aethiopica*. University of California Los Angeles.

- Guez, J. 2012. "Le royaume d'Aphrodite et la grotte d'Artémis: amour et chasteté chez Achilles Tatius." *Publications de la Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée*, vol 48, 33-53.
- Hägg, T. 1971. *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances*. Svenska Institutet i Athen, Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri Aktiebolag.
- Hägg, T. 1983. *The Novel in Antiquity*. University of California Press.
- Haight, E. 1943. *Essays on the Greek Romances*. Longmans, Green, and Co. Inc.
- Halliwell, S. 1995. *Aristotle: Poetics*. Loeb Classical Library 199. Harvard University Press.
- Halperin, D. M, J. J. 1990. Winkler, F. I. Zeitlin, eds. *Before Sexuality*. Princeton University Press. Princeton, New Jersey.
- Halverson, J. 1986. "The Succession Issue in the *Odyssey*." *Greece & Rome* 33.2, 119-128.
- Harsh, P. 1950. "Penelope and Odysseus in *Odyssey* XIX." *The American Journal of Philology* 12.2, 66-76.
- Hefti, V. 1950. *Zur Erzählungstechnik in Heliodors Aethiopica*. Wien: Holzhausen.
- Held, G. F. 1987. 'Phoenix, Agamemnon and Achilleus. Problems and Paradeigmata', *Classical Quarterly* 37, 245-61.
- Henderson, J. 2009. *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe, Xenophon of Ephesus: Anthia and Habrocomes*. Loeb Classical Library 69. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England.
- Hilton, J. 2017. "The Cost of Leadership." *Mass and Elite in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, ed. R. Evans. Routledge: London, New York.
- Holzberg, N. 1996. "The Genre: Novels Proper and the Fringe." In *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. G. Schmeling. E. J. Brill.
- Hunter, R. 2008. "Ancient Readers." In Whitmarsh, T, ed. *The Greek and Roman Novel*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kamio, M. 1970. *The Chorus of Greek Drama within the Light of the Person and Number Used*. Comm. Hum. Litt. Soc. Sc. Fennicae, 46. Helsinki.
- Kaimio, M. 1995. "How to Manage in a Male World: The strategies of the heroine in Chariton's novel." *Acta Antiqua* 36, 119-132.
- Kaimio, M. 1996. "How to Enjoy a Greek Novel." *Arctos*, vol. 30, 49-73.

- Katz, M. A. 1991. *Penelope's Renown: Meaning and Indeterminacy in the Odyssey*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Kauffman, N. 2015. "Beauty as Fiction in *Leucippe and Clitophon*." *Ancient Narrative* 12, 43-69.
- Kerényi, K. 1927. *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr.
- Kermode, F. 1967. *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Keydell, R. 1966. "Zur Datierung der *Aithiopika* Heliodors." *Polychronion: Festschrift Für Fr. Dölger*, ed. P. Wirth. Heidelberg.
- Kirk, G. S. 1962. *The Songs of Homer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- König, J. 2006. "Body and Text." In Whitmarsh, T, ed. 2008. *The Greek and Roman Novel*. Cambridge University Press.
- Konstan, D. 1994. *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*. Princeton University Press.
- Kruchio, B. 2017. "What Charicles Knew: Fragmentary Narration and Ambiguity in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*." *Ancient Narrative* 14, 175-194.
- Kuch, H., ed. 19889. *Der antike Roman: Untersuchungen zur literarischen Kommunikation und Gattungsgeschichte*. Berlin.
- Kuch, H. 1996. "A Study on the Margin of the Ancient Novel: 'Barbarians' and Others." In *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. G. Schmeling. Brill: Leiden, New York, Köln.
- Lacan, J. 1966. *Ecrits*. Trans. A. Sheridan, 1977. New York: Norton.
- Lattimore, R. 1965. *The Odyssey of Homer*. Harper Perennial.
- Létoublon, F. 1993. *Les Lieux Communs Du Roman*. Mnemosyne Supplement 123. Brill.
- Le Retour de Martin Guerre*. 1982. Directed and produced by Daniel Vigne. S.F.P.C., Production Marcel Dassault, France 3.
- Liddell, P. 1953. *Some Principles of Fiction*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Loraux, N. 1987. *Tragic Ways of Killing a Woman*. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press.

