The Masculinity of Hippothoos*

AKIHIKO WATANABE
University of Kentucky

Introduction

Hippothoos in Xenophon's *Ephesiaka* presents the reader with a puzzling set of attributes. He is a ruthless bandit who in the end settles down for a quiet life in the city. He repeatedly threatens the life and chastity of the heroine and is at the same time a devoted friend of her husband. He is a connoisseur of male beauty with a corresponding misogynistic strain, yet manages to seduce a rich woman into marriage and ends up with a legitimate male heir. In many ways he is the complete opposite of the novelistic hero, but like Habrokomes,[1] Hippothoos emerges unscathed and victorious after all his incredible adventures. This essay is an attempt to reconcile these contradic-

* This article is based on the research I did for my 2003 Yale U. dissertation, and my first and foremost thanks are due to my main advisor Professor Michael J. Anderson. I also wish to thank Dr. Shilpa Raval (Yale U.) and Dr. David Konstan (Brown U.) for kindly undertaking to read and comment on the dissertation, and Dr. Gareth Schmeling (U. of Florida), Mr. Justin Mansfield (U. of Chicago), Dr. Maaike Zimmerman (Groningen) and the anonymous reader for *Ancient Narrative* for their helpful suggestions regarding the draft of this article.

[1] The name is usually spelled Habrokomes/Habrocomes, and older editions of the *Ephesiaka* consistently write Ἀβροκόμης. Here I follow the conventional aspirated spelling, although the manuscript has smooth breathing more often than rough according to what Dalmeyda and Papanikolaou report. Papanikolaou's edition, which is the most authoritative one currently available (as Reeve 1976 acknowledges, although he otherwise has a number of reservations), consistently adopts the spelling with smooth breathing. A complicating factor is the possible Persian origin of the name; see Hdt. 7,224, where an Abrokomes and a Hyperanthes(!) are mentioned as sons of Darius. The name however can also be interpreted in Greek as a compound beginning with the adjective ἁβρός; cf. the adjective ἁβροκόμης or -κόμας in poetic Greek and the pun on Habrokomes' 'beautiful hair' in X.Eph. 1,9,5. For more on the name see Ruiz-Montero 1981 and Harrison 1998, note 139 (I owe the second citation to Mr. Justin Mansfield (U. of Chicago)).

tions by examining Hippothoos' characterization in the context of elite Greco-Roman masculinity.

Once upon a time it may have been permissible to dismiss the apparently odd set of qualities as an indication of the author's incompetence or even moral insensitivity,[2] but a deeper appreciation of the ideal Greek novel that has characterized the scholarly endeavor of the last few decades[3] has thankfully given rise to less dismissive interpretations. For one thing, it has now been recognized that Hippothoos is depicted through much of the novel as a character antithetical to the passive hero Habrokomes.[4] The antithesis is particularly marked in his capacity as an arch-bandit, who instead of submitting to criminal violence chooses to exercise it at the top of the hierarchy, and his role as a pederastic *erastes*, who pursues, secures and jealously guards his beloved object instead of pining away in helpless solitude.[5] What position, then, does this anti-hero occupy in the ethics of the novel? Is he presented as a warning to the reader, a lesson that banditry, pederasty and the active brand of masculinity underlying them bring nothing but disaster? One scholar who has examined the characterization of Hippothoos answers the last question in the affirmative. According to his view, Hippothoos starts out being an active male and suffers one misfortune after another, first as a pederast deprived of his *eromenos* and then as a leader of brigands who suffers a series of crushing defeats under the forces of law and order. In the end however he unlearns this pernicious brand of masculinity, adopts the passivity of the hero, and is permitted to settle with the heroic couple in the civilized world once more.[6]

I present in this paper an alternative view that posits an essence underlying Hippothoos' characterization in all of its narrative manifestations. Indeed Alvares himself, despite his perception of Hippothoos' career as a change from the bad to the good, recognizes that there is a certain quality that is always associated with him and which he describes as follows:

---

[2] See e.g. Rohde 1914, 428–429; Helm 1948, 44–45; Gärtner 1967, 2070; cf. Ruiz-Montero 1994, 1105.

[3] See. e.g. Swain 1999, 26.

[4] Schmeling 1980, 123–124.

[5] Cf. Konstan 1994, 28–29.

[6] See Alvares 1995.

> Nevertheless, Hippothous' life of brigandage does not detract from his fundamental status as a hero in the sense of one especially favored by the gods. This favor is something inborn, like extraordinary physical beauty. It is a type of innocence. Hippothous' character remains essentially noble and no excuses are made for his life of crime, and he remains protected by the gods, as evidenced by his various escapes from disaster and his eventual good fortune.[7]

This essay is an attempt to delineate this 'fundamental status as a hero,' 'type of innocence,' and 'essentially noble' character by utilizing the concept of elite or hegemonic masculinity.

Since hegemonic masculinity is not a term often encountered in classics,[8] further explanation is probably called for. Connell in his seminal study defines it as:

> The configuration of gender practices which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women.[9]

The phrase in Connell's definition which is especially worth underlining is 'currently accepted answer.' Hegemonic masculinity is not static, but mutates in response to changing social circumstances, and contrasting characteristics like independence and corporate loyalty, aggression and conformity may in turn come to mark hegemonic masculinity as they become necessary in justifying male hegemony in society. Modern America has seen the independent farmer, businessman, and white-collar worker emerge one after another as icons of masculinity to prop up male dominance,[10] and studies on early modern Britain and mediaeval Europe have also articulated changes across time in the tactics employed to maintain the status of the hegemonic

---

[7] Alvares 1995, 398.

[8] As far as I am aware, the only classicist to use the term is Kuefler, and he does so only in a preface (Kuefler 2001, 4–5).

[9] Connell 1995, 77; cf. Hatty 2000, 115–118; Haywood 2003, 9–10 and 153.

[10] See e.g. Kimmel 1996.

male,[11] while for the classical world Veyne, Gleason and Koehler have documented changes in literary representations of elite[12] masculinity.[13]

Ancient Greek literature, tracing its history back to Homer and kept in production through different periods, had, by the time of the Second Sophistic, a wide variety of hegemonic masculinities to offer, including those of the warlike tribal leader (e.g. Achilles, Odysseus), the sober and steadfast philosopher (e.g. Socrates), and the self-made orator (e.g. Favorinus). The novel seems to offer a new hegemonic male, the passive hero of outstanding physical beauty and elite origin, but typically there is another male who shares some of these characteristics and yet in other respects reminds one more of the heroes of other genres and earlier periods. Hippothoos is one such character, and through studying him and other similar novelistic creations one comes to a deeper understanding and appreciation of the diversity of the novel, both in its gender ideals and the literary traditions it incorporates. In resolving the apparent contradictions in Hippothoos' characterization, then, I also hope to shed light on one aspect of the rich polyphony that is the hallmark of the ideal Greek novel.

Hyperanthes

The pederastic love affair between Hyperanthes and Hippothoos recounted in 3,2,1–14 is the longest of all the inserted tales in the *Ephesiaka*.[14] In this section, I will consider how Hippothoos as a male is presented in this inset narrative. In doing so, I shall take especial care to place the text within the cultural context of late antique Hellenic literature. The age when uncritical essentialism[15] was acceptable in discussions of Greco-Roman homosexuality

[11] See Foyster 1999 and Hadley 1999. The number of studies employing the concept of multiple masculinities and shifts in hegemonic masculinity has grown dramatically in the last few years and it is neither possible nor useful to give a full list of citations here.

[12] In this paper I will be using 'elite' and 'hegemonic' as loosely equivalent terms for the sake of variation.

[13] See Kuefler 2001; Gleason 1995; Veyne 1987.

[14] The other inserted tales are to be found in 5,1,4–5,1,9 (Aigialeus and Thelxinoe) and 5,7,7–5,7,9 (Anthia's ghost story). They are, respectively, 1 and ¼ Teubner pages long, while the Hippothoos-Hyperanthes tale occupies 2 Teubner pages out of a total of 71 for the whole novel.

[15] On essentialism and social constructionism in contemporary scholarly debates on ancient homosexuality, see e.g. Karras 2000.

is hopefully long gone, and a social-constructionist interpretation of the love story which is sensitive to the ancient preconceptions about pederasty will let one better understand how Xenophon intended to depict, and his immediate audience would have perceived, Hippothoos the *erastes*.

The very first sentence of the tale clearly marks Hippothoos as an elite Greek male with a background on par with that of the hero Habrokomes. Hippothoos says that formerly he was a citizen of Perinthos, one of the more famous Greek *poleis* in the ancient Mediterranean. One may well suspect that Xenophon, in making Hippothoos say:

> And as you are aware, Perinthus is an important city and its citizens are well-to-do (3,2,1).[16]

wanted to make extra clear the respectable origin of Hippothoos even to those readers with a shakier knowledge of geography. So like Habrokomes and Anthia, Hippothoos was bred and born a Hellenic citizen, 'one of us' for the cultured Second Sophistic[17] reader and not some country rustic or a barbarian. Hippothoos moreover comes from an elite family within that city, again just like the hero; he is one of the 'well-to-do' (3,2,1), and the wording here is identical as the one applied to the family of Habrokomes (1,1,1).[18]

If the first sentence establishes the credentials of Hippothoos as an elite Greek urban male, then what follows begins to show that his love affair with Hyperanthes is in accordance with the classical pederastic paradigm. To begin with, the asymmetry in the relationship is clearly marked out. Hippothoos says that he 'fell in love' (3,2,2)[19] with a beautiful youth exercising in a gymnasium. The subject of the verb is Hippothoos, and the object is Hy-

---

[16] The translation of the *Ephesiaka* cited in this essay, unless otherwise noted, is of Anderson in Reardon 1989. Translated passages from Heliodorus and Longus are also from this collection, while for Achilles Tatius, I used Gaselee 1934, and for Chariton, Goold 1995.

[17] Xenophon of Ephesus, along with Chariton, has in the past been labeled a 'presophistic' novelist, with the implication that he predated the Second Sophistic and/or he and his readers were less sophisticated; see e.g. Hägg 1983, 34–35, 107. The earlier dating and the lower-class readership however have both been challenged more recently. Swain 1999, 27–28 argues for the rejection of the division between 'sophistic' and 'presophistic' novels altogether, while Morgan 1995, 14; Bowie 1996, 106; and Swain 1996, 103–104 see a highly educated readership even for Xenophon. My discussion assumes the latter view.

[18] τὸν τὰ πρῶτα ἐκεῖ δυναμένων.

[19] ἠράσθην.

peranthes, placing the former in the category of the active *erastes* and the latter in that of the passive *eromenos*. The erotic asymmetry is corroborated by a number of other details in the rest of the tale. Hippothoos takes the initiative in starting the relationship, for not only is he the one who falls in love but he also ventures to approach the youth and to beg him take pity on his erotic suffering (3,2,3), while all that Hyperanthes has to do is to listen to him and comply. And later it is Hippothoos who strikes and kills the erotic rival Aristomachos, while Hyperanthes just acquiesces (3,2,10)[20] with the crime. In the elopement that follows, again it is Hippothoos who takes the initiative; he leads away (3,2,11)[21] Hyperanthes with him, and the steps in travel – going back to Perinthos and boarding a ship sailing away to Asia – are all told by Hippothoos in the first person singular, not plural. He alone is the active agent, and Hyperanthes' will, if he had any, has vanished into silence. Finally, when the ship breaks apart in a storm and the two are desperately swimming in the ocean, Hippothoos is the one to display greater initiative as well as physical strength by helping the failing Hyperanthes.

The location where Hippothoos first catches sight of Hyperanthes is also significant in the context of ancient pederastic tradition. The gymnasium, a peculiarly Greek institution, is regularly associated with pederasty in classical and post-classical sources.[22] The sight of young boys exercising naked was imagined to provide a powerful stimulus for pederasts, and Hippothoos' desire is kindled at the very moment when Hyperanthes is engaged in a wrestling match (2,2,2). That Hyperanthes should be exercising in a gymnasium also has implications for the boy's status. Membership in the gymnasium was one of the prized symbols of elite Hellenic heritage,[23] and Hyperanthes presumably is not only, as Hippothoos says, native to the region (2,2,2)[24] but also, like Hippothoos himself, of respectable parentage. Hyperanthes moreover is young and beautiful (2,2,2), possessing the right physical

---

[20] συνδοκοῦν.

[21] ἐπαγόμενος.

