

# Rhetoric and Irony in Chariton: a case-study from *Callirhoe*.<sup>1</sup>

KONSTANTIN DOULAMIS

Exeter

Rhetoric plays a prominent part in Chariton's *Callirhoe*, which comprises several rhetorical sections, including two interesting trial scenes in Book five.<sup>2</sup> Chariton's apparent fascination with rhetoric, especially forensic rhetoric, and familiarity with legal processes of his time (as demonstrated, for example, in the scene of the sale of Callirhoe to Phocas in Book one)<sup>3</sup> has been conveniently attributed to his occupation as 'clerk of the lawyer Athenagoras',<sup>4</sup> stated in the very opening of his work.<sup>5</sup>

Equally central to this novel is the theme of Love, which is more or less dictated by the subject-matter of the genre and is found in all Greek novels. In *Callirhoe*, Love seems to play a particularly important role. The reader is presented with an Eros who not only appears to be the invincible power that implants a burning desire in the heart and mind of the enamoured, but is also

---

<sup>1</sup> A form of this paper was first presented at the International Conference on the Ancient Novel in Groningen, July 2000.

<sup>2</sup> In an essay presenting the findings of his stylistic analysis of Chariton's text, Hernández Lara (1990) argues that *Callirhoe* is 'a clear case of artistic prose' and shows that there are good reasons to believe that 'the presence of Rhetoric [in *Callirhoe*] is unquestionable. Most rhetorical devices used coincide not only with those used by Atticists but also with Diodorus of Sicily, Flavius Josephus and Plutarch.'. Laplace (1997) has demonstrated in detail how Chariton exploits the rhetorical tradition known to him, mainly the works of Isocrates, to construct a novel which can be read as an *encomium* of Syracuse, Chaereas and Callirhoe, and Aphrodite – an *encomium* of Chaereas and Callirhoe and of Love more than anything else, in my opinion. In a much earlier study of Chariton's novel, Billault (1981: esp. 210–211) had already noted the rhetorical character of *Callirhoe* and Chariton's high level of sophistication.

<sup>3</sup> See Scarcella (1990).

<sup>4</sup> I have used the translations of Reardon (1989) and Goid (1995).

<sup>5</sup> 1,1,1.

portrayed as constantly interfering in the characters' lives and often haunting their mind and shaping their thoughts.<sup>6</sup>

In this article I aim to examine an example of amatory rhetoric from Chariton which combines these two central themes (Rhetoric and Eros), in the light of contemporary rhetorical treatises.<sup>7</sup> More specifically, I intend first to analyse the structure, content and context of this passage. I will then determine the style of the speech by correlating it to its contemporary rhetorical tradition,<sup>8</sup> and I will also address the question of whether it is intended to be taken seriously or ironically. Finally, I will conclude by making a suggestion about the likely readership of Chariton's *Callirhoe*.

Scholarship has already noted that nearly half of Chariton's novel consists of direct speech,<sup>9</sup> and most of the other half, i.e. the narrative parts, 'is taken up with setting the stage',<sup>10</sup> which gives the characters of the novel several opportunities for rhetorical expression. Thus, the reader is not simply

---

<sup>6</sup> Eros engineers a meeting for the hero and heroine who fall in love at first sight (1,1,6); at 6,7,2 the king Artaxerxes, who has fallen madly in love with Callirhoe, is kept up all night by god Eros who keeps reminding him of the moment when he first saw her; at 6,4,4–7 Artaxerxes is burnt by his passion for Callirhoe and Eros adds fuel to the fire by putting in the king's mind images of her beauty and fantasies about her; at 6,3,2 the King confesses that he has been captured by Eros as if a great battle had taken place ('with irresistible might Love has invaded my heart. It is hard to admit, but I am truly his captive.'). For the presentation of the physiological and psychological effects of Love in Chariton's novel and the influence of earlier literature see Toohey (1999). Alvares (1997) shows how Chariton transforms material from Greek historiography to create an erotic history that "revolves around Aphrodite and Eros".

<sup>7</sup> Mainly Demetrius, *On Style*, and also Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Demosthenes*.

<sup>8</sup> The rhetoric of the Greek novel and its relationship to its contemporary literary discourse is a relatively neglected area, although in recent years a few worthwhile attempts have been made to bring out the potential value of this approach. Hunter (1983: 84–98) has shown how stylistic clarity (καθαρότης), simplicity (ἀφέλεια) and sweetness (γλυκύτης) are employed by Longus for certain parts of his novel. S. Bartsch (1989) has demonstrated the usefulness of considering the Greek Novel against the background of the contemporary rhetorical tradition and literary practices of the Sophistic world. With respect to Chariton's novel, Ruiz Montero (1991a) has shown that there is a correspondence between *Callirhoe* and the "preliminary exercises" in Aelius Theon's *Progymnasmata*, and Hunter (1994: esp. 1065ff.), in the course of an analysis of how Chariton exploits motifs from both epic poetry and historiography, discusses briefly the novelist's stylistic and literary pretensions. In connection with the Roman Novel, Conte (1996) has pointed to ways in which reference to the idea of the "sublime" in rhetoric can help the reader to locate the authorial tone of Petronius' *Satyricon*.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Hägg (1971: 82ff.); Reardon (1999: 172–173).

<sup>10</sup> Goold (1995), xii–xiii.

informed by the narrator of the characters' actions or intentions, but is told by the characters themselves.<sup>11</sup> Of all characters it is the heroine, Callirhoe, who seems to dominate the story with her emotional monologues every time she faces a dilemma or a crisis.<sup>12</sup> Such a monologue is Callirhoe's lament at the end of Book three (3,10,4–8), an example of amatory rhetoric on which I intend to focus, hoping to demonstrate how Chariton exploits effectively the rhetorical tradition in order to bring out the ironic and over-stated quality of the speech.