- Lowe, N. 2000. *The Classical Plot and the Invention of Western Narrative*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lumb, T. W. and R. M. Rattenbury. *Héliodore: Les Éthiopiennes (Théagène et Chariclée)*. Trans. J. Maillon. Societe d'Édition « Les Belles Lettres ».
- Mackail, J. W. 1926. *Classical Studies*. New York: MacMillan.
- Marinčič, M. 2007. "Advertising One's Own Story: Text and Speech in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*." In *Seeing Tongues, Hearing Scripts: Orality and Representation in the Ancient Novel*, ed. V. Romell. *Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 7, 168-200.
- Mastrorade, D. 1998. "Il coro euripideo: Autorità e integrazione." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, New Series, 60.3, 55-80.
- Mastrorade, D. 1999. "Knowledge and Authority in the Choral Voice of Euripidean Tragedy." *Syllecta Classica* 10.1, 87-104.
- Merkelbach, R. 1962. *Roman und Mysterium in der Antike*. Munich: Beck.
- Miller, D. A. 1981. *Narrative and its Discontents*. Princeton University Press.
- Mitchell, E. 2014. "The Boy's Own Love Story: The romantic adventures of Leucippe, Kleitophon, and Kleitophon's friends." *Ancient Narrative*, vol 11, pp. 43-73.
- Monro, D. B. 1901. *Homer's Odyssey XIII-XXIV*. Oxford University Press.
- Montiglio, S. 2012. *Love and Providence: Recognition in the Ancient Novel*. Oxford University Press.
- Morales, H. 2004. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*. Cambridge University Press.
- Morgan, J. R. 1978. *A commentary on the ninth and tenth books of the Aithiopica of Heliodoros*. University of Oxford.
- Morgan, J. R. 1982. "History, Romance, and Realism in the Aithiopika of Heliodoros." *Classical Antiquity*, 1.2, 221-265.
- Morgan, J. R. 1989a. "A Sense of the Ending: The Conclusion of Heliodoros' Aithiopika." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 119, 299-320.
- Morgan, J. R. 1989b. "The Story of Knemon in Heliodoros' Aithiopika." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*. Vol. 109, pp. 99-113.

- Morgan, J. R. and R. Stoneman, ed. 1994. *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*. Routledge.
- Morgan, J. R. 1996. "Heliodoros." *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed G. Schmeling. Brill
- Morgan, J. R. 2004. *Daphnis and Chloe*. Aris and Phillips Classical Texts, Oxbow Books. Darby Road, Havertown, PA.
- Morgan, J. R. 2005. "The Greek Novel: Towards a sociology of production and reception." *The Greek World*, ed. A. Powell. Routledge.
- Morgan, J. R. 2006. 'Un discours figuré chez Héliodore: 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 B. Pouderon and J. Peigney (eds.), indexed by C. Bost-Pouderon, *Discours et débats dans l'ancien roman*. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée, 51–62.
- Morgan, J. R., M. Jones, eds. 2007. *Philosophical Presences in the Ancient Novel*. *Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 10.
- Morgan, J. R. 2008. "Heliodorus: An Ethiopian Story." *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, ed. B. P. Reardon. University of California Press: Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.
- Montiglio, S. 2012. "*Love and Providence: Recognition in the Ancient Novel*." Oxford Scholarship Online.
- Murnaghan, S. 1987. *Disguise and Recognition in the Odyssey*. Princeton University Press.
- Murray, A. T. 1919. *Homer. The Odyssey with an English Translation* Cambridge, MA., Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann, Ltd.
- Napolitano, F. 1983-4. "Leucippe nel Romanzo di Achille Tazio." *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia della Università di Napoli* 26 :85-101.
- Ní Mheallaigh, K. 2007. "Philosophical Framing: The Phaedran Setting of *Leucippe and Clitophon*." *Philosophical Presences in the Ancient Novel*, ed. J. R. Morgan, M. Jones. *Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 10.
- Nimis, S. 1999. "A Sense of Open-Endedness in the Ancient Novel." *Arethusa* 32.2, 215-238.
- Nimis, S. 2004. "Egypt in Greco-Roman History and Fiction." *Alif: Journal of Comparative Poetics*, 24, 24-67.
- Nock, A. D. 1972. "Greek Novels and Egyptian Religion." Review of Kerényi 1927, reprinted in *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, ed. Z. Stewart. 1.169-175. Oxford.
- Oakley, J. and R. Sinos. 1993. *The Wedding in Ancient Athens*. University of Wisconsin Press.



