

*Studia Philologica Valentina*  
Vol. 18, n.s. 15 (2016) 385-402

ISSN: 1135-9560

## Some remarks on the reception of ancient drama in Chariton of Aphrodisias

### Observaciones sobre la recepción del drama antiguo en Caritón de Afrodisias

*Consuelo Ruiz-Montero*  
Universidad de Murcia

Fecha de recepción: 30 de junio de 2016  
Fecha de aceptación: 15 de septiembre de 2016

---

It is a well-known fact that both the «oral» and the «visual» are fundamental and complementary categories in ancient Greek culture, which has been labelled a «performative culture». The classical drama constituted a major demonstration, yet this type of culture kept alive for centuries, and, especially, in the Empire, when, besides of new adaptations of classical works, other dramatical forms are attested to, in such a way that the Empire world could be called a «theatrocratía»<sup>1</sup>. I refer to mime and pantomime, two successful genres which shared the audience applause with a good number of public contests (*agones*) and readings (*epideixeis*, *akroaseis*)<sup>2</sup>, a topic to which I shall refer later.

The connections between mime and pantomime, on the one hand, and the contemporary Greek novel, on the other, have been

---

<sup>1</sup> Pl., *Leg.* 658c-d; 700-701b, referring to his own age.

<sup>2</sup> See Ch. Roueché, *Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias*, 1993 on both genres; on mime R. Beacham, *The Roman Theatre and its Audience*, Cambridge, Mass., 1991; E. Csapo, W.J. Slater (eds.), *The context of Ancient Drama*, Michigan 1994. On pantomime see the books by P. Easterling, and E. Hall, *Greek and Roman Actors. Aspects of an Ancient Profession*, Cambridge 2002; I. Lada-Richards, *Silent Eloquence: Lucian and Pantomime Dancing*, London 2007; E. Hall and R. Wyles, *New Directions in Ancient Pantomime*, Oxford 2008; R. Webb, *Demons and Dancers: Theatrical Performance in late Antiquity*, Cambridge, Mass., 2008.

observed by several scholars, me included<sup>3</sup>. The main characters of the oldest Greek novels fragments, Ninus, Methiochus and Parthenope are also quoted by Lucian *On dance*, the fullest of the ancient treatises on pantomime.<sup>4</sup> Among the papyri of mime we also find a Leucippe<sup>5</sup>. It has also been suggested that the «Callirhoe» cited by Persius (1.134, *his mane edictum, post prandia Callirhoen do*) might be the name of a comic performance, or of a mime-artist, as they generally performed at three in the afternoon<sup>6</sup>. Other scholars believe that Persius refers to the novel by Chariton<sup>7</sup>. Whatever the case, Persius seems to allude to an «oral performance», in parallel to the *edictum*.

<sup>3</sup> See E. Mignogna «Leucippe in Tauride (Ach. Tat. 3,15-22): mimo e «pantomimo» tra tragedia e romanzo, *MD* 38 (1997), pp. 225-36; M. Andreassi, «Il mimo tra «consumo» e «letteratura». *Charition Moicheutria*», *Ancient Narrative* 2 (2002), pp.30-46, and R. Webb «Mime and the Romance», in T. Whitmarsh and S. Thomson (eds.), *The Romance between Greece and the East*, Cambridge 2014, pp. 285-99 for mime and the novel; for pantomime, C. Ruiz-Montero, «Novela y pantomimo: vidas paralelas», in: A. López Martínez, H. Velasco (eds.), *Agalma. Ofrenda desde la Filología Clásica al Prof. Manuel García Teijeiro*, Valladolid 2014, 609-21.

<sup>4</sup> They appear in mosaics in Antioch from around 200 A.D.: see M. H. Quet, «Romans grecs, mosaïques romaines», in: F. Baslez et alii (eds.), *Le monde du roman grec*, Paris 1992, pp. 125-62; for mosaics of a theatrical origin in the late Empire, see E. Handley, «Acting, action and words in New Comedy», in: P. Easterling and E. Hall (eds.), *Greek and Roman Actors. Aspects of an Ancient Profession*, Cambridge, 2002, pp.169-73, (Mitylene); Ch. Roueché «Images of Performance: New Evidence from Ephesus», in: P. Easterling and E. Hall (eds.), *Greek and Roman Actors. Aspects of an Ancient Profession*, Cambridge 2002, pp. 254-81 (Paphos).

<sup>5</sup> The name can be read in a «memorandum of props of Iene» (fifth cent. A. D.) in the edition by Cunningham for the Teubner collection 1987, 60-61, (now in the Loeb 2002, 8-421); on the mimus, see the above quoted Mignogna 1997.

<sup>6</sup> See the commentary *ad locum* by W. Kissel *Aules Persius Flaccus. Satiren*, Heidelberg 1990, pp. 285-287, who mentions several possibilities but who does not believe that the reference is to the novel. T. Whitmarsh, «The Greek Novel: Titles and Genre», *AJPh* 126 (2005), pp. 587-611, here 590, n. 14, inclines towards the idea of a literary text, a comedy or a satire. Also the name «Chione», which appears in a fragment from an ideal love novel (S. Stephens and J. Winkler (eds.), *Ancient Greek Novels. The Fragments*, Princeton 1995, p. 289; M<sup>a</sup> P. López Martínez, *Fragmentos papiáceos de novela griega*, Alicante 1998, pp. 287-95), is mentioned several times by Martial to refer to a *scortum* (see the *index* in Martial's edition for the Teubner collection). My colleague Rosario Cortés reminds me that «Chione» occurs in Juvenal 3.136, and that Persius 1.134 refers to a prostitute: all this makes difficult to see the *Callirhoe* mentioned by Persius as an ideal novel.

<sup>7</sup> So E. Bowie «The Chronology of the earlier Greek novels since B. E. Perry: revisions and precisions», *Ancient Narrative* 2 (2002), pp. 47-62, here p. 54, with further bibliographical references; B. P. Reardon, *Chariton. De Callirhoe Narrationes Amatori-*

At the same time, it is clearly the case that the same story could inspire different literary genres or even theatrical performances. Graverini has made the point in relation to the novel of Apuleius and has proposed a «multimedia» transmission of the work, taking his cue from texts like *Met.* 6.29.7, which points to the coexistence of orality and writing<sup>8</sup>. The dramatic features of Petronius and Apuleius have been acknowledged for a long time, but the study *Apuleius and Drama* by Regine May strikes me as being especially relevant to the Greek novels, in particular to Chariton, whose novel I'd like to discuss here<sup>9</sup>. May concludes that by presenting the text as a *spectaculum*, the addresses to the audience are comparable to those the sophist Apuleius could have made to the spectators who filled the theatre at Carthage<sup>10</sup>. The novel would have been theatrical, both oral and performative in nature. Hardly surprisingly, several of the work's critics have suggested that a recital in the theatre was the appropriate context for the *Metamorphoses*<sup>11</sup>.