[22] For classical Greek sources see Dover 1989, 54–55. According to Cicero pederasty is an evil born in the gymnasia (Cic. *Tusc.* 4,70), while in Athenaeus wrestling-schools (παλαίστραι) are likened to a stout bulwark erected against tyranny, since jealous pederasts often became defenders of democracy (Ath. 13,602 D).

[23] See e.g. Goldhill 2001, 1–2.

[24] Note also that Habrokomes' mother, who is the wife of Megamedes, τῶν τῷ πρῶτα ἐκεῖ δυναμένων, is described as an ἐπιχωρία (1,1,1). Anthia's parents on the other hand are ἐγχώριοι (1,2,5), but the adjective is presumably equivalent in meaning to ἐπιχώριος.

qualifications for the classical *eromenos*. The desirable mental attributes are not lacking, either. Hyperanthes does not actively or aggressively seek out Hippothoos' attention, but submits only after being beseeched. He is also not promiscuous, but tries, though unsuccessfully, to remain faithful to Hippothoos at the emergence of a richer and more powerful rival (3,2,7). The only detail in the Hippothoos-Hyperanthes relationship that may not fit the classical paradigm is the age balance, as Hippothoos seems to be about as old as his beloved,[25] but *erastai* who are as young as, or even younger than their *eromenoi* are attested, albeit rarely, in ancient sources.[26]

Relationships between elite male pairs showing clear erotic asymmetry are featured extensively in Achilles Tatius (1,7–1,8; 2,34–2,38) as well as in Xenophon, and in Chariton Callirhoe makes a passing remark that Chaireas has been much sought after by other men before marriage (1,3,6). The abortive relationship between Daphnis and Gnathon in Longus (4,10–4,18) is anomalous only in that the boy, at the time when Gnathon is chasing after him, is ostensibly a country slave and is a long way below even the parasite in the social scale. But he is of the right age to be a *paidika*, and of the right beauty and social background, only the last bit of detail is not known at that time. Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*, which is the latest of the surviving novels and is peculiar in a number of other respects,[27] is also the only surviving novel that does not contain any mention of pederasty. It is worth noting that in all of these pederastic episodes every appearance of physical *hubris* as well as of crass monetary exchange is carefully avoided. In the *Ephesiaka*, even the pirate Korymbos opts to attempt persuasion before force when he falls in love with Habrokomes (1,15), and Amphimachos, Hippothoos' rival who essentially purchases Hyperanthes with money, nevertheless pretends that he is taking in the boy for the purpose of rhetorical education (3,2,8). And even the dissolute Gnathon, who thinks that he can easily set his hands on the slave Daphnis, conjures up the pretense of teaching him city manners (Longus 4,19,1), while his comical attempt at rape stands no chance of suc-

[25] The passage in 3,2,4 contains a textual problem that possibly affects the meaning; see Papanikolaou 1973 ad loc. For the typical age difference between *erastai* and *eromenoi* see e.g. Buffière 1980, 605–612.

[26] See Dover 1989, 86–87.

[27] See Hägg 1983, 54–73. On the unique complexity of the heroine's characterization in Heliodorus see Haynes 2003, 67–73.

cess (4,12).[28] When homosexual relationships between young boys and older men play a part in the novels, then, the classical Greek ideal of consensual, mutually beneficial, educational and non-commercial pederasty is preserved, or at least the characters pretend to abide by it.

If everything I enumerated above seems unremarkable, data from the roughly contemporary Greek and Roman comic novels provide a salutary reminder that the ancients could imagine other, radically different homosexual relationships. Instances of androphile homosexuality – i.e. sexual acts committed between males past their teens – as well as of homosexual rape are a dime a dozen in Petronius' *Satyrica*, Pseudo-Lucian's *Onos* and Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.[29] Petronius is certainly aware of and plays with classical Greek conventions of pederasty, especially when he is depicting the love quadrangle between the youthful Giton and his adult lovers Encolpius, Ascyltos and Eumolpus. Petronius' purpose however is to hold up to ridicule the ingrained duplicity of these characters that casually alternate between verbal professions of fidelity and promiscuous sex acts.[30] The pederastic couples in the Greek novels by contrast remain faithful to each other, at least for as long as the beloved partner is alive. In the Roman novels male homosexual prostitution is also featured without any educational cover. Ascyltos is purchased by a Roman knight for a night's company (Petron. 92), and the Galli of Apuleius, not content with their male sex-slave, hire a robust man for their pathic and (in the eyes of Lucius as well as, presumably, of the novel's readers) utterly perverted pleasures (Apul. *Met.* 8,29).[31]

That the Greek novelists depict homosexual relationships conducted in accordance with classical conventions does not, of course, prove by any means that classical pederasty was 'alive' or institutionalized in contemporary social practices to the same extent as in classical Athens. The ideal novel, as a number of critics have shown, presents an amalgam of post-classical socio-historical conditions and the classical past as perceived and inter-

[28] On the comical effect intended in the unsuccessful rape scene in Longus 4,12 see also Goldhill 1995, 50–51.

[29] On homosexual episodes in the Roman novels see Richardson 1984; Pomeroy 1992; Richlin 1992, 190–195; Taylor 1997; Williams 1999 with the 'Index to Passages Cited,' 376–390; Watanabe 2003, 50–65.

[30] See e.g. Petr. 9, 85–87, 92–93, 114, 130, 140; cf. Richlin 1992, 190–191.

[31] Also cf. Ps.-Luc. *Asin.* 38.

preted by later generations.[32] Separating fact from fiction in the novel, even if we posit for the moment that these are in fact separable concepts, is most of the times impossible partly because of the paucity of available documentary evidence and more fundamentally because the authors and consumers of these works made no firm distinction between them.

I am however inclined towards the belief that the pederastic episodes in the novels are more heavily colored by previous literary traditions than by any contemporary social institution. My belief is based on direct references to the classics as well as borrowed narrative patterns that are detectable in the novelistic depictions of pederasty. Achilles Tatius, the sophistic author *par excellence*, makes the most conspicuous use of classics, letting his characters introduce a barrage of classical examples in a playful debate on the relative merits of pederasty and the love of women (Ach. Tat. 2,35–38). The tragic tale narrated by Menelaos about the death of his *eromenos* (2,34) is also patterned on a classical story, the legend of Adrastos and Atys recounted in Herodotus 1,35 f., and the speech by the priest of Artemis accusing Thersandros of ἀσέλγεια in youth (Ach. Tat. 8,9) may contain echoes of Aischines 1.[33] Longus' Gnathon also defends his love for Daphnis with an impressive speech with a liberal sprinkling of classical exempla. This he is able to do, Longus tells us, because he has learned all the erotic mythology in the symposia of the depraved (4,17,3), which statement may be designed to recall in the literate readers' mind the Socratic dialogue on love.[34]

Even Xenophon of Ephesus, who is usually not credited with much literary pretension, manages to insert at least one piece of learned classical allusion in the Hippothoos-Hyperanthes tale. When Hippothoos is burying Hyperanthes, he inscribes on the tombstone an epitaph in hexameters – the form itself shows Xenophon not to have been without a certain degree of classical learning – and its first line describes the deceased as κλεινός, 'renowned' (3,2,13).[35] Now Hyperanthes, though he presumably is, as I mentioned above, of elite extraction, has not yet been of age to distinguish himself in

---

[32] On the dynamics between literary 'fiction' and contemporary socio-historical 'reality' in the novels see Bowie 1977; Treu 1989; Morgan 1993; Bowersock 1994; Saïd 1994; Scarcella 1977 and 1996; Rife 1999, 10–53; Riess 2000–2001, 262–266; Haynes 2003, 11–12.

[33] Watanabe 2003, 39–41. On literary puns in this speech see Vilborg 1962, 132–133.

[34] See Swain 1996, 127; cf. also Goldhill 1995, 47–48 for suggestions of other classical sources.

[35] My translation: Anderson omits it.

civil or military affairs, and the application of this adjective may appear puzzling at first sight. The contextual significance of this word can be appreciated in full only if one is aware that the adjective, according to geo-graphers and lexicographers, was regularly applied to beautiful young boys in the Cretan dialect.[36]

The overall narrative design moreover of the Hippothoos-Hyperanthes episode follows the same pattern as the stories of pederastic tyrannicides told and retold since classical times. The archetype may be the story of Harmodios and Aristogeiton recounted in Thucydides 6,54–59, but similar tales come from later periods and different locales. Even when tyrants, together with the truly independent Greek *poleis*, were long gone, the narrative type survived, as attested by anecdotes contained in the writings of Parthenius and Aelian.[37] Aristomachos in Xenophon is of course not a tyrant and Hippothoos does not win public praise with his murder, but most of the other elements – the mutually faithful pederastic couple, intrusion of a baser rival *erastes*, the revenge of the true *erastes* and the attempted rescue of the *eromenos* – are reproduced. What Hippothoos does to his rival is technically a crime, and for this reason he can never return to his native city. But to a reader who is immersed in and appreciates the tradition of honorable murders committed by wronged *erastai*, he begins to look more like a hero than a criminal.

Pederasty in the ideal novels, including the *Ephesiaka*, is depicted by and for the *literati* conscious of the great Hellenic heritage. As Haynes remarks,

> The vignettes of pederasty…deliberately hark back to the Classical past, functioning as oblique references to the cultural myth of homosexuality, so often associated with the Golden Age of Athens.[38]

It is only proper, then, that the masculinity of Hippothoos the pederast should be assessed in the context of this tradition, and not in the framework of modern Western homosexuality, for example. For if we assimilate Hippothoos to the popular American conceptual category of the homosexual, he

---

[36] See Locella 1796, 220 and *LSJ* s.v. For another possible piece of classical reference compare 3,2,4 with *AP* (Phld.) 5,306; cf. Plu. *Alc.* 193 C; Locella 1796, 215; and Dalmeyda 1926, 6–37.

[37] See Parth. 7; Ael. *VH* 4,2; Ath. 13,562 A; Arist. *Pol.* 5,11; 5,22; 5,28; cf. Percy 1996, 120–121, 181–182.

[38] Haynes 2003, 152.

might look like an incomplete male, an emasculated deviant, but the same figure would appear under a radically different light in the ancient Greek context, where a strict differentiation is maintained between the active *erastes* and the passive *eromenos*.

The masculinity of the *eromenos* to be sure may come under question. Aristophanes in Plato's *Symposium* asserts that the boy's preference to associate with *erastai* is a sign of his manliness and virility (192A)[39] but this observation, he acknowledges, is contrary to the widely held opinion. The *eromenos*, provided that he follows certain conventions such as not accepting monetary returns for sexual favors, appearing to shun rather than draw the attention of the *erastai* and not enjoying the sexual act itself, is not seen as such a corrupt gender deviant as the grown-up *kinaidos* who with or without the incentive of pay is avid of being penetrated.[40] Yet the *eromenos* must always remain a problematic figure from the elite male standpoint, being at best a *potential* male without his promises coming to fruition as yet, if anything because of his age. The proper Greek *eromenos* cannot be much older than the late teens, an age when one is not likely to be entrusted with leadership of the clan, the *polis* or even the *oikos*.

The masculinity of the *erastes* is an entirely different matter. He would typically be of an age that would qualify him to be a civic leader, and his active pursuit of the object of desire would display the resolve and resources appropriate for an elite male. What is more, his preference for the male rather than female erotic object could itself be seen as a sign of his own manliness. In the patriarchal and misogynistic tradition of Greek erotic discourse, it was not only possible but actually common to argue that appreciation of natural male beauty (provided, however, that it appeared in a boy and not an adult – a point silently passed over in most discussions) and the corresponding rejection of artificial female charms show appropriate manliness in the loving subject. The line of argument appears in all the debates over the relative merits of the love for boys and the love for women, which come down to us in imperial Greek sources, including Achilles Tatius, but which may have originated in Hellenistic times.[41] Women, the proponents of peder-

[39] ἀνδρείας καὶ ἀρρηνωπίας.

[40] For the code of behavior prescribed to the classical *eromenos*, see Foucault 1985, 204–214. On the *kinaidos* as an iconic bogeyman, see e.g. Gleason 1990 and Winkler 1990, 45–70.

[41] On the literary and intellectual heritage lying behind these debates see Wilhelm 1902.

asty say, must of necessity be disgusting in their unadorned state, whereas the boy, being his natural self, even if he is covered with dirt and sweat, is always attractive to the elite male, the subject both of the *eros* under discussion and of the discussion itself.[42] While such an assertion may not have been made in all seriousness, considering the playful tone of these debates, it is still significant that the line of argument appears in a number of sources and never encounters contradiction from the self-professed (male) lovers of women.