The heroine has just been informed that the ship on which her husband Chaereas was travelling had been burnt down by oriental brigands the night before, and that the following day eye-witnesses had seen 'blood mixed with water and corpses floating on the waves' (3,10,2). Although Chaereas is not actually reported dead and no mention is made of his corpse being found, this piece of information is enough for Callirhoe to assume that he *is* dead. Not only does she jump to this conclusion, but she also grieves by 'ripping her clothes off' and by 'beating at her eyes and cheeks' (3,10,3). Later on, in the privacy of her room, we find her 'sitting on the ground sprinkling dust on her head and tearing her hair' (3,10,4). The ground has been prepared for Callirhoe to burst into a dramatic lament for the loss of Chaereas.

Her monologue at the end of Book three echoes Andromache's laments for Hector in *Il.* 22,477–514 and 24,725–745, both of which are included by Alexiou in the general category of 'solo laments': these are all of similar length and have the same three-part structure, consisting of a direct address, a narrative (future or past) and a renewed address together with an expression of grief and/or a reproach<sup>13</sup>. The passage in question seems to follow Alexiou's model except that, instead of a renewed address to Chaereas, we have an address and reproach directed at the 'unjust goddess Aphrodite',<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Fusillo (1996: 53ff.): "il narratore sembra consegnare la parola ai personaggi, ottenendo una trasparenza piena della storia, che facilita l'identificazione del lettore".

<sup>12</sup> Reardon (1999). Cf. Helms' detailed portrayal of Callirhoe (1966: 42–66, 129–132).

<sup>13</sup> Under the same heading are also listed by Alexiou (1974: 132–134) the other two laments for Hector in *Il.* 24 (748–759 and 762–775), as well as a number of laments found in tragedy, including *A. Pers.* 532–597, 852–906, *Ch.* 306–478, *S. Aj.* 992–1039, *El.* 86–120, 1126–1170, *Ant.* 891–928, *E. HF* 451–496, *IT* 143–235, 344–391, *Ph.* 1485–1538, *Med.* 1021–1080.

<sup>14</sup> Aphrodite is no doubt invoked here in her capacity as the goddess of Love who should have used her divine powers to help and protect the couple. Throughout the novel the heroes, and especially Callirhoe, pray to the goddess when in need of aid (1,1,7–8, 2,2,7–8, 3,2,13, 3,8,7–9, 8,4,10–11), complain to her when a crisis arises (2,2,6 and 2,2,7–8,

accused of showing no pity to the young lovers, and a second one directed at the ‘odious sea’, which is held responsible for the couple’s trials.<sup>15</sup> The structure of the passage is organised as follows:

- Direct address (to Chaereas): 3,10,4.
- Narrative (past): 3,10,5–6.
- First reproach (to Aphrodite): 3,10,7.
- Lament: 3,10,8.
- Final reproach (to the sea): 3,10,8.

Callirhoe’s lament is introduced as *gooi* (3,10,4), a term used in Homer and in tragedy, normally for intense mourning.<sup>16</sup> Also, at the beginning of Book four, we learn that the heroine had spent the entire night *en thrênōis*<sup>17</sup> (lamentations, 4,1,1), of which this passage represents, presumably, only a small part. The use of the above terms to describe Callirhoe’s mourning undoubtedly highlights the tragic character of her situation. Yet we also find in the text several subtle narrative comments which quite possibly undercut the seriousness of the entire scene. Firstly, the reader, who, unlike Callirhoe, is already aware that Chaereas has not died, is reminded that the latter is still alive (a possibility that had not crossed Callirhoe’s mind for a second!): ‘So Callirhoe spent that night in lamentation, *mourning for Chaereas who was still alive.*’ (4,1,1).<sup>18</sup>

---

3,2,12, 7,5,1–5) and thank her and pay homage to her when things go well (2,3,5, 3,8,7, 8,4,10, 8,8,15–16); cf. Helms (1966: 115–117).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Char. 3,6,6, where, ironically, Chaereas complains to the sea for preserving him.

<sup>16</sup> *Od.* 1,242, 4,103, 4,758, 4,801, 8,540, 10,248, 17,8, 19,213, 19,251, 19,268, 19,513, 20,349, 19,251, 24,323; *Il.* 17,37, 18,51, 22,430, 23,10, 23,98, 24,723, 24,741, 24,747, 24,761; *A. Pers.* 947, *Ch.* 449; *S. Aj.* 579. Various forms of the verb *goaô* are also used extensively in the same sense: *Od.* 4,800, 8,92, 10,567, 19,210; *Il.* 6,373, 6,500, 14,502, 16,857, 22,363, 23,106; *A. Pers.* 676, 1072, *Ch.* 632, *S. Tr.* 51.

<sup>17</sup> According to Alexiou (1974, 11–14, and 102–103) the Homeric and Archaic *goos* and *thrênos* were distinguished on the basis of the ritual manner of their performance. The definitions given by *LSJ* imply a certain difference in the intensity of the lament expressed by each of these terms: *LSJ* (s.v. γόος) holds that *goos* is used for ‘louder signs of grief’ (e.g. *Od.* 4,103), while *thrênos* (s.v. θρήνος), translated as ‘dirge, lament’, seems to be more of a ‘sad strain’. Perhaps the term *goos* instead of *thrênos* describing Callirhoe’s monologue here, is employed deliberately with intent to mark the intensity of the lament and single it out from the general lamentation (*thrênōi*) that went on for the whole night.