---

*ae*, München und Leipzig 2004, *praef.* V. The date of Persius' verses, 59 A. D., would be the *terminus ante quem* for Chariton, earlier than *Ninus* for Bowie. Bowie, 2002, p. 55, observes that «Chaereas» occurs in the new comedy, but prefers to see in the character a reference to an audacious historical figure, Cassius Chaerea, dated in the mid-first century A.D. and mentioned by Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.32). Luc., *Lex.* 9 also cites an Attic named Chaereas. The name is attested at least seven times in the 2007 on-line edition of the inscriptions at Aphrodisias by Reynolds and Roueché, <http://insaph.kcl.ac.uk/iaph2007/html:at.12.523> and 529 a «sophist Chaereas» appears (2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> cent. A. D. , the age of «splendour» of rhetoric in the city, according to B. Puech *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d' époque impériale*, Paris 2002, pp.165-166). The names Athenagoras, Diogenes, Dionysius and Adrastus appear in the same dedication to Aphrodite and *Demos* in Aphrodisias inscriptions (cf. J. Reynolds and Ch. Roueché, 1.4). For both reasons of language and social context I continue to believe that Chariton might have been a contemporary of Plutarch and Dio of Prusa (see C. Ruiz-Montero , «Chariton von Aphrodisias: ein Überblick», in: *ANRW* II.34.2 (1994), pp. 1006-1054, with bibliography). K. Dowden, «A lengthy sentence : Judging the Prolixity of the Novels», *Ancient Narrative Suppl.*, Groningen, 2007, pp. 135-50, here 142 concludes, too, that the novel by Chariton should be dated at the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> cent. A. D.

<sup>8</sup> L. Graverini, *Le Metamorfose di Apuleio. Letteratura e Identità*, Pisa 2007, p. 151.

<sup>9</sup> R. May, *Apuleius and Drama. The Ass on Stage*, Oxford 2006. On Chariton see now S. Tilg, *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the Invention of the Greek Love Novel*, Oxford-New York 2010.

<sup>10</sup> May, 2006, *o.c.*, p. 332.

<sup>11</sup> K. Dowden, «Apuleius and the Art of Narration», *CQ* 32 (1982), pp.419-35; G. Jensson, *The Recollections of Encolpius. The Satyrica of Petronius as Milesian Fiction*, Groningen 2004, pp. 75f.; May 2007, pp. 113f.; W. Keulen, «Vocis immutatio: The Apuleian Prologue and the Pleasures and Pitfalls of Vocal Versality», in: V. Rimell (ed.), *Orality and Representation in the Ancient Novel, Ancient Narrative*

Now, the same deliberately ambiguous character, half-way between the written and the oral, is more than evident in the novel by Chariton, who uses the oral-narrative verb *diēgēsomai* at the start of the novel: Χαρίτων Ἀφροδισιεύς, Ἀθηναγόρου τοῦ ῥήτορος ὑπογραφεύς, πάθος ἐρωτικὸν ἐν Συρακούσαις γενόμενον διηγήσομαι, (1.1.1), only to conclude it with the formula: Τοσάδε περὶ Καλλιρόης συνέγραψα, (8.8.16), which is a feature of writing and which also appears in the rhetorical handbooks<sup>12</sup>. The terms *diēgēma* and *diēgēmata*, used always to apply to oral narrative, are omnipresent in the novel<sup>13</sup>. A significant example is to be found in the monologue in which Callirhoe rues the fact she has become a *diēgēma* in Asia and

---

Suppl. 7, Groningen 2007, pp. 106-37. L. Graverini, *Le Metamorfose di Apuleio. Letteratura e Identità*, Pisa 2007, p. 151.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. also Luc., *On dance*. 35; Demetrius, *On style* 111. The verb *diēgeomai*, already used by Plato (and others) for oral tales (*Symp.* 172b2-174a2: eight occurrences), is a verb typical of forensic Attic oratory, to the extent that *diēgēsis* became the technical term for the «narration» (*narratio*) of the facts (cf., Arist., *Rh.* 1414a37). But *diēgēsis* does not appear in Chariton, nor in Xenophon of Ephesus, which is worth noting, while Achilles and Heliodorus employ both terms (cf. the *erōtikai diēgēseis* attributed to Plutarch). Theon uses *diēgēma* for the name of the exercise, but refers to *diēgēma* and *diēgēsis* in his *Progymnasmata*, though in the later rhetorical theory, *diēgēsis* is the term employed for a larger comprehensive narration (like *poiēsis*), and *diēgēma* is employed for a shorter one (like *poiēma*): cf. the *Progymnasmata* by Hermogenes (4) and by Aphthonius (22).

Ruurd Nauta has drawn my attention to the fact that the name Athenagoras belongs to a fictional character in Mart. 9. 95 and 95b, and that the «rhetor Athenagoras» of AP 11.150, written by Ammianus, could be, too, fictional, like the «rhetor Flaccus» of AP 11.146, also by Ammianus. Although this could be the case of Chariton's rhetor, the proper Nauta admits the possibility of a real figure in the latter because «Athenagoras» is a frequent name (twice more in the index of AP). We know that the poet Ammianus lived around the end of the first cent. and the first decades of the second cent. A. D., and was operative at Smyrna (see Nisbet 2005, who does not cite the AP epigrams). Martial's reasons for the choice of name are a matter of debate (see the commentary by C. Henriksen, *Martial, Book IX. A Commentary*, Vol. 2, Uppsala 1999, pp. 145 f.; the epigrams would have been written between 94 and 95 A.D.), but the name is widely attested in the inscriptions of families belonging to the elite at Aphrodisias (to which rhetors and sophists generally belonged), and in Chariton it is a case of authenticating the truth of his tale, by citing his name and profession: the rhetor Athenagoras must have been familiar to Chariton's audience; now, this piece of information may be relevant for the chronology of Chariton.

<sup>13</sup> Among numerous other examples, see 1.10.6; 2.10; 2. 5. 9; 3. 4. 2; 9. 8; 4.3.5; 9; 6.1; 7.5, etc. He uses *Pheme* and *logos* in the same sense. Chariton is the novelist who uses these terms most often, followed by Heliodorus (see F. Conca, E. de Carli, G. Zanetto, *Lessico dei romanzieri Greci*, vol. II, Darmstadt 1989, s.v.).