When seen within the Greek pederastic tradition, then, Hippothoos comes out as more, rather than less, of an elite male for loving Hyperanthes. There is another background however against which the masculinity of Hippothoos the pederast must be assessed, that of the novel, and here the subject may seem trickier at first sight. For as a number of critics have remarked, the world of the ideal Greek novel, at least as far as we have it represented in the surviving examples, is not a place where pederastic couples enjoy relationships that are as stable and prosperous as those of the heterosexual heroes and heroines.[43] No work of this genre is ever known to have been written which places a pederastic instead of heterosexual couple at its center, and the few pederastic love episodes which do appear as sub-plots almost all end in the premature death of the *eromenoi*. In this regard again however it is essential to be on guard against essentialism. It is surely inadvisable to uncritically project modern assumptions onto antiquity and to assume that the ancient audience of the novels held an unfavorable attitude towards 'homosexuals' for example. Rather, one must go back to the primary sources and other texts emanating from the same temporal and cultural environment to see how and why pederasty is marginalized.

To start with the 'how' then, it is significant that the practice of pederasty may be marginalized in the novels but that this is not necessarily the case with the *erastai* themselves. Hippothoos, Kleinias and Menelaos, the three characters in the novels whose relationship with *eromenoi* is successfully developed and described at some length, all come from the upper crust

---

[42] Ach. Tat. 2,35,3; 2,38,2–2,38,5; *AP* (Strat.) 12,7,1–12,7,2, 12,192; cf. Maxwell-Stuart 1972, 216–217; Ps.-Luc. *Am.* 38–43; 45–46; Plu. *Moralia* 752 C; cf. Wilhelm 1902, 64–65, 71–72. Compare also Pl. *Smp.* 181 C. The disputants in all of these debates are men – Kleitophon's statement in Ach. Tat. 2,35,1 that Leukippe had left the scene before the debate started underscores the 'for men only' nature of the discussion.

[43] See e.g. Effe 1987; Konstan 1994, 28–29; Perkins 1995, 72–73; Swain 1996, 126–127; Haynes 2003, 152.

of urban Mediterranean society, like the heroes and heroines. They are not barbarians, slaves, or members of some other socio-ethnic group whose background would immediately stigmatize them as second-class citizens in the novelistic world. Moreover they display behavior that befits this privileged rank, exercising bravery and generosity in helping the heroes, rather than acting for their self-interest like Thersandros or Manto for example. And as novelistic justice demands, they are all restored to their privileged elite status in the end, if they have ever lost it. In this respect, they are as narratively favored as the heroes and the heroines.

Still, their love affairs do not prosper as long as those of the heroic couple which culminate in stable marriage, as the *eromenoi* of Hippothoos, Kleinias and Menelaos all die tragic deaths in the bloom of their youth. But this course of events may actually not be indicative of any disapproval placed on the pederasts *per se*. Pederastic relationships in the Greek tradition were bound to end with the physical maturation of the *eromenoi*, and the *erastai*'s laments over the growth of hair on the cheeks of their beloved boys, presaging the termination of their love affairs, is a common motif in Hellenistic and later epigrams.[44] As matters stood thus, end of the relationship brought about by the boys' death could actually be seen as one of the more aesthetically pleasing options. Continuation of the erotic relationship into the adulthood of the beloved would have been stigmatized as a perverse act, while the maturation of the boy and his inevitable marriage with a woman was a prospect thought to cause anguish to the *erastes*, as can be seen in Pisias' violent reaction in Plutarch's *Erotikos* (749 E–F; 752 B–C) as well as Kleinias' verbose complaint in Achilles Tatius (1,7,4–1,8,8). If on the other hand the boy died in the bloom of youth, he could live on and be celebrated in the mind of the *erastes*, an example of such a romantic attachment being offered by no less a figure than Hadrian, the ruler of all the known civilized world and the great patron of the Greek cultural revival, who also immortalized the memory of his beloved Antinous by erecting monuments all over the empire.[45] Hippothoos as well as Kleinias and Menelaos keep alive the memory of their *eromenoi* in their conversation with oth-

[44] See Richlin 1992, 35; and *AP* (Alc.) 12,29–12,30, (Phan.) 12,31, (Thymocl.) 12,32, (Mel.) 12,33, (Anon.) 12,39.

[45] On Hadrian and Antinous see Williams 1999, 60–61, 290–191. The imperial myth contains a few parallels with the Hippothoos-Hyperanthes episode, such as the death of the boy by drowning and the erection of a tomb with verse epitaph.

ers concerning their tragic love affairs. The youthful image of their *eromenoi* may be idealized in their discourse forever without the pederasts' being compromised by insinuations of sexual perversion or the embarrassment of losing the boy to a woman.

The stringent age restriction placed on the *eromenos* in the Greek pederastic tradition confined the relationship within tight temporal boundaries. Heterosexual marriage, by contrast, could last much longer and lead to biological and social reproduction, as advocates for the love of women keep on triumphally asserting in their debates against the lovers of boys.[46] Lasting marriage that creates alliance between leading families of the polis, forms a new familial unit, and will hopefully result in the birth of the next generation of citizens, is also the *telos* towards which the novel strives, as a number of critics have demonstrated,[47] and it is this kind of union that Greek pederasty could not provide, however much status this form of erotic relationship might possess based on its association with the classical past. The temporal and reproductive shortcomings of pederasty as perceived by the ancients constitute one important reason why it is sidelined in the novels.[48] But a brilliant solution is offered to these problems towards the end of the *Ephesiaka*, which I will discuss below in the penultimate section ('Redemption').

Within the gender systems of late antique classicizing culture, Hippothoos the lover of Hyperanthes may plausibly be styled an ideal elite male. His conduct is in accordance with the classical standards demanded of an *erastes*, and even his illegal use of violence against a rival may be sanctioned by the examples of heroes like Aristogeiton of Athens and Chariton of Agrigentum. His relationship with Hyperanthes comes to a tragic end, but it is an end that spares him from the stigma of sexual perversion or the embarrassment of losing the boy to a woman. Hippothoos emerges from the episode as an elite urban Greek male who acts in ways appropriate to his station. The loss of Hyperanthes drives him to desperation and a career in banditry, but his lot as a destitute outcast at this point is not much worse than that of the hero Habrokomes. In having as his erotic object a boy instead of a woman he differs from the hero, but this difference would not have compromised his

---

[46] Plu. *Moralia* 751C–752 A; Ach. Tat. 2,37,5–2,37,10; Ps.-Luc. *Am.* 20–22; 24–25; 27–28; Ath. 13,605 D; cf. Wilhelm 1902, 59–60.

[47] Perkins 1995, 41–76; Cooper 1996, 20–44; Swain 1996, 119–122; Aubin 1998, 258–260; Haynes 2003, 156–162.

[48] See Perkins 1995, 72; Swain 1996, 126–131; Watanabe 2003, 69–87. For alternative (and perhaps complimentary) explanations, see Effe 1987 and Konstan 1994, 26–29.

masculinity in the perception of the ancient audience to whom the modern conceptual category of the deviant homosexual would have been completely alien. The figure to which Hippothoos would have been assimilated was rather that of the honorable and heroic *erastes*, whose masculinity had been so much valorized in the literary tradition.

Bandit

After the death of Hyperanthes, desperation and destitution drive Hippothoos to banditry, a career diametrically opposed to that of the secure, elegant and prosperous citizenry in which he had been raised and with which the author and the readers of the *Ephesiaka* would have likely identified themselves. Hippothoos moreover does not become any ordinary brigand but a leader in command of hundreds of other cut-throat criminals. He and his band leave a trail of destruction through several provinces in the southeastern Mediterranean, eradicating entire villages and massacring their inhabitants. His behavior during this phase does not bear much similarity to that of the idealized Robin Hood as celebrated in modern literature and films, to take one example. He and his band are never depicted helping the poor, although they certainly do rob from the rich (as well as the poor, and murder them to boot), and Hippothoos himself is far from being genteel to women but reserves the most outrageous acts of cruelty for the captive heroine. Yet unlike most of the bandits and pirates[49] in the novels, he does not vanish from the scene once his dramatic role as a menace to the heroic couple is over, nor is he brought to justice to end his life on the gallows. He eventually gives up his bandit career, becomes rich, and by the end of the novel is assimilated to the hero both in terms of social and material circumstances, having become a resident of a Greek *polis* and a patriarch at the head, not of a band of desperate brigands, but of a household consisting of legitimately acquired servants and a young male heir. While it is possible to assign the reason for this ap-

[49] In the following discussion, I will be using 'bandits' to mean violent criminal gangs operating on land, 'pirates' to mean those operating on sea and 'brigands' as a blanket term covering both. While bandits and pirates tend to be distinguished more consistently in modern English usage, in ancient Greek typically they are both designated by one term – λῃσταί – and distinction between the two groups in ancient discussions is less certain. Hence I will mostly be treating bandits and pirates together as well. For more on terminology and usage see De Souza 1999, 9–13.

parent incongruity to the 'incompetence,' however qualified or defined, of the author, here I will be seeking a different and hopefully more acceptable mode of interpretation. And above all, as in the preceding discussion on pederasty, here, too, I believe that one must be on guard against essentialism. Just as Hippothoos is not a 'homosexual' in the most commonly accepted modern sense of the term, so he should not be labeled a 'terrorist'[50] for example and be dismissed as such. The aim of this section is to arrive at a more intelligent and nuanced understanding of Hippothoos the bandit by considering other relevant ancient sources, novelistic and otherwise. The final, fleshed out representation of Hippothoos' criminal side can hopefully be reconciled more easily with the rest of his multi-faceted characterization.

To start with novelistic depictions of bandits and pirates in general, there is no question that they suffer from an image problem. Their very appearance inspires fear and revulsion. φοβερός, 'frightening,' is an adjective often used to describe how they look.[51] It is mentioned as a surprising fact at the opening of the *Aithiopika* that Charikleia is so absorbed in taking care of the wounded Theagenes that she is unperturbed even by the 'bandit-like appearance' of the Egyptian *boukoloi*[52] who descend on the couple (Heliod. 1,2,8). A more normal reaction would doubtlessly be that of the helmsman in Achilles Tatius who cries out in despair 'we are done for' (Ach. Tat. 3,9,3) once he sees the ship surrounded by a crowd of Egyptian bandits, who in turn are described in the following colorful terms:

> …terrifying savage men, all tall, dark-coloured…with shaven heads, small feet, and gross bodies: all spoke an outlandish jargon (Ach. Tat. 3,9,2).

These *boukoloi* speak in a barbaric tongue, as indicated by the verb (ἐβαρβάριζον), as do those of Heliodorus, who constantly reminds his readers of the bandits' ignorance of Greek (Heliod. 1,3,2; 1,4,1; 1,19,3). Heliodorus' linguistic xenophobia appears under the most striking light when Thermouthis, one of the brigands, is said to know one Greek word only, the

---

[50] Cf. the description of bandit groups in the Roman Empire as 'organized terrorists' in Swain 1996, 116. Using such a label on ancient bandits is not appropriate because in the sources they are described as operating for economic rather than political goals. See Watanabe 2003, 106.

[51] X. Eph. 1,13,3; Ach. Tat. 3,9,2; Heliod. 2,20,5.

[52] On the Egyptian *boukoloi* see Winkler 1980, Graf 1986, Alston 1999, Rutherford 2000.

name of a woman whom he had kept as a sex-slave (Heliod. 2,12,4), and he manages to mangle even that dissyllable (2,14,5). Thyamis too, who otherwise shares a number of characteristics with Hippothoos, is specifically said to be ignorant of Greek – but the language barrier between him and the hero curiously disappears as he comes closer to recovering his birthright as the priest of Memphis. When Thyamis is the bandit king of the marshland and an imminent threat to the Greek hero and heroine, he needs an interpreter to communicate with them (Heliod. 1,19,3). But as he gets ready to challenge the usurper to the priesthood in an honorable single combat, he apparently has no difficulty conversing with Theagenes, who is now his trusted friend (Heliod. 7,5). The linguistic barrier that formerly divided the barbarian arch-bandit from the hero vanishes without a word of explanation as the Egyptian is gentrified.[53]

Aside from the ethnic and linguistic divide, the brigands also stand a long distance away from respectable Greek citizens when seen from socio-economic and geographical perspectives. Theron the arch-pirate in Chariton is a Sicilian Greek learned enough to quote a Menandrian proverb (Chariton 1,7,1) but his associates are to be found, not in city-councils, theatres or temples, but in taverns and brothels, and they are 'a suitable army for such a general' (1,7,3) as the author sarcastically remarks.[54] In Apuleius there is also a story of a Greek man who acquires some bandit acquaintances while frequenting prostitutes and bars (Apul. *Met.* 8,1). But more often, bandits are to be found outside city walls in the wild countryside. Caves are frequently the hideouts of these elusive and treacherous criminals, as well as are forests, marshlands and other locations difficult of access.[55] Real-life bandits in the Roman Empire may have had their bases in such locales for practical reasons, but in literature such a geographic placement also has a symbolic meaning; the wild bandits are suitably paired with inhospitable and uncivilized habitations.