<sup>18</sup> The Greek text reads: Ταύτην μὲν οὖν τὴν νύκτα Καλλιρόη διήγευεν ἐν θρήνοις, Χαίρειαν ἔτι ζῶντα πενθοῦσα. Another possible translation here would be ‘...mourning for Chae-

As equally undermining could be read the narrative statement in the scene whereby Callirhoe has a cenotaph built for her first husband. The reader is told that the tomb which had been constructed for Chaereas ‘was very similar to her own tomb in Syracuse in shape, size and opulence’ (4,1,6). This is obviously intended to remind us that Callirhoe too had ‘died’ and, after a sumptuous funeral complete with intense mourning, had miraculously returned to life, and at the same time it hints at Chaereas’ impending ‘resurrection’ later on in the narrative. In addition to 4,1,1 mentioned above, we are once again reminded that ‘this, (i.e. Chaereas’ tomb), just like that, (i.e. Callirhoe’s tomb), *was for a living person*’ (4,1,6). Also, later in Book four the author (rather light-heartedly) observes again that ‘while Callirhoe was burying Chaereas in Miletus, Chaereas himself was working in chains in Caria’ (4,2,1). It would seem that the above narrative comments result in undermining to a certain degree the otherwise tragic character of the heroine’s lament. The frequency of Callirhoe’s mourning in the course of the narrative also contributes to that. Not only is this not her only monologue in the novel but, in fact, she appears to lament her misfortune at every given opportunity, normally as soon as she finds herself alone:<sup>19</sup> there are at least seven examples of such speeches in Chariton, mainly in Books one and five.<sup>20</sup>

Returning to the lament under discussion, it is noteworthy that the passage seems to be fairly ornate, which is not particularly surprising if we take into account the widely accepted view that Chariton wrote a novel for educated readers in an ‘educated *koine*’.<sup>21</sup> What is interesting and perhaps less

---

reas, *although* he was still alive’, but in either case the tragic irony of the sentence remains unaffected. Cf. the Trojan women’s laments for Hector when the latter, still alive, decides to throw himself into the battle, although admittedly in this case Hector *will* die eventually (*Il.* 6,500): αἱ μὲν ἔτι ζῶν ἄνθρωπον ἔκτορα ᾗ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. 1,14,6; 5,1,4; 5,9,4; 6,6,2.

<sup>20</sup> Callirhoe soliloquises when she realises she has been buried alive (1,8,4); when she is carried off by Theron (1,11,2–3); when she is sold as a slave (1,14,6–10); when she is about to cross the river Euphrates on her way to Babylon to attend her present husband’s trial with Mithridates (5,1,4); when she appears in court in Babylon, where she ‘bitterly condemns her fate’ (5,5,2); and shortly after seeing Chaereas (whom she had thought dead) alive in court (5,9,4).

<sup>21</sup> Ruiz Montero (1991), after a close – though by no means exhaustive – study of Chariton’s vocabulary (including separate sections on colloquialisms, atticisms, literary terms, poeticisms, ionisms, late terms as well as the general linguistic style of *Callirhoe*), concludes that ‘Chariton uses two styles: that which corresponds to his time and that which was inherited from literary tradition. It is then a mixed language in which various levels

obvious at first glance, however, is that Callirhoe's lament seems to have the characteristics attributed by Demetrius to what he calls the 'forceful style of composition' (*deinotês*, *deinôsis*<sup>22</sup>) in his rhetorical treatise *On Style* (Περὶ ἔμπνησίας).<sup>23</sup> I will now demonstrate how Callirhoe's address can be perceived as a forceful piece of rhetoric, by identifying in this passage the main markers of Demetrius' forceful style.

One of the features that Demetrius identifies as essential to a forceful text is the *dialusis*, i.e. a word-arrangement characterised by lack of connectives<sup>24</sup> (268, and esp. 269 and 301). This feature is found in the Chariton passage, where the conjunctive *kai* is used little and where two asyndeta can be found, the most striking of which is: 'you have robbed me of my companion, my countryman, my lover, my darling,<sup>25</sup> my husband'<sup>26</sup> (3,10,7–8). The lack of connectives was not only seen as an effective way of lending forcefulness to a text, but it was also, apparently, thought to encourage a theatrical delivery, and was thus considered especially suited to debate and oral performance, as Demetrius points out elsewhere in his treatise: 'the disjointed style is perhaps better for immediacy, and that same style is also called the actor's style since the asyndeton stimulates dramatic delivery ...' (193).

An author aiming at *deinotês* should keep his clauses as short as possible – in fact, the shorter the clauses the more forceful the text (241–242, and 274) – and periods should consist of no more than two clauses, advises De-

---

of language are combined'. Cf. Hernández Lara (1990) and (1994), and Reardon (1996: 319ff.);

<sup>22</sup> Demetrius uses the terms *deinotês* (240–301) and *deinôsis* (130) (derived from *deinos* meaning 'fearful' as well as 'rhetorically skilled') as synonyms, meaning 'the capacity to make things appear fearful'. For a more extensive discussion of the meaning of *deinos* in classical and late antiquity see Grube 1961, App. I, A.

<sup>23</sup> I have used Grube's (1961) text and translation in conjunction with the Loeb edition of Demetrius (ed. and transl. by D. C. Innes 1995). I have also consulted Rutherford's work on ancient stylistic theories (1998).

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Dion.H. *Dem.* 20, where the use of antithetical pairs with *men* and *de* by Isocrates is identified as 'frigid' and lacking in force, and is blamed for 'weakening the style' of the text.

<sup>25</sup> The pair of terms *erastês* and *erômenos*, central to Plato's *Symposium* and linked in antiquity with homosexuality (cf. Dover 1978) is applied here to a heterosexual relationship, that of Chaereas and Callirhoe, possibly to indicate that their love was reciprocated: Chaereas both loved and was loved by Callirhoe; cf. Konstan (1994: esp. 33–35).