Europe διήγημα καὶ τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης γέγονα (5.5.3)<sup>14</sup>. Chariton insists again and again on the παράδοξον, μᾶλλον δὲ ἄπιστον nature of his novel (2.8.4)<sup>15</sup>. The use of these terms links the novel to the Milesian tradition above mentioned, and indeed the love story of Calirroe and Dionysius of Miletus could be connected with the *fabula Milesia*<sup>16</sup>. But, of course, the tendency to underline the plot of the novel by continuous recapitulations, lengthy *diēgēmata* on the part of the characters or by means of letters is, as Hägg noted some years ago, a technique which is epic in origin<sup>17</sup>. It is well known that Chariton quotes more than thirty hexameters from Homer, one of Chariton's essential models<sup>18</sup>. Taking his cue from these repetitions, Hägg proposed the idea of an oral performance before a real audience: the formulae used by Chariton and Xen-

<sup>14</sup> K. Kerényi, *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur in religions-geschichtlicher Beleuchtung*, Tübingen 1927, p. 19, n.102 recalls here Prop., 1.15.23 (*historia*). In 6.1.8 Policharmus and Chaereas will leave a *diēgēma* for posterity, which echoes *Od.* 8. 480 (*aoidē* for posterity). In any case, the oral character of the tale needs to be emphasized: the verb γίγνομαι is used in the sense of «acted as, performed [the part of]» in Aphrodisias (Roueché, 1993, p.18). The *narratum* mentioned in *Met.*, 9.30.1 could be an equivalent of the Greek *diēgēma*. For the rarity of the term in Apuleius, see the commentary by B. L.Hijmans, *et alii*, *Apuleius Madaurensis Metamorphoses. Book IX, Text, Introd., and Comm.*, Groningen 1995, *ad loc.*, who recall also 4.27 (*narrationibus*), and cite Ovid's *Met.* 5. 499 (*narratibus*) as a possible antecedent.

<sup>15</sup> See also 2.10. 4; 3. 3. 2; 4.1, etc. On *paradoxon* in Chariton see Kerényi, *o.c.*, pp. 9f.; 15, n.55. It is worth recalling that the expedition of the Athenians against Sicily was already described by the Syracusan Hermocrates as an *apiston* in Th. 6.33.1; see the commentary by S. D. Smith, *Greek Identity and the Athenian Past in Chariton: The Romance of Empire, Ancient Narrative Suppl.* 9, Groningen 2007, pp. 153 f. It is well known that this expedition became one of the preferred topics of later *declamations*.

<sup>16</sup> Despite the idealist nature of the novel, there is a reference to Sybaris as the fictional homeland of Callirhoe in 1.12.8; 2.1.9; 5.5, while the reputation of the city and of the tales connected with it, comparable to the *Milesiae*, was widespread: on Mart. 12.95.1-2, *Sybaritici libelli*, obscene, like the *Sybaritica* mentioned by Ovid, and other related literature, see Jansson 2004, 270 and 297. I extend on the Milesian tradition in my forthcoming paper «Oral tales and Greek fictional narrative in Roman imperial prose».

<sup>17</sup> T. Hägg, *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances*, Stockholm 1971, a fundamental and classic study.

<sup>18</sup> For a general survey of Chariton's literary models, I refer the reader to Ruiz-Montero 1994 (*cf.* n.7) and «The Rise of the Greek Novel», in: G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden 1996 (reed.2003).

ophon of Ephesus would be proof of a popular oral reception<sup>19</sup>. But I think that this penchant for the repetitions, which lend a peculiar rhythm to the narrative, is a demonstration of a rhetorical *mimesis* as they are too excessive to be explained *purely* in terms of oral reception; more so if we are thinking of a cultivated audience, as would appear to have been the case for Chariton, a *pepaideumenos*. Nevertheless, he does display other narrative strategies that bind him to orality in some way. First let's consider his relation to the theatre.

That Chariton was familiar with the theatre of Euripides and Menander, whom he cites verbally, has already been established, as has the fact that he models whole scenes on these genres<sup>20</sup>, something I will illustrate with just a few quotations.

The πανουργία δουλική of Plangon (2.10.7; cf. 1.4.2<sup>21</sup>), confidant first of Dionysius and later of Callirhoe, by way of *trophos*, date back to the new comedy: Chariton even describes the expression on her face and her body (2. 11.4; cf. 1. 4. 5) and insists upon *axiopistia* (2. 10.3; cf. 1.4.2; 6.9.7). And the same could be said of the attempted act of erotic persuasion by the eunuch Artaxates (6.5.5)<sup>22</sup>.

The plot of the novel is described as *skythrōpē hypothesis* (4.3.11; cf. 6.8.1) and *drama skythrōpon* (4.4.2; cf.1.4.2; 8.1.2), and other theatrical metaphors might also be mentioned<sup>23</sup>. Callirhoe herself is likened to Medea (2.9.3).

A frequent and characteristic aspect of Chariton's work is the use of the mixed-emotions *topos*, often associated in the plot with public scenes (cf.5.8.2).The dramatic model is, thus, a decisive part of the texture of the narrative.

<sup>19</sup> See especially T. Hägg «Orality, Literacy, and the «Readership» of the early Greek Novel», in: R. Eriksen (ed.), *Contexts of Pre-Novel Narrative: The European Tradition*, Berlin -New York 1994, pp. 47-81.

<sup>20</sup> See Ruiz-Montero 1994.

<sup>21</sup> See also 1.2.4; 4.1; 4.5; 4.6. The name «Plangon» appears in the comic tradition; for «Chaereas» see above n. 7.

<sup>22</sup> See also Char., 6.7.5; 6.5.8 (διαφθείρω); 1.4.9; 2.10.7; a *parasitos* in 1.4.1. There is also a clear reference to comic episodes in 1.2.3f., already noticeable in *Ninus*, fr. A (cf. Char. 1.3.4; on *Ninus* see R. Kussl, «Ninos-Roman», *Papyrologica Lupiensia* 5 (1997), pp. 141-204). Cf. Ter., *Adelph.*, 535-36: *facio te apud illum deum / uirtutes narro...*

<sup>23</sup> For these metaphors in Greek literature, see M. Kokolakis *The Dramatic Simile of Life*, Athens 1960 (on Chariton see p. 61).

The author is especially interested in presenting the plot as a *spectaculum*. And so the presence of spectators (*theatai*) is constant throughout the work, becoming a motif which gives unity to the plot: not only does Chariton insist on Callirhoe's visual beauty (3.8.6; 5.5.8; 6.4.5; 8.6.11), but whole cities turn out to see her (4.2.6; 5.9; 7.6). The people of Babylon want to watch the trial as if it were the Olympic games (6.2.1); the whole of Babylon is a court (5.3.6; 4.4; 13.6); men and women discuss what's gone on (3.2.15; 6.2; 8.7.2; 6.6); the masses want to watch the fight at Tyre (7.4.7); the people (*dēmos*), or the masses (*plēthos*), are everywhere in the novel, shouting in the streets or the agora (1.5.3; 3.2.17; 4.4-5; 8.6.8; 10, *boaō*, *krazō*, *anakrazō*), or talking (*lalountes* 8.1.11); Chaereas' whole army even has a shout (7.3.10; 11). The mass could truly be said to be *periergos* (8.6.7)<sup>24</sup> and have nothing better to do than to watch and to listen (*blepein kai akouein*, 8.7.1<sup>25</sup>), and to take part.