---

[53] The representation in the text of course has Thyamis speaking in Greek, but the implicit understanding of the reader may have been that Theagenes has rapidly learned Egyptian – though more probably such pragmatic considerations would not have entered the ancient reader's mind, confused and overloaded as it was with the complexity of Heliodorus' plot. Heliodorus uses language barriers when convenient, but is capable of ignoring them when expedient; cf. Winkler 1982, 104–105.

[54] Cf. Hopwood 1998, 96.

[55] See Shaw 1984, 21–22; Saïd 1999, 86, 107; cf. Hijmans *et alii* 1977, 62.

In the novels bandits are not described as having any concomitant legitimate sources of income, although bandit herdsmen do appear in historical sources.[56] Some fictional pirates on the other hand, perhaps because ships, their crew, and navigational skills constituted a great amount of investment in antiquity, are represented as having a 'front' that utilizes these same resources. The businesses they engage in nevertheless would not be something fit for the urban upper class. Theron and his subordinates are ostensibly ferrymen (Chariton 1,7,1), and in Achilles Tatius there are two groups of pirates who also take part in the fishing industry (Ach. Tat. 2,17,3; 5,6,7). The Tyrian arch-pirate Apsyrtos in the *Ephesiaka*, unusually, seems to be a respectable trader at the same time and a citizen of prosperous means. He is also unique among novelistic brigands in actually trying to make amends to the hero for the sufferings he has caused, and his characterization may owe something to the rhetorical stereotype of the humane bandit.[57] But more normally, brigands either solely profess robbery and kidnapping, or if they have any legitimate side jobs, they are the kind of physical labor unsuitable for the citizen elite.

More than their unkempt looks, uncivilized haunts and low-class side jobs, however, what makes brigands brigands is their lack of inhibition in committing crimes. Again, the best illustration is offered by Chariton's Theron. After he has conceived a plan to rob Callirhoe's tomb, he gathers together his associates and explains that he has found a lucrative job. It is also a kind of work, he obliquely adds, with which they are all familiar, and from which sensible people like them can draw profit, though it may bring condemnation from the foolish (Chariton 1,7,5). Theron's associates have no trouble understanding that he is proposing some kind of crime like piracy, tomb-breaking or temple-robbing, and tell him that there is no need to persuade those who are already willing. In these pirates' mind, as Chariton represents them, they are the wiser ones for not being afraid to break human and divine laws in pursuit of wealth. The contempt of law divides them and

---

[56] See Shaw 1984, 31 and Herz 1988. The ποιμένες in X. Eph. 3,12,2 who pounce on the shipwrecked Habrokomes may possibly qualify as such, but it is also quite possible that they are the *boukoloi* (on which see note 53 above), who seem to have had as little to do with cattle-raising as the urban cowboys of today. See however also Winkler 1980, 179–180.

[57] For humane pirates see Sen. *Con.* 1,7; 7,1; Lib. *Decl.* 46; cf. Heliod. 5,20,7; 5,24,5. Manto's love for Habrokomes also looks as if it was lifted out of the *filia archipiratae* motif; see Sen. *Con.* 1,6.

those who are, in their conception, the more foolish ordinary folk. In the fictional world that Chariton created, where the good are rewarded and the bad duly punished, the pirates of course are proven to be the more foolish in the end and they all die miserable deaths by divine retribution (3,3,3–12).

Another kind of activity in which the novelistic brigands manifest their amorality is human sacrifice. The *boukoloi* in Achilles Tatius (3,15) as well as the fanciful account of the historian Dio Cassius (72,4) butcher human beings and then eat their remains in bizarre quasi-religious rites. The association between Egyptian brigands and human sacrifice is also detectable in Heliodorus, as Thyamis at one point obliquely refers to his murder of a Greek woman as a religious rite performed in preparation for battle (Heliod. 1,30–31). Hippothoos' Cilician band in the *Ephesiaka* is also depicted practicing human sacrifice in the belief that it guarantees the favor of Ares (X. Eph. 2,13).[58] Bandits in the novelistic imagination, like the most horrendous of the barbarians and anti-social conspirators,[59] turn religion itself into a tool of terror. In their hands the holy rite of sacrifice becomes an outrageous act of crime, signaling their antipodal position in respect to the normative Hellenic culture in the moral economy of the novel.[60]

The brigands in the novels are thus the very antitheses of the heroes, heroines and the Hellenic civilization they represent. Their unkempt and wild appearance inspires fear and loathing, their natural home is the uncultivated countryside, they are either barbarians or, if Greek, are of low social standing, and they display an utter lack of regard for the human and divine laws which govern the behavior of the heroic couple and ultimately control the entire novelistic universe. In the words of one scholar who has explored the relationship between the novelistic bandit and elite masculinity, they may indeed be considered 'undesirable role models for those wishing to construct a socially sanctioned masculine identity.'[61] There are, nevertheless, two characters who do not entirely agree with this general picture: Xenophon's Hippothoos and Heliodorus' Thyamis.

---

[58] Herodotus reports the Scythian custom of sacrificing human captives to Ares (4,63), and Xenophon may have been inspired by this passage. The possibility has also been suggested that the scene is based on a Gothic rite; cf. Procop. *Goth.* 2,15,25 and De Boor 1924. For a scene involving human sacrifice in the Lollianus fragment see Stephens and Winkler 1995, 319–321.

[59] On human sacrifice in Greco-Roman literature see Henrichs 1970 and Rives 1995.

[60] See also Hopwood 1998, 199–201.

[61] Hopwood 1998, 195.

Hippothoos and Thyamis, as far as one can see, exude powerful erotic attraction instead of terror and repulsion. It is in accordance with Xenophon's jejune style that Hippothoos' physical appearance is never described in detail,[62] but he exercises enough manly appeal to land him in a marriage with a rich widow (X. Eph. 5,9,1). Thyamis fortunately is presented in greater detail. As a youth he was so attractive as to make Arsake, the Persian satrap's wife and sister of the Great King, conceive a wild passion for him (Heliod. 7,2,2). Later on, when he reappears as an arch-bandit threatening to destroy an entire city, he nevertheless emits so much charm that he renews the old flame in Arsake's heart (Heliod. 7,4,2). The Egyptian Thyamis in this scene is as sweet an eye-candy as the Greek hero Theagenes and the Persian noblewoman is at a loss which of the two men is more deserving of her libidinous gaze. Hippothoos and Thyamis, far from inspiring loathing, exude irresistible erotic attraction even towards elite urban women.

Hippothoos and Thyamis sojourn mostly in the countryside in their capacity as bandits, but they both start and end their narrative journeys in the city. Unlike Theron and his associates, moreover, both at the beginning and the end their social and economic backgrounds place them firmly among the elites – Hippothoos comes from a powerful family in Perinthos and ends up as a resident of Ephesus allied to the elite hero and heroine, while Thyamis is born heir to the chief priest of Memphis and eventually regains his birthright.

The morality of these two characters is more problematic. As mentioned above, Hippothoos and his band perform human sacrifice and Thyamis is not above conceiving of murder as a ritual act to please the gods. Hippothoos the bandit is especially bloodthirsty and he massacres entire villages in Egypt (X. Eph. 4,1,1; 5,2,2). The two arch-bandits are also shown to be lacking in self-control – Thyamis, torn between rage and jealousy, rushes to kill a woman whom he cannot keep (Heliod. 1,30,5–7), while Hippothoos drinks to excess and as a result lets Habrokomes slip away from the band (X. Eph. 3,10,4).[63] In these respects they are assimilated to the general picture of detestable brigands and alienated from the heroes and heroines.

It is worth noting however that authorial apologies are offered on a few occasions on behalf of them. When Hippothoos condemns Anthia to be food

[62] It is also possible that a sentence or two which introduced Hippothoos before 2,11,11 have been lost during textual transmission; see Bürger 1892, 43–45; Hägg 1966, 127–131; cf. O'Sullivan 1995, 91.

[63] Hopwood 1998, 197.

for dogs, his cruelty is said to proceed from his regard for Anchialos (X. Eph. 4,6,3), the bandit whom the heroine has killed in self defense but whom Hippothoos himself has held in high regard because the young man was so 'spirited' (X. Eph. 4,5,1).[64] The mention of his grief for the fallen subordinate as a motivating force is surely designed to mitigate the enormity of the punishment that he proposes; a manly feeling of camaraderie is to blame, not a native appetite for violence. In Heliodorus, Knemon, an urban elite of Athenian origin and himself a victim of bandit violence, acknowledges nevertheless that Thyamis has been a moderating force among the brigands, forcing them to be 'the more self-controlled' (Heliod. 2,17,4).[65] Thyamis is also depicted as consciously adopting an almost stoic philosophical persona in a speech addressed to his subordinates as he describes how he has always treated his female captives with decorum and has never put himself above his subordinates in the distribution of booty (Heliod. 1,19,4–5). He is presented as possessing at least an understanding of and a conscious striving after the self-image of a man in control of his baser appetites. At other times, however, he becomes the typically irrational and libidinous barbarian, depriving the freedom and wealth of urban elites without any sign of compunction and presenting a grave threat to the life and chastity of the heroine. In short, the similarity of Thyamis and Hippothoos to 'noble' bandits like Robin Hood does not go so far as to make them religiously respect the life and chastity of their victims. These ancient fictitious bandits are more like the 'avengers' in Hobsbawm's anthropological classification[66] as they revel in desperate and berserk acts of atrocity.

The two sides of Hippothoos and Thyamis delineated above, those of the elite male and the bloodthirsty brigand, may appear incongruous at first and one may be tempted to attribute the combination to the insensitivity or incompetence of the authors. In the following discussion I hope to show that the two aspects may be reconciled instead by subsuming them under hegemonic masculinity. And I further hope to demonstrate that not only we, the moderns, may construct this link, but the ancients who produced and consumed the novels could and likely did do so as well.

---

[64] νεανικός – perhaps also 'youthful' *vel sim*. The choice of vocabulary is suggestive considering Hippothoos' former (and subsequent) involvement in pederasty.

[65] τὸ σωφρονέστερον: my translation.

[66] See Hobsbawm 1969, 15; cf. Grünewald 1999, 196–230.

In contemporary criminology, the link between hegemonic masculinity and illegal use of violence has been explored by Messerschmidt, whose work, though exclusively dealing with the modern world, may provide a useful parallel in understanding the ancient material we are dealing with. Messerschmidt set out to find the reason for the trans-cultural male preponderance in the commission of violent crime and attributed it to the drive to be the hegemonic male finding its outlet in illegal channels when other socially sanctioned means are not available for reasons of poverty, race, or lack of education. Thus for example Black and Hispanic American males excluded from the legitimate labor market by lack of social connections may resort to armed robbery in order to exercise temporary control over others and to acquire money, two hallmarks of contemporary hegemonic masculinity. The alternative would be to give up the pursuit of becoming 'the' man, which for many is a less desirable option.[67]

Granted that hegemonic masculinity is not an eternal and invariable entity and should not automatically be assumed to have functioned the same way in the late antique Hellenic world as it does in the West today, there are ancient sources which do suggest the existence of the same kind of mechanism at work in popular urban thinking even then. One piece of evidence comes from Dio Chrysostom's *Alexandrian Oration*, in which the sophist par-excellence surprises the audience by declaring his preference to die a bandit than be like one of his effeminate addressees. A number of Alexandrian citizens, he says, have descended to such depths of insanity as to commit suicide over their infatuation with flute-girls and suchlike creatures. Dio pretends to be so scandalized by their behavior that he is led to extol the life of a violent bandit over that of such a citizen:

> And so great is the misfortune of the poor wretches that they regard as manly what is most unmanly of all, and as dignified what is most shameful. Why, I would rather be put to death for robbery[68] than for such a cause. For in the one case it is the death of a bad man but a *man*,[69] in the other of a slave in hard luck. The one possibly came to such a pass because he had been wronged and was striving to get redress over and

[67] See Messerschmidt 1993, 84–117; Messerschmidt 2000; Walktale 1998, 71–90; Hatty 2000, 117–118.