- O'Grady, W. 1965. "On plot in modern fiction: Hary, James, and Conrad." *Modern Fiction Studies* 11, 107-15.
- O'Sullivan, J. N. ed. 2005. *Xenophon Ephesius: De Anthia et Habrocome Ephesiacorum Libri V*. Bibliotheca Teubneriana.
- Panayotakis, S., M. Zimmerman, and W. Keulen, ed. *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*. Brill.
- Pantelia, M. C. 1993. "Spinning and Weaving: Ideas of Domestic Order in Homer." *The American Journal of Philology*, vol 114.4, pp. 493-501.
- Parrinder, P. 2006. *Nation and Novel: The English Novel from its Origins to the Present Day*. Oxford University Press.
- Paschalis, M., and S. Frangoulidis, eds. *Space in the Ancient Novel, Ancient Narrative Supplementum 1*.
- 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*. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Pervo, R. 1996. "The Ancient Novel becomes Christian." In Schmeling, G. ed. *The Novel in the Ancient World*. E. J. Brill, Leiden, New York, Köln.
- Platt, A. 1899. "Notes on the *Odyssey*." *The Classical Review* 13.8, 382-384.
- Podlecki, A. J. 1972. "The Aeschylean Chorus as Dramatic Persona." *Studi classici in onore Quintino Cataudella I*, 187-204. Catania.
- Price, A. W. 1989. *Love and Friendship in Plato and Aristotle*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Radway, J. 1987. *Reading the Romance: Women, Patriarchy, and Popular Literature*. University of North Carolina Press.
- Reardon, B. P. 1969. "The Greek Novel." *Phoenix* 23.3, 291-309.
- Reardon, B. P. 1971. *Courants littéraires grecs des Iie et IIIe siècles après J.-C.*, 390-2. Paris.
- Reardon, B. P. 1976. "Novels and Novelties, or Mysteriuser and Mysteriuser." *The Mediterranean World: Papers Presented in Honor of Gilbert Bagnani*, ed. R. J. Williams. 78-100. Peterborough, Ontario.

- Reardon, B. P. 1989. "Chariton: Chaereas and Callirhoe," *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, ed. B. P. Reardon. University of California Press: Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.
- Reardon, B. P., ed. 1989. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. University of California Press: Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.
- Reardon, B. P. 1991. *The Form of Greek Romance*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Reardon, B. P. 1994. "Achilles Tatius and Ego-Narrative." *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, ed. J. R. Morgan and R. Stoneman. Routledge.
- Reardon, B. P., ed. 1996. *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Brill.
- Reardon, B. P. 2004. *Chariton: De Callirhoe Narrationes Amatoriae*. K. G. Saur Verlag GmbH, München and Leipzig.
- Repath, I. 2005. "Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Cleitophon: What Happened Next?" *The Classical Quarterly* 55.1, 250-265.
- Roberts, D. H., F. M. Dunn, and D. Fowler, eds. 1997. *Classical Closure*. Princeton University Press.
- Rohde, 1876. *Der Greischiche Roman und Seine Vorläufer*. Breitkopf und Härtel, Leipzig.
- Romell, V. 2007. *Seeing Tongues, Hearing Scripts: Orality and Representation in the Ancient Novel*. *Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 7.
- Ruiz-Montero, C. 1981. "The Structural Pattern of the Ancient Greek Romances and the Morphology of the Folktale of V. Propp." *Fabula* 22, 228-238.
- Rutherford, R. 2012. *Greek Tragic Style: Form, Language, and Interpretation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sandy, G. N. 1992. *Heliodorus*. Boston: Twayne.
- Sandy, G. N. 1994. "Apuleius' 'Metamorphoses' and the Ancient Novel." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2, 34.2, 1512-74.
- Scarcella, A. 1996. "The Social and Economic Structures of the Ancient Novels." In *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed G. Schmeling. Brill.
- Schlegel, A. W. 1840. *A course of lectures on dramatic art and literature...* 2d. ed. Trans. J. Black. London: Templeman.
- Schmeling, G. ed. 1996. *The Novel in the Ancient World*. E. J. Brill, Leiden, New York, Köln.

- Scholes, R. and R. Kellogg. 1966. *The Nature of Narrative*. New York.
- Schwartz, E. 1924. *Odyssee*. Munich.
- Scourfield, J. 2003. "Anger and Gender in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*." *Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen*, ed. S. Braund and G. Most. Yale Classical Studies 32. Cambridge University Press.
- Shklovsky, V. 1921. "Sterne's *Tristram Shandy*: Stylistic Commentary." Reprinted in *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*, trans. L. T. Lemon and M. J. Reis. University of Nebraska Press.
- Silk, M, ed. 1996. *Tragedy and the Tragic*. Oxford University Press.
- Smith, B. H. 1968. *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, London.
- Smith, S. D. 2007. *Greek Identity and the Athenian Past in Chariton: The romance of an empire*. *Ancient Narrative Supplementum* 9. Groningen.
- Sowa, C. A. 1984. *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns*. Chicago: Bolchazy-Carducci.
- Stark, I. 1989. "Religiöse Elemente im antiken Roman." *Der antike Roman: Untersuchungen zur literarischen Kommunikation und Gattungsgeschichte*, ed. H. Kuch. Berlin.
- Sternberg, M. 1978. *Expositional Modes and Temporal Ordering in Fiction*. Baltimore and London.
- Stephens, S. 2008. "Cultural Identity." In *The Greek and Roman Novel*, ed. T. Whitmarsh. Cambridge University Press.
- Stewart, Z., ed. 1972. *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*. Oxford University Press.
- Swain, S. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50-250*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Swain, S. 1999. *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*. Oxford University Press.
- Szepessy, T. 1957. "Die Aithiopika des Heliodoros etc." *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 5, 241-259.
- Tagliabue, A. 2015. "Heliodorus' Aethiopica and the Odyssean Mnesterophonia: An Intermedial Reading." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 145.2, 445-468.