The novel ends with the final *diēgēma* at the theatre in Syracuse, which is attended by men and women who shout, discuss, question the orator Chaereas, break out in laments and yell incessantly (8.7). The whole thing could be said to resemble a public debating session. The audience, we know, could propose topics, voice its approval or disagreement, butt in, weep with the orator<sup>26</sup>. The reactions are the same as those Lucian attributes to the pantomime<sup>27</sup>.

---

<sup>24</sup> As it is well known, this is a key word in the Ass and in the *Metamorphoses* (*curiositas*).

<sup>25</sup> See also 8.6.8; 6.10; 6.11; *theatai* and *akroatai* together in 5.5.8: this is a sophistic *topos* (cf. Th. 3.38.4) which is also used to indicate a real event. Cf. Luc., *On dance* 85 for pantomime as «enchantement» for ears and eyes, mentioned as *theamata kai akousmata* in 68; for *τεράσια ἰδεῖν καὶ ἀκοῦσαι* in Antonius Diogenes' *Incredible things beyond Thule*, see Photius, *cod.* 166, 111a5. For *theatron* and related terms in Lucian, see O. Karavas *Lucien et la tragédie*, Berlin 2005, pp. 205 f. (ca. 50 occurrences; *theatai* ca. 40 items in Plato). See also the remarks by Graverini, o.c., 2007, p. 149, n. 27.

<sup>26</sup> See T. Schmitz *Bildung und Macht. Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der Zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit*, München 1997, pp. 60-96; M. Korenjak, *Publikum und Redner. Ihre Interaktion in der sophistischen Rhetorik der Kaiserzeit*, München 2000, pp. 41-65. On sites for declamation, see pp. 27-33.

<sup>27</sup> Lucian says that the audience is very vocal in its response (76, *anaboaō*), and that the spectacle (*theama*), *terprnon kai chrēsison* (71) is of a kind which could be said to improve the spectator morally (23; 81. For an extense commentary I refer

Chariton enjoys mixing dramatic genres: at 8.1.4 he warns his readers that they are about to witness the ultimate *metabolē* of the twists and turns of Tyche<sup>28</sup>: νομίζω δὲ καὶ τὸ τελευταῖον τοῦτο σύγγραμμα τοῖς ἀναγινώσκουσιν ἥδιστον γενήσεσθαι· καθάρσιον γὰρ ἐστὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις σκυθρωπῶν. οὐκέτι ληστεία καὶ δουλεία καὶ δίκη καὶ μάχη καὶ ἀποκατέρησις καὶ πόλεμος καὶ ἄλωσις, ἀλλὰ ἔρωτες δίκαιοι ἐν τούτῳ <καὶ> νόμιμοι γάμοι. πῶς οὖν ἡ θεὸς ἐφώτισε τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ τοὺς ἀγνοουμένους ἔδειξεν ἀλλήλοις λέξω. While combining again *sungramma* and *lexō*, the story of Chaereas and Callirhoe, which mixes comedy and tragedy, is to end happily, just like the comedies of Menander and, previously, some pieces of Euripides, though it should not be forgotten that for the third of the protagonists, Dionysius, it is in fact a tragedy. The concept of pleasure (ἥδιστον) is mixed here with a certain relaxation. Moreover the novel provides a convenient morality, referred to by the subsequent mention of «right love» and «legal marriage»; the wedding of Policharmus and Chaereas' sister quoted at 8.8.12, is written in the same vein.

These concepts are comparable to the functions attributed to Menander's comedy by Plut., *Quaest. conv.* 712b-c; 854a-61b: a kind of mental relaxation for the *pepaideumenoī* and an example of convenient morality<sup>29</sup>. So, like comedy, the novel could combine both *hēdonē* and *ōpheleia*<sup>30</sup>. Both genres are *narrationes in person-*

---

to Ruiz-Montero «¿Antonio Diógenes, autor de comedia? Observaciones sobre la recepción de la comedia en época imperial», in: L. M. Pino Campos y G. Santana Henríquez (eds.), *Homenaje a J. A. López Férez*, Madrid 2014, pp. 749-56; Roueché, *o.c.*, 1993, 15; 26 stressed the connections between pantomime and tragedy.

<sup>28</sup> For *catharsion* in Chariton I refer to Ruiz-Montero 1994, *o.c.* Further allusions to a change of genre at 6.3,8; of scene at 4.3,7; 5,10 (banquet); cf. 3.4,4; 9,8 and 8.7,3; 3.9,9 and 8.7,1f. The use of imperatives is worth remarking on, though they are not as prominent as in Apuleius' novel.

<sup>29</sup> See the commentary on Plutarch's text by R. Hunter, «The Politics of Plutarch's Comparison of Aristophanes and Menander» in: S. Gödde and T. Heinze (eds.), *Skenika Beiträge zum Antiken Theater und seiner Rezeption*, Darmstadt 2000, pp. 267-76. The same function is assigned to prose fiction by Luc., *VH* 1.1. For the reception of Menander in the Empire see S. Nervegna, *Menander in Antiquity. The Contexts of Reception*, Cambridge 2013.

<sup>30</sup> Photius already noticed it at the end of his commentaries on Antonius Diogenes's work (112a7), whose contents are *hēdy* and his denouement *chrēsīmōtaton*. See Graverini 2007, *o.c.*, pp.45-6 for quotations on charming power of poetry and narrative, comparing the *topos* with the beginning of *Phaedrus* and that of Apul., *Metamorphoses*. See p. 155 for a comparison between the reading of a novel and the attendance to a theatre, and his commentaries on *fabula* in *Met.* 10.2.4,



is *positae*, and are subject to the same rhetorical treatment, and indeed both were paralleled by ancient theorists<sup>31</sup>. In this manner it is worth noting that another novelist, Antonius Diogenes, a probable contemporary of Chariton, identified himself as a «poet of a comedy set in old times» (ποιητής κωμωδίας παλαιᾶς) in Photius's summary (cod.166)<sup>32</sup>.

Chariton and Diogenes, therefore, constitute different samples of the reception of «dramatic/comic» tradition in this age. At the same time they are a demonstration that Hellenistic *poikilia* of genres continued in the Empire, in which we see the dramatic tradition connected with different genres and understood with diverse nuances<sup>33</sup>. We want to add other aspects for a better understanding of Chariton's presentation of his novel.