<sup>26</sup> The list of epithets attributed to Chaereas, which seems to mark the stages of Callirhoe's relationship with him in chronological order, is reminiscent of the famous list of Eros' qualities in Agathon's peroration in Plato's *Symposium* (197D–E).

metrius: ‘These massed periods should, however, be short (I suggest two clauses), since periods with many clauses will produce beauty rather than force.’ (252). The idea is that short phrases (but ones rich in content) are more likely to enhance vehemence and achieve the effect of speaking in abrupt and forceful manner, even when one does not really speak forcefully (240). Terseness and brevity of speech are mentioned here as examples of forceful and commanding expression, contrasted with speaking at length (*makrêgorein*), which is more appropriate in supplications and requests (‘length in speech suits supplications and requests.’ 242). Chariton, with his curt and sharp clauses, certainly lives up to the terseness recommended for forcefulness. Let us consider the following extract from the passage in hand:

Δυστυχοῦσα μέχρι νῦν ἐλογιζόμην / "ὄψομαί ποτε Χαιρέαν / καὶ  
διηγῆσομαι αὐτῷ πόσα πέπονθα δι' ἐκείνον / ταῦτά με ποιήσει  
τιμιωτέραν αὐτῷ. // πόσης ἐμπλησθήσεται χαρᾶς, / ὅταν ἴδῃ τὸν υἱόν". //  
ἀνόνητά μοι πάντα γέγονε, / καὶ τὸ τέκνον ἤδη περισσόν / προσετέθη  
γάρ μου τοῖς κακοῖς ὀρφανός. // (3,10,5–6).

Moreover, Demetrius maintains that ‘it also creates force to put the most striking part at the end, since if it is put in the middle, its point is blunted...’ (249). Again we find this in Callirhoe’s speech, where the most forceful word is left last in each sentence. The following two cases may serve as examples:

1. πάντως δέ μοι κἄν ἐπαποθανεῖν ἀναγκαῖον<sup>27</sup> (3,10,4, instead of ἀναγκαῖον πάντως δέ μοι κἄν ἐπαποθανεῖν).
2. προσετέθη γάρ μου τοῖς κακοῖς ὀρφανός<sup>28</sup> (3,10,6, instead of ὀρφανός προσετέθη γάρ μου τοῖς κακοῖς).

This word order not only allows the stress to fall on the last word, but it also links the final word with the preceding one, thus placing emphasis upon both and making the end of the sentence forceful: ἐπαποθανεῖν ἀναγκαῖον, and τοῖς κακοῖς ὀρφανός.

<sup>27</sup> ‘Now it is indeed imperative for me to die.’

<sup>28</sup> ‘For an orphan has been added to my misfortunes.’

Other rhetorical devices found in the passage are the following: firstly, the repetition at the beginning of the lament (ἐγὼ μὲν προαποθανεῖν ἢ συναποθανεῖν [...] κἄν ἐπαποθανεῖν,<sup>29</sup> 3,10,4).

Secondly, the succession of verbs in the Aorist (second person singular) in the part of the speech addressed to Aphrodite, which takes the form of a charge being brought against the goddess. The accusation is expressed by three successive pairs of verbs, one negative and one affirmative, stressing that Aphrodite did *not* do what she should have done, and that she *did* do what she should not have done: σὺ μόνη εἶδες... οὐκ ἔδειξας... παρέδωκας... οὐκ ἠλέησας... ἀπέκτεινας... οὐκ ἐβοήθησας (3,10,6).<sup>30</sup> Thirdly, we have a *homoioteleuton* at the very end of the speech: καὶ Χαίρεαν εἰς Μίλητον ἤγαγες φονευθῆναι καὶ ἐμὲ πραθῆναι (3,10,8).

Another feature that Demetrius sees as an integral part of forcefulness is *kakophōnia*:<sup>31</sup> ‘violence contributes to forcefulness in word-arrangement, for harsh sounds are often forceful, like rough roads.’<sup>32</sup> (246). His examples of harshness of sound raise the question of the contemporary relevance of those categories. Demetrius based his study and observations about style on authors who wrote in the Attic Dialect,<sup>33</sup> at a time when the *koine* in which Chariton wrote his novel was widely spoken. The *koine* of Chariton’s time had already undergone many changes in phonology and morphology<sup>34</sup> and its vowel and consonant systems differed considerably from those of Attic.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>29</sup> ‘To die before or with (you) ...to die even if after (you).’ The sequence of infinitive compounds with *apothanein* echoes Socrates in Plato’s *Symposium* (208D2–5).

<sup>30</sup> ‘Only you saw ...you never showed ...you delivered ...you had no pity ...you killed’.

<sup>31</sup> The term is used here as a synonym of *dusphōnia*, i.e. the combination of discordant sounds.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Dion.H. (*Dem.* 20), who disapproves of the smoothness and softness of language in a text which ought to be ‘rough and harsh’ and have ‘almost the effect of a blow’ instead, otherwise it will lack ‘intensity and ‘force’.

<sup>33</sup> The Attic Dialect was undoubtedly the language of literary prose in Classical Greece and was employed not only by Athenians (such as Isocrates, Demosthenes and Plato) but also by men from other parts of Greece whose native dialects differed from it, (Aristotle, Theopompus of Chios, Anaximenes of Lampsacus).

<sup>34</sup> These changes are admittedly difficult to date with precision, not least because the literate few, from whom our literary evidence mainly comes, would naturally maintain in use words and forms which had already been replaced in everyday language. Besides, historical orthography makes phonological changes even more difficult to detect. In the case of the *koine*, such changes are normally given away by errors in papyrus letters and other documents.

<sup>35</sup> Browning (1983: 19–52, esp. 25–28); cf. Swain (1996: esp. 30–31) and Horrocks (1997: 67–70 and ch. 6). See also Kapsomenos (1985) and Andriotis (1992). It has been con-



The overall effect was a number of new much softer sounds, which naturally raises the following question: would certain vowel and consonantal clashes sound as harsh to Hellenistic ears as they would have done to a Classical Greek? Could forcefulness still be achieved by means of harshness of sound in literature, even though in the everyday speech of the masses the same combination of sounds would not have had the same harsh effect as it would have done in the Classical period? It seems to me that Demetrius would not have included such a number of examples of harsh sounds in his handbook had he believed that there would be no practical use made of them. Moreover, if we accept the view that the majority of the people who read the Greek novels had a reasonably high level of education<sup>36</sup> then we could assume that the average reader of Chariton's work would still have the ability to identify in literature certain sounds as harsh (by Classical Greek standards) and perceive them as forceful, even though they may not have been pronounced in exactly the same way in everyday life. Such examples in Callirhoe's lament are:

1. συναποθανεῖν ἠὲ ξάμην (3,10,4),
2. ἐν τῷ ζῆν (3,10,4),
3. κατεχοῦσα; δυστυχοῦσα (3,10,4–5),
4. "ὄψομαί ποτε Χαιρέαν [...]" (3,10,5),
5. πόσα πέπονθα (3,10,5),
6. πόσης ἐμπλησθήσεται χαρᾶς (3,10,5),
7. οὐκ ἐβοήθησας ἐν νυκτὶ φοβερᾷ φονευόμενον (3,10,7).