[68] **λῃστεύων** ἀποθανεῖν.

[69] **ἀνδρὸς** πονηροῦ.

> above the laws, and it may be that he might have achieved something actually noble, had he not encountered such an evil genius (32,49).[70]

It is worth noting that the discussion here is clearly framed in terms of gender politics, a feature that the Loeb translators managed to express so felicitously. The bandit, for the moment, becomes the *man*, in control of his own destiny however badly he manages it, while the Alexandrians languish lower in the scale of masculinity because they let vulgar entertainers drive them to misery and death. Another point worth remarking is the implication that one may become a bandit through a desire for revenge, which Dio concedes may be illegal yet presents in this context as one further sign of manliness. Both Hippothoos and Thyamis, it may be recalled, are catapulted into criminal careers through illegal acts of vendetta.

The above piece of evidence comes armed with solidly Hellenic and sophistic credentials.[71] The other citation is Christian but may be no less relevant since it belongs to a narrative text originating from the eastern Mediterranean of the early Roman period. The story is of a youth who lapses into a career of brigandage but is saved by the admonitions of a merciful saint, a pattern repeated elsewhere in the hagiographic tradition[72] but which seems to appear on the record first in this tale told by Clement of Alexandria.[73] After Saint John was released from his confinement on the island of Patmos, the story goes, he made a tour in the region around Ephesus and, while addressing a congregation in a certain unnamed polis, caught sight of 'a strongly built youth of refined (or perhaps even 'urbane' – see note) appearance and ardent spirit.'[74] St John is struck by the great promise the youth exhibits and commends him to the care of the local bishop[75] before leaving for Ephesus. For a while the bishop takes good care of his charge, but after the youth is baptized begins to be remiss in his care and the young man is seduced into a criminal career by some profligate companions.

---

[70] The translation (including italics) is that of Cohoon 1969.

[71] On Dio of Prusa and the Second Sophistic see e.g. Swain 1996, 187–241 and Whitmarsh 2001, 156–167.

[72] See van Hooff 1988, 114–115.

[73] In Clem. Al. *Quis Dives Salvetur?* 42, supplemented by Eus. Hist. 3,23.

[74] νεανίσκον ἱκανὸν τῷ σώματι καὶ τὴν ὄψιν **ἀστεῖον** καὶ θερμὸν τὴν ψυχὴν: Clem. Al. *Quis Dives Salvetur?* 42/Eus. Hist. 3,23. The translation used is of Butterworth 1919, note in brackets mine. For ἀστεῖον cf. the entry in *LSJ*.

[75] Or presbyter; cf. Butterworth 1919, 358.

In the end he is rescued by St. John, who comes chasing after him and drags him back to the fold of church, but interestingly for us, before that happens the youth becomes not some mediocre thief or even a rank-and-file bandit but organizes a band of his own, 'of which he was a ready chieftain, the most violent, the most blood-thirsty, the most cruel.'[76] And his fall is not great *in spite of* his former promises, but all the greater precisely *because of* them. Once he is resolved on the path downward, his corresponding rise in criminal career is specifically said to be all the more spectacular 'because of his great nature.'[77] Being avid of distinguishing himself even in this area of effort, he is not content with 'any slight offence'[78] but feels compelled to accomplish 'something great'[79] and is likened to a 'restive and powerful horse'[80] that has deviated from the right course. By his natural resourcefulness, competitiveness and leadership he is catapulted to the pinnacle of bandit career. They would have been desirable masculine qualities in the church or in pagan civic life, for that matter, and these are presumably what attracted St. John's attention in the first place, but according to the ethical system that governs the narrative, these same characteristics make him all the more terrible a criminal.

To be sure, neither the citation from Dio of Prusa nor that from Clement of Alexandria proves that Xenophon of Ephesus, Heliodorus or their immediate readers used the interpretative strategy linking hegemonic masculinity with bandit violence in creating and interpreting Hippothoos and Thyamis – assuming for a moment that such an elusive proposition can be proved or disproved. What I aimed to show in my preceding discussion is that the strategy was available in the cultural environment to which the novels, too, belonged. That being said, I do feel sufficiently justified to suggest that the hegemonic masculinity of Hippothoos could be and was seen by the ancient audience as a motivating force behind his horrific acts of violence. This may be less clear in the case of Thyamis because he is at times assimilated, as I have shown above, to the babbling, impotent barbarian. Hippothoos on the other hand is a Hellene from beginning to end and there is never a hint that he is anything else.

---

[76] ἕτοιμος λῃσταρχος ἦν, βιαιότατος, μιαιφονώτατος, χαλεπώτατος: Clem. Al. *Quis Dives Salvetur?* 42/Eus. Hist. 3,23. Trans. Butterworth 1919.

[77] διὰ μέγεθος φύσεως.

[78] τι μικρόν.

[79] μέγα τι.

[80] ἄστομος καὶ εὔρωστος ἵππος.

It is regrettable that in neither the *Ephesiaka* nor the *Aithiopika* is there such an explicit statement as in the two non-novelistic texts linking masculinity with bandit violence. I hope to have demonstrated nevertheless that the two, in their non-bandit manifestations, are unmistakably elite males, and that their two sides can be reconciled if we use the interpretative strategy found in Dio of Prusa and Clement of Alexandria as well as that of the contemporary criminologist Messerschmidt. The alternative is always available of blaming poor authorial designs or lack of 'sensitivity,' but this I hope is an option that would seem less attractive to the readers of this journal.

Friend of Habrokomes

Hippothoos conceives a friendly feeling for Habrokomes the moment he runs into him in the Cilician woods, and the two make a vow to help each other in whatever situation (2,14,2). Interestingly, Hippothoos states that he feels attracted to Habrokomes because, among other things, he is 'handsome and manly too',[81] but there seems to be no hint of a pederastic relationship developing between them through the rest of the novel.[82] Even after his young friend runs away in search of Anthia, however, Hippothoos is always on the lookout for him, eager to help (4,1,2; 5,9,2; 5,9,13; 5,11,1). Ironically, it is Hippothoos who first discovers Anthia (5,9) and he subsequently effectuates the grand reunion of the star-crossed couple (5,19). In this section, I will investigate the implications this friendship has to Hippothoos' masculinity.

But before I begin, I would want to briefly define what I mean by 'friendship' as this term has suffered some unfortunate abuses in a few modern discussions on ancient Greek texts. As Konstan has demonstrated, the ancient Greeks did recognize an elective, non-contractual, non-kinship based and non-erotic relationship that is close enough to the modern Western notion of friendship as to justify its being called by the same name.[83] The noun by which the Greeks typically designated this kind of relationship, φιλία, can actually be applied to the affection that binds family members or even pederastic and heterosexual couples as well and the wideness of its semantic range has been responsible for some confusion in modern scholarly discussions, as

[81] ὀφθῆναι καλὸν καὶ ἄλλως ἀνδρικόν.
[82] Despite the suggestion of Schmeling 1980, 52; see below.
[83] See Konstan 1996; Konstan 1997, 53–56.

an uncritical equation of this word with 'friendship' could lead to one writing about Aristotle's views on friendship between family members, for example, a usage that stretches the meaning of the English term considerably and which might lead to implications that ancient Greek 'friendship' is something very different from what the English word means.[84] The trick however is to look out for the substantive use of the word φίλος which demonstrably occurs only to describe someone whom another person has chosen to associate with voluntarily, not because of kinship, legal contract, or erotic feelings. Careful examination of linguistic usage confirms the view that the ancient Greeks did recognize a kind of relationship approximating what is meant by the modern English term 'friendship' although they lacked a close enough noun for the relationship itself.[85]

Friendship thus circumscribed is definitely featured in the ideal novels as well. Polycharmos, to take one example, may be said to be the friend of the hero Chaireas in Chariton's novel. He and Chaireas are not related by kinship, they are not implicated in a contractual relationship like slavery, and neither do they form a pederastic couple, yet they stay together in their wanderings and choose to help one another. Polycharmos repeatedly prevents his friend from killing himself and undertakes extra work to lighten his companion's burden both when working as a slave and later as an adjutant in a rebel army, and Chaireas in the end rewards his services by publicly praising him in a general assembly of the city and giving him his sister as wife.[86] The heroes of the other novels are also helped by their friends: Kleitophon by Menelaos, Theagenes by Knemon and Thyamis, and Habrokomes by Hippothoos.[87]

---

[84] See e.g. Schollmeier 1994. Cf. the *Oxford English Dictionary* s.v. 'friend': 'A. n. 1. a. "One joined to another in mutual benevolence and intimacy" (J.). Not ordinarily applied to lovers or relatives...'

[85] See Konstan 1996. For linguistic usage in the novels, see Watanabe 2003, 147–154.

[86] See Hock 1997.

[87] These characters display the greatest number of characteristics attributed to friendship in the Greek tradition and may be said to make up the category of 'exclusive/best/true friends'; cf. Stählin 1974, 153, Arist. *EN* 1171 A. But I do not wish to suggest that one should limit novelistic friendship to these alone. Other 'friends' in the novels are: Thersandros and his friend who counsels him in his marital troubles, Ach. Tat. 5,25,1; 5,26,13; 6,3,1; friends of Thersandros out to rally for him at his trial, Ach. Tat. 7,10,1; Sosthenes, the steward of Thersandros, accused of having pirates as friends, Ach. Tat. 7,10,1; Theron telling Callirhoe in Miletus that he is leaving her with his friends, Charito 1,13,9; Dionysios' courtiers called his 'friends' (φίλοι), Charito 2,3,3; 2,4,1; 2,4,3; 2,5,1; 3,1,7; 3,2,3; 4,2,11; 5,4,5; 5,4,12; 5,8,6; cf. Hock 1997, 157–158; similarly 'friends' of

Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* is alone in not featuring any friend of the hero, or any other friendship for that matter. The novel has helping neighbors, a fawning parasite and an obliging sex tutor but no couple like Chariton's Chaireas and Polycharmos whose relationship is not predicated on economic contract, simple geographic or social proximity, or *eros*. The reason that Daphnis is friendless is surely to be sought in the unusual situation he is in through most of the novel, namely that he is an urban elite in the disguise of a country slave and that those he may associate with are themselves true rustics. His noble nature shines out in the darkness of the countryside, but because of his social and geographic separation from the class he truly belongs to, he cannot come in contact with others similar enough to be his friends. The only exception is Chloe, and the couple is initially like a pair of friends, helping each other in danger and sharing their meager resources. As the two are squeezed into the molds of their respective genders however the relationship is changed into something else. The emergence of the man and the woman who adopt the codes of behavior expected of their genders signals the end of their puerile companionship.[88]

The other novelistic pairs of friends all belong to the same social class, that of the urban elite. Like the heroes, their friends too can trace their origin and in the end return to the privileged upper crust of urban civilization, even though, again just like the heroes, they may lose the external trappings of their elite status during their sojourn in the wild countryside. Friendship in the novels never crosses the line that separates the elites from the rest, unlike what happens in the epic of Gilgamesh, for example, in which the all-powerful king of Uruk befriends the country bumpkin Enkidu.[89] In the novels, the widest social disparity of all is perhaps to be seen in the friendship between Chaireas and Polycharmos. The latter, when interrogated by his Persian captors, says that his friend is of the top rank of the citizen population, whereas he himself is of a lowly station (Chariton 4,3,1). Here Polycharmos may be humbling himself in order to better the prospects for Chaireas,[90] but it may

---

Perilaos present in a wedding feast in X. Eph. 3,6,4 (for more on political friendships, see Stählin 1974, 148; Konstan 1997, 96–97); friendship between aristocratic women, Chariton 5,8,9; 6,9,4; 8,3,8; 8,4,8; see Hock 1997, 159.

[88] For the gendering of Chloe and the change in the nature of relationship between her and Daphnis this entails see also Winkler 1990, 101–126.

[89] Although Enkidu does turn out to be a *divine* country bumpkin; for his friendship with Gilgamesh see Hammond 1987, 246–248.

[90] The opinion of d'Orville 1783, 382.

be significant that elsewhere he is likened to Patroklos, the humbler companion to the noble Achilles. Polycharmos nevertheless is unmistakably a free citizen and in addition has been a 'comrade' (Chariton 3,5,7)[91] and 'fellow-student' (4,3,1)[92] of Chaireas. Furthermore, Chaireas' announcement about marrying off his sister to Polycharmos is met with the approval of the entire population of Syracuse. Polycharmos' family may not be as rich and as politically well-placed as that of Chaireas, but his background is respectable enough that the elevation of his status to the same level as that of the hero can be made without provoking any opposition from the citizen body. In the other novels there is not the least suggestion that the friends of the heroes are anything less than urban elites themselves, from Thyamis who comes from the most prestigious family in the ancient city of Memphis to Hippothoos, who belongs to the 'first rank of the city' just like Habrokomes. The homosocial nature of novelistic friendship is reinforced by similarity in age. The heroes and their friends all belong to the age group which in Greek would be designated νεανίαι, μειρίκια or ἔφηβοι, ranging from the mid teens to the early twenties.