As I stated above, Chariton is the only novelist to refer explicitly to readers (in 8.1.4, τοῖς ἀναγνώσκουσιν), but also to allude clearly to an oral audience in 2.8.3, where he refers to the Tyches' power to change the course of events: κατεστρατηγήθη <δ'> ὑπὸ τῆς Τύχης, (...) καὶ τότε οὖν πρᾶγμα παράδοξον, μᾶλλον δὲ ἄπιστον κατώρθωκεν· ἄξιον δὲ ἀκοῦσαι τὸν τρόπον. The formula ἄξιον ἀκοῦσαι was used by Plato for oral narrative, but is also a feature of classical Attic oratory<sup>34</sup>. That Chariton is acting as an Attic orator is also plain in his well-known

---

having the meaning of «story», not that of «comedy» too literally. He observes (p.156) very well that «the ambiguous meaning of the word *fabula*, that identifies both prose narratives and theatrical plays, is not due to chance». For a discussion on the *utile* and the *dulce* see p. 160.

<sup>31</sup> Macrobius 1.2.7-8 also equates the comedies of Terence with the works of Petronius and Apuleius: both genres would be *argumenta* (cf. *ad Heren.* 1.8.12 and *Cic., de inv.*,1.19.27). See also Graverini 2007, o.c., with further sources.

<sup>32</sup> I studied the topic in Ruiz-Montero 2014, quoted in n. 27.

<sup>33</sup> See Plut 711b-c for *dramatikoï* dialogs in Plato; on their performance I refer to N. Charalabopoulos, *Platonic Drama and its Influence*, Cambridge 2012, pp.113-58; 238. In p. 84, n.30 he observes that Homer is classified as a tragic poet in *R.* 595b-c; 598d; 605c; 607a. I give more data on these topics in my forthcoming paper «Oral tales and Greek fictional narrative in Roman imperial prose».

<sup>34</sup> Pl., *Phaed.*, 110b1; *Euthd.*, 283b2; 304d9; *Ion*, 530d6, etc. More issues for these and other uses in Attic oratory in *TLG*. On the connections between orality and writing in this novel see also the observations by P. Robiano, «La voix et la main: la lettre intime dans Chéreas et Callirhoe», in: V. Rimell (ed), *Seeing Tongues, Hearing Scripts: Orality and Representation in the Ancient Novel, Ancient Narrative Suppl.* 9, Groningen 2007, pp. 201-22, and Smith 2007, o.c., pp. 120f; for atticisms in Chariton, see C. Hernández Lara, *Estudios sobre el aticismo en Caritón de Afrodísias*, Amsterdam 1991.

rhetorical questions of the *τίς ἄν...* kind (*τίς ἄν φράση κατ' ἀξίαν*), and in his comments on the *βούλομαι δὲ εἰπεῖν πρῶτον...* kind (3.2.17). All these expressions have their correlates in Attic oratory: Chariton tells the facts as a rhetor would do it, and so do his characters in their relently fondness for story-telling. Is this merely a bookish instance of rhetorical mimesis or does the phenomenon *also* respond to a real context? The *diēgēma* at the theatre in Syracuse may prove of some assistance here.

On the heroes' return to Syracuse the whole populace makes its way to the assembly at the theatre: Ἀθρόον δὲ τὸ πλῆθος ἀνεβόησεν «ἐξίωμεν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.» ἐπεθύμουν γὰρ αὐτοὺς καὶ βλέπειν καὶ ἀκούειν· λόγου δὲ θάπτον ἐπληρώθη τὸ θέατρον ἀνδρῶν τε καὶ γυναικῶν. εἰσελθόντος δὲ μόνου Χαιρέου πᾶσαι καὶ πάντες ἐπεβόησαν «Καλλιρόην παρακάλει.» (8.7.1)

The importance of the people and their opinions is a feature of oral narrative<sup>35</sup>, but is also typical of oratory. After a few words from Hermocrates by way of introduction and also recapitulation of the first part of the plot, Chaereas gets up to speak in 8.7.9: Ὁ δὲ Χαιρέας ἔνθεν ἑλών διηγείτο....

It's already been noted that the expression *ἐνθεν ἑλών* comes from the *Odyssey* 8.500<sup>36</sup>, in the scene in which Demodochus has just finished speaking and slightly before Ulysses' long speech to the Phaeacians, in this case at a banquet, though they had previously gathered at the agora to listen to Alcinous (8.5f). As it happens, Chariton says the people of Syracuse hold Alcinous in special esteem (2.8.11), and indeed Theon, when dealing with the *diēgēma* in his *Progymnasmata*, cites the example of the story of Ulysses addressing the Phaeacians<sup>37</sup>. Chaereas here is being a new Ulysses and / or an orator in a performance which tells the story of his life, albeit *paradoxon* or *apiston*. Chariton,

---

See also the reference to the *akroasis* of the story of Callirhoe by Dionysius in 3.9.9; of the trial at Babylon by Artaxerxes in 5.3.11, and by the people attending the trial in 5.5.8 (*cf.* 5.6.11).

<sup>35</sup> *Cf.* Petr., 112. 8 *populus miratus est*, and his commentaries in 112.1; 2; the beauty of the *matrona* is also a *spectaculum* in 111.5.

<sup>36</sup> Quoted by Reardon 2004, *o.c.*, *ad loc.* (*cf.* also Char., 5.7.10). The formula is employed also in the Ass 6 in an erotic context.

<sup>37</sup> Theon, *Prog.*, 80; 86. Chariton provides his novel with a rounded closure through the episode at the theatre of Syracuse, the prayer of Callirhoe to Aphrodite, and the already quoted final formula of the author: all these elements are in correspondence with the beginnings of the plot.

our *hypographeus*, is turning out to be a veritable rhetor. But let's turn from fiction to reality.

The inscriptions give us some idea of how successful the itinerant epic poets were in the imperial period<sup>38</sup>. But this is not all. Chaereas' long final story is a display of local pride at the deeds of two of its most illustrious citizens, its children and *politai*, who have returned to the homelad safe and sound. At the same time Policharmus, the faithful Chaereas' friend is considered as its benefactor as well: ἐπευφήμησεν ὁ δῆμος «ἀγαθῷ ἀνδρὶ Πολυχάρμῳ, φίλῳ πιστῷ, ὁ δῆμός σοι χάριν ἐπίσταται. τὴν πατρίδα εὐηργέτηκας ἀξίως Ἑρμοκράτους καὶ Χαϊρέου.» μετὰ ταῦτα πάλιν Χαϊρέας εἶπε «καὶ τούσδε τοὺς τριακοσίους, Ἕλληνας ἀνδρας, στρατὸν ἐμὸν ἀνδρεῖον, δέομαι ὑμῶν, πολίτας ποιήσατε.» πάλιν ὁ δῆμος ἐπεβόησεν «ἄξιοι μεθ' ἡμῶν πολιτευέσθαι· χειροτονείσθω ταῦτα.» ψήφισμα ἐγράφη καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκεῖνοι καθίσαντες μέρος ἦσαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας. (8.8.13-14)<sup>39</sup>. And indeed, the term *patris* is frequent in the inscriptions at Aphrodisias<sup>40</sup>. This final scene in the novel underlines the importance of the *demos*, which intervenes no fewer than seven times to cheer the hero on and to ratify its desires, and so we see him passing a decree conferring citizenship on the soldiers who had fought next to Chaereas, something we can compare with so many other honorary decrees passed at Aphrodisias and other towns in Asia Minor. Let's consider one of these: it belongs to the second text from a series of three, not inscribed simultaneously, and whose third text is dated in 127A.D., probably not much later than Chariton<sup>41</sup>.