Rhetorical questions constitute another characteristic of forcefulness, according to Demetrius: 'It is also forceful to express some points by asking the

---

cluded that the complex vowel system of the Attic, consisting of five short and seven long vowels, was gradually replaced by a new system of only six short vowels and the second vowel of the diphthongs slowly disappeared. As for the consonant system, spelling mistakes and the transcription of linguistic borrowings, especially those from Latin, indicate that it had been simplified too.

<sup>36</sup> Bowie (1994) convincingly argues that the novel was known in intellectual circles, that 'the novelists were steeped in sophistic literature, if not practising sophists themselves', and that 'their readership overlapped with the educated classes who read poetry, history, and occasionally philosophy and attended the lectures of sophists and philosophers.'; cf. Wesseling (1988) and S. A. Stephens (1990).

audience questions rather than by making a statement ...' (279). These are also found in Callirhoe's speech:

1. 'For what hope is left any more to keep me alive?' (3,10,4)
2. 'Who could pray to such a goddess, who killed her own suppliant?' (3,10,6–7)
3. 'What crime had the warship committed for orientals to burn it, which not even the Athenians could vanquish?' (3,10,8).

The questions here are seemingly addressed to Chaereas and Aphrodite, both of whom are of course absent from the scene. As Chariton has emphasised the absence of all other characters, it is not unreasonable to assume that what Demetrius calls the '*akouontes*' are, in this case, none other than the readers, who automatically become the audience of this theatrical monologue.<sup>37</sup> At this point we may also think of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who points out that a powerful and forceful text invariably dictates the actions that must accompany the reading and that it stirs the emotions of the audience and has nearly the same effect on the reader as an oral delivery by the author himself would have had.<sup>38</sup> Thus Isocrates' lack of forcefulness in his political speeches is criticised on the ground that it results in a 'virtual absence of spirit' and a complete 'lack of life and feelings in his style.'<sup>39</sup>

Perhaps the most interesting of the techniques recommended for *deinotês*, are the *exairesthai* along with the *epanastasis* (277–278), and the *prosopopoeia* (265–6). They are all said by Demetrius to give the speaker the opportunity of a histrionic delivery, and indeed would be appropriate for Callirhoe's *gooi* in this case.

The first two techniques are closely linked with each other, in that the *exairesthai*<sup>40</sup> (a rise in emotional tension in the speaker) normally causes the

<sup>37</sup> Chariton seems to acknowledge the theatrical dimension of certain scenes in his novel, e.g. in 5,8,2 when Callirhoe suddenly sees Chaereas (whom she thought dead) alive in court, and the narrator remarks: 'Who could do justice to the scene in that courtroom? What dramatist ever staged such an extraordinary situation? An observer would have thought himself in a theatre filled with every conceivable emotion. All were there at once: tears, joy, astonishment, pity, disbelief, prayer.'

<sup>38</sup> Dion.H. *Dem.* 22.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.* 18.

<sup>40</sup> Grube (1961, App. I, A) rightly observes that the very example from Demosthenes cited here by Demetrius for the *exairesthai* clearly shows that the word does not refer to elevation of style or to elaborate language, and therefore should not be confused with *exairein*,

*epanastasis*<sup>41</sup> (a sudden rise in emotional tone). Demetrius explains that the *epanastasis* occurs ‘when in the middle [of what we are saying] we get emotionally aroused (*exarthentes*) and denounce someone’, and offers two examples, both from Demosthenes. The same type of emotional arousal is found in Callirhoe’s lament, when she suddenly interrupts her discourse to Chaereas to launch into a vehement invective against Aphrodite at the start and against the sea at the end. With short, clipped sentences and rhetorical questions, both fundamental characteristics of forcefulness as we have shown above, Callirhoe accuses them both of separating her from her husband. Her words are emotionally charged when she denounces Aphrodite first, whom she calls “unjust” (*adike*’ 3,10,6), and later the sea, which she calls “hateful” (*miara*’ 3,10,8). Having Demetrius’ examples of *epanastasis* in mind, one can easily imagine Callirhoe altering the tone and volume of her voice at the change of addressee.

The *prosopopoeia* is given by Demetrius a twofold definition: firstly, as personifying and making the personified figure speak, and secondly as bringing characters into the discourse in the form of *dramatis personae* (265–6). As far as the first definition is concerned, one could argue that the sea is personified in Callirhoe’s lament, since it is being charged with Chaereas’ murder and accused of Callirhoe’s enslavement, although it must be said that the personification is not made to speak in this case.

As for the second type of personification, it renders a passage ‘much more vivid and forceful’, according to Demetrius, by turning it into some sort of ‘dramatic presentation’ (266). The above device is indeed employed by Chariton in this passage. In 3,10,5 Callirhoe does more than just commu-

---

whose classical meaning is ‘to raise, to exalt’ (*LSJ* s.v. ἐξάίρω I) and it is so used in 122 and 123; the word *exairesthai* is used here in the sense of ‘getting excited’ to describe the emotional tension caused by the *epanastasis* (for which see following footnote), and it applies to the speaker.