Friendships in the novels tend to be homosexual[93] as well, that is to say they do not cross gender boundaries. There may be cases of some kind of voluntary mutual help occurring between the sexes, but these take place, if not between the hero and the heroine, then between the hero and his obliging female lover or, in the case of Callirhoe and Dionysios, between the heroine and her surrogate husband. Aside from the lone case of Anthia and the noble shepherd in the *Ephesiaka* (X. Eph. 2,8,4),[94] where the relationship is not developed enough to be called friendship, attraction between two persons of different sex, if not motivated by kinship, is invariably imagined to be the effect of erotic desires.[95] In male homosexual friendship, on the other hand, there is no hint of erotic attraction or of any sexual component. The faintest of hints possibly appears in the relationship between Hippothoos and Habro-

[91] ἑταῖρος.

[92] συμφοιτητής; Goold 1995 has 'companion,' but cf. *LSJ* s.v.

[93] I do not mean to imply that there is anything sexual in the relationship, only that it takes place within one sex. Though I understand that my use of the term may be misleading, I cannot find any other handy adjective that does the job.

[94] The figure of the noble shepherd may be based on Electra's rustic surrogate husband in Euripides' play; see Schmeling 1980, 47–48.

[95] See Clark 1979, 35–41 and Konstan 1997, 91 on the rarity of heterosexual friendship elsewhere in the classical tradition.

komes, which begins with the latter attracting the former with his 'handsome and manly' looks (X. Eph. 2,14,2). There is no clear indication however that anything erotic eventually develops between the two. Although it is true that Habrokomes is of the right age to be an *eromenos*, pederasty, neither in the 'real' world at this time nor in the imaginary universe of the novel, is institutionalized to such an extent that taking on this role is an obligatory rite of passage. None of the other heroes in the novels ever become *eromenoi*, although they belong to the same age group as Habrokomes, and Daphnis emphatically rejects that role when offered to become one. In the rest of classical tradition, Cretans are regarded as having been exceptional in encouraging the practice of pederasty to such an extent as to attach opprobrium on a boy who would not acquire an *erastes*.[96] As for the scene that Habrokomes has with Hippothoos in 3,3,5–6, which one scholar takes to be evidence of an erotic attachment having sprouted between them,[97] it can in fact be understood more easily if one does not resort to such an explanation. In this scene Habrokomes is surely asking Hippothoos not to harm him, because delaying the chance of discovering his wife does constitute for him a great damage in itself, not because he is worried about his friend using him as a sexual object. The young hero furthermore invokes the spirit of Hyperanthes to aid in his plea because the youth was to Hippothoos exactly what Anthia is to himself, rather than that he is exhorting him to remain chaste to his dead *eromenos* instead of dallying with him. Habrokomes in any case raises no objection later on to Hippothoos having a new boy, Kleisthenes. As to his leaving Cilicia in the first place with Hippothoos, a more straightforward explanation than pederasty would be simple companionship which would be a great asset especially to Habrokomes, a complete stranger in the wild and bandit-infested province. As far as one can see, the boundary between male homosexual friendship and pederasty is not permeable in the *Ephesiaka*, and the two kinds of relationship remain distinct from each other in the other novels as well as more generally in the ancient Greco-Roman literary tradition.[98]

---

[96] See Str. 10,4,21; and Percy 1996, 64–67.

[97] Schmeling 1980, 56–57; cf. Haynes 2003, 151–152.

[98] Cf. Price 1989, 236–249 with Konstan 1993, 5–8 and Konstan 1997, 39 note 29. There are however exceptions; exempla of friendship and pederasty seem to be deliberately confounded in order to marshal support for the latter in Ath. 13,602 E–13,604 D; Ach. Tat. 2,36,4; Ps.-Luc. *Am.* 47–48. Some early Christian authors warn against those who

There is one point however in which the romantic, exclusive friendship of the kind I have been discussing and classical pederasty come into contact – both are hallmarks of elite masculinity in Hellenic civic culture. In Chariton, Chaireas' friend Polycharmos is said to be manly specifically in the context of friendship. When the two have been enslaved and Polycharmos is doing double work to lessen the burden on Chaireas, the author explains that he is able to perform the friendly duty because he is 'manly by nature' (4,2,3),[99] and towards the end the citizens of Syracuse publicly thank him for having been such a good man (8,8,13).[100] Similarly, in Lucian's *Toxaris*, a collection of romantic friendship tales which, as Pervo has argued, seems thematically linked with the ideal novel,[101] a Scythian interlocutor at one point derides his Greek counterpart on the ground that the stories the latter has to offer contain nothing 'manly' (Lucian. *Tox.* 35)[102]; since the two are competing to see which of either culture, Scythian or Greek, can offer tales of truer friendship, the expectation behind this remark must be that genuine friends must of necessity display manliness in an incontrovertible manner.

Male friendship in the novel tends to be highlighted in the (at least in the ancient context) most manly of occupations, war. In Chariton, it is Polycharmos' friendly feelings for Chaireas that provide the impetus for the pair to join the Egyptian rebel army and wage war against the Persian forces. When Chaireas finds out that he has been cheated by the Great King and that Callirhoe has been promised to his rival before the end of the trial, he becomes suicidal again but his friend forbids him to die.[103] This time however Polycharmos thinks up a clever ruse to make it appear that the suicide is just going to be delayed, and that by this delay the revenge which his friend seeks will be all the more sweet. Let us put up a fight this time, says Polycharmos, and 'bequeath to posterity the legend of two Greeks who made the Great King suffer for the injustice he did them and died like *real men*' (Cha-

---

practice homosexuality under the pretence of friendship; see Kuefler 2001, 199–200 and cf. Konstan 1997, 173.

[99] ἀνδρικὸς τὴν φύσιν.

[100] ἀνδρὶ ἀγαθῷ.

[101] Pervo 1997, 179–190.

[102] ἀνδρεῖον.

[103] Suicide prevention is perhaps the most common *topos* in novelistic friendship tales and Polycharmos in the course of the novel forbids Chaireas to die no fewer than six times (1,5,2; 1,6,1–1,6,2; 5,10,6–5,10,10; 6,2,8; 6,2,9–6,2,11; 7,1,8). For the same *topos* see also Ach. Tat. 3,17,3–3,17,4; Heliod. 2,2,1; 2,5,3; Luc. *Tox.* 58.

riton 7,1,8).[104] In Heliodorus, Theagenes and Knemon are literally on the same boat as the island they are on comes under attack by rival brigands (Heliod. 1,31,2). This scene is the high point in their friendship, which steadily deteriorates after the battle with Knemon showing unmanly cowardice and Theagenes making him a butt of jokes (Heliod. 2,7,3; 2,18,4). Toxaris the Scythian's remark in Lucian's work concerning manliness and friendship, cited above, is also found in the context of warfare. Toxaris explains that while Greek friendship has nothing manly in it, the Scythian exempla he is about to narrate will be full of murders, wars, and deaths on behalf of friends (36).

The idea that friendship is a 'man thing' as far as the novels are concerned is also reinforced by the examination of women's friendship. There is in fact not a single instance of female friendship in the novels that approximates the relationships between heroes and their friends in duration or intensity, as Haynes remarks.[105] In the fictitious world of the ideal novels, women rarely help other women without having some selfish, ulterior motive. Melite in Achilles Tatius is kind to Leukippe, but only because she hopes to secure Kleitophon's affection through the latter's agency (Ach. Tat. 5,22,3). Similarly, Arsake in Heliodorus addresses Kybele as her 'dearest' (heliod. 7,10,3; 7,10,6)[106] and Kybele in turn tries in ingratiate herself to the hero and the heroine by using the same term of address towards them (7,12,3), all in an effort to turn Theagenes into Arsake's exclusive erotic object. Chariton's Plangon on the other hand is motivated by Dionysios' promise of eventual freedom in initiating a friendly relationship with Callirhoe (Chariton 2,7,2; 3,8,1). In the case of Plangon and Kybele, their status as slaves obligated to help their masters also disqualify them from being engaged in the kind of equal relationship that characterizes elite male friendship. The only female character in the novels who displays disinterested friendly feelings towards other elite women is, significantly, Callirhoe the 'phallic' woman,[107] but her initiatives are not reciprocated, either because of jealousy, in the case of Stateira who is afraid for the fidelity of the Great King (Chariton 6,1,6), or in the case of Rhodogyne because her appearance is so brief (Chariton 7,5,5;

---

[104] I changed Goold's 'heroes' to 'real men' (for ἄνδρες in the original) in order to bring out the gender politics involved in this passage more clearly.

[105] Haynes 2003, 124–126.

[106] φίλτατον.

[107] Cf. Elsom 1992.

8,3,8). The fact that the heroines in the novels are never engaged in altruistic friendship the way the heroes are is all the more remarkable considering that Sappho, an author with some currency in the Second Sophistic, celebrates intensely devotional female friendship in a number of her poems[108] and that the novelistic heroines, compared to the *virgo* of the New Comedy for example, have relatively great freedom to move outside their households and form their own associations.[109] It remains true, nevertheless, that '(i)n this genre a reciprocal and equal friendship is generally the preserve of the upper class *male*.'[110]

Thus, friendship of the kind that Hippothoos and Habrokomes engage in, the durable and altruistic desire to help one another not on the basis of temporary utility or pleasure but, presumably, the recognition of superior character,[111] is, in the novelistic universe, a practice in which only elite males may participate, which is itself said to be manly, and which makes its participants manly in the perception of others. The reason for all this is not hard to find, as analysis of the plot reveals that friendship in the novels is a tool for asserting hegemonic masculinity, a mechanism by which elite males can present a united front and subjugate non-elite males and women.[112] Time and again the reader of the novel sees the hero's friend recovering the heroine from the clutches of barbarians or otherwise unworthy males. Polycharmos discovers Callirhoe among the captives on the island of Arados and delivers her to Chaireas (Chariton 8,1,6), Hippothoos brings Anthia back to Habrokomes after purchasing her as a slave (X. Eph. 5,9; 5,13), and Menelaos saves Leukippe first from the *boukoloi* (Ach. Tat. 3,19–22) and then from a

[108] For Sappho and female homosexual (and possibly homoerotic) friendship, see Konstan 1997, 47–48. Sappho is alluded to in Longus 3,33,4–3,34.

[109] See Johne 1996, 151–156.

[110] Haynes 2003, 151; italics mine. The idea that friendship is the preserve of men, and specifically of 'real' men is prevalent in preindustrial discourses; see Hammond 1987 for ancient Mesopotamian, ancient Greek and mediaeval European narratives, Clark 1979 for classical and Hellenistic Greek philosophy, and Kuefler 2001, 197–201 for classical and Christian Roman texts. This picture presents an interesting contrast to the modern American cultural environment, where, as Williams 1992 argues, implicit equation of male intimacy with homosexuality coupled with widespread homophobia seems to have had a withering effect on male friendship while allowing female friendship to flourish.

[111] To follow the Aristotelian tripartite division, on which see Arist. *EN* 8,2–8,3 and Fraisse 1974, 217–226; Schollmeier 1994, 39–41; Konstan 1997, 72–78.

[112] For an anthropological study on the role of male friendship in propping up male hegemony, see Spain 1992.

libidinous military commander (4,6–8), all for the sake of Kleitophon.[113] Significantly, in performing such services, these characters are motivated more by their friendly feelings for the hero than by any regard for the heroine herself. When Polycharmos stumbles upon Callirhoe, he is in fact looking simply for a beautiful female captive to divert Chaireas' gloom (Chariton 8,1,6). By a fortunate turn of events he is able to benefit both the hero and the heroine, but his original purpose was to help his friend at the expense of his wife, who is imagined to have been lost forever. Hippothoos' attitude toward Anthia is anything but friendly until the very end, as he attempts to kill her twice (X. Eph. 2,13; 4,5–6) and rape her the third time they meet (5,9,12–13); only when he learns that she is his friend's wife does he make a 180 degree turn and begins to treat her with utmost respect. Menelaos declares that he performed the dangerous task of deceiving the *boukoloi* and staging the mock-death of Leukippe specifically for the sake of his male friend (Ach. Tat. 3,22,1). Later, when Menelaos is pretending to act as a middleman between the general and Leukippe, he does not disclose any of the dealings to her but is consulting only with Kleitophon (4,6; 4,8). The friends are represented in the narratives as having in mind primarily the interest of the male heroes, even when they happen to benefit the heroines.