<sup>38</sup> See the *data* and the bibliography quoted by Ruiz-Montero 2003b, and the papers edited by R. Hunter and I. Rutherford (eds.), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travelling, Locality, and Pan-Hellenism*. Cambridge 2009.

<sup>39</sup> Char., 3.10.8: Chaereas as *politēs*; 1.1.12; 6.2; 6.5; 8.6.11: the ephebes as their comrades. Smith 2007, *o.c.*, p. 246 comments Naber's old hypothesis that underlying the novel is a local legend concerning Dionysius I of Syracuse. On the possibility of considering this novel as a *logos politikos* see my forthcoming paper quoted in n. 33.

<sup>40</sup> I refer to the indexes of the on-line edition by Reynolds and Roueché 2007, quoted in n.7. J. Alvarez, «Some political and ideological Dimensions of Chariton's Chaereas and Callirhoe», *CJ* 97 (2001-2002), pp.113-44, here 130, recalls the Zoilus frieze at Aphrodisias, where this figure is crowned by *Polis* and greeted by *Demos*.

<sup>41</sup> Reynolds and Roueché 2007, 12.27. The names «Chariton» and «Aristophanes», both used as «aliases», refer to two brothers in an inscription at Thera dating from the second half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> cent. A.D.: see Puech, *o.c.* (above, n.7), pp. 185-186; for the name «Chariton» among a list of literary authors in a school

In the inscription the *demos* of Halicarnassus honours the poet Caius Iulius Longianus of Aphrodisias for the varied public readings of all kinds of poems (ποιημάτων παντοδαπῶν ἐπιδείξεις ποικίλας ἐποιήσατο, 1.2-3), so that he will be granted bronze statues in the most illustrious places of the city, in the *temenos* dedicated to the Muses, and next to the old Herodotus in the *gymnasion* of the ephebes (καὶ εἰκόσιν *vac.* χαλκαῖς ἅς ἐν τε τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνασταθῆναι τοῖς ἐπισημοτάτοις τῆς πόλεως χωρίοις καὶ ἐν τῷ τῶν Μουσῶν τεμένει καὶ ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ τῶν ἐφήβων παρὰ τὸν παλαιὸν Ἡρόδοτον, 1.10-14), and the public display of his books in the libraries, in order that the young may learn from them as from the writings of the ancients (ἐψηφίσθαι δὲ καὶ τοῖς βιβλίοις αὐτοῦ δημοσίαν ἀνάθεσιν ἐν τε βιβλιοθήκαις ταῖς παρ' ἡμεῖν ἵνα καὶ ἐν τούτοις οἱ νέοι παιδεύονται τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ὃν καὶ ἐν τοῖς τῶν παλαίων συ[v]γράμμασιν, 1.14-18).<sup>42</sup>

The text is an eulogy of *paideia*, by which the poet of Aphrodisias, the city to which a copy is sent (the one we are seeing), is awarded the honours of a citizen (ἦσθεις ὁ δῆμος τειμὰς αὐτῷ προσέταξε τὰς προσηκούσας ψηφίσασθαι *stor* δεδόχθαι Γάιον Ἰούλιον Λογγιανὸν προῖκα πεπολιτεῦσθαι παρ' ἡμεῖν, 1. 5-7). It should be added that the poet Longianus was *enjoyable* to the old and *useful* to the young (καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους εὐφρανεν καὶ τοὺς νεωτέρους ὠφέλησεν, 1. 3-4), two of the very concepts we have observed in Chariton, in Plutarch's commentaries on the comedy, in Lucian, and in Photius' remarks on Antonius Diogenes' novel.

Moreover, the importance of Aphrodite for the city of Aphrodisias is well-known: Is the goddess in the novel of Chariton a *mere* technical device taken from the literary tradition? Or does Chariton *also* allude to contemporary religious beliefs and should his text be seen within this contemporary framework? I think the latter.

---

papyrus, see A. Stramaglia, «Fra «consumo» e «impegno»: usi didattici della narrativa nel mondo antico», in: O. Pecere, A. Stramaglia (eds.), *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo Greco-Latino*, Cassino 1996, 129-131. Philostr., *Epist.* 66 also includes an attack on a «Chariton».

<sup>42</sup> More books in libraries cited in Luc., *adv. ind.*, 4; *Life of Aesop* 100 (the author's own fables); *Life of Secundus* (sacred library); for other instances in the novel, cf. X. Ephes., 5. 15.5 (the adventures of the heroes deposited at the temple of Artemis of Ephesus); Longus, *praeef.* 4 (his own books as an offer to Eros, Pan and the Nymphs); on Antonius Diogenes see *supra*, I; *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri* (RB) 51 (a copy of his adventures in the temple of Diana of Ephesus and another in a private library).

In several inscriptions at Aphrodisias there are references to competitions of tragic and comic poets, and to *enkomia* and other *theamata* and *akroamata*<sup>43</sup>. I believe that this is the context in which Chariton was operating. I do not mean that the novel could be performed as a category within public *agones*<sup>44</sup>, but I suggest the possibility of an oral spread for the genre in some manner.

From the work of a considerable number of authors of the imperial age we know that there were public readings of comedies and tragedies—either whole ones or parts of them—but also of prose works, in theatres and private houses from as early as the Hellenistic period or before<sup>45</sup>. What is not clear is whether there were any readings of novels, at least with a special and distinctive name; what we do know is what they were called when they were circulating<sup>46</sup>. Diogenes claimed to be a «poet of ancient comedy», but his text was full of *diēgēmata*. Now, «hearing» and «seeing» are categories which are constantly linked in the period, and so they

---

<sup>43</sup> See Roueché, *o.c.*, 1993; *cf.* Apul., *Flor.* 18. 3 for these entertainments.

<sup>44</sup> We are aware of the existence of *akroaseis* to Apollo at Delphos and Delos in assemblies and theatres, (also, in these same localities, the more numerous inscriptions honouring literary authors between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> centuries B.C.: see L. del Corso, *La lettura nel mondo ellenistico*, Roma 2005, p. 80).