<sup>41</sup> The word is often found to mean ‘rising up’ or even ‘rising up against, rebellion’ in Classical literature (*LSJ* s.v. ἐπανάστασις I 1 and 2). In Demetrius it is used to describe the rise in the emotional tone which results from excitement in the speaker (*LSJ* s.v. ἐπανάστασις III), and as Grube (1961) points out, ‘the word does not seem to be used elsewhere in this sense or as a technical term’. Callirhoe’s lament is not the only example of such a rhetorical *epanastasis* in Chariton: in Book five, Mithridates seems to employ this very rhetorical technique (5,7,10), when towards the end of his speech (the style of which is strikingly theatrical) he raises his voice and asks for divine aid from the deities who rule Heaven and the Underworld; the *epanastasis* is there marked by the narrator, who observes that ‘taking up from this point, Mithridates raised his voice and uttered as though under divine inspiration ...’ (5,7,10).

nicate her thoughts; she acts them out in direct speech: ‘Until now I used to think in my misfortune, “Some day I shall see Chaereas and tell him all that I have suffered for him and this will endear me to him.” How overjoyed he will be to see our son!’ Admittedly this is dramatisation rather than personification, since it is only her own reflections that she is presenting in a more lively manner. However, this technique is not restricted only to Callirhoe’s mind, and the personification becomes more obvious when it is extended to other people’s thoughts, namely those of Chaereas and her parents: ‘At this moment the parents of both of us are sitting by the sea longing and waiting for our return, and whenever a ship is seen in the distance they say “Chaereas is bringing Callirhoe home!”’ The stage is set first with an introduction of the characters followed by a brief description of the set, and then, in direct speech, comes the line of the parents waiting in vain for their children to return. The personification in this case not only renders the description more vivid and the passage more forceful, but it clearly gives the soliloquy a dramatic character and makes it sound more like a theatrical monologue. This is not the only example of this type of personification in Chariton. The same technique is employed by other speakers too, e.g. by Mithridates when he strives to prove his innocence in court (5,6,7–5,7,10).<sup>42</sup>

So far I have tried to show that Callirhoe’s lament in Book three of Chariton possesses the main style-markers that Demetrius prescribes for the ‘forceful style’ (a style best exemplified by Demosthenes and ‘appropriate to censure’<sup>43</sup>). These include the accumulation of short clauses and periods, a marked lack of connectives, use of rhetorical questions, the personification, the sudden rise in the emotional tone, the juxtaposition of harsh sounds, and the use of rhetorical figures appropriate to forcefulness such as placing the most forceful word at the end of a sentence.

I have also suggested that this speech has a theatrical quality, on the basis of its context, and, more specifically, the way in which the scene is introduced and presented. The theatricality of the passage is further reinforced by the use of rhetorical devices that allow or even require, according to Demetrius, a histrionic delivery: the use of rhetorical questions, the sudden rise

---

<sup>42</sup> Mithridates has the difficult task of refuting Dionysius’ arguments, which, we are told, ‘had impressed the audience’ (5,6,11). In an attempt to make his case even more impressive and as convincing as possible, he presents an elaborate hypothetical conversation between himself and the plaintiff! (5,7,1–7).

<sup>43</sup> Demetrius 301.

in the tone resulting from a rise in the emotional tension in the speaker, and the personification.

I shall now address the question of the tone of this passage.<sup>44</sup> We are dealing here with what at first sight appears to be the serious lament of a young woman in a plight. She has been separated from her husband, she has died and has returned to life – twice –,<sup>45</sup> she has been sold as a slave and has been forced to live abroad away from her family and home, when she discovers that she is pregnant by Chaereas she is forced by the circumstances to remarry, always hoping that some day she will be reunited with her true love, and finally she finds out that Chaereas has been killed. One might argue that, under the circumstances, her tendency to mourn so often for her ordeals is understandable. But Chaereas is not really dead, which Callirhoe will be the very last one to find out, and he will come back to life just as she did in Book one.

One might also argue that the tragic irony of Callirhoe's ignorance is in accordance with the *topoi* and conventions of the genre, in which the ruling force of Fortune allows many sudden separations, unexpected reunions, astonishing revelations and other *paradoxa* to colour the incredible lives of its characters. However, it is difficult to ignore the humorous manner in which the author seems to handle tragic situations such as this, a manner often mirrored in more or less explicit comments and hints *ex voce auctoris* throughout the novel. And it is nearly impossible not to single out as highly unusual the fact that, in this scene, we have a woman declaiming.<sup>46</sup> Not only that, but Callirhoe's forceful and highly elaborate speech of reproach is levelled at none other than the goddess Aphrodite and the sea.

At this point I would like to return to the first type of personification mentioned above and discuss briefly the use of a word from this passage, which I believe reflects the general tone of the whole speech. Personified or not, it is intriguing to note that the sea is qualified by the adjective *miaros*

---

<sup>44</sup> G. Anderson (1982, ch.2) has already detected a humorous and playful touch throughout the novel, and having established that Chariton 'owes much to New Comedy' he goes so far as to compare the characters from *Callirhoe* to characters from New Comedy. In the framework of this comparison he explores Chariton's techniques of irony, including that of dramatic irony, which are used 'to set up elaborate deceptions for the characters'.

<sup>45</sup> 'As for Callirhoe, she experienced a second return to life.' (1,8,1). Callirhoe's first 'return to life' (*paligenesia*) was described in 1,1,15.

<sup>46</sup> Not surprisingly, it seems that women had been excluded from the teaching and practising of the art of declamation. See Russell (1983); cf. Richlin (1997).