All the services that the hero's friend performs, including the recovery of the heroine and the rescue of the hero himself, ultimately lead to the confirmation of the hero's position as a husband and a present or (in those cases where the hero's parents are still alive) future head of household protected and promised prosperity by the civil institutions of the *polis*. At times the friend, too, receives a similar reward; Polycharmos is given Chaireas' sister in marriage (Chariton 8,8,12), and Hippothoos is permitted to settle in Ephesus together with a legitimate heir (X. Eph. 5,15,4). Novelistic friendship allows its participants to recover and defend their birthright as elite males against the threats of the chaotic world. Such is the practice Hippothoos is engaged in, and his being Habrokomes' friend marks another significant enhancement of his masculinity.

---

[113] Interestingly Heliodorus, whose heroine Charikleia is sufficiently independent to be 'no piece of furniture to be passed from one owner to the next' (Haynes 2003, 67), lacks the *topos* of the hero's friend rescuing the heroine and bringing her back to the hero. With this novel it is rather the case that the hero's friend, Thyamis, brings the *hero* back to the *heroine* (Heliod. 6,3–7,8).

Redemption

From the destruction of his second band in X. Eph. 5,3 to the end of the novel, the conditions surrounding Hippothoos change dramatically. By the time these changes are completed, he is no longer an arch-bandit roaming the countryside, in the company of violent, desperate men and with nothing to expect but a short and brutish life ahead of him, but an inhabitant of a large and prestigious city, at the head of a household that consists of a good number of slaves and a legitimate heir, and about to enjoy peaceful years together with powerful local friends for the rest of his natural life. These changes can certainly be called an improvement as far as his material and social circumstances are concerned. His essential nature as an elite male,[114] on the other hand, remains the same. As I have shown above, even as a bandit he is depicted as a character endowed with the appropriately elite male drive to prove himself a man. It is simply that his surroundings change so that he may express his masculinity in a more socially acceptable manner. In these peripheral changes too however one can see Hippothoos' masculinity at work, and this is the subject I will cover in this section.

Alvares emphasizes Hippothoos' voluntary abandonment of banditry at the beginning of the transformative stage. In contrast with what happened at the destruction of his first band (2,13,4), this time Hippothoos throws away his weapons when fleeing from the battlefield (5,3,3), symbolizing his turning away from armed pursuits and the adoption of a more passive brand of masculinity favored in the novel. His travel to Sicily, a rich province (5,3), is not said to be motivated by a desire to found a new band and prey on the island's inhabitants, whereas his earlier journey to Cappadocia has been made with the explicit purpose of renewing his bandit activity with the help of this province's prospering economy (2,14,3; 3,1,2). Even though he suffers from abject poverty, he seems to have learned somehow that banditry is not a good way out of his troubles.[115] It may be that he has learned from the example of the patiently suffering Habrokomes, though such an explanation becomes less likely considering that this transformation on the part of Hippothoos is effected after the two friends have been separated for about 1/3 of

[114] Although use of such terms may appear essentialist, I am deliberately speaking here from the standpoint of the (non-postmodernist) culture, in which the *Ephesiaka* was conceived and consumed.

[115] See Alvares 1995, 402–403.

the whole (textual) bulk of the narrative, during which moreover he has been so successful a bandit.[116] A more straightforward explanation might be that Hippothoos' own narrow escape, repeated twice, has finally convinced him that the risks of the bandit career are too great. In any case, as is the case with a number of other crucial events in the novel, the motive behind the decision of Hippothoos not to start another criminal gang is not explained in the current text.[117]

But Hippothoos does not have to suffer for long, as a rich old woman falls in love with him and weds him. Hippothoos is said to go along with the arrangement specifically in order to escape poverty (5,9,1), rather than for any reciprocated erotic feelings. Older and richer women desiring young attractive males for marriage is a situation that appears elsewhere in the *Ephesiaka* (3,12,4) as well as in the novel of Achilles Tatius (5,11,5–6) and the *Erotikos* of Plutarch (749 D–E). This kind of arrangement is also comparable to that between Odysseus and Calypso, with the latter actively seeking the love of the male and helping her lover with her superior resources. In all of these cases, it is to be noted that the object of the active feminine *eros* is a properly gendered male within the framework of the narrative, and in this section of the *Ephesiaka*, too, Hippothoos' being at the receiving end of heterosexual desire may be taken as an enhancement of, rather than detraction from, his elite masculinity. The lack of genuine erotic feelings on Hippothoos' part may tend to the same direction as this bit of detail would assure the ancient reader that he does not possess any sexual preference for older women, a possible sign of gender deviance.[118]

The old woman quickly and conveniently dies, leaving Hippothoos an ample inheritance including much money, a crowd of slaves, a good wardrobe and an expensive set of furniture (5,9,1). He is now equipped with the economic means suitable for an elite urban male, though he still lacks a place

---

[116] The *Ephesiaka* currently stands at 5 books. Habrokomes and Hippothoos are separated towards the end of the third book (3,10,4) and do not reunite until near the end of the fifth book (5,13,2). This makes for about 24 Teubner pages out of a total of 71.
Hippothoos the arch-bandit is so successful that his band at one point of time has as many as 500 members (4,1,5), a number that compares favorably with some of the largest bandit groups reported in (quasi-)historical sources from the Roman period; cf. D.C. 72,4; 77,10; Herodianus 1,10. Menalaos' account in Ach. Tat. 3.24.1 that there are up to 10,000 *boukoloi* amassed against the army sounds overblown, but it may be based on the memory of the national/ethnic uprising of 171/2 reported in D.C. 71,4.

[117] For problems with motivation in the plot of the *Ephesiaka* see Schmeling 1980, 84–86.

[118] Cf. Martial 3,76 and Richlin 1992, 109–116.

of permanent residence and the necessary social resources, including a legitimate heir. The problem with residency is solved through his friendship with Habrokomes. After he brings Anthia back to the young hero, the entourage travel all together to Ephesus and Hippothoos, doubtless because of his long-standing relationship with the hero, decides to settle in the city and spend there the rest of his life (5,15,1; 5,15,4). This arrangement also guarantees that he is living in close proximity with, and under the protection of, the powerful families of the hero and the heroine.[119]

Finally, Hippothoos acquires a legitimate heir by adopting Kleisthenes, his new *eromenos*, as his son (5,15,4), an ingenious response to two common objections raised against pederasty in ancient discourses, namely the impermanence of the relationship and the inability of its participants to produce descendants biologically. As adoptive father and son, Hippothoos and Kleisthenes are now incorporated in an institutional grid that guarantees the permanence of their co-habitation,[120] even though the erotic component may be gone.[121] Hippothoos moreover now has an heir to inherit the resources he has brought together and continue to head the household he has founded. The author has noted earlier that Kleisthenes comes from an elite background himself (5,9,3), marking him as a suitable young male to eventually take the place of the equally elite Hippothoos. Hippothoos is now a citizen of affluent means, incorporated into the local elite network and a father of a young promising male. Like the hero, he too is fully granted the privileged status to which he has been entitled all along by his elite origins.

Conclusion

The novelistic hero, perpetually under the debilitating influence of heterosexual *eros* and shrinking from opportunities to exercise hegemony, may be a unique construct among the pantheon of ancient heroes.[122] The fantasy

---

[119] Cf. also the alliance between Polycharmos and Chaireas' powerful family cemented in Chariton 8,8,12–13.

[120] Cf. Perkins 1995, 72. In a possible modern parallel, in 1971 a Minnesota judge allowed a gay couple to legalize their relationship by letting one partner adopt the other after they had unsuccessfully petitioned for a marriage license; see Cloud 2004, 58 (I owe this reference to Dr. Michael Anderson (Yale U.)).

[121] See Konstan 1994, 39; Alvares 1995, 404.

[122] See Haynes 2003, 81–83; Konstan 1994, 15–26.

world of the novel however is not one in which this new hero alone is capable of defending his privileged status. Precisely because of his passivity, in fact, the hero typically requires the assistance of a male friend who is better equipped to surmount the numerous challenges posed by the dangerous and chaotic countryside. The male friend embodies an alternate masculinity which is nevertheless as elite and as narratively favored as that of the hero.

In other respects, the two masculinities present stark contrasts. The hero's friend may temporarily experience erotic desire for a woman, even the heroine herself, but otherwise he is either impervious to *eros* or is in love with a boy. In the latter case, the erotic role he takes on as the dominant pederast jealously guarding the immature *eromenos* radically differs from that of the hero who is engaged in a more symmetrical relationship with the heroine.[123] The friend also proves to be the more resourceful helper and guide to the hapless and frequently suicidal hero lost in the foreign countryside. He is so much more prepared to exercise hegemony, in fact, that he may come to command bandits, rather than falling victim to them.

One may search in vain for precedents for the passive masculinity of novelistic heroes, but this is not the case with their friends. The pederastic *erastes* is a familiar object of admiration in philosophical and historical discourse since classical times. The figure of the trustworthy young man ready to sacrifice his all for his friend is even older; the *Iliad* features Patroklos, to whom Chariton likens Polycharmos. Even the figure of the manly brigand, I would like to suggest, is not without a Homeric precedent; Thucydides and the scholiasts note that Odysseus, who starts his journey home by plundering settlements on his way, is nothing other than a brigand.[124]

The novel may have invented a new hero, but the polyphonic and omnivorous genre also evinces appreciation of other masculinities celebrated in the rich and diverse literary tradition which surrounds it and of which it is the culmination.[125] And of this receptiveness of the novel as regards alternate masculinities there is no better representative than Hippothoos, who is at once a pederast, bandit, friend – and something of a hero, too.[126]

---

[123] Cf. Konstan 1994, 26–30.

[124] See Th. 1,5; *Scholia ad Homeri Odysseam* 3,70–74; and cf. De Souza 1995, 180–181, 194 notes 14–18.

[125] See e.g. Selden 1994; Hägg 1983, 109–124.

[126] Cf. Schmeling 1980, 123: 'If the novel has a hero, it is Hippothoos.' Hippothoos may in fact fit the modern Western conception of the hero closer than most male characters of the novelistic corpus because of his remarkable transformation and development in the

Bibliography

Alston, R. 1999. 'The Revolt of the Boukoloi: Geography, History and Myth', in: K. Hopwood (ed.), *Organised Crime in Antiquity*, London and Oakville, CT: G. Duckworth, 129–153.

Alvares, J. 1995. 'The Drama of Hippothous in Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaka*', *CJ* 90.4, 393–404.

Anderson, G. (trans.) 1989. 'Xenophon of Ephesus: An Ephesian Tale', in: B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London: University of California Press, 128-169.

Aubin, M. 1998. 'Reversing Romance? The *Acts of Thecla* and the Ancient Novel', in: R.F. Hock, J.B. Chance, and J. Perkins (eds.), *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative*, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 257–272.

Bowersock, G.W. 1994. *Fiction as History: Nero to Julian,* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bowie, E.L. 1974. 'Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic', in: M.I. Finley (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Society*, London – Boston: Routledge and K. Paul, 166–209.

Bowie, E.L. 1977. 'The Novels and the Real World', in: B.P. Reardon (ed.), *Erotica Antiqua: Acta of the International Conference on the Ancient Novel*, Bangor, Wales: n.p., 91–99.

— 1996. 'The Ancient Readers of the Greek Novels', in: G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden – New York: E.J. Brill, 87–106.

Buffière, F. 1980. *Eros adolescent: la pédérastie dans la Grèce antique*, Paris: Belles Lettres.

Bürger, K. 1892. 'Zu Xenophon von Ephesus', *Hermes* 27, 36–67.

Butterworth, G.W. (ed. and trans.), 1919. *Clement of Alexandria*, London – New York: W. Heinemann and G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Clark, E.A. 1979. *Jerome, Chrysostom, and Friends: Essays and Translations*, New York – Toronto: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Cloud, J. 2004. 'The Battle over Gay Marriage', *Time* 163.7, 56-63.

Cohoon, J.W. and Crosby, H.L. (eds. and trans.), 1969. *Dio Chrysostom: Discourses 31–36*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Connell, R.W. 1995. *Masculinities*, Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Cooper, K. 1996. *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Dalmeyda, G. (ed. and trans.) 1926. '*Xénophon d'Éphèse: les Éphésiaques*', Paris: Budé.

De Boor, H. 1924. 'Eine griechische Romanstelle und ein nordischer Opferbrauch', in: *Festskrift tillägnad Hugo Pipping på hans sextioårsdag den 5 november 1924*, Helsingfors: Mercators tryckeri, 25–37.

De Souza, P. 1999. *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman World*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Dover, K. 1989. *Greek Homosexuality*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Effe, B. 1987. 'Der griechische Liebesroman und die Homoerotik', *Philologus* 131, 95–108.

Elsom, H.E. 1992. 'Callirhoe: Displaying the Phallic Woman', in: A. Richlin (ed.), *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*, New York: Oxford University Press, 212–230.

---

course of the narrative, which contrast with the static nature of the typical novelistic character; cf. Nimis 1999, 220.

Foucault, M. 1985. *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality, Volume Two* (Eng. Trans. Robert Hurley), New York: Vintage Books.

Foyster, E.A. 1999. *Manhood in Early Modern England: Honour, Sex and Marriage*, London – New York: Longman.

Fraisse, J.-C. 1974. *Philia : la notion d'amitié dans la philosophie antique: essai sur un problème perdu et retrouvé*, Paris: J. Vrin.

Gärtner, H. 1967. 'Xenophon von Ephesos', *RE* II 9.2, 2055–2089.

Gaselee, S. (ed. and trans.) 1934. *Achilles Tatius*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Graf, F. 1986. 'ΒΟΥΚΟΛΟΙ', *ZPE* 62, 43–44.

Gleason, M. 1990. 'The Semiotics of Gender: Physiognomy and Self-Fashioning', in: D. Halperin, J. Winkler, and F. Zeitlin (eds.), *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World Before Sexuality*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 399–402.

Gleason, M. 1995. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Goldhill, S. 1995. *Foucault's Virginity: Ancient Erotic Fiction and the History of Sexuality*, Cambridge, UK – New York: Cambridge University Press.

Goldhill, S. (ed.), 2001. *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic, and the Development of Empire*, Cambridge, UK – New York: Cambridge University Press.

Goold, J.P. (ed. and trans.) 1995. *Chariton Callirhoe*, Cambridge, MA – London: Harvard University Press.

Grünewald, T. 1999. *Räuber, Rebellen, Rivalen, Rächer: Studien zu Latrones im Römischen Reich*, Stuttgart: F. Steiner.

Hadley, D.M. (ed.) 1999. *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, London – New York: Longman.

Hägg, T. 1966. 'Die Ephesiaka des Xenophon Ephesios – Original oder Epitome?', *C&M* 27, 118–161.

— 1983. *The Novel in Antiquity*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hammond, J. and A. Jablow. 1987. 'Gilgamesh and the Sundance Kid: The Myth of Male Friendship', in: H. Brod (ed.), *The Making of Masculinities*, Boston: Allen and Unwin, 241-258.

Harrison, T. 1998 'Herodotus' Conception of Foreign Languages', *Histos* 2, <http://www.dur.ac.uk/Classics/histos/1998/harrison.html>.

Hatty, S.E. 2000. *Masculinities, Violence, and Culture*, Thousand Oaks – London – New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Haywood, C. and M. Mac an Ghaill 2003. *Men and Masculinities: Theory, Research and Social Practice*, Buckingham – Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Haynes, K. 2003. *Fashioning the Feminine in the Greek Novel*, London – New York: Routledge.

Helm, A. 1948. *Der Antike Roman*, Berlin: Wissenschaftliche Editionsgesellschaft.

Henrichs, A. 1970. 'Pagan Ritual and the Alleged Crimes of the Early Christians: A Reconsideration', in: P. Granfield and J.A. Jungmann (eds.), *Kyriakon. Festschrift Johannes Quasten*, Münster: Aschendorf, 18–35.

Herz, P. 1988. 'Latrocinium und Viehdiebstahl', in: I. Weiler (ed.), *Soziale Randgruppen und Aussenseiter im Altertum: Referate vom Symposion "Soziale Randgruppen und Antike Sozialpolitik"*, Graz: Leykam, 221–241.

Hijmans, B.L, R.T. van der Paardt, E.R. Smits, R.E.H. Westendorp Boerma, and A.G. Westerbrink (eds.), 1977. *Metamorphoses Book IV, 1–27: Text, Introduction and Commentary*, Groningen: Bouma.

Hobsbawm, E.J. 1969. *Bandits*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Hock, R.F. 1997. 'An Extraordinary Friend in Chariton's *Callirhoe*: The Importance of Friendship in the Greek Romances', in: J.T. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 145–162.

Hooff, A.J.L. van 1988. 'Ancient Robbers: Reflections Behind the Facts', *AncSoc* 19, 105–124.

Hopwood, K. 1998. '"All that may Become a Man": The Bandit in the Ancient Novel', in: L. Foxhall and J. Salmon (eds.), *When Men were Men: Masculinity, Power, and Identity in Classical Antiquity*, London – New York: Routledge, 195–204.

Johne, R. 1996. 'Women in the Ancient Novel', in: G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden – New York: E.J. Brill, 151–207.

Karras, R.M. 2000. 'Active/Passive, Acts/Passions: Greek and Roman Sexualities', *AHR* 105.4, 1250–1265.

Kimmel, M. 1996. *Manhood in America*, New York: Free Press.

Konstan, D. 1993. 'Friends and Lovers in Ancient Greece', *SyllClass* 4, 1–12.

— 1994. *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

— 1996. 'Greek Friendship', *AJP* 117, 71–94.

— 1997. *Friendship in the Classical World*, Cambridge – New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kuefler, M. 2001. *The Manly Eunuch: Masculinity, Gender Ambiguity, and Christian Ideology in Late Antiquity*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Locella, A.E. (ed. and trans.) 1796. *Xenophontis Ephesii de Anthia et Habrocome Ephesiacorum Libri V*, Vienna: Blumauer.

Maxwell-Stewart, P.G. 1972. 'Strato and the Musa Puerilis', *Hermes* 100, 215–240.

Messerschmidt, J.W. 1993. *Masculinities and Crime: Critique and Reconceptualization of Theory*, Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Messerschmidt, J.W. 2000. *Nine Lives: Adolescent Masculinities, the Body, and Violence.* Boulder: Westview Press.

Morgan, J.R. 1993. 'Make-Believe and Make Believe: The Fictionality of the Greek Novels', in: C. Gill and T.P. Wiseman (eds.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 175–223.

— 1995. 'The Greek Novel: Towards a Sociology of Production and Reception', in: A. Powell (ed.), *The Greek World*, London and New York: Routledge, 130–152.

Nimis, S. 1999 'The Sense of Open-Endedness in the Ancient Novel', *Arethusa* 32.2, 215-238.

Orville, J.P. d' (ed.) 1783. *ΧΑΡΙΤΩΝΟΣ Ἀφροδισιέως τῶν περὶ ΧΑΙΡΕΑΝ καὶ ΚΑΛΛΙΡΡΟΗΝ ΕΡΩΤΙΚΩΝ ΔΙΗΓΗΜΑΤΩΝ ΛΟΓΟΙ Η*, Leipzig: E.B. Schwickerti.

O'Sullivan, J.N. 1995. *Xenophon of Ephesus: His Compositional Technique and the Birth of the Novel*, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Papanikolaou, A.D. (ed.) 1973. *Xenophontis Ephesii Ephesiacorum Libri V: De Amoribus Anthiae et Abrocomae*, Leipzig: Teubner.

Percy, W.A. 1996. *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Perkins, J. 1995. *The Suffering Self : Pain and Narrative Representation in the Early Christian Era*, London – New York: Routledge.

Pervo, R.I. 1997. 'With Lucian: Who Needs Friends? Friendship in the *Toxaris*', in: J.T. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 163–180.

Pomeroy, A. 1992. 'Trimalchio as *Deliciae*', *Phoenix* 46, 45–53.

Price, A.W. 1989. *Love and Friendship in Plato and Aristotle*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Reardon, B.P. (ed.), 1989. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – London: University of California Press.

Reeve, M.D. 1976. Review of Papanikolaou 1973, *JHS* 96, 192–193.

Richardson, T.W. 1984. 'Homosexuality in the *Satyricon*', *C&M* 35, 105–127.

Richlin, A. 1992. *The Garden of Priapus*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Riess, W. 2001. 'Between Fiction and Reality: Robbers in Apuleius' Golden Ass', *Ancient Narrative* 1, 260–282.

Rife, J.L. 1999. *Death, Ritual and Memory in Greek Society During the Early and Middle Roman Empire*. U. Mich. dissertation.

Rife, J.L. 2002. 'Officials of the Roman Provinces in Xenophon's *Ephesiaca*', *ZPE* 138, 93–108.

Rives, J. 1995. 'Human Sacrifice among Pagans and Christians', *JRS* 85, 65–85.

Rohde, E. 1914. *Der Griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.

Ruiz-Montero, C. 1981. 'Jenofonte de Efeso: ¿ Ἀβροκόμης ο Ἀβροκόμης?', *Faventia* 3, 83–88.

— 1994. 'Xenophon von Ephesos: Ein Überblick', *ANRW* II 34.2, 1088–1138.

Rutherford, I. 2000. 'The Genealogy of the Boukoloi: How Greek Literature Appropriated an Egyptian Narrative-Motif', *JHS* 120, 106–121.

Saïd, S. 1994. 'The City in the Greek Novel', in: J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 216–236.

— 1999. 'Rural Society in the Greek Novel, or the Country Seen from the Town', in: S. Swain (ed.), *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, 81–107.

Scarcella, A. 1977. 'Les structures socio-économiques du roman de Xénophon de Éphèse', *REG* 90, 249–262.

— 1996. 'The Social and Economic Structures of the Ancient Novels', in: G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden and New York: E.J. Brill, 221–276.

Schmeling, G. 1980. *Xenophon of Ephesus*, Boston: Twayne Publishers.

Schollmeier, P. 1994. *Other Selves: Aristotle on Personal and Political Friendship*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

Selden, D.L. 1994. 'Genre of Genre', in: J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 39–64.

Shaw, B.D. 1984. 'Bandits in the Roman Empire', *P&P* 105, 3–52.

Spain, D. 1992. 'The Spatial Foundations of Men's Friendships and Men's Power', in: P.M. Nardi (ed.), *Men's Friendships*, Newbury Park, London – New Delhi: Sage Publications, 59–73.

Stählin, G. 1974. '┼φίλος, ┼φίλη, ┼ φιλία', in: G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament Vol. 9* (Eng. trans. G.W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 146–171.

Stephens, S.A. and J. Winkler (eds.), 1995. *Ancient Greek Novels: The Fragments*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Swain, S. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50–250*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

— (ed.) 1999. *Oxford Readings in the Greek Novel*, Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, R. 1997. 'Two Pathic Subcultures in Ancient Rome', *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 7.3, 319–371.

Treu, K. 1989. 'Der Realitätsgehalt des antiken Romans', in: H. Kuch (ed.), *Der Antike Roman: Untersuchungen zur literarischen Kommunikation und Gattungsgeschichte*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 107–125.

Veyne, P. 1987. 'The Roman Empire', in: P. Veyne (ed.), *A History of Private Life 1: From Pagan Rome to Byzantium* (Eng. trans. Arthur Goldhammer), Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 5–234.

Vilborg, E. 1962. *Achilles Tatius Leucippe and Clitophon: A Commentary. Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia XV*, Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.

Walktale, S. 1998. *Understanding Criminology: Current Theoretical Debates*, Buckingham – Bristol, PA: Open University Press.

Watanabe, A. 2003 *Hippothoos the Lover, Bandit, and Friend: A Study on Elite Masculinity in the Novel*, Yale U. dissertation.

Whitmarsh, T. 2001. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*, London – New York: Oxford University Press.

Wilhelm, F. 1902. 'Zu Achilles Tatius', *RhM* 57, 55–75.

Williams, C. 1999. *Roman Homosexuality*, Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press.

Williams, W.L. 1992. 'The Relationship Between Male-Male Friendship and Male-Female Marriage: American Indian and Asian Counterparts', in: P.M. Nardi (ed.), *Men's Friendships*, Newbury Park, London, and New Delhi: Sage Publications, 186–200.

Winkler, J. 1980. 'Lollianus and the Desperadoes', *JHS* 100, 155–181.

— 1982. 'The Mendacity of Kalasiris and the Narrative Strategy of Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*', *YCls* 25, 93–158.

— 1990. *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sex and Gender in Ancient Greece*, New York: Routledge.