<sup>45</sup> See Plut., *Quaest. conv.* 711b-d; 712e-713f for *akroamata* at the banquet (both performances of dialogues from Plato and readings from comedies, especially Menander); *adv. Col.* 1107f for reading and discussion of a text by Plato and other philosophers; Plin., *Ep.* 3.1.4 and 9 for a reading and a comic piece during (*remissius... et dulcius* 3.1.8), and a *comoedus* or a *lyristes* after, dinner, beside several more serious readings aloud during the day; *cf.* also 9.36; 3.5.1. Further data in W. A. Johnson «Toward a Sociology of reading in Classical Antiquity», *AJPh* 121 (2000), pp. 593-627; M. L. Lakmann, «Dramatische Aufführungen der Werke Platons», in: S. Gödde und T. Heinze (eds.), *Skenika Beiträge zum Antiken Theater und seiner Rezeption*. Darmstadt 2002, pp. 277-89). *Cf.* D. P. 18; 19.4-5 for recitations of tragedies and comedies in the theatre; Athen. 381f-382a for erudite dinners; for public banquets at theatres («theatre-dinners») see C. P. Jones, «Dinner-Theatre» in: W. J. Slater (ed.), *Dining in a Classical Context*, Michigan 1991, pp. 185-98; add E. Valette-Cagnat *La lecture à Rome*, Paris 1997; L del Corso 2005; W. A. Johnson, and H. N. Parker (eds.), *Ancient Literacies. The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*, Oxford 2009, and my forthcoming paper quoted in n. 33.

<sup>46</sup> Why are there no citations of readings or performances of the novel as a literary genre? There are, I believe, four possible explanations: 1-) because they simply did not exist; 2-) for terminological reasons: there was no single, «official» term for the genre in this period (for Photius, it was *dramatikon*); 3-) because of indifference towards a contemporary, non-«ancient», genre; 4-) for some strange or irrational reason beyond the scope of philological inquiry. Some of these explanations could be combined.

appear in the entertainments at banquets. We scholars tend to make more genre-distinctions than was the case back then.

Orality was part of the literary culture of the period, like the other side of the same coin. Chariton combines and works three orally-performed traditional genres, epic, drama and oratory, into a new genre which is then performed as a contemporary declamatory reading or oratory spectacle, that is, which is both written and oral, text and word<sup>47</sup>, though to what extent he was an innovator here is unknown. The fact that there is a papyrus with rather different readings of the *Laurentianus*, and the anomalies observed in the so-called *codex Thebanus*, are intriguing, though the case of Chariton would seem rather different to the «open tradition» of the *Life of Aesop* and the like<sup>48</sup>. In her study *Gymnastics of the Mind* Cribiore<sup>49</sup> concludes that life imitated school; Chariton does not distinguish between them but imitates them both.

### Bibliography

- J. Alvares, «Some political and ideological Dimensions of Chariton's Chaireas and Callirhoe», *CJ* 97 (2001-2002), pp.113-44.
- M. Andreassi, «Il mimo tra «consumo» e «letteratura». *Charition Moicheutria*», *Ancient Narrative* 2 (2002), pp.30-46.
- E. Bowie, «The Chronology of the earlier Greek novels since B. E. Perry: revisions and precisions», *Ancient Narrative* 2 (2002), pp. 47-62.
- F. Conca, E. de Carli, G. Zanetto, *Lessico dei romanzieri Greci*, vol. II, Darmstadt 1989.
- L. del Corso, *La lettura nel mondo ellenistico*, Roma 2005.

---

<sup>47</sup> The success of a *recitatio* could lead to a public performance: see Valette-Cagnat 1997, p. 159; as opposed to the dinner-time *akroama*, whose aim was to entertain, the *recitatio* was serious; there were also readings of extensive works of history: the *Panegyricus* of Trajan (*ibid.*, 120f.) took three whole days. For *anagnostai* of public readings in Smyrna, Cos and Priene during the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 1<sup>st</sup> cents. B.C., see L del Corso 2005, pp. 87-88; an *antigraphus* for transcriptions is also documented at Priene (p. 88, n. 97).

<sup>48</sup> M. Sanz Morales, «The Copyist as Novelist. Multiple versions in the Ancient Greek Novel», *Variants* 5 (2006), pp. 129-46, observes the «freedom» of textual transmission in the *codex Thebanus* of Chariton; B. P. Reardon «Chariton», in: G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden 1996, pp. 309-35, p. 515 held that the scribe may have introduced new scenes on the understanding that the text was public property; see also his 2004 edition, *ad locum*.

<sup>49</sup> R. Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind. Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, Princeton 2001.

- R. Crihiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind. Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, Princeton 2001.
- Charalabopoulos, N. *Platonic Drama and its Influence*, Cambridge 2012.
- J. Dowden, «Apuleius and the Art of Narration», *CQ* 32 (1982), pp.419-35.
- «A lengthy sentence: Judging the Prolixity of the Novels», *Ancient Narrative Suppl.*, Groningen, 2007, pp. 135-50.
- P. Easterling, and E. Hall, (eds.), *Greek and Roman Actors. Aspects of an Ancient Profession*, Cambridge 2002.
- R. E. Fantham, «Mime: The Missing Link in Roman literary History», *CW* 82 (1989), pp. 153-63.
- L. Graverini, *Le Metamorfose di Apuleio. Letteratura e Identità*, Pisa 2007.
- T. Hägg, *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances*, Stockholm 1971.
- «Orality, Literacy, and the «Readership» of the early Greek Novel», in: R. Eriksen (ed.), *Contexts os Pre-Novel Narrative: The European Tradition*, Berlin -New York 1994, pp. 47-81.
- E. Hall, R. Wyles, *New Directions in Ancient Pantomime*, Oxford 2008.
- E. Handley, «Acting, action and words in New Comedy», in: P. Easterling and E. Hall (eds.), *Greek and Roman Actors. Aspects of an Ancient Profession*, Cambridge, 2002, pp.165-88.
- C. Henriksén, *Martial, Book IX. A Commentary*, Vol. 2, Uppsala 1999.
- C. Hernández Lara, *Estudios sobre el aticismo en Caritón de Afrodisias*, Amsterdam 1991.
- B. L.Hijmans, et alii, *Apuleius Madaurensis Metamorphoses. Book IX, Text, Introd., and Comm.*, Groningen 1995.
- N. Horsfall, «The Uses of Literacy and the *Cena Trimalchionis*: I», *G&R* 56 (1989), pp. 74-85; II: pp. 194-209.
- R. Hunter, «The Politics of Plutarch's Comparison of Aristophanes and Menander» in: S. Gödde and T. Heinze (eds.), *Skenika Beiträge zum Antiken Theater und seiner Rezeption*, Darmstadt 2000, pp. 267-76.
- R. Hunter and I. Rutherford (eds.), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travelling, Locality, and Pan-Hellenism*. Cambridge 2009.
- G. Jensson, *The Recollections of Encolpius. The Satyrical of Petronius as Milesian Fiction*, Groningen 2004.