(3,10,8), which, in this context, does not mean ‘impure, sacrilegious’ or ‘offensive to moral feeling’, a meaning that occurs in Homer<sup>47</sup> and Herodotus,<sup>48</sup> and is also discussed by Aristotle,<sup>49</sup> but rather ‘hateful, odious’.<sup>50</sup> The latter meaning also occurs in tragedy,<sup>51</sup> but it is particularly popular with orators. In fact, *miaros* seems to be one of the commonest epithets in the vocabulary of classical orators, who employ the term not in its traditional sense with direct connotations of impurity and moral pollution, but as a general imprecation when attacking their opponents.<sup>52</sup> Its frequent recurrence in oratory, presumably, attests to the effectiveness of the term, but Aristophanes uses it too as a term of comic reproach.<sup>53</sup> In Plato’s *Phaedrus* the word occurs in a semi-comic context. It comes up in the playful conversation between Socrates and Phaedrus before the former delivers his first speech. To Phaedrus’ serious threat never to read or tell Socrates of another discourse, the latter sarcastically replies: Βαβαί, ὦ μιαρῆ, ὡς εὖ ἀνεῦρες τὴν ἀνάγκην ἀνδρὶ φιλολόγῳ ποιεῖν ὃ ἂν κελεύης.<sup>54</sup> It appears, therefore, that the legalistic tone of the indictment against Aphrodite is extended to the sea, which is being reproached with a term echoing forensic oratory. That this is what Chariton had in mind cannot be proved, but it seems likely enough that the strong term *miaros* with colourful connotations already from the Classical period, employed here as a term of reproach against *thalassa* which is being blamed for the ‘crime’ of contributing to the misery of a couple, is being used with a certain amount of irony.

Callirhoe’s discourse is not impromptu but is a carefully structured and composed rhetorical speech. It starts off as a lament and suddenly takes the form of an indictment against Aphrodite and the sea. The forcefulness of the speech perhaps highlights the seriousness of Callirhoe’s plight, but at the same time it also underlines the role of the address as an accusation brought against a goddess and an element of nature, thus giving the passage a light

<sup>47</sup> E.g. used for Hector’s corpse in *Il.* 24,420.

<sup>48</sup> E.g. used for *thêrion* in *Her.* 2,47.

<sup>49</sup> *Ar. Poetics* 53B37–54A9.

<sup>50</sup> As translated by Reardon (1989); Goold’s translation as ‘cruel’ does not convey fully the meaning of the Greek *miara* in this passage.

<sup>51</sup> E.g. *S.Ant.* 746, *S.Tr.* 987.

<sup>52</sup> Moulinier (1952: 180, n.10) cites no less than fifty occurrences of the word in oratory.

<sup>53</sup> E.g. *Ach.* 182, 285, *Eq.* 218, 831. The superlative *miarôtatos* is also used extensively in Aristophanes. See O. J. Todd’s *Index Aristophaneus* (1932).

<sup>54</sup> ‘Oh, you wretch! What a nice way you found to make a lover of discourse do as you wish.’ (*Pl. Phdr.* 236E).

touch of exaggeration. The theatrical element of the scene, on the other hand, in combination with the above characteristics gives the speech an over-the-top quality not suited to an otherwise serious lament.

Was this passage deliberately composed as forceful in order to give the soliloquy an ironic tone? Is the reader really presented with a heart-rending lament or is this just a humorous melodramatic scene? Is this scene intended to move or amuse the reader? Although it is impossible to answer with certainty any of the above questions, I would be inclined to see Callirhoe's monologue as an example of Chariton's ability to maintain a balance between pathos and irony, by injecting a light ironic twist into scenes which would otherwise be taken as serious, perhaps also reflected in the use of the adjective *miaros* discussed above.

As for the reader's response to this 'forceful' piece of rhetoric which also serves as the heroine's lament for the death of her husband, I would think that it affords him ample opportunity for a second reading. In a world where rhetoric and oratory play a major part in education and in the culture more generally,<sup>55</sup> rhetorical training inevitably moulds the novelist's style of composition and at the same time also shapes the reader's expectations of the novels. In the case of Callirhoe's lament it would seem that, without excluding the less sophisticated reader, Chariton gives his educated readers the opportunity to get more pleasure out of this passage by enabling them to enjoy the text on a different level.<sup>56</sup> Intelligent *pepaideumenoi* readers of Chariton, educated in a system to which rhetoric was central and being well familiar with the usual rhetorical exercises and at least some of the stylistic

---

<sup>55</sup> T. Morgan (1998: esp. ch. 6); Horrocks (1997: ch. 5, esp. 72–73, 79–83 and 97–98); Swain (1996: 89–100).

<sup>56</sup> A view expressed – but not elaborated – by Wesseling (1988: 75–76) mainly in connection with Petronius, Apuleius, Achilles Tatius, Longus and Heliodorus. It can be inferred that, by rejecting Perry's theory about the readership of *Callirhoe*, Wesseling (*op. cit.*) adopts the same view for Chariton too (although not without scepticism) and concludes that "perhaps the real audience [of Chariton's novel] was of a more varied composition.". Wesseling also seems to include Chariton in the group of novelists whose intended audience was "probably the intellectuals in the first place but not exclusively". The idea is exploited by Hägg (1994: 53–55) who presents convincingly the likelihood that Chariton's novel required primarily but *not* exclusively a well-educated reader whose *παιδεία* would undoubtedly enable him to appreciate the novel on a different level and therefore give him the advantage of getting greater satisfaction out of it, without at the same time making it impossible for less educated readers to find delight – although possibly to a lesser degree – in reading it too. Bowie (1996: 95–96) also seems to accept the possibility of a "multi-level" reading of Chariton's novel.

theories of the period, would probably see more in this passage than just a tragic monologue. They would see an unusual type of female lament, vaguely reminiscent of Homeric models, dressed up with the stylistic features suitable for a forceful Demosthenic accusatory speech. All this, uttered by a woman and delivered in a theatrical way, would probably leave the discerning reader with more than just sympathy for the heroine. To the eyes of the educated reader, the tragic character of the text is undercut not only by the narrative comments surrounding it, but also by its forceful style. To the rest, the text is just one more of Callirhoe's tragic monologues. The subtle reminder that Chaereas was still alive, which follows the lament, would probably enhance the tragic effect of the scene in the eyes of the 'common' type of reader, whereas it would merely justify the educated reader's more sceptical reaction to Callirhoe's monologue. In other words, the first type of reader would be swept along by the heroine's mourning, adopt more or less her standpoint and follow her response to the crisis, whilst the second type of reader will form their own views and draw their own conclusions independently from Callirhoe's reactions. Therefore, the only difference between the reaction to this passage of the unsuspecting, ordinary reader and that of the perceptive, well-educated reader would be that the latter would read it with more sceptical detachment. As the plot unfolds, the two categories of readers follow the same story-line and their understanding of the passage is the same, but, while the first group remain at the basic level of interpretation, only the second group will be able to go a step further and appreciate the ironic undertones in the text.