- Tagliabue, A. 2017. *Xenophon's Ephesiaca: A Paraliterary Love-Story from the Ancient World*. *Ancient Narrative supplementum* 22. Barkhuis & Groningen University Library.
- Thalmann, W. G. 1998. *The Swineherd and the Bow: Representations of Class in the Odyssey*. Cornell University Press: Ithaca and London.
- Thornton, A. 1970. *People and Themes in Homer's Odyssey*. University of Otago Press.
- Thomas, C. 1988. "Penelope's Worth: Looming Large in Early Greece." *Hermes* 116. 257-264.
- Tilg, S. 2010. *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the Invention of the Greek Love Novel*. Oxford University Press.
- Torgovnick, M. 1981. *Closure in the Novel*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Turcan, R. 1963. "Le Roman Initiatique: à Propos d'un Livre Récent." *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 163, 149-199.
- Vernant, J. 1988. *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*. Trans. J. Lloyd. New York: Zone Books.
- Vilborg, E. 1962. *Achilles Tatius: Leucippe and Clitophon. A Commentary*. *Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia* XV. Göteborg.
- Vlahos, J. 2011. "Homer's 'Odyssey': Penelope and the Case for Early Recognition." *College Literature* 38.2, 1-75.
- Watanabe, A. 2004. "The Masculinity of Hippothous." *Ancient Narrative* Vol. 3, 1-42.
- Weiss, N. 2017. *Music of Tragedy*. California Scholarship Online.
- Whitman, C. H. 1958. *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2001. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*. Oxford University Press.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2003. "Reading for Pleasure: Narrative, Irony, and Erotics in Achilles Tatius." In *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, ed. S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman, and W. Keulen. Leiden: Brill, 191-205.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2005. *The Second Sophistic. Greece & Rome New Surveys in the Classics*. Oxford University Press.
- Whitmarsh, T, ed. 2008. *The Greek and Roman Novel*. Cambridge University Press.
- Whitmarsh, T. 2011. *Narrative and Identity in the Greek Novel*. Cambridge University Press.

- Whitmarsh, T. 2013. *Beyond the Second Sophistic: Adventures in Greek Postclassicism*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1884. *Homerische Untersuchungen*. In *Philologische Untersuchungen 7*, ed. A. Kiessling and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Williams, R. J., ed. 1976. *The Mediterranean World: Papers Presented in Honor of Gilbert Bagnani*. Peterborough, Ontario.
- Winkler, J. J. 1982. "The mendacity of Kalsiris and the narrative strategy of Heliodoros' Aithiopika." *Yale Classical Studies* 27, 93-158.
- Winkler, J. J. 1985. *Auctor & Actor*. University of California Press.
- Winkler, J. J. 1989. "Leucippe and Clitophon." *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, ed. B. P. Reardon. University of California Press: Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.
- Winkler, J. J. 1990a. *Constraints of Desire*. Routledge: New York, London.
- Winkler, J. J. 1990b. "The Ephebes' Song: Tragoidia and Polis." *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*, ed J. J. Winkler and F. I. Zeitlin. Princeton University Press: Princeton, New Jersey.
- Winkler, J. J., and F. I. Zeitlin, eds. 1990. *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*. Princeton University Press.
- Wirth, P., ed. 1966. *Polychronion: Festschrift Für Fr. Dölger*. Heidelberg.
- Wohl, V. J. 1993. "Standing by the Stathmos: The Creation of Sexual Ideology in the 'Odyssey.'" *Arethusa* 26, 19-50.
- Woronoff, M. 1992. "L'art de la composition dans les *Éthiopiennes* d'Héliodore." *Le monde du roman grec : actes du colloque international tenu à l'École normale supérieure (Paris 17-19 décembre 1987)*, ed Baslez et al, 33-42. Paris : Presses de l'École Normale Supérieure.
- Yamagata, N. 2011. "Penelope and Early Recognition: Vlahos, Harsh, and Eustathius." *College Literature* 38.2, 122-130.
- Zeitlin, F. I. 1990. "The Poetics of *Erōs*: Nature, Art, and Imitation in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*." *Before Sexuality*, ed. D. M. Halperin, J. J. Winkler, F. I. Zeitlin. Princeton University Press: Princeton, New Jersey.
- Zerba, M. 2009. "What Penelope Knew: Doubt and Scepticism in the *Odyssey*." *Classical Quarterly*, 59.2, 295-316.