- W. A. Johnson, «Toward a Sociology of reading in Classical Antiquity», *AJPh* 121 (2000), pp. 593-627.
- W. A. Johnson, and H. N. Parker (eds.), *Ancient Literacies. The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*, Oxford 2009.
- C. P. Jones, «Dinner-Theatre» in: W. J. Slater (ed.), *Dining in a Classical Context*, Michigan 1991, pp. 185-98.
- O. Karavas, *Lucien et la tragédie*, Berlin 2005.
- K. Kerényi, *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur in religions-geschichtlicher Beleuchtung*, Tübingen 1927.
- W. Keulen, «Vocis immutatio: The Apuleian Prologue and the Pleasures and Pitfalls of Vocal Versality», in V. Rimell (ed.), *Orality and Representation in the Ancient Novel*, *Ancient Narrative Suppl.* 7, Groningen 2007, pp. 106-37.
- W. Kissel, *Aules Persius Flaccus. Satiren*, Heidelberg 1990.
- M. Kokolakis, *The Dramatic Simile of Life*, Athens 1960.
- M. Korenjak, *Publikum und Redner. Ihre Interaktion in der sophistischen Rhetorik der Kaiserzeit*, München 2000.
- R. Kussl, «Ninos-Roman», *Papyrologica Lupiensia* 5 (1997), pp. 141-204.
- M.L. Lakmann, «Dramatische Aufführungen der Werke Platons», in: S. Gödde und T. Heinze (eds.), *Skenika Beiträge zum Antiken Theater und seiner Rezeption*. Darmstadt 2002, pp. 277-89.
- M<sup>a</sup> P. López Martínez, *Fragmentos papiráceos de novela griega*, Alicante 1998.
- R. May, *Apuleius and Drama. The Ass on Stage*, Oxford 2006.
- «Visualising Drama, Oratory and Truthfulness in Apuleius *Metamorphoses* 3», in: V. Rimell (ed.), *Orality and Representation in the Ancient Novel*, *Ancient Narrative Suppl.* 7, Groningen 2007, pp. 86-105.
- E. Mignogna, «Leucippe in Tauride (Ach. Tat. 3,15-22): mimo e «pantomimo» tra tragedia e romanzo», *MD* 38 (1997), pp. 225-36.
- S. Nervegna, *Menander in Antiquity. The Contexts of Reception*, Cambridge 2013.
- B. Puech, *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d'époque impériale*, Paris 2002.
- M-H. Quet, «Romans grecs, mosaïques romaines», in: F. Baslez et alii (eds.), *Le monde du roman grec*, Paris 1992, pp. 125-62.
- P. Robiano, «La voix et la main: la lettre intime dans Chéreas et Callirhoe», in: V. Rimell (ed), *Seeing Tongues, Hearing Scripts: Orality and Representation in the Ancient Novel*, *Ancient Narrative Suppl.* 9, Groningen 2007, pp. 201-22.



- B. P. Reardon, «Chariton», in: G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden 1996, pp. 309-35.  
— (ed.), *Chariton. De Callirhoe Narrationes Amatoriae*, München und Leipzig 2004.
- C. Roueché, *Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias in the Roman and late Roman Periods*, London 1993.  
— «Images of Performance: New Evidence from Ephesus», in: P. Easterling and E. Hall (eds.), *Greek and Roman Actors. Aspects of an Ancient Profession*, Cambridge 2002, pp. 254-81.
- C. Roueché, and R.R.R. Smith, (eds.), *Aphrodisias Papers 3*, Michigan 1996.
- C. Ruiz-Montero, «Chariton von Aphrodisias: ein Überblick», in: *ANRW II.34.2* (1994), pp. 1006-1054.  
— «The Rise of the Greek Novel», in: G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden 1996, (reed.2003).  
— «Xenophon of Ephesus and Orality in the Roman Empire», *Ancient Narrative 3* (2003), pp. 43-62.  
— «¿Antonio Diógenes, autor de comedia? Observaciones sobre la recepción de la comedia en época imperial», in *Homenaje a J. A. López Férez*. Madrid 2014, pp. 749-56.  
— (forthcoming) «The prefatory letters of the *Incredible Things beyond Thule* and their literary context».  
— (forthcoming) «Oral tales and Greek fictional narrative in Roman imperial prose».
- M. Sanz Morales, «The Copyist as Novelist. Multiple versions in the Ancient Greek Novel», *Variants 5* (2006), pp. 129-46.
- G. Schmeling, (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden 2003 (1996).
- T. Schmitz, *Bildung und Macht. Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der Zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit*, München 1997.
- S. D. Smith, *Greek Identity and the Athenian Past in Chariton: The Romance of Empire*, *Ancient Narrative Suppl. 9*, Groningen 2007.
- S. Stephens, and J. Winkler, (eds.), *Ancient Greek Novels. The Fragments*, Princeton 1995.
- A. Stramaglia, «Fra «consumo» e «impegno»: usi didattici della narrativa nel mondo antico», in: O. Pecere, A. Stramaglia (eds.), *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo Greco-Latino*, Cassino 1996.
- S. Tilg, *Chariton of Aphrodisias and the Invention of the Greek Love Novel*, Oxford-New York 2010.

- E. Valette – Cagnat, *La lecture à Rome*, Paris 1997.  
R. Webb, «Mime and the Romance», in T. Whitmarsh and S. Thomson (eds.), *The Romance between Greece and the East*, Cambridge 2014, pp. 285-99.  
T. Whitmarsh, «The Greek Novel: Titles and Genre», *AJPh* 126 (2005), pp. 587-611.

RUIZ-MONTERO, Consuelo, «Some remarks on the reception of ancient drama in Chariton of Aphrodisias», *SPhV* 18, pp. 385-402.

#### ABSTRACT

---

In this paper we consider firstly the relationship of Chariton's novel with the theatre, while stressing his interest in presenting the plot as a *spectaculum* and its common points with comedy as a genre. Then we proceed by studying its connections both with other orally-performed traditional genres, as epic and oratory, and contemporary inscriptions. At the end we suggest the possibility of an oral spread for the genre in some manner.

KEYWORDS: Reception of ancient drama; ancient novel.

#### RESUMEN

---

En este trabajo nos planteamos en primer lugar la relación de la novela de Caritón de Afrodisias con el teatro, subrayando su interés en presentar su obra como un *spectaculum* y sus puntos comunes con la comedia. A continuación pasamos a estudiar sus conexiones tanto con otros géneros tradicionalmente ejecutados oralmente, como la épica y la oratoria, como con las inscripciones contemporáneas. Finalmente apuntamos la posibilidad de una difusión oral del género de alguna manera.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Recepción del drama antiguo; novela antigua.