In this case-study I have chosen to examine an erotic speech from Chariton's *Callirhoe*, in which amatory rhetoric is prominent and there is scope for debate about the tone of the speeches. My aim was to give an example of how the study of speech-making in the Greek novels, an important and under-researched area, can help us in our interpretation of these works. Close attention to the rhetorical character of the Greek novels can have important implications for long-standing questions about the readership as well as the literary objectives of the novels, and it can contribute to placing them within the larger literary discourse of the late Hellenistic and Roman Imperial period.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> I am indebted to Prof. C. J. Gill for his very useful comments on this paper and generally for his help and support throughout its preparation.



## Bibliography

- Alexiou, M. 1974. *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*, Cambridge.
- Alvares, J. 1997. 'Chariton's Erotic History', *American Journal of Philology* 118, 613–29.
- Anderson, G. 1982. *Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play*, California.
- Andriotes, N. 1992. *Ιστορία της ελληνικής γλώσσας: τέσσερις μελέτες*, Thessaloniki.
- Bartsch, S. 1989. *Decoding the Ancient Novel: The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius*, Princeton.
- Billault, A. 1981. 'Aspects du roman de Chariton', *Information littéraire* 33, 205–211.
- Bowie, E. L. 1994. 'The Readership of Greek Novels in the Ancient World', in: Tatum 1994, 435–459.
- 1996. 'The Ancient Readers of the Greek Novels', in: Schmeling 1996, 87–106.
- Browning, R. 1983. *Medieval and Modern Greek*, Cambridge.
- Conte, G. B. 1996. *The Hidden Author: an Interpretation of Petronius' 'Satyricon'* (trans.), Berkeley.
- Fusillo, M. 1996. 'Il romanzo antico come paraletteratura? Il *topos* del racconto di ricapitolazione' in: O. Pecere – A. Stramaglia (edd.), *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo Greco-Latino, Atti del convegno internazionale, Cassino, 14–17 settembre 1994*.
- Goold, G. P. (ed.). 1995. *Chariton, Callirhoe* (Loeb Classical Library), Cambridge, Mass. – London.
- Grube, G. M. A. 1961. *A Greek Critic: Demetrius on Style*, Toronto.
- Hägg, T. 1971. *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances. Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius and Achilles Tatius*, Stockholm.
- 1994. '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, 47–81.
- Helms, J. 1966. *Character Portrayal in the Romance of Chariton*, The Hague – Paris.
- Hernández Lara, C. 1990. 'Rhetorical Aspects of Chariton of Aphrodisias' in: *Giornale Italiano di Filologia* XLII.2, Rome.
- 1994. *Estudios sobre el aticismo de Caritón de Afrodiasias*, Amsterdam.
- Horrocks, G. 1997. *Greek: a History of the Language and its Speakers*, London – New York.
- Hunter, R. 1983. *A Study of 'Daphnis and Chloe'*, Cambridge.
- 1994. 'History and Historicity in the Romance of Chariton', *ANRW* 34.2, 1055–1086.
- Innes, D. C. (ed. and trans.) 1995. 'Demetrius. On Style' in: G. P. Goold (ed.), *Aristotle XXIII. Aristotle, Poetics – Longinus, On the Sublime – Demetrius, On Style* (Loeb Classical Library), Cambridge, Mass. – London.
- Kapsomenos, S. 1985. *Από την ιστορία της ελληνικής γλώσσας*, Thessaloniki.
- Konstan, D. 1994. *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, Princeton.

- Laplace, M. 1997. 'Le roman de Chariton et la tradition de l'éloquence et de la rhétorique', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 140.1, 38–71.
- Morgan, T. 1998. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, Cambridge.
- Moulinier, L. 1952. *Le pur et l'impur dans la pensée des grecs d'Homère à Aristote* (Etudes et Commentaires, 12), Paris.
- Rademacher, L. (ed.). 1966. *Demetrius Phalereus, De Elocutione*, Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Reardon, B. P. (ed.). 1989. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London.
- 1996. 'Chariton', in: Schmeling 1996, 309–335.
- 1999. 'Theme, Narrative and Structure in Chariton' in: Swain 1999, 163–188.
- Ruiz Montero, C. 1991. 'Aspects of the Vocabulary of Chariton of Aphrodisias', *CQ* 41, 484–489.
- 1991a. 'Caritón de Afrodísias y los Ejercicios Preparatorios de Elio Teón', in: L. Ferreres (ed.), *Actes del IX<sup>e</sup> Simposi de la Secció Catalana de la SEEC*, Treballs en Honor de Virgilio Bejarano, vol. 2, 709–713, Barcelona.
- Russell, D. A. 1983. *Greek Declamation*, Cambridge.
- Scarcella, A. M. 1990. 'Nomos nel romanzo greco d'amore', *Giornale Italiano di Filologia* 42, 243–66.
- Schmeling, G. (ed.). 1996. *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden – New York – Köln.
- Stephens, S. A. 1990. "'Popularity" of the Ancient Novel' in: Tatum and Vernazza 1990, 148–149.
- 1994. 'Who Read Ancient Novels?', in: Tatum 1994, 405–418.
- Swain, S. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50–250*, Oxford.
- (ed.). 1999. *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, Oxford.
- Tatum, J. (ed.). 1994. *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore.
- Toohy, P. 1999. 'Dangerous Ways to Fall in Love: Chariton I 1,5–10 and VI 9,4', *Maia* 51: 259–275.
- Usher, S. (ed. and trans.). 1974. *Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The critical essays, volume I* (Loeb Classical Library), Cambridge, Mass. – London.
- Wesseling, B. 1988. 'The Audience of the Ancient Novels', *GCN* I, 67